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1.0 INTRODUCTION

The City of Poway (Lead Agency) is preparing the Poway Road Corridor Specific Plan (Specific Plan) to guide the long-term growth and development of the Poway Road Corridor Specific Plan planning area (project area). The Poway Road Specific Plan was originally adopted in May, 1996. The proposed Specific Plan represents a comprehensive amendment to the 1996 Poway Road Specific Plan.

The proposed Specific Plan constitutes a project that is subject to review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code, Division 13, Section 21000, et seq.), the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, Division 6, Chapter 3, Section 15000, et seq.). The lead agency prepared an Initial Study pursuant to the requirements of the CEQA Statutes and determined that the proposed project requires an Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

An EIR is a public document designed to provide decision makers and the public with an analysis of the environmental effects of a proposed project, to indicate possible ways to reduce or avoid environmental damage, and to identify alternatives to a project.

This EIR has been prepared to assess the short-term, long-term, and cumulative environmental impacts that could result from the long-term implementation of the proposed project. Furthermore, this EIR has been prepared in accordance with the CEQA statutes and was prepared by professional planning consultants under contract to the City of Poway, the lead agency for the preparation of this EIR, as defined by CEQA (Public Resources Code, Section 21067, as amended). The content of this document reflects the independent judgment of the City of Poway.

The controlling law is CEQA, which was originally enacted in 1970 and has been amended a number of times since then. The legislative intent of these regulations is established in Section 21000 of the California Public Resources Code:

The Legislature finds and declares as follows:

a) The maintenance of a quality environment for the people of this state now and in the future is a matter of statewide concern.

b) It is necessary to provide a high-quality environment that at all times is healthful and pleasing to the senses and intellect of man.

c) There is a need to understand the relationship between the maintenance of high-quality ecological systems and the general welfare of the people of the state, including their enjoyment of the natural resources of the state.

d) The capacity of the environment is limited, and it is the intent of the Legislature that the government of the state take immediate steps to identify any critical thresholds for the health and safety of the people of the state and take all coordinated actions necessary to prevent such thresholds being reached.

e) Every citizen has a responsibility to contribute to the preservation and enhancement of the environment.

f) The interrelationship of policies and practices in the management of natural resources and waste disposal requires systematic and concerted efforts by public and private interests to enhance environmental quality and to control environmental pollution.

g) It is the intent of the Legislature that all agencies of the state government which regulate activities of private individuals, corporations, and public agencies which are found to affect the quality of the
environment, shall regulate such activities so that major consideration is given to preventing
environmental damage, while providing a decent home and satisfying living environment for every
Californian.

Furthermore, Section 21001 states that the Legislature further finds and declares that it is policy of the State to:

a) Develop and maintain a high-quality environment now and in the future, and take all action necessary to
protect, rehabilitate, and enhance the environmental quality of the state.

b) Take all action necessary to provide the people of the state with clean air and water, enjoyment of
aesthetic, natural, scenic, and historic environmental qualities, and freedom from excessive noise.

c) Prevent the elimination of fish or wildlife species due to man’s activities, ensure that fish and wildlife
populations do not drop below self-perpetuating levels, and preserve for future generations
representations of all plant and animal communities and examples of major periods of California history.

d) Ensure that the long-term protection of the environment, consistent with the provision of a decent home
and suitable living environment for every Californian, shall be the guiding criterion in public decisions.

e) Create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony to fulfill
the social and economic requirements of present and future generations.

f) Require governmental agencies at all levels to develop standards and procedures necessary to protect
environmental quality.

g) Require governmental agencies at all levels to consider qualitative factors as well as economic and
technical factors and long-term benefits and costs, in addition to short-term benefits and costs and to
consider alternatives to proposed actions affecting the environment.

A concise statement of legislative policy, with respect to public agency consideration of projects for some form of
approval, is found in Section 21002 of the Public Resources Code, quoted below.

The Legislature finds and declares that it is the policy of the state that public agencies should not approve
projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would
substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects, and that the procedures required
by this division are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects
of proposed projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or
substantially lessen such significant effects. The Legislature further finds and declares that in the event
specific economic, social, or other conditions make infeasible such project alternatives or such mitigation
measures, individual project may be approved in spite of one or more significant effects thereof.

This EIR was prepared in accordance with the applicable CEQA Statutes.

Type and Purpose of EIR

The purpose of an EIR, under the provisions of CEQA, is “to identify the significant effects on the environment of a
project, to identify alternatives to the project, and to indicate the manner in which those significant effects can be
mitigated or avoided.” (Public Resources Code Section 21002.1[a]) The previously certified Program EIR for the
General Plan update provided information to public agencies, the general public, and decision makers regarding
potential environmental impacts and recommended mitigation measures related to the adoption and long-term
implementation of the City of Poway General Plan.
1.0 INTRODUCTION

The previously certified General Plan EIR is a Program EIR under the provisions of Section 15168 of the State CEQA Guidelines. According to Section 15168, a Program EIR may be prepared on a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project and which are related geographically or represent logical parts in the chain of contemplated actions in connection with issuance of rules, regulations, or plans. The Program EIR allows for a more exhaustive consideration of effects and alternatives than would be practical in EIRs on separate individual actions. A Program EIR allows for consideration of cumulative impacts that might not be fully considered on a case-by-case basis.

The proposed Specific Plan is a long-term planning program to guide growth and development within the project area. It is intended to communicate the City’s vision of the future for the project area and to establish design guidelines and policy framework. It would govern decision-making concerning the physical development of the project area including assurances that the community at large would be supported by an adequate range of public services and infrastructure systems.

The Specific Plan would not authorize any specific development project or other form of land use approval or any kind of public facilities or capital facilities expenditures or improvements. As such, a Program EIR is the appropriate type of document to identify the geographic extent of sensitive resources and hazards, along with existing and planned services and infrastructure support systems that occur in the project area. Further, the Program EIR is described in Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines as the appropriate analytical framework to assess the cumulative environmental effects of the full plan, in a first-tier level of analysis, to identify broad concerns and sets of impacts, and to define/develop regulatory standards and programmatic procedures that reduce impacts and help achieve environmental goals and objectives.

Later activities proposed pursuant to the Specific Plan would be reviewed in light of this EIR and may focus on those site-specific and localized environmental issues that could not be examined in sufficient detail as part of this EIR. If a subsequent project or later activity would have effects that were not examined in the certified Program EIR, or not examined at an appropriate level of detail to be used for the later activity, an Initial Study would need to be prepared, leading to a Negative Declaration or an EIR. If the Lead Agency (the City of Poway) finds that, pursuant to Section 15152 (Tiering) of the CEQA Guidelines, no new effects could occur or no new mitigation measures would be required on a subsequent project, the Lead Agency can approve the activity as being within the scope of the project covered by a certified Program EIR, and no new environmental documentation would be required.

Section 15152 of the CEQA Guidelines indicates that tiering is appropriate when the sequence of analysis is from an EIR prepared for a general plan, policy, or program to an EIR or Negative Declaration for another plan, policy, or program of lesser scope, or to a site-specific EIR or Negative Declaration. The General Plan EIR provides a first-tier analysis of the environmental effects of the Poway Road Corridor Specific Plan Amendment. This EIR is the second-tier analysis.

This EIR serves as an information document for use by public agencies, the general public, and decision makers. This EIR is not a City of Poway policy document. It does, however, discuss the impacts of development pursuant to the Poway Road Corridor Specific Plan Amendment, and analyzes project alternatives. This Program EIR will be used by the City of Poway City Council in assessing impacts prior to adoption of the Specific Plan.

Case Law Regarding the Purpose of an EIR

In addition to the policies declared by the Legislature concerning environmental protection and administration of CEQA in Sections 21000, 21001, 21002, and 21002.1 of the Public Resources Code, the courts of the State have declared the following policies to be implicit in CEQA:
The EIR requirement is the heart of CEQA. (County of Inyo v. Yorty, 32 Cal. App. 3d 795.)

The EIR serves not only to protect the environment but also to demonstrate to the public that it is being protected. (County of Inyo v. Yorty, 32 Cal. App. 3d 795.)

The EIR is to inform other governmental agencies and the public generally of the environmental impact of a proposed project. (No Oil, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles, 13 Cal. 3d 68.)

The EIR is to demonstrate to an apprehensive citizenry that the agency has, in fact, analyzed and considered the ecological implications of its action. (People ex rel. Department of Public Works v. Bosio, 47 Cal. App. 3d 495.)

The EIR process will enable the public to determine the environmental and economic values of their elected and appointed officials thus allowing for appropriate action come election day should a majority of the voters disagree. (People v. County of Kern, 39 Cal. App. 3d 830.)

CEQA was intended to be interpreted in such manner as to afford the fullest possible protection to the environment within the reasonable scope of the statutory language. (Friends of Mammoth v. Board of Supervisors, 8 Cal. 3d 247.)

The purpose of CEQA is not to generate paper, but to compel government at all levels to make decisions with environmental consequences in mind. (Bozung v. LAFCO (1975) 13 Cal.3d 263)

The lead agency must consider the whole of an action, not simply its constituent parts, when determining whether it will have a significant environmental effect. (Citizens Assoc. For Sensible Development of Bishop Area v. County of Inyo (1985) 172 Cal.App.3d 151)

CEQA does not require technical perfection in an EIR, but rather adequacy, completeness, and a good-faith effort at full disclosure. A court does not pass upon the correctness of an EIR's environmental conclusions, but only determines if the EIR is sufficient as an informational document. (Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford (1990) 221 Cal.App.3d 692)

CEQA requires that decisions be informed and balanced. It must not be subverted into an instrument for the oppression and delay of social, economic, or recreational development or advancement. (Laurel Heights Improvement Assoc. v. Regents of U.C. (1993) 6 Cal.4th 1112 and Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553)

CEQA does not require evaluation of impacts to a project but is concerned with the impacts created by a project, except in limited cases where an existing condition may be exacerbated and in certain situations involving schools or housing. (California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (2015) 62 Cal.D 369)

A lead agency has discretion to omit existing conditions analyses by substituting a baseline consisting of environmental conditions projected to exist solely in the future when use of existing conditions would result in a misleading or informationally valueless analysis of project impacts (Neighbors for Smart Rail v. Exposition Metro Line Construction Authority (2013) 57 Cal.4D 439)

Organization of the EIR

The EIR is divided into two volumes. Volume 1 contains the primary analysis of potential environmental impacts discussed in the following nine sections:
Section 1 Introduction
Section 2 Executive Summary
Section 3 Project Description
Section 4 Environmental Impact Analysis
Section 5 Alternatives
Section 6 Analysis of Long-Term Effects
Section 7 Effects Found Not to be Significant
Section 8 Preparation Team
Section 9 References

Volume 2 includes the EIR appendices, including documentation of the scoping process and Notice of Preparation (NOP). The appendices include:

Appendix A: Scoping Documents
Appendix B: Initial Study
Appendix C: Cultural Resources Assessment
Appendix D: Complete Streets Report
Appendix E: CalEEMod Output Data
Appendix F: Noise Output Data
Appendix G: Biological Resources Assessment

In compliance with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6, a mitigation monitoring reporting program (MMRP) will be prepared as a separately bound document that will be adopted in conjunction with the certification of the Final EIR. The MMRP, responses to public comments, any revisions to the Draft EIR, and findings will be identified as Volume 3.

Approach to EIR Analysis
The approach to the analysis presented in this EIR is programmatic in nature given the geographic scope and timeframe of the proposed Specific Plan. Each environmental issue is analyzed in the same manner, starting with a discussion of the existing environmental setting, including physical conditions and pertinent planning and regulatory framework. Thresholds of significance are then defined and are used to measure the proposed Specific Plan’s potential impact to the environment. Thresholds of significance are based on a broad list of questions and impact topics set forth in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines. The impact analysis and cumulative impact sections examine potential environmental impacts for future development within the project area and the consideration of those impacts over the long term development of the project area, respectively and to the extent possible. Utilizing the exemption and streamlining tools provided by CEQA, future development proposals within the project area may not require additional environmental review assuming the future proposed project is consistent with the Specific Plan.

Existing Development
The project area is generally built, supporting primarily commercial and institutional uses and a few residential projects. It is anticipated that over the life of the Specific Plan approximately 60.27 acres would not be redeveloped. Continued operation of existing development is not subject to CEQA review as it constitutes the baseline conditions and could not result in physical changes to the environment.

Categorical Exemptions
The City estimates that approximately 174.7 acres of the project area could be redeveloped over the life of the Specific Plan. Minor changes to existing facilities, replacement or reconstruction of existing structures and facilities,
new construction or conversion of small structures, and infill development would likely occur. These types of activities and others are categorically exempt from environmental review pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15300 et seq. The City would evaluate future development and use proposals within the project area to determine if they are exempt from CEQA review. Exempt projects would require no additional environmental review and a Notice of Exemption would be filed upon approval of the project. Common exemptions that would be applicable to future projects in the project area are listed herein. However, this list is not exhaustive.

**Housing Exemptions**

CEQA provides exemptions for affordable housing projects and residential infill projects pursuant to Guidelines Section 15194 and 15195, respectively. Any residential projects meeting the requirements of these sections would be exempt from future environmental review and the City would file a Notice of Exemption upon approval of the project.

**Residential Project Pursuant to a Specific Plan**

Those residential projects that do not meet the affordable or infill housing exemptions identified above would be eligible for a special exemption pursuant to Guidelines Section 15182. Any residential development that is consistent with an adopted Specific Plan is exempt from further environmental analysis and would have a Notice of Exemption filed upon approval. Considering Guidelines Sections 15182, 15194, and 15495, all consistent residential development proposed in the project area would not require any additional environmental review.

**Streamlining for Infill Projects**

CEQA provides for the streamlined environmental review of infill projects pursuant to Guidelines Section 15183.3. Infill projects must comply with the performance standards identified in Appendix M of the Guidelines and be consistent with the land use designation and zoning requirements for the project site. This option of streamlined environmental review would be applied primarily to non-residential development, considering that residential development would be exempt from further environmental review. Projects that meet the performance standards of Appendix M and do not result in any new environmental impacts would require no further environmental review.

**Program- and Project-Level Analysis**

For those projects that would not qualify for exemptions or streamlining, some level of future environmental review would be required. This EIR is a Program EIR as defined in the Guidelines Section 15168. Section 15168 et seq. of the State CEQA Guidelines describes a Program EIR as “… an EIR which may be prepared on a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project and are related … as logical parts in the chain of contemplated actions … [where] subsequent activities in the program must be examined in the light of the program EIR to determine whether an additional environmental document must be prepared.” Analysis of the Specific Plan at the program level was conducted as described in Section 15146(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines.

An EIR on a project such as the adoption of amendment of a comprehensive zoning ordinance or local general plan should focus on the secondary effects that can be expected to follow from the adoption, or amendment, but the EIR need not be detailed as an EIR on the specific construction projects that might follow.

Those environmental issues that can be examined in enough detail at the program level would allow for tiering in the future environmental review of projects in the project area. Those environmental issues that cannot be evaluated at the program level would need to be evaluated on a project-by-project basis.

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

The greenhouse gas emissions analysis and supporting technical data in this EIR meets the requirements of Guidelines Section 15183.5 allowing for the tiering and streamlining of greenhouse gas emissions analysis in future projects within the project area.
Scoping and Public Review

Scoping Meeting
A scoping meeting was held on March 22, 2017 to receive agency and public input of the content of this EIR. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15082 (c) and 15083, the scoping meeting helps to consult directly with agencies and the community regarding concerns related to the environmental effects of the proposed project. Over 4,000 notices were sent to property owners, tenants, and businesses within 500 feet of the project boundary regarding the scoping meeting. Seven individuals attended the meeting, and five commented on the project at this scoping meeting. Notes were taken to record attendee questions and comments. Table 1-1 (Scoping Meeting Comments) summarizes the comments received at the meeting.

Notice of Preparation
To define the scope of the investigation of this EIR, the City of Poway distributed a Notice of Preparation (NOP) on March 13, 2017 to city, county, and State agencies; other public agencies; and interested private organizations and individuals (attached as Appendix A). The purpose of the NOP was to identify agency and public concerns regarding potential impacts of the proposed project and to request suggestions concerning ways to avoid significant impacts (Section 15082, CEQA Guidelines).

An Initial Study was prepared pursuant to Section 15063 of the State CEQA Guidelines that sets forth the required contents of an Initial Study (see Appendix B). Those requirements include a description of the proposed project, including the location of the proposed project, identification of the environmental setting, identification of environmental effects by use of a checklist, matrix, or other methods, provided that entries, a discussion of ways to mitigate significant effects identified, if any, an examination of whether the proposed project is compatible with existing zoning, plans, and other applicable land use controls, and the name(s) of the person(s) who prepared or participated in the preparation of the Initial Study.

The Initial Study was used as a screening tool to identify potentially significant impacts to be analyzed in the EIR. Any impacts found to be less than significant or non-existent need not be analyzed in the EIR. The Initial Study was made available with the NOP to provide the rationale for those topics to be analyzed in or excluded from the EIR. Fifteen electronic copies of the Initial Study were submitted to the State Clearinghouse on March 13, 2017 for distribution to state agencies. Copies of written comments received during the public review period for the NOP are included in Appendix A of this EIR. Six comment letters were submitted in response to the NOP and have been summarized in Table 1-2 (NOP Comments).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Topic</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Views, Design Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population and Housing</td>
<td>Increase in residential units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Allowable land uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Traffic</td>
<td>Traffic, future improvements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1-2
NOP COMMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native American Heritage Commission</td>
<td>The NAHC states that the project may be subject to AB 52 and SB 18 consultation and includes brief summaries of portion of AB 52 and SB 18 as well as NAHC recommendations for preparation of cultural resource assessments and mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego Planning Department</td>
<td>The City of San Diego provides comments related to the assessment of impacts to transportation facilities in the City of San Diego, the watershed, and storm drainage facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway Unified School District</td>
<td>The Poway USD provides an estimated build out student population and projected enrollment at Poway schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Department of Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td>The CDFW provides comments and recommendations to assist the City in adequately identifying and/or mitigating the project’s impacts on fish and wildlife resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Archaeological Society, Inc.</td>
<td>The San Diego County Archaeological Society requests to be placed on the EIR distribution list for public review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Association of Governments</td>
<td>SANDAG provides a list of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures to consider and a list of resources for additional information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notice of Completion and Public Review of the Draft EIR

Pursuant to Section 15085 of the State CEQA Guidelines, a Notice of Completion (NOC) has been filed with the State Office of Planning and Research (OPR) on or about August 25, 2017, initiating a 45-day public review period for the Draft EIR (DEIR). Printed copies of the DEIR have been made available at the City of Poway Community Development Department and main library at 13137 Poway Road. Electronic copies of the DEIR have been sent to OPR, responsible agencies, local agencies, and concerned agencies and individuals, as requested.

Response to Comments on DEIR

Comments from all agencies and individuals are invited regarding the information contained in the DEIR. Such comments should explain any perceived deficiencies in the assessment of impacts and identify the information that is purportedly lacking in the DEIR or indicate where the information may be found. All comments on the DEIR are to be submitted to:

Joseph Lim, City Planner  
City of Poway  
Planning Division  
13325 Civic Center Drive  
Poway, California 92064  
jlim@poway.org

Following a 45-day period of circulation and review of the DEIR, all comments and the responses to the comments shall be incorporated into a Final EIR prior to certification of the document by the City of Poway.
Availability of EIR Materials

All materials related to the preparation of this EIR are available for public review at the following locations:

- City of Poway
  - Planning Division
  - 13325 Civic Center Drive
  - Poway, California 92064

- San Diego County Library
  - Poway Branch Library
  - 13137 Poway Road
  - Poway, CA 92064

Citation

Preparation of this EIR relied on information from many sources including the appendix materials previously listed and numerous other references. Pursuant to Section 15148 of the State CEQA Guidelines, citations from the appendix materials and other sources are provided throughout the EIR. Citations listed in Section 9.0 References, at the end of this EIR. Resources are referenced in the following manner:

**Government Resources**


**State Laws**

“Title of Act/Bill” (AB/SB #, Approval Date), Code Reference, P. ##.

**Books and Technical Reports**

Author. Agency. Department. Document Title. Publication Date

**Internet Resources**

Author. Agency. Department. Webpage Title, Access Date. Web Address

**Persons Consulted**

Name. Agency. Department. “Personal Communication”. Date Consulted
This page is purposely blank.
2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Project Summary
The Poway Road Corridor Specific Plan identifies the long-term vision and objectives for land use development and public improvements along a 2.65-mile portion of Poway Road between Oak Knoll Road and Garden Road in the City of Poway. The City originally adopted The Poway Road Specific Plan in 1996. The proposed Specific Plan amendment would establish new zoning districts and district boundaries, as well as updated site planning, building, parking, architectural, and open space standards and guidelines for development within the Specific Plan planning area. The proposed Specific Plan amendment would provide new development standards and incentives to encourage reuse and reinvestment, particularly with regard to underutilized commercial and vacant properties. Also, the Specific Plan amendment would provide for public right-of-way improvements to better accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists.

The Specific Plan planning area encompasses 235 acres and includes land use designations/zoning districts supporting mixed-use, commercial office, general commercial, automotive, town center, and open space uses. To help guide new development within the Specific Plan planning area, the City has identified eight Opportunity Areas. These are key sites where private reinvestment and redevelopment activity are anticipated and encouraged. Within the remaining portion of the Specific Plan area, new development is not anticipated due to the fact that existing uses are relatively new or well maintained. Table 2-1 (Development Potential) summarizes the estimated development potential within the Specific Plan planning area. The City estimates a potential for approximately 260,000 square feet of net new commercial development and 1,148 net new dwelling units. The maximum build out potential includes consideration of an incentive-based bonus system in specific districts to encourage lot consolidation and provision of community benefits. Qualifying community benefits include public open space, mid-block passageway, public right-of-way improvement fund contribution, creation of a neighborhood restaurant row, public art, and enhanced transportation demand management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity Area</th>
<th>Proposed Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Non-Residential SF</th>
<th>Dwelling Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Proposed</td>
<td>Existing Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Commercial General</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>162,054</td>
<td>267,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>196,250</td>
<td>82,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Commercial Office</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>239,914</td>
<td>331,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>491,991</td>
<td>549,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Commercial General</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>117,480</td>
<td>130,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>130,948</td>
<td>136,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>144,056</td>
<td>151,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Automotive/Commercial General</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>267,216</td>
<td>361,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal Opportunity Area</td>
<td>174.7</td>
<td>1,749,909</td>
<td>2,010,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Change Area</td>
<td>60.27</td>
<td>681,900</td>
<td>681,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Area</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>2,432,000</td>
<td>2,692,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net Development Potential</td>
<td></td>
<td>+260,000</td>
<td>+1,148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Location
The Specific Plan planning area is located along Poway Road between Oak Knoll Road and Garden Road in the City of Poway, San Diego County, California (see Exhibit 3-1, Regional Context and Vicinity Map).

Environmental Setting
The City of Poway is located in San Diego County, approximately 18 miles northeast of Downtown San Diego. Within the Specific Plan planning area, Poway Road is an east/west roadway that connects to Interstate 15 (I-15) approximately two miles to the west and Highway 67 approximately three miles to the east.

The Specific Plan planning area encompasses 235 acres and is generally occupied by retail commercial, low-scale office, restaurant, and auto sales and related uses. Commercial uses cover 72.6 percent of the total acreage and are distributed along the Poway Road corridor both in multi-tenant centers and as stand-alone buildings. Office uses occupy approximately 20 percent of the commercial uses, and automobile sales and service establishments make up approximately 17 percent.

Approximately 11 percent of the acreage supports multi-family residential development between Pomerado Road and Community Road.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Conflict with or obstruct applicable air quality plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criteria Pollutants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cumulative Air Quality Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sensitive Receptors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Candidate or Sensitive Species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riparian Habitat or Sensitive Natural Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wetlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Migratory Species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Policies or Ordinances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Habitat Conservation Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Historic Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeological Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paleontological Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tribal Cultural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Hazardous Materials Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wildland Fire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Industrial uses such as warehousing, self-storage facilities, and auto repair garages represent just under seven percent of land use, largely clustered at the east end of the Specific Plan planning area.

Approximately three percent of the Specific Plan planning area is devoted to community and civic uses, including the library, civic center, Sheriff’s office, and park space. The remaining two percent of land consists of vacant parcels.

The Specific Plan planning area is primarily surrounded by multiple-family and single-family residential development. Poway City Hall is located south of the Specific Plan planning area boundary on Civic Center Drive.

Environmental Impacts

The preliminary analysis of the project in the project Initial Study (see Appendix B) identified the potentially significant environmental effects associated with the adoption and long-term implementation of the Specific Plan, as indicated in Table 2-2.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15128 requires a statement indicating the reason that various potential impacts are determined not to be significant and therefore are not addressed in the EIR. The Notice of Preparation (NOP) was sent to agencies on the City’s standard distribution list on March 13, 2017. The public comment period on the NOP ran from March 13, 2017 to April 12, 2017. The Initial Study prepared for the project determined that the impacts listed below would not occur or would be less than significant; therefore, these topics have not been analyzed in this EIR. Refer to Appendix B (Initial Study) for explanations for these conclusions.

Aesthetics
- Scenic Vista – Less than Significant Impact
- Scenic Resources – No Impact
- Visual Character – Less than Significant Impact
- Light and Glare – Less than Significant Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</td>
<td>Water Quality*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groundwater Supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Storm Drainage Capacity*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100-Year Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use &amp; Planning</td>
<td>Habitat Conservation Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Noise Level Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vibration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ambient Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary and Periodic Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population &amp; Housing</td>
<td>Induce Population Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation &amp; Traffic</td>
<td>Measure of Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congestion Management Program Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities and Service</td>
<td>Wastewater Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water and Wastewater Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water Supply</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Issue was screened out by the Initial Study but has been included in EIR analysis to address NOP comment by City of San Diego.
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Agricultural and Forest Resources
- Farmland Mapping and Monitoring – No Impact
- Agricultural Use/Williamson Act – No Impact
- Timberland – No Impact
- Loss or conversion of forest land – No Impact
- Conversion of farmland or forestland – No Impact

Air Quality
- Odors – No Impact

Cultural Resources
- Human Remains – Less than Significant Impact

Geology and Soils
- Fault Rupture – Less than Significant Impact
- Seismic Ground Shaking – Less than Significant Impact
- Seismic-related Ground Failure – Less than Significant Impact
- Landslides – No Impact
- Soil Erosion/Loss of Topsoil – Less than Significant Impact
- Unstable Geologic Unit or Soil – Less than Significant Impact
- Expansive Soil – Less than Significant Impact
- Septic Tanks – No Impact

Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Release of Hazardous Materials – Less than Significant Impact
- Hazardous Emissions within ¼-mile of School – Less than Significant Impact
- Airport Planning – No Impact
- Private Airstrip – No Impact
- Emergency Planning – No Impact

Hydrology and Water Quality
- Water Quality Standards – Less than Significant Impact*
- Drainage Patterns – No Impact
- Runoff – No Impact*
- Degrade Water Quality – No Impact
- Failure of Levee or Dam – No Impact
- Inundation by Seiche, Tsunami, Mudflow – No Impact

Land Use and Planning
- Division of Communities – No Impact
- Conflicts with Applicable Plan, Policy, or Regulation – Less than Significant Impact

Mineral Resources
- Availability of Mineral Known Mineral Resource – No Impact
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- Locally Important Resource Recovery Site – No Impact

Noise
- Airport Noise – No Impact
- Private Airstrip – No Impact

Population and Housing
- Displacement of Housing – No Impact
- Displacement of People – No Impact

Public Services
- Fire Protection – Less than Significant Impact
- Police Protection – Less than Significant Impact
- Schools – Less than Significant Impact
- Parks – Less than Significant Impact
- Other Public Facilities – Less than Significant Impact

Recreation
- Deterioration of Existing Facilities – Less than Significant Impact
- Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities – Less than Significant Impact

Transportation and Traffic
- Air Traffic Patterns – No Impact
- Hazardous Design Features – No Impact
- Emergency Access – Less than Significant Impact
- Alternative Transportation – Less than Significant

Utilities and Service Systems
- Storm Water Drainage – No Impact
- Landfill Capacity – Less than Significant Impact
- Solid Waste Regulation – Less than Significant Impact

ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED
Pursuant to Section 15123(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR summary must identify “Issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate the significant effects.” This EIR identifies and resolves issues related to project alternatives in Section 5. Potentially significant impacts are identified in the analysis provided in Section 4 and mitigation is considered for all impacts.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT
CEQA requires that an EIR examine alternatives to the project that are capable of reducing or eliminating environmental impacts. The alternatives examined in Section 5 are:

Alternative 1: No Project
Alternative 2: Couplet Plan
Alternative 3: Alternative Locations
Alternative 4: Reduced Development Potential
Alternative 5: No Residential Development

The five alternatives were screened for consistency with the objectives of the project and the ability to avoid one or more significant impacts associated with the project. Alternative 1 is considered to be the environmentally superior alternative because it would result in the fewest environmental impacts compared to the project. However, pursuant to Section 15126.6(e) (2) of the State CEQA Guidelines, when the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project alternative, another environmentally superior alternative must be selected among the remaining alternatives. Based on this provision, Alternative 4 is the environmentally superior alternative because it would result in fewer environmental impacts compared to the project.

### TABLE 2-4
**SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Long-term cumulative air quality impacts on the region due to implementation of the Specific Plan would remain potentially significant and unavoidable; project-related emissions would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to those impacts despite the adoption of mitigation measures.</td>
<td>None available to reduce or avoid impacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2-5
**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Mitigation measures have been incorporated into the project to minimize impacts. The project would not result in adverse cumulative impacts to biological resources with mitigation incorporation.</td>
<td>BIO-1 To avoid impacts to nesting birds and violation of State and federal laws pertaining to birds, on properties where mature trees are present, all construction-related activities (including but not limited to mobilization and staging, clearing, grubbing, vegetation removal, fence installation, demolition, and grading) should occur outside the avian nesting season (generally prior to February 1 or after August 31). If construction and construction noise occurs within the avian nesting season (from February 1 to August 31 or according to local requirements), all suitable habitats located within the project’s area of disturbance including staging and storage areas plus a 250-foot (passerines) and 1,000-foot (raptor nests) buffer around these areas shall be thoroughly surveyed, as feasible, for the presence of active nests by a qualified biologist no more than five days before commencement of any site disturbance activities and equipment mobilization. If project activities are delayed by more than five days, an additional nesting bird survey shall be performed. Active nesting is present if a bird is sitting in a nest, a nest has...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2-5
**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIO-2</td>
<td>If pre-construction nesting bird surveys result in the location of active nests, no site disturbance and mobilization of heavy equipment (including but not limited to equipment staging, fence installation, clearing, grubbing, vegetation removal, fence installation, demolition, and grading), shall take place within 250 feet of non-raptor nests and 1,000 feet of raptor nests, or as determined by a qualified biologist in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, until the chicks have fledged. Monitoring shall be required to insure compliance with the MBTA and relevant California Fish and Game Code requirements. Monitoring dates and findings shall be documented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| BIO-3                                            | For development projects involving the removal of mature trees and existing buildings, a preconstruction survey for maternity (March 1 to August 1) or colony bat roosts (year-round) shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within seven days prior to activities that remove trees or structures. If an occupied maternity or colony roost is detected, CDFW shall be contacted about how to proceed. Typically, a buffer exclusion zone would be established around each occupied roost until bat activities have ceased. The size of the buffer would take into account:  
  - Proximity and noise level of project activities  
  - Distance and amount of vegetation or screening between the roost and construction activities  
  - Species-specific needs, if known, such as sensitivity to disturbance  
  Due to restrictions of the California Health Department, direct contact by workers with any bat is not allowed. The qualified bat biologist |
### TABLE 2-5
**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>shall be contacted immediately if a bat roost is discovered during project construction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|        |         | **BIO-4**
Prior to construction in areas within or near wetlands, creeks, or riparian habitat, a qualified wetland scientist shall perform a wetland delineation sufficient to determine the extent of Waters of the U.S., Waters of the State, and stream and riparian habitat potentially jurisdictional under Section 404/401 of the Clean Water Act, Porter-Cologne Act, and Section 1600 of the California Fish and Game Code. |
|        |         | **BIO-5**
A setback buffer of at least 50 feet shall be implemented between development (e.g., parking lots, commercial uses) and riparian/creek habitat. Redevelopment of existing commercial uses shall incorporate a reduction of paved surfaces (e.g., parking lots) within 50 feet of creek/riparian habitat, to the extent feasible (CDFW 2017c). |
| Cultural Resources | No site within the Specific Plan planning area is listed as a California Historical Landmark, California Historical Resource, or the National Register of Historic Place. Should one of these building be reclassified with a historical designation in the future, Mitigation Measures have specifically been identified to ensure that proper steps are taken should a potential historic structure be proposed for demolition or substantial alteration. All future projects within the Specific Plan planning area would be subject to mitigation. These mitigation measures would ensure that historic resources and the knowledge and significance they hold are not lost to future development. Cumulative impacts related to the loss of historic resources would be less than significant. | **CULT-1**
Adhere to the Secretary of the Interior’s Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings. Prior to the demolition, removal, or alteration of a structure that is more than 45 years old, a qualified professional architectural historian shall make a recommendation to the City as to whether the project fully adheres to the Secretary of Interior’s Standards and any specific modifications to do so. |
|        |         | **CULT-2**
Incorporate identified existing historical resources into the proposed new site design. Prior to the demolition, removal, or alteration of a structure identified as or that qualifies for listing as a historical resource, project applicants shall evaluate the potential for incorporation of a portion of the resource into the proposed site design. Applicants shall retain a professional historic architect who meets the qualifications set forth by the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications and Standards to incorporate a
TABLE 2-5
LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Specific Plan planning area is built out and has been previously disturbed and heavily affected by past uses, specifically construction of structures and associated improvements. Mitigation Measures have been incorporated to ensure that proper steps are taken should potential archaeological and/or tribal materials be uncovered. All future projects would be subject to General Plan policies and mitigation related to archaeological resources. This would ensure that archaeological resources are not lost to long-term development. Cumulative impacts related to the loss of archaeological and tribal cultural resources would be less than significant with implementation of existing regulations and mitigation.</td>
<td>CULT-3 Document any identified historic resource prior to the demolition, removal, or alteration that would cause a loss of integrity and/or loss of continued eligibility. This documentation shall be completed by project applicants, and the documentation shall adhere to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation. The level of documentation shall be proportionate with the level of significance of the resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>CULT-4 Conduct archaeological sensitivity training for construction personnel. Project applicants shall retain a qualified professional archaeologist who meets U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications and Standards, to conduct an Archaeological Sensitivity Training for construction personnel prior to commencement of excavation activities. The training session shall be carried out by a cultural resource professional with expertise in archaeology who meets the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Processional Qualifications and Standards. The training session would include a handout and focus on how to identify archaeological resources that may be encountered during earthmoving activities and the procedures to be followed in such an event, those duties of archaeological monitors, and the general steps a qualified professional archaeologist shall follow in conducting a salvage investigation if one is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CULT-5 Cease ground-disturbing activities and implement treatment plan if archaeological resources are encountered. In the event that archaeological resources are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, ground-disturbing activities shall be halted or diverted away from the vicinity of the find so that the find can be evaluated. A buffer area of at least 50 feet shall be established around the find where construction activities would not be allowed to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2-5
**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>continue until a qualified archaeologist has examined the newly discovered artifact(s) and has evaluated the area of the find. Work should be allowed to continue outside of the buffer area. All archaeological resources unearthed by project construction activities shall be evaluated by a qualified professional archaeologist, who meets the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications and Standards. Should the newly discovered artifacts be determined to be prehistoric, Native American Tribes/individuals shall be contacted and consulted and Native American construction monitoring should be initiated. The developer and City shall coordinate with the archaeologist to develop an appropriate treatment plan for the resources. The plan may include implementation of the archaeological data recovery excavations to address treatment of the resource along with subsequent laboratory processing and analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CULT-6 Conduct periodic archaeological resources spot checks during grading and earth-moving activities in younger alluvial sediments. Project applicants shall retain a qualified professional archaeologist who meets the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications and standards to conduct periodic archaeological spot checks beginning at depths below two feet to determine if construction excavations have exposed or have a high probability of exposing archaeological resources. After the initial archaeological spot check, further periodic checks would be conducted at the discretion of the qualified archaeologist. If the qualified archaeologist determines that construction excavations have exposed or have a high probability of exposing archaeological artifacts, construction monitoring for archaeological resources would be required. Developers shall retain a qualified archaeological monitor who would work under the guidance and direction of a professional archaeologist, who meets the qualifications set forth by the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications and Standards. The archaeological monitor shall be present during all construction excavations (e.g., grading, trenching, or clearing/grubbing).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2-5
**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Cultural Resources| **The context for assessing cumulative impacts to buried paleontological resources is the presence of any native, subsurface soil in which paleontological resources have the potential to occur. A significant impact would occur if construction projects collectively destroyed paleontological resources that provide pre-historic information to the extent that such information would be permanently lost. Most likely surficial and near-surface paleontological resources in the Specific Plan planning area would have been destroyed or recovered as a result of past development and redevelopment.** Mitigation Measures have been incorporated to reduce impacts to any resources uncovered during future development activity; therefore, cumulative impacts related to the loss of paleontological resources would be less than significant. | *into non-fill younger Pleistocene alluvial sediments. Multiple earth-moving construction activities may require multiple archaeological monitors. The frequency of monitoring shall be based on the rate of excavation and grading activities, proximity to known archaeological resources, the materials being excavated (native versus artificial fill soils), the depth of excavation, and if found, the abundance and type of archaeological resources encountered. Full-time monitoring could be reduced to part-time inspections if determined adequate by the project archaeologist.*  
**CULT-7 Prepare report upon completion of monitoring services.** The archaeological monitor, under the direction of a qualified professional archaeologist who meets the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications and Standards, shall prepare a final report at the conclusion of archaeological monitoring. The report shall be submitted to the Applicant, the South Coastal Information Center, the City, and representatives of other appropriate or concerned agencies to signify the satisfactory completion of the project and required mitigation measures. The report shall include a description of resources unearthed, if any, evaluation of the resources with respect to the California Register and CEQA, and treatment of the resources.  
**CULT-8 Conduct paleontological sensitivity training for construction personnel.** The Applicant shall retain a professional paleontologist, who meets the qualifications set forth by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology, shall conduct a Paleontological Sensitivity Training for construction personnel prior to commencement of excavation activities. The training would include a handout and would focus on how to identify paleontological resources that may be encountered during earthmoving activities, and the procedures to be followed in such an event; the duties of paleontological monitors; notification and other procedures to follow upon discovery of resources; and, the general steps a qualified professional paleontologist...* |
### TABLE 2-5
LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>would follow in conducting a salvage investigation if one is necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CULT-9 <strong>Conduct periodic paleontological spot checks during grading and earth-moving activities.</strong> The Applicant shall retain a professional paleontologist, who meets the qualifications set forth by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology, shall conduct periodic Paleontological Spot Checks beginning at depths below six feet to determine if construction excavations have extended into older Pleistocene alluvial deposits. After the initial Paleontological Spot Check, further periodic checks would be conducted at the discretion of the qualified paleontologist. If the qualified paleontologist determines that construction excavations have extended into the Puente Formation or into older Pleistocene alluvial deposits, construction monitoring for Paleontological Resources would be required. The Applicant shall retain a qualified paleontological monitor, who would work under the guidance and direction of a professional paleontologist, who meets the qualifications set forth by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology. The paleontological monitor shall be present during all construction excavations (e.g., grading, trenching, or clearing/grubbing) into older Pleistocene alluvial deposits. Multiple earth-moving construction activities may require multiple paleontological monitors. The frequency of monitoring shall be based on the rate of excavation and grading activities, proximity to known paleontological resources and/or unique geological features, the materials being excavated (native versus artificial fill soils), and the depth of excavation, and if found, the abundance and type of paleontological resources and/or unique geological features encountered. Full-time monitoring can be reduced to part-time inspections if determined adequate by the qualified professional paleontologist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CULT-10 <strong>Cease ground-disturbing activities and implement treatment plan if paleontological resources are encountered.</strong> In the event that paleontological resources and/or unique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>geological features are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, ground-disturbing activities shall be halted or diverted away from the vicinity of the find so that the find can be evaluated. A buffer area of at least 50 feet shall be established around the find where construction activities shall not be allowed to continue until appropriate paleontological treatment plan has been approved by the Applicant and the City. Work shall be allowed to continue outside of the buffer area. The Applicant and City shall coordinate with a professional paleontologist, who meets the qualifications set forth by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology, to develop an appropriate treatment plan for the resources. Treatment may include implementation of paleontological salvage excavations to remove the resource along with subsequent laboratory processing and analysis or preservation in place. At the paleontologist's discretion, and to reduce construction delay, the grading and excavation contractor shall assist in removing rock samples for initial processing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CULT-11</td>
<td><strong>Prepare report upon completion of monitoring services.</strong> Upon completion of the above activities, the professional paleontologist shall prepare a report summarizing the results of the monitoring and salvaging efforts, the methodology used in these efforts, as well as a description of the fossils collected and their significance. The report shall be submitted to the Applicant, the City, San Diego Natural History Museum, and representatives of other appropriate or concerned agencies to signify the satisfactory completion of the project and required mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gases</td>
<td>Implementation of the Specific Plan would not conflict with statewide, long-term planning goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The Specific Plan would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts related to climate change with GHG-1 incorporated.</td>
<td>GHG-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The installation of wood-burning devices such as fireplaces, stoves, and heaters shall be prohibited at new residential development within the Specific Plan planning area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2-6
**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT AND NO IMPACTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>No significant impacts to Scenic Vistas are anticipated to occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological</td>
<td>The proposed Specific Plan is covered by the Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP as a public project under “Projects Outside the Mitigation Area” and would not conflict with implementation of the HCP/NCCP. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts related to consistency with the Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Considering that existing cases of leaking underground storage tanks are currently either eligible for closure or responsible parties are taking steps toward closure, adoption of the Specific Plan could not contribute considerably to on- or off-site cumulative public or environmental exposure to hazardous materials. No cumulatively considerable impacts would occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology</td>
<td>Future development within the Specific Plan planning area, City, and surrounding area would be subject to applicable standards and regulations, such as NPDES, JRMP, the WQIP, and LID practices. Implementation of the Specific Plan would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts related to water quality standards or storm drainage capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed Specific Plan has been determined to result in less than significant impacts related to water supply and would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on water supply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The City does not rely on groundwater resources; Specific Plan implementation would not result in the depletion of groundwater resources due to increased demand. Impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use and Planning</td>
<td>Upon implementation of the proposed Specific Plan, General Plan land use designations for the Specific Plan planning area would reflect Specific Plan land uses and densities and would be considered in future growth projection efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise/Vibration - Construction</td>
<td>Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not approve any specific development and would therefore not result in cumulatively considerable construction noise and vibration impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise – Stationary Sources</td>
<td>Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not generate new stationary noise sources outside of the Specific Plan planning area and would not, therefore, result in cumulatively considerable noise impacts involving stationary noise sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise - Traffic</td>
<td>Additional traffic volumes associated with future development within the Specific Plan planning area would combine with regional traffic on major, interjurisdictional roads and highways leading to Poway, which would contribute to cumulative effects involving roadway noise. The level of traffic noise attributable to the Specific Plan trips that would occur outside the Specific Plan planning area would increase incrementally over time as development occurs (the Specific Plan horizon year is 2035) and would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative changes in roadway noise levels in the context of regional traffic growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population and Housing</td>
<td>With consideration of other long-range plans and regional projections, the proposed Specific Plan would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on population, housing, and employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>The Specific Plan planning area circulation network is anticipated to operate at acceptable LOS for all modes of transportation under year 2035 conditions. Therefore, implementation of the proposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2-6
**Less Than Significant and No Impacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specific Plan would not result in cumulatively considerable traffic impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Project energy demand would not be wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary since the project would not increase energy demand over typical construction and operating requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Project Title
Poway Road Corridor Specific Plan Amendment

Lead Agency Name and Address
City of Poway
Planning Division
13325 Civic Center Drive
Poway, California 92064

Project Location
The Specific Plan planning area is located generally along Poway Road between Oak Knoll Road and Garden Road in the City of Poway, San Diego County, California (see Exhibit 3-1, Regional Context and Vicinity Map). The intersection Poway Road and Tarascan Drive is the approximate central point of the Specific Plan planning area. The Specific Plan planning area includes all properties within the Poway Road Corridor Specific Plan boundaries.

Project Sponsor’s Name and Address
City of Poway
Planning Division
13325 Civic Center Drive
Poway, California 92064

Baseline Environmental Setting
The City of Poway is located in San Diego County, approximately 18 miles northeast of downtown San Diego. Within the Specific Plan planning area, Poway Road is an east/west that connects to Interstate 15 (I-15) approximately two miles to the west and Highway 67 approximately three miles to the east.

Existing Land Uses
The Specific Plan planning area encompasses 235 acres and is generally occupied by retail commercial, low-scale office, restaurant, and auto sales and related uses. Commercial uses comprise 72.6 percent of the total acreage and are distributed along the corridor, both in multi-tenant centers and as stand-alone buildings. Office uses comprise approximately 20 percent of the commercial uses, and automobile sales and service establishments make up approximately 17 percent of commercial uses.

Approximately 11 percent of the acreage supports multifamily residential development located between Pomerado Road and Community Road.

Industrial uses such as warehousing, self-storage facilities, and auto repair garages comprise just under seven percent of land use, largely clustered at the east end of the Specific Plan planning area.
Approximately three percent of the Specific Plan planning area is devoted to community and civic uses, including the library, civic center, Sheriff's office, and park space. The remaining two percent of land within the Specific Plan planning area consists of vacant parcels.

**Existing General Plan Land Use Designations**

The majority of the Specific Plan planning area is designated for commercial uses, as identified in the General Plan. The Poway General Plan assigns five land use designations within the Specific Plan planning area: Commercial General, Community Business, Mixed Use, Town Center, and Automotive General Commercial. Manufacturing Services are designated for the area east of Adah Lane, with the remainder of the project area designated for commercial uses.

**Existing Zoning Districts**

The majority of the project area is zoned for commercial uses. According to City GIS data, approximately 22.5 percent is zoned Automotive General Commercial (AGC), 29.9 percent is zoned Community Business (CB), 3.9 percent is zoned Commercial General (CG), 7.9 percent is zoned Mixed Use (MU), and 27.3 percent is zoned Town Center (TC). The remainder of the project area is zoned as Open Space Resource Management (OS-RM), Residential Single Family 2 (RS-2), Residential Single Family 7 (RS-7), Residential Condominium (RC), and Residential Apartment (RA).

**Poway Road Specific Plan**

The project area lies entirely within the Poway Road Specific Plan planning area. This project represents a comprehensive amendment to the Poway Road Specific Plan (Specific Plan) originally adopted in May of 1996. The current Specific Plan has four land use districts: Community Business District, Mixed Use District, Town Center District, and Automotive/General Commercial District (see Exhibit 3-2). These districts would be realigned and renamed as part of the proposed Specific Plan amendment.

**Surrounding Land Uses**

The project area is primarily surrounded by multiple-family and single-family residential development. Poway City Hall is located south of the project area on Civic Center Drive. See Exhibit 3-3 for a photographic survey of the project area.

**Utilities**

The City of Poway provides water service within the City via approximately 14,136 potable and recycled metered connections (Poway 2016). Approximately 99 percent of the City’s water supply is from the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) in the form of raw, untreated water, with the remaining water demands met with recycled water purchased from the City of San Diego. Raw, untreated water is treated at the Lester J. Berglund Water Treatment Plant, which is owned and operated by the City of Poway. The project area is served by water mains between six and 10 inches in diameter that were installed between 1954 and the early 1990s.

The City of Poway owns and operates approximately 185 miles of sewer mains, 3.4 miles of force mains, and five lift stations (Poway 2013). Wastewater generated within the City is transported to and treated by the City of San Diego. The Project area is served by a sewer system consisting of wastewater mains between four and 30 inches in diameter that were installed between 1958 and the late 2000s.

The project area is served by an extensive storm drainage system maintained by the City’s Public Works Department. Several stormwater inlets and outfalls are located along the Poway Road corridor that direct stormwater to a system of stormwater pipes located throughout the project area.
Electricity and gas service is provided by San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E), and trash and recycling collection is provided by contract by EDCO Disposal.

**Project Under Review**

The proposed project is the adoption and long-term implementation of the Poway Road Corridor Specific Plan Amendment. The comprehensive Specific Plan is organized to address the requirements of California Government Code Sections 65450 through 65457 with an introduction, a description of existing conditions, a proposal for updated land use designations and development standards, specification of focused development opportunities, identification of infrastructure needs, and an implementation program.

Program-level analysis was conducted for the Specific Plan as a whole to account for the broad, cumulative impacts that may occur due to the anticipated, collective redevelopment within project area. Programmatic analysis focused on the long-term subregional and regional changes that the Specific Plan implies and how those changes can be accommodated by area wide plans to minimize the impacts of land use decisions on the environment. The program-level analysis in this EIR is analogous with the cumulative impacts analysis required by CEQA.

**Proposed Poway Road Corridor Specific Plan Amendment Objectives**

The City's objectives for the proposed Specific Plan Amendment are as follows:

1. Create a distinct and vibrant Town Center with a mix of commercial and residential uses supported by civic uses that would de-emphasize automobile-accessible uses in favor of pedestrian-focused linkages and uses.
2. Provide a balanced mix of uses along the Poway Road Corridor to include residential, office, and retail uses.
3. Implement a Complete Street concept for Poway Road to improve multimodal access, including enhanced bicycle lanes and pedestrian crossings.
4. Provide capacity for at least an additional 200,000 square feet of high-quality, non-residential projects that would generate aesthetic improvements and renovations for existing businesses and create opportunities for new businesses on infill sites that are vacant, underutilized, or publicly owned.
5. Provide capacity for at least 1,000 residential units of high-quality multi-family housing, mixed-use residential, lofts, and townhomes that would meet the regional housing demand for a diverse mix of income levels.

**Project Characteristics**

The Poway Road Corridor Specific Plan identifies the long-term vision and objectives for land use development and public improvements along a 2.65-mile portion of Poway Road between Oak Knoll Road and Garden Road. The proposed Specific Plan Amendment would establish new zoning districts and district boundaries, as well as updated site planning, building, parking, architectural, and open space standards and guidelines for development within the project area (see Exhibit 3-4, Project Area). The proposed Specific Plan Amendment would provide new development standards and incentives to encourage reuse and reinvestment, particularly with regard to underutilized commercial and vacant properties. Also, the Specific Plan Amendment would provide for public right-of-way improvements to better accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists.

The project area encompasses a total of 235 acres and includes land use designations/zoning districts supporting mixed-use, commercial office, general commercial, automotive, town center, and open space uses. To help guide new development within the Specific Plan planning area, the City has identified eight Opportunity Areas that comprise approximately 174.7 acres of the project area. These are the areas where private reinvestment and
redevelopment activity are anticipated and encouraged. Within the remaining 60.27 acres, very little new development is anticipated due to the fact that existing uses are relatively new or well maintained. Table 3-1 (Development Potential) summarizes the estimated development potential within the Specific Plan planning area (see Exhibit 3-5, Proposed Land Use Plan and Exhibit 3-6, Opportunity Areas Map). The City estimates that build out within the Specific Plan boundaries will result in the net new development of 260,000 square feet of commercial development and 1,148 net new dwelling units. These estimates represent a maximum net new development based on an analysis of existing development that is assumed to remain through the life of the Specific Plan. The maximum build out potential includes consideration of an incentive-based bonus system in specific districts to encourage lot consolidation and provision of community benefits. Qualifying community benefits include public open space, mid-block passageway, public right-of-way improvement fund contribution, creation of a neighborhood restaurant row, public art, and enhanced transportation demand management.

### TABLE 3-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity Area</th>
<th>Proposed Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Non-Residential SF</th>
<th>Dwelling Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Proposed</td>
<td>Existing Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General General</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>162,054</td>
<td>267,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>196,250</td>
<td>82,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Commercial Office</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>239,914</td>
<td>331,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>491,991</td>
<td>549,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>General Commercial</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>117,480</td>
<td>130,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>130,948</td>
<td>136,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>144,056</td>
<td>151,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Automotive/General Commercial</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>267,216</td>
<td>361,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal Opportunity Area**

174.7 1,749,909 2,010,500 251 1,399

**No Change Area**

60.27 681,900 681,900 -- --

**Total Area**

235 2,432,000 2,692,000 251 1,399

**Net Development Potential**

+260,000 +1,148

---

**Town Center**

The Town Center (TC) district facilitates a distinct Town Center that supports a mix of land uses, with unique shopping, dining, and entertainment uses integrated with housing, civic buildings, cultural uses, and parks and other public spaces. The physical form within this district will consist of higher-intensity vertical and horizontal mixed-use building types that accommodate active storefronts, boutiques, restaurants, cafes, small offices, civic uses, and residential uses. The TC district will permit a maximum by-right height of two stories/35 feet, lot coverage of 60 percent, and residential density of 24 units per acre. The Specific Plan provides for additional height, and density, which are granted to projects that provide lot consolidation and/or additional community benefits. These incentives allow buildings up to three stories/40 feet and 35 units per acre.

**Mixed Use**

The Mixed Use (MU) district accommodates residential development types that provide opportunities for home ownership, encourages new retail activity that complements long-established businesses, and introduces new uses that serve surrounding neighborhoods, residents throughout Poway, and visitors to the corridor. Allowed uses include attached and detached residential developments, mixed-use residential/commercial projects, and stand-alone retail, service, office, dining, and recreational commercial businesses. The physical form emphasizes moderate-scale development that has a clear relationship to the street and a mix of residential and commercial uses along the street frontage. The MU zone will permit a maximum by-right height of two stories/35 feet, lot coverage of 55 percent, and residential density of 24 units per acre. The Specific Plan provides for additional height, and density, which are
granted to projects that provide lot consolidation and/or additional community benefits. These incentives allow buildings up to three stories/40 feet and 35 units per acre.

**Commercial Office**
The Commercial Office (CO) district provides an environment for professional office, service, and retail uses where local and national/international businesses can meet the needs of Poway residents, support the local economy, and provide opportunities for jobs growth. Allowed uses include a full range of commercial businesses. The CO district is envisioned to be an employment center where established office and retail space will be enhanced by new infill development and new flexible building spaces will be created to meet business needs and practices, including buildings with large and open layouts that can easily be reconfigured and places where multiple individual companies can co-locate. The physical form consists of lower-intensity office and retail buildings, with opportunities for office over retail. The CO zone will permit a maximum building height of two stories/35 feet and lot coverage of 50 percent.

**General Commercial**
The Commercial General (CG) district is strengthens established retail businesses and accommodates a diverse range of specialty shopping, personal service, dining, entertainment, and hotel uses within a business-friendly environment that supports the needs of the local community, visitors, and tourists. The CG district provides opportunities for retail and service businesses to locate in a central commercial environment and to establish incubator space for small, local businesses, including uses that do not require high pedestrian visibility. The physical form responds to the need for maximum flexibility to allow buildings and uses to easily transform over time as market demands shift. The CG zone will permit a maximum building height of two stories/35 feet and lot coverage of 50 percent.

**Automotive/ General Commercial**
The Automotive/ General Commercial (A/GC) district accommodates a full range of retail, service, and wholesale commercial activities and particularly, auto sales and vehicle service and repair businesses. The A/GC district supports a broad array of more intensive commercial businesses that are separated from residential uses and clearly oriented toward auto-dependent and auto-related uses and customers. While the district serves as a place for clustering auto sales and related activities, technological and market trends over the longer term may lead to the downsizing of space needed to accommodate such uses. Thus, land use regulations provide flexibility for other commercial uses that require larger lots and separation from residential development. The physical form consists of medium to large commercial buildings designed for maximum flexibility and compatibility, along with accommodation of a range of intensive commercial uses. The A/GC zone will permit a maximum building height of two stories/35 feet and lot coverage of 40 percent.

**Required Approvals**
- General Plan Amendment
- Specific Plan Amendment
- Zoning Code Amendment

**Other Public Agency Whose Approval is Required**
None
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4.1 Air Quality

This section analyzes the potential direct and cumulative air quality impacts of the proposed project and determines whether project implementation would result in air emissions that exceed applicable air quality standards, cause cumulatively considerable increases in criteria pollutants, or significantly impact sensitive receptors.

As concluded in the Initial Study (Appendix B) analysis, the proposed project would not create objectionable odors. Therefore, odors are not analyzed here.

Environmental Setting
San Diego Air Basin

The City of Poway is located within the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB), the boundaries of which encompass the entirety of San Diego County (County). The County is divided by the Laguna Mountain Range, which runs parallel to the Pacific coast approximately 45 miles inland and separates the coastal area from the desert area. The coastal region is made up of coastal terraces that rise from the ocean into wide mesas that transition into the Laguna foothills farther to the east. From the foothills, the topography gradually rises to the rugged Laguna Mountain range. On the east side, the mountains drop off rapidly to the Anza-Borrego Desert, which is characterized by several broken mountain ranges with desert valleys in between. The Santa Ana Mountains are located north of the County along the Coast of Orange County before turning east to join with the Laguna Mountains near the San Diego-Orange County border.

The SDAB is managed by the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (SDCAPCD). Pursuant to the California Clean Air Act (CCAA), SDCAPCD is responsible for bringing air quality within the basin into conformity with federal and State air quality standards by reducing existing emission levels and ensuring that future emission levels meet applicable air quality standards. SDCAPCD works with federal, State, and local agencies to reduce pollutant emissions from stationary, mobile, and indirect pollutant sources through rules and regulations.

Climate

The climate of the San Diego region is classified as Mediterranean, but is incredibly diverse because of the topography. The climate is dominated by the Pacific high pressure system that results in mild, dry summers and mild, wet winters. The San Diego region experiences an average of 201 days above 70º F and 9 to 13 inches of rainfall annually between November and March. El Niño and La Niña patterns have large effects on the annual rainfall received in throughout the region.

An El Niño is a warming of the surface waters of the eastern Pacific Ocean. It is a climate pattern that occurs across the tropical Pacific Ocean that is associated with drastic weather occurrences, including enhanced rainfall in Southern California. La Niña is a term for cooler than normal sea surface temperatures across the Eastern Pacific Ocean. The San Diego region receives less than normal rainfall during La Niña years.

The Pacific high pressure system drives the prevailing winds in the SDAB. The winds tend to blow onshore in the daytime and offshore at night. In the summer, an inversion layer is created over the coastal areas and increases the ozone levels. In the winter, the San Diego region often experiences a shallow inversion layer which tends to increase carbon monoxide (CO) and small particulate (PM$_{2.5}$) concentration levels due to the increased use of residential wood burning.

In the fall months, the SDAB is often impacted by Santa Ana winds. These winds are the result of a high-pressure system over the Nevada-Utah region that overcomes the westerly wind pattern and forces hot, dry winds from the east to the Pacific Ocean. These winds are powerful and incessant. They blow the air basin's pollutants out to sea.
However, a weak Santa Ana can transport air pollution from the adjacent South Coast Air Basin and greatly increase the San Diego ozone concentrations. A strong Santa Ana also primes the vegetation for firestorm conditions. (APCD 2017a)

**Existing Air Quality**

Existing air quality is measured at 11 monitoring sites operate by the SDCAPCD. Monitored air quality is evaluated and in the context of ambient air quality standards. These standards are the levels of air quality that are considered safe, with an adequate margin of safety, to protect the public health and welfare. National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) currently in effect, as well as effects of each pollutant regulated under these standards are shown in Table 4.1-1 (Ambient Air Quality Standards).

Whether a region’s air quality is healthful or unhealthful is determined by comparing ambient air sample contaminant levels with the state and federal standards. A region’s air quality is considered to be in attainment by the state if the measured ambient air pollutant levels for O₃, CO, sulfur dioxide (SO₂), PM₁₀, and PM₂.₅ are below the State standard in any consecutive three-year period; and the federal standards (other than O₃, PM₁₀, PM₂.₅, and those based on annual average or arithmetic mean) are not exceeded more than once per year. The O₃ standard is attained when the fourth highest eight-hour concentration in a year, averaged over three years, is equal to or less than the standard. For PM₁₀, the 24-hour standard is attained when 99 percent of the daily concentrations, averaged over three years, are equal to or less than the standard.

Criteria pollutants are pollutants that are regulated through the development of human health based and/or environmentally based criteria for setting permissible levels. Criteria pollutants, their typical sources, and effects are identified below:

**Criteria Pollutants**

**Ozone**

Ozone is a highly reactive and unstable gas that is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NOₓ) are byproducts of internal combustion engine exhaust, undergo slow photochemical reactions in the presence of sunlight. Ozone concentrations are generally highest during the summer months when direct sunlight, light wind, and warm temperature conditions are favorable to the formation of this pollutant.

**Carbon Monoxide**

Carbon monoxide is a colorless, odor less gas produced by the incomplete combustion of carbon-containing fuels, such as gasoline or wood. CO concentrations tend to be the highest during the winter morning, when little to no wind and surface-based inversions trap the pollutant at ground levels. Because CO is emitted directly from internal combustion engines, unlike ozone, motor vehicles operating at slow speeds are the primary source of CO in the air basin. The highest ambient CO concentrations are generally found near congested transportation corridors and intersections.

**Nitrogen Dioxide**

Nitrogen dioxide consists of nitric oxide (NO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), and nitrous oxide (N₂O) and is formed when nitrogen (N₂) combines with oxygen (O₂). Their lifespan in the atmosphere ranges from one to seven days for nitric oxide and nitrogen dioxide, to 170 years for nitrous oxide. Nitrogen oxides are typically created during combustion processes and are major contributors to smog formation and acid deposition. NO₂ is a criteria air pollutant and may result in numerous adverse health effects; it absorbs blue light, resulting in a brownish-red cast to the atmosphere and reduced visibility. Of the seven types of nitrogen oxide compounds, NO₂ is the most abundant in the atmosphere. As ambient concentrations of NO₂ are related to traffic density, commuters in heavy traffic may be exposed to higher concentrations of NO₂ than those indicated by regional monitors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Averaging Time</th>
<th>California Standards</th>
<th>National Standards</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ozone (O3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Hour</td>
<td>0.09 ppm (180 µg/m³)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ultraviolet Photometry</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Same as Primary Standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Hour</td>
<td>0.07 ppm (137 µg/m³)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07 ppm (137 µg/m³)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ultraviolet Photometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respirable Particulate Matter (PM_{10})</strong></td>
<td>24 Hour</td>
<td>50 µg/m³</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gravimetric or Beta Attenuation</td>
<td>150 µg/m³</td>
<td>Same as Primary Standard</td>
<td>Inertial Separation and Gravimetric Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Arithmetic Mean</td>
<td>20 µg/m³</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gravimetric or Beta Attenuation</td>
<td>12 µg/m³</td>
<td>15 µg/m³</td>
<td>Inertial Separation and Gravimetric Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fine Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5})</strong></td>
<td>24 Hour</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>35 µg/m³</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Arithmetic Mean</td>
<td>12 µg/m³</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gravimetric or Beta Attenuation</td>
<td>12 µg/m³</td>
<td>15 µg/m³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carbon Monoxide (CO)</strong></td>
<td>1 Hour</td>
<td>20 ppm (23 mg/m³)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Dispersive Infrared Photometry (NDIR)</td>
<td>35 ppm (40 mg/m³)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Non-Dispersive Infrared Photometry (NDIR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Hour</td>
<td>9.0 ppm (10 mg/m³)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 ppm (10 mg/m³)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Hour (Lake Tahoe)</td>
<td>6 ppm (7 mg/m³)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂)</strong></td>
<td>1 Hour</td>
<td>0.18 ppm (339 µg/m³)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gas Phase Chemiluminescence</td>
<td>100 ppb (188 µg/m³)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Gas Phase Chemiluminescence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Arithmetic Mean</td>
<td>0.03 ppm (57 µg/m³)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.053 ppm (100 µg/m³)</td>
<td>Same as Primary Standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂)</strong></td>
<td>1 Hour</td>
<td>0.25 ppm (665 µg/m³)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ultraviolet Fluorescence</td>
<td>75 ppb (196 µg/m³)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Ultraviolet Fluorescence; Spectrophotometry (Pararosaniline Method)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Hour</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.5 ppm (1300 µg/m³)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 Hour</td>
<td>0.04 ppm (105 µg/m³)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.14 ppm (for certain areas)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Arithmetic Mean</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.03 ppm (for certain areas)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead</strong></td>
<td>30 Day Average</td>
<td>1.5 µg/m³</td>
<td></td>
<td>Atomic Absorption</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calendar Quarter</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 µg/m³ (for certain areas)</td>
<td>Same as Primary Standard</td>
<td>High Volume Sampler and Atomic Absorption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rolling 3-Month Average</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15 µg/m³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visibility Reducing Particles</strong></td>
<td>8 Hour</td>
<td>See footnote 14</td>
<td>Beta Attenuation and Transmittance through Filter Tape</td>
<td>No National Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sulfates</strong></td>
<td>24 Hour</td>
<td>25 µg/m³</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ion Chromatography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hydrogen Sulfide</strong></td>
<td>1 Hour</td>
<td>0.03 ppm (42 µg/m³)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ultraviolet Fluorescence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vinyl Chloride</strong></td>
<td>24 Hour</td>
<td>0.01 ppm (26 µg/m³)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gas Chromatography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** CARB 2016  
Footnote information available: [https://www.arb.ca.gov/research/aaqs/aaqs2.pdf](https://www.arb.ca.gov/research/aaqs/aaqs2.pdf)
PM$_{10}$
Particulate matter less than 10 microns is a major air pollutant consisting of tiny solid or liquid particles of soot, dust, smoke, fumes, and aerosols. The size of the particles (10 microns or smaller, about 0.0004 inches or less) allows them to easily enter the lungs where they may be deposited, resulting in adverse health effects. PM$_{10}$ also causes visibility reduction and is a criteria air pollutant.

PM$_{2.5}$
Particulate matter less than 2.5 microns is a similar air pollutant consisting of tiny solid or liquid particles which are 2.5 microns or smaller (which is often referred to as fine particles). These particles are formed in the atmosphere from primary gaseous emissions that include sulfates formed from SO$_2$ release from power plants and industrial facilities and nitrates that are formed from NO$_x$ release from power plants, automobiles and other types of combustion sources. The chemical composition of fine particles highly depends on location, time of year, and weather conditions. PM$_{2.5}$ is a criteria air pollutant.

Sulfur Dioxide
Sulfur dioxide is a colorless, extremely irritating gas or liquid. It enters the atmosphere as a pollutant mainly as a result of the burning of high sulfur-content fuel oils and coal and from chemical processes occurring at chemical plants and refineries. When SO$_2$ oxidizes in the atmosphere, it forms sulfates (SO$_4$). Collectively, these pollutants are referred to as sulfur oxides (SO$_x$).

Volatile Organic Compounds
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) are hydrocarbon compounds (any compound containing various combinations of hydrogen and carbon atoms) that exist in the ambient air. VOCs contribute to the formation of smog through atmospheric photochemical reactions and/or may be toxic. Compounds of carbon (also known as organic compounds) have different levels of reactivity; that is, they do not react at the same speed or do not form ozone to the same extent when exposed to photochemical processes. VOCs often have an odor, and some examples include gasoline, alcohol, and the solvents used in paints. Exceptions to the VOC designation include carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, carbonic acid, metallic carbides or carbonates, and ammonium carbonate. VOCs are a criteria pollutant since they are a precursor to O$_3$, which is a criteria pollutant. The terms VOC and ROG can be used interchangeably.

Reactive Organic Gases
Similar to VOC, Reactive Organic Gases (ROG) are also precursors to forming ozone and consist of compounds containing methane, ethane, propane, butane, and longer chain hydrocarbons, which are typically the result of some type of combustion/decomposition process. Smog is formed when ROG and nitrogen oxides react in the presence of sunlight. ROGs are a criteria pollutant since they are a precursor to O$_3$, which is a criteria pollutant. The terms VOC and ROG can be used interchangeably.

Lead
Lead is a heavy metal that is highly persistent in the environment. In the past, the primary source of lead in the air was emissions from vehicles burning leaded gasoline. Lead is a criteria air pollutant.
Health Effects of Air Pollutants

**Ozone**

Individuals exercising outdoors, children, and people with preexisting lung disease, such as asthma and chronic pulmonary lung disease, are considered to be the most susceptible subgroups for ozone effects. Short-term exposure (lasting for a few hours) to ozone at levels typically observed in Southern California can result in breathing pattern changes, reduction of breathing capacity, increased susceptibility to infections, inflammation of the lung tissue, and some immunological changes. Elevated ozone levels are associated with increased school absences. In recent years, a correlation between elevated ambient ozone levels and increases in daily hospital admission rates, as well as mortality, has also been reported. An increased risk for asthma has been found in children who participate in multiple sports and live in communities with high ozone levels.

Ozone exposure under exercising conditions is known to increase the severity of the responses described above. Animal studies suggest that exposure to a combination of pollutants that includes ozone may be more toxic than exposure to ozone alone. Although lung volume and resistance changes are observed after a single exposure diminish, with repeated exposures, biochemical and cellular changes appear to persist, which can lead to subsequent structural changes.

**Carbon Monoxide**

Individuals with a deficient blood supply to the heart are the most susceptible to the adverse effects of CO exposure. The effects observed include earlier onset of chest pain with exercise, and electrocardiograph changes indicative of decreased oxygen supply to the heart. Inhaled CO has no direct toxic effect on the lungs, but exerts its effect on tissues by interfering with oxygen transport and competing with oxygen to combine with hemoglobin present in the blood to form carboxyhemoglobin (COHb). Hence, conditions with an increased demand for oxygen supply can be adversely affected by exposure to CO. Individuals most at risk include fetuses, patients with diseases involving heart and blood vessels, and patients with chronic hypoxemia (oxygen deficiency) as seen at high altitudes.

Reduction in birth weight and impaired neurobehavioral development have been observed in animals chronically exposed to CO, resulting in COHb levels similar to those observed in smokers. Recent studies have found increased risks for adverse birth outcomes with exposure to elevated CO levels; these include pre-term births and heart abnormalities.

**Particulate Matter**

A consistent correlation between elevated ambient fine particulate matter (PM\textsubscript{10} and PM\textsubscript{2.5}) levels and an increase in mortality rates, respiratory infections, number and severity of asthma attacks and the number of hospital admissions has been observed in different parts of the United States and various areas around the world. In recent years, some studies have reported an association between long-term exposure to air pollution dominated by fine particles and increased mortality, reduction in life span, and an increased mortality from lung cancer.

Daily fluctuations in PM\textsubscript{2.5} concentration levels have also been related to hospital admissions for acute respiratory conditions in children, to school and kindergarten absences, to a decrease in respiratory lung volumes in normal children, and to increased medication use in children and adults with asthma. Recent studies show lung function growth in children is reduced with long-term exposure to particulate matter.

The elderly, people with pre-existing respiratory or cardiovascular disease, and children appear to be more susceptible to the effects of high levels of PM\textsubscript{10} and PM\textsubscript{2.5}.

**Nitrogen Dioxide**

Population-based studies suggest that an increase in acute respiratory illness, including infections and respiratory symptoms in children (not infants), is associated with long-term exposure to NO\textsubscript{2} at levels found in homes with gas
stoves, when compared to the higher than ambient levels found on all homes of Southern California. An increase in resistance to air flow and airway contraction is observed after short-term exposure to NO2 in healthy subjects. Larger decreases in lung functions are observed in individuals with asthma or chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (e.g., chronic bronchitis, emphysema) than in healthy individuals, indicating a greater susceptibility of these sub-groups.

In animals, exposure to levels of NO2 considerably higher than ambient concentrations result in increased susceptibility to infections, possibly due to the observed changes in cells involved in maintaining immune functions. The severity of lung tissue damage associated with high levels of ozone exposure increases when animals are exposed to a combination of ozone and NO2.

**Sulfur Dioxide**

A few minutes of exposure to low levels of SO2 can result in airway constriction in some asthmatics, all of whom are sensitive to its effects. In asthmatics, increase in resistance to air flow, as well as reduction in breathing capacity leading to severe breathing difficulties, are observed after acute exposure to SO2. In contrast, healthy individuals do not exhibit similar acute responses even after exposure to higher concentrations of SO2.

Animal studies suggest that despite SO2 being a respiratory irritant, it does not cause substantial lung injury at ambient concentrations. However, very high levels of exposure can cause lung edema (fluid accumulation), lung tissue damage, and sloughing off of cells lining the respiratory tract.

Some population-based studies indicate that the mortality and morbidity effects associated with fine particles show a similar association with ambient SO2 levels. In these studies, efforts to separate the effects of SO2 from those of fine particles have not been successful. It is not clear whether the two pollutants act synergistically or one pollutant alone is the predominant factor.

**Volatile Organic Compounds**

The health effects of VOC exposure include eye, nose, and throat irritation; headaches, loss of coordination, nausea; damage to liver, kidney, and central nervous system. Some organics can cause cancer in animals; some are suspected or known to cause cancer in humans. Key signs or symptoms associated with exposure to VOCs include conjunctival irritation, nose and throat discomfort, headache, allergic skin reaction, dyspnea, declines in serum cholinesterase levels, nausea, emesis, epistaxis, fatigue, dizziness.

The ability of organic chemicals to cause health effects varies greatly from those that are highly toxic to those with no known health effect. As with other pollutants, the extent and nature of the health effect will depend on many factors including level of exposure and length of time exposed. Eye and respiratory tract irritation, headaches, dizziness, visual disorders, and memory impairment are among the immediate symptoms that some people have experienced soon after exposure to some organics. At present, not much is known about what health effects occur from the levels of organics usually found in homes. Many organic compounds are known to cause cancer in animals; some are suspected of causing, or are known to cause, cancer in humans.

**Lead**

Fetuses, infants, and children are more sensitive than others to the adverse effects of lead (Pb) exposure. Exposure to low levels of lead can adversely affect the development and function of the central nervous system, leading to learning disorders, distractibility, inability to follow simple commands, and lower intelligence quotient. In adults, increased lead levels are associated with increased blood pressure.

Lead poisoning can cause anemia, lethargy, seizures, and death; although it appears that there are not direct effects of lead on the respiratory system, it can be stored in the bone from early age environmental exposure, and elevated blood lead levels can occur due to breakdown of bone tissue during pregnancy, hyperthyroidism (increased secretion...
of hormones from the thyroid gland) and osteoporosis (breakdown of bony tissue). Fetuses and breast-fed babies can be exposed to higher levels of lead because of previous environmental lead exposure of their mothers.

Regional Air Quality

Air pollution levels are measured at monitoring stations located throughout the basin. Areas that are in nonattainment in respect to criteria pollutants are required to prepare plans and implement measures that will bring the region into attainment. Table 4.1-2 (San Diego Air Basin Attainment Status) summarizes the attainment status in the SDAB for the criteria pollutants. The SDAB is currently in nonattainment for ozone, PM\(_{10}\), and PM\(_{2.5}\) (APCD 2017b).

Pollution problems in the SDAB are caused by emissions within the area and the specific meteorology that promotes pollutant concentrations. Emissions sources vary widely from smaller sources such as individual residential water heaters and short-term grading activities to extensive operational sources including long-term operation of electrical power plants and other intense industrial uses. The combination of topography and climate influence air quality in the SDAB and are constraints to efforts to reduce air pollution in the region. During the summer months, a warm air mass frequently descends over the cool, moist marine layer produced by the interaction between the ocean’s surface and the lowest layer of the atmosphere. This warm upper layer forms a cap over the cool marine layer and inhibits pollutants in the marine layer from dispersing away from the surface. In addition, light winds during the summer further limit ventilation. The SDAB experiences more days of sunlight than many other urban areas in the nation, and sunlight triggers the photochemical reactions that produce ozone, a criteria pollutant.

### Table 4.1-2
San Diego Air Basin Attainment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone (8-Hour)</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone (1-Hour)</td>
<td>Attainment*</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM(_{10})</td>
<td>Unclassifiable**</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM(_{2.5})</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur Dioxide</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfates</td>
<td>No Federal Standard</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen Sulfide</td>
<td>No Federal Standard</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>No Federal Standard</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District. 2017

* The federal 1-hour standard of 12 ppm was in effect from 1979 through June 15, 2005. The revoked standard is referenced here because it was employed for such a long period and because this benchmark is addressed in State Implementation Plans.

** At the time of designation, if the available data does not support a designation of attainment or nonattainment, the area is designated as unclassifiable.

Pollutant Trends

The Specific Plan planning area is located within the jurisdiction of the SDCAPCD. The SDCAPCD prepares annual air quality monitoring plans to describe the network of ambient air quality monitors, how pollutant monitoring is meeting mandated programs, and pollutant trends. The following monitoring information is provided by the 2016 draft of the Annual Air Quality Monitoring Network Plan (APCD 2017a).

Over the years, O\(_3\) concentration levels have been decreasing. The SDAB has realized a significant decrease in the three-year average of the exceedance days for O\(_3\) and has seen a sharp decrease in its 8-hour Design Value since 1990. See Figure 4.1-1 (Ozone Concentrations for San Diego: 1996-2016).
Concentration levels for NO₂ have been steadily decreasing as a result of improved emissions control technology on mobile sources. SDCAPCD anticipates continued decrease in concentrations. See Figure 4.1-2 (Nitrogen Dioxide Concentrations for San Diego: 1996 – 2016).

Concentration levels for CO have been decreasing. The 2003 wildfires caused the SDAB to exceed the standards for CO, but the exceedances are considered an exceptional event and do not have a lasting impact in the air basin. Even with the last two wildfires in 2003 and 2007, the County still qualifies for attainment status. See Figure 4.1-3 (Carbon Monoxide Concentrations for San Diego: 1995 – 2015).
Emissions of SO₂ have declined tremendously in California over the last 20 years due to improved source controls and switching from fuel oil to natural gas for electric generation and industrial boilers. See Figure 4.1-4 (Sulfur Dioxide Concentrations for San Diego: 1996 – 2016).

The rapid decrease in lead emissions over the past 20 years can be attributed primarily to phasing out the lead in gasoline. No testing was done in the SDAB from 1997 to 2012. See Figure 4.1-5 (Lead Concentrations for San Diego: 1996 – 2016).
As with the state, PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations in the SDAB have declined. The high maximum 24-hour concentrations measured in 2003 and 2007 were due to severe wildfires that occurred in Southern California. The 98th percentile of 24-hour PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations showed substantial variability within this period, a reflection of changes in meteorology and the influence of the 2003 and 2007 wildfires. See Figure 4.1-6 (PM$_{2.5}$ Manual Concentrations for San Diego: 1996 – 2016).

According to the SDCAPCD, PM$_{10}$ concentrations do not correlate well to growth in population or vehicle usage, and high PM$_{10}$ concentrations do not always occur in high population areas. Emissions from stationary sources and motor vehicles form secondary particles that contribute to PM$_{10}$ in many areas. The three-year average of the annual average shows a large decrease; however, there is a great deal of variability from year to year. Much of this variability is due to meteorological conditions rather than changes in emissions. Due to the firestorms of 2003 and 2007, the annual average exceeded the national 24-hour standard for those years. The firestorms are considered as
exceptional events and they do not have lasting impact in the SDAB. Even with the last two firestorms, the County still qualifies for attainment status. See Figure 4.1-7 (PM$_{10}$ Concentrations for San Diego: 1994 – 2016).

**Figure 4.1-7**

---

**Regulatory Framework**

The following summarizes federal, state, and local regulations related to air quality and pollution control.

**Clean Air Act**

The Federal Clean Air Act (CAA), enacted in 1970 and amended in 1977 and 1990, defines the Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) responsibilities of protecting and improving the United States air quality and ozone layer (EPA 2017). Key components of the CAA include reducing ambient concentrations of air pollutants that cause health and aesthetic problems, reducing emission of toxic air pollutants, and stopping production and use of chemicals that destroy the ozone.

In 1971, to achieve the purposes of Section 109 of the CAA, the EPA developed primary and secondary national AAQS. Primary standards are designed to protect human health with an adequate margin of safety. Secondary standards are designed to protect property and public welfare from air pollutants in the atmosphere. If an air basin is not in attainment of federal standards for O$_3$, the basin is classified as marginal, moderate, serious, severe, or extreme. In 2003, the SDAB was classified as an attainment area for the one-hour NAAQS for O$_3$. In 2004, the SDAB was designated as a “basic” nonattainment area for the 8-hour NAAQS federal standard for O$_3$.

Federal clean air laws require areas with unhealthy levels of ozone, inhalable particulate matter, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, and sulfur dioxide to develop State Implementation Plans (SIPs), which are comprehensive documents that identify how an area will attain NAAQS. Deadlines for attainment were established in the 1990 amendments to the CAA based on the severity of an area’s air pollution problem. Failure to meet air quality deadlines can result in sanctions against the State or the EPA taking over enforcement of the CAA in the affected area.
California Clean Air Act
The California Clean Air Act (CCAA) of 1988 was enacted to develop plans and strategies for attaining California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS). The California Air Resources Board (CARB), which is part of the California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal-EPA), develops statewide air quality regulations, including industry-specific limits on criteria, toxic, and nuisance pollutants. The CCAA is more stringent than federal law in a number of ways, including revised standards for PM_{10} and ozone and for visibility-reducing particles, sulfates, hydrogen sulfide, and vinyl chloride.

California Health and Safety Code Section 39607(e) require the CARB to establish and periodically review area designation criteria. These designation criteria provide the basis for the designation of areas in the State as “attainment,” “nonattainment,” or “unclassified” for the CAAQS. On April 15, 2004, the SDAB was designated a basic nonattainment area for the 8-hour NAAQS for O_3. The SDAB is currently classified as a nonattainment area under the CAAQS for O_3, PM_{10}, and PM_{2.5}.

California State Implementation Plan
The federal CAA required each state to prepare an air quality control plan referred to as the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The SIP is a document that is periodically modified to reflect the latest emissions inventories, plans, and rules and regulations of air basins as reported by the agencies with jurisdiction over them. The EPA has the responsibility to review all SIPs to determine if they conform to the requirements of the CAA, and will achieve air quality goals when implemented. The CARB adopts the California SIP. The SDCAPCD has developed the SDAB’s input to the SIP, which is required under the federal CAA for areas that are out of attainment of air quality standards. The SIP includes the SDCAPCD’s plans and control measures for attaining the O_3 NAAQS. The SIP is also updated on a triennial basis. The CARB adopted its 2007 State Strategy for California’s 2007 SIP on September 27, 2007. The State Strategy was submitted to the EPA on November 16, 2007 for review and approval. As part of the State Strategy, the SDCAPCD developed its Eight-Hour O_3 Attainment Plan for San Diego County which provides plans for attaining and maintaining the 8-hour NAAQS for O_3. This plan accommodates emissions from all sources, including natural sources, through implementation of control measures, where feasible, on stationary sources to attain the standards. Mobile sources are regulated by the EPA and the CARB, and the emissions and reduction strategies related to mobile sources are considered in the SIP. The SIP does not address impacts from sources of PM_{10} or PM_{2.5}, although it does include control measures (rules) to regulate stationary source emissions of those pollutants. The final O_3 Attainment Plan for San Diego County was adopted by the SDCAPCD on December 14, 2016. Additionally, the 2004 Revisions to the California SIP for CO were adopted on July 22, 2004. The original SIP for CO was adopted in 1996. The SIP for CO demonstrates how the SDAB would continue to maintain compliance with federal CO standards.

Toxic Hotspots
State requirements specifically address air toxics issues through Assembly Bill (AB) 1807 (known as the Tanner Bill) that established the state air toxics program and the Air Toxics Hot Spots Information and Assessment Act (AB 2588). The air quality regulations developed from these bills have been modified recently to incorporate the federal regulations associated with the Federal Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990. The Air Toxics Hot Spots Information and Assessment Act (Hot Spots Act) was enacted in September 1987. Under this bill, stationary sources of emissions are required to report the types and quantities of certain substances that their facilities routinely release into the air.

The SDCAPCD works with the operators of regulated stationary sources to produce more comprehensive and accurate emissions inventories. With the release of CARB’s health risk assessment (HRA) software, the SDCAPCD is able to quantitatively evaluate HRAs and continues to modify priorities based on approved inventories. Ongoing implementation of programs such as the Air Toxics “Hot Spots” Program, District Rules 1200 (Toxic Air Contaminants
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New Source Review) and 1210 (Toxic Air Contaminant Public Health Risks – Public Notification and Risk Reduction) serve to reduce local public health risks associated with emissions of TACs. These efforts improve information on levels of exposure and risk as well as identify the compounds, processes, and facilities that are potentially causing significant risks.

San Diego County Regional Air Quality Strategy

The SDCAPCD is the local agency responsible for the administration and enforcement of air quality regulations for San Diego County. The SDCAPCD and the SANDAG are responsible for developing and implementing the clean air plan for attainment and maintenance of the AAQS in the SDAB. The strategy, called the San Diego County RAQS, (Regional Air Quality Strategy) outlines SDCAPCD’s plans and control measures specifically designed to attain the CAAQS for O3. The RAQS was initially adopted in 1991, and is updated on a triennial basis. The RAQS was updated in 1995, 1998, 2001, 2004, 2009, and most recently in 2016. The RAQS outlines SDCAPCD’s plans and control measures designed to attain the State air quality standards for O3 (via control measures to reduce emissions of O3 precursors) (APCD 2016). Like the SIP, this plan accommodates emissions from all sources, including natural sources, through implementation of control measures, where feasible, on stationary sources to attain the standards. Emissions and reduction strategies related to mobile sources are also considered in the RAQS.

The RAQS relies on information from CARB and SANDAG, including mobile (vehicular) and area source emissions, as well as information regarding projected growth in the County, to project future emissions and then determined from that the strategies necessary for the reduction of emissions through regulatory controls. Since SDCAPCD only regulates non-mobile (stationary and some area) sources, only the stationary and area source control measures identified in the RAQS and SIP have been developed by the SDCAPCD into regulations. The rules are developed to set limits on the amount of emissions from various types of sources and/or require specific emission control technologies. Following rule adoption, a permit system is used to require air pollution controls on new and modified stationary sources and to ensure compliance with regulations by prescribing specific operating conditions, monitoring, record keeping, reporting, and emissions testing. Stationary sources are inspected by SDCAPCD on a regular basis to ensure compliance with all emissions, maintenance, and operating requirements.

The CARB mobile source emission projections and SANDAG growth projections are based on population and vehicle trends and land use plans developed by the cities and by the County as part of the development of the County’s General Plan. The SIP relies on the same information from SANDAG to develop emission inventories and emission reduction strategies that are included in the attainment demonstration for the SDAB. The SIP also includes rules and regulations that have been adopted by the SDCAPCD to control emissions from stationary sources. These SIP-approved rules may be used as a guideline to determine whether a project’s emissions would have the potential to conflict with the SIP and thereby hinder attainment of the NAAQS for O3.

SDCAPCD Rules and Regulations

The source control measures identified in the RAQS and SIP have been developed by the SDCAPCD into regulations through a formal rulemaking process. Rules are developed to set limits on the amount of emissions from various types of sources and/or by requiring specific ECTs. Following rule adoption, a permit system is used to impose controls on new and modified stationary sources and to ensure compliance with regulations by prescribing specific operating conditions or equipment on a source.

It is difficult to ensure that new or modified sources do not interfere with attainment or maintenance of the established air quality standards for O3. Since O3 is a secondary pollutant (i.e., O3 is not directly emitted, but results from complex chemical reactions in the atmosphere from precursor pollutants), control of the precursors is required. Therefore, control of emissions of VOCs and NOx, the O3 precursors, is essential.
The SDCAPCD implements Rule 55, the Fugitive Dust Rule. This regulation prohibits dust impacts from construction activities. The rule defines impacts that must be avoided, but does not specify particular measures to be implemented to reduce impacts.

Rule 67.0.1 regulates architectural coatings and incorporates tighter VOC limits of the ARB’s 2007 Suggested Control Measures.

**Poway General Plan EIR**

The General Plan EIR Section 5.3 includes the following mitigation measures pertaining to air quality. Development within the City of Poway, including the Specific Plan planning area, is subject to the requirements laid out within these measures. (Poway 1991)

1. The City's Circulation System shall be maintained in such a way as to provide an efficient and effective transportation system.
2. The City shall continue to work with the San Diego County Transit District to provide bus service to commuters.
3. The City of Poway shall continue to maintain adequate pedestrian and bicycle circulation systems that promote non-motorized transportation.
4. Transportation system management techniques, such as restriping, spot widening, and traffic signal coordination shall be made by the City of Poway as necessary to maximize the capacity of the existing and planned traffic system.
5. The City of Poway shall promote a development pattern that reduces daily trips for shopping, school, and recreation.
6. The City of Poway shall encourage ridesharing, the use of transit, and other transportation systems management programs to reduce the number of vehicle miles traveled and traffic congestion.
7. The City of Poway shall use clean fuel systems in new local government fleet vehicles.
8. The City of Poway shall implement plans and programs to phase-in energy conservation improvements.
9. The City of Poway shall investigate incentives and regulations to reduce emissions from swimming pool heaters, residential and commercial water heating, and heaters.
10. The City shall require as a condition of development approval that developers implement proper measures to reduce short-term construction related impacts to air resources. These measures include that developers shall, during clearing, grading, and earth moving or excavation:
   - Control fugitive dust by regular watering, paving construction roads, or other dust preventive measures;
   - Maintain equipment engines in proper tune;
   - Seed and water until vegetation cover is grown;
   - Spread soil binders;
   - Wet the area down, sufficient enough to form a crust on the surface with repeated soakings, as necessary, to maintain the crust and prevent dust pick up by the wind;
   - Street sweeping should silt be carried over to adjacent public thoroughfares;
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- Use water trucks or sprinkler systems to keep all areas where vehicles move damp enough to prevent dust raised when leaving the site;
- Wet down areas in the late morning and after work is completed for the day;
- Use of low sulfur fuel (0.5% by weight) for construction equipment.

Thresholds of Significance
Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would result in significant impacts if it would:

A. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plan;
B. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation;
C. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors); or
D. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Environmental Impacts
Impact 4.1.A
Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego County Regional air quality strategy. Impacts would be less than significant.

Based on the CEQA Guidelines and the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance, Air Quality, the proposed Specific Plan would have a significant impact if it would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the RAQS, applicable portions of the SIP, and/or any local air quality plans (SD County 2007).

The RAQS relies on information from CARB and SANDAG, including projected growth in the County and mobile, area source, and all other source emissions to project future emissions and determine from that the strategies necessary for the reduction of emissions through regulatory controls. According to the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Air Quality, a project that proposes development that is greater than that anticipated in the General Plan and SANDAG’s projections might have potentially significant impacts.

The proposed Specific Plan identifies the long-term vision and objectives for land use development and public improvements along a 2.65-mile portion of Poway Road between Oak Knoll Road and Garden Road. The proposed Specific Plan amendment would establish new zoning districts and district boundaries, as well as updated site planning, building, parking, architectural, and open space standards and guidelines for development within the Specific Plan planning area. Development capacity of the proposed Specific Plan would result in a greater number of dwelling units and non-residential square footage than currently exists on the ground. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would provide development capacity for up to an additional 1,148 dwelling units and up to 260,000 nonresidential square feet.

The proposed Specific Plan would not authorize any specific construction. Potential development of the Specific Plan planning area that would be accommodated by the proposed Specific Plan would be included in future SANDAG projections and future RAQS and SIP attainment demonstrations for nonattainment pollutants. Development of future projects within the Specific Plan planning area would be subject to the City’s standard CEQA review process, including analysis of the project’s consistency with the current RAQS, compliance with RAQS strategies for attainment of CAAQS for O₃, VOC and NOX emission reduction strategies, SIP plans for attaining and maintaining...
the 8-hour NAAQS for O₃, and SDCAPCD measures for the reduction of particulate matter. With project-specific analysis of air quality impacts for future development within the Specific Plan planning area, the proposed Specific Plan would not conflict with or obstruct with implementation of the San Diego RAQS, applicable portions of the SIP, or SDCAPCD particulate matter reduction measures.

Impact 4.1.B

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not result in any direct violations of any air quality standards. However, future development facilitated by the Specific Plan could result in significant and unavoidable construction and/or operational criteria pollutant emissions.

Based on the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Air Quality, construction and operation of a project would have a significant impact if it would exceed the screening-level thresholds summarized in Table 4.1-3 (Screening-Level Thresholds for Air Quality Impact Analysis).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Daily Emissions (lbs/day)</th>
<th>Annual Emissions (tons/year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM₁₀</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM₂.₅</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOₓ</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOₓ</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SD County 2007

Note that screening-level thresholds are meant for the analysis of emissions from specific development projects and are not meant for analysis of land use programs such as the proposed Specific Plan. The proposed Specific Plan identifies the long-term vision and objectives for land use development and public improvements along a 2.65-mile portion of Poway Road between Oak Knoll Road and Garden Road. The proposed Specific Plan amendment would establish new zoning districts and district boundaries, as well as updated site planning, building, parking, architectural, and open space standards and guidelines for development within the Specific plan planning area. Development capacity of the proposed Specific Plan would result in a greater number of dwelling units and nonresidential square footage than currently exists on the ground. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would provide development capacity for up to an additional 1,148 dwelling units and up to 260,000 non-residential square feet.

Construction Emissions

Short-term criteria pollutant emissions would occur during on-site demolition, clearing, grading, building construction, paving, and architectural coating activities. Emissions would occur from use of construction equipment, worker, vendor, and hauling trips, and disturbance of on-site soils in the form of fugitive dust. To determine if the construction of a project could result in significant air quality impact, construction emissions can be modeled utilizing the California Emissions Estimator Mode (CalEEMod). CalEEMod utilizes construction survey data to estimate construction phase lengths and equipment needs based on the area of a project site.

The proposed Specific Plan would not authorize any specific construction. Note that the SDCAPCD’s screening-level thresholds are meant for the analysis of emissions from specific development projects and are not meant for analysis of land use programs such as the proposed Specific Plan. Development of future projects within the Specific Plan
planning area would be subject to SDCAPCD Rule 55 regulating fugitive dust and Rule 67.0.1 regulating the VOC content of architectural coating, the City’s standard CEQA review process, and would be required to assess project-specific emissions in relation to the screening-level thresholds. However, the significance of project-specific construction emissions cannot be determined until specific construction details are available. Therefore, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

It is important to note that even without adoption of the updated Specific Plan, projects could still be built consistent with existing Specific Plan. Project-specific construction emissions could have similar effects as those associated the proposed project.

**Operational Emissions**

The Specific Plan would accommodate new residential and commercial uses. The SDCAPCD has established daily screening-level thresholds for the operation of land uses within the SDAB. Long-term criteria pollutant emissions would result from the operation of potential residential, retail, and office uses supported by the proposed Specific Plan. Air quality emissions are evaluated in terms of area source emissions, energy demand emissions, and mobile emissions. Operational emissions from a range of development scenarios can be modeled utilizing CalEEMod. Area source emissions are the combination of many small emission sources that include use of outdoor landscape maintenance equipment, use of consumer products such as cleaning products, and periodic repainting of a project. Energy demand emissions result from use of electricity and natural gas. Mobile emissions result from automobile and other vehicle sources associated with daily trips to and from the project vicinity. The project traffic study project build out average daily traffic conditions within the Specific Plan planning area. Residential and motel trip rates are based on SANDAG trip generation rates. To remain consistent with projected traffic, trip rates for all nonresidential uses have been modified in CalEEMod to reflect a standard nonresidential use by dividing all nonresidential trips by total nonresidential square footage.

Note that the SDCAPCD’s screening-level thresholds are meant for the analysis of emissions from specific development projects and are not meant for analysis of land use programs such as the proposed Specific Plan. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would provide development capacity for up to an additional 1,148 dwelling units and up to 260,000 non-residential square feet. Because the purpose of the screening-level thresholds is to evaluate project-specific emissions, it is not appropriate to compare total net emissions that could occur at Specific Plan build out to the screening-level thresholds to determine significance. Development of future projects within the Specific Plan planning area would be subject to the City’s standard CEQA review process and would be required to assess project-specific emissions in relation to the screening-level thresholds.

For disclosure purposes, Table 4.1-4 (Specific Plan Build Out Net Operational Emissions) identifies the maximum net increase in criteria pollutant emissions at full build out of the proposed Specific Plan. The SDCAPCD does not promulgate a program-level numeric threshold for which to compare daily or annual emissions. Because the Specific Plan would not allow any specific development project, the significance of potential project operations within the Specific Plan planning area cannot be determined.

SDCAPCD guidance recognizes that operational impacts from land development projects typically result from increased traffic. Typical mitigation that would reduce emissions related to vehicular traffic includes transportation demand management (TDM) measures, which refers to a variety of strategies to improve transportation efficiency. SANDAG provides a reference for cities to integrate TDM into the planning and development process (SANDAG 2012). One strategy for implementation of TDM measures identified by SANDAG includes the Complete Streets concept, where the design concepts and principles of roadway design focuses on the design for use by all potential users including transit, bicyclists, pedestrians, and cars. Specific TDM measures that can be implemented at the project level include the following (SANDAG 2012):
- Secure bicycle parking (racks, lockers, or bike station)
- Showers and lockers
- Site design that facilitates transit use, walking, and cycling. This includes transit stops, bike and pedestrian pathways, landscaping, benches and awnings, lighting, etc.
- Off-site amenities such as sidewalk improvements, bike network improvements, transit station improvements, improved transit service, transit shelters, roadway and streetscape improvements, intersection improvements, etc.
- On-site amenities that reduce the need to drive by requiring or encouraging a mix of uses (cafes, drug stores, groceries, banks, post office, services, gyms and childcare) into major developments so workers don’t need to use cars during the day.
- Parking maximums
- Unbundled parking
- Priority parking for HOVs
- Market rate parking

TDM strategies that can be implemented by employers include incentivizing and subsidizing carpool, transit, and vanpool, allowing flexible work hours, providing a commuter information center, and providing secure bicycle facilities, showers, and locker facilities on site. To reduce mobile emissions as the Specific Plan planning area develops, Mitigation Measure AQ-1 has been included. Mitigation Measure AQ-1 requires that future development projects implement TDM measures. In addition, Mitigation Measure GHG-1 (see chapter on Greenhouse Gases) prohibits the installation of wood-burning devices such as fireplaces, stoves, and heaters and all new residential developments. The use of wood-burning fireplaces release greater amounts of air pollution, indoors and outdoors, than heaters and fireplaces using other fuels. Wood smoke contains air pollutants that could reduce the blood’s ability to supply oxygen to body tissues (CO), impair the respiratory system and its ability to fight infection (NOₓ), injure the lungs and make breathing difficult (VOC), cause cancer (benzene and formaldehyde), and aggravate a number of respiratory illnesses (particulate matter) (APCD 2017c).

Although Mitigation Measure AQ-1 and GHG-1 would result in decreased operational emissions, until future development projects are proposed, project-specific criteria pollutant emissions can be evaluated, and project-specific mitigation measures applied, impacts would be considered significant and unavoidable.

It is important to note that even without adoption of the updated Specific Plan, projects could still be built consistent with existing Specific Plan. Project-specific operational emissions could have similar effects as those associated the proposed project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VOC</th>
<th>NOₓ</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO₂</th>
<th>PM₁₀</th>
<th>PM₂.₅</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>2,549.26</td>
<td>1,354.59</td>
<td>5,542.86</td>
<td>16.10</td>
<td>1,196.63</td>
<td>605.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>708.83</td>
<td>942.15</td>
<td>2,884.50</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>583.88</td>
<td>210.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Emissions</td>
<td>1,840.43</td>
<td>412.44</td>
<td>2,658.36</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>612.75</td>
<td>395.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-Level Threshold</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1-4
Specific Plan Build Out Net Operational Emissions
Impact 4.1.C
Future development facilitated by the Specific Plan could result in cumulative construction and operational emissions. Impacts are significant and unavoidable.

Construction Emissions
According to the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Air Quality, cumulatively considerable net increases during the construction phase would occur if: (1) project construction would result in direct impacts on air quality with regard to emissions of PM\textsubscript{10}, PM\textsubscript{2.5}, NO\textsubscript{x}, or VOCs, or (2) if two or more projects near each other are simultaneously constructing projects. (SD County 2007)

Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan does not authorize the construction of any specific development project. Development of future projects within the Specific Plan planning area would be subject to the City’s standard CEQA review process and would require assessment of project-specific emissions in relation to the screening-level thresholds and San Diego County guidelines, as described above. However, the significance of future construction emissions cannot be determined at this time. In addition, although no specific development projects would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed Specific Plan, construction of two future projects simultaneously within the Specific Plan planning area could occur. Therefore, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Operational Emissions
According to the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Air Quality, cumulatively considerable net increases during the operational phase would occur if (1) a project does not conform to the RAQS and/or has a significant direct impact on air quality with regard to emissions of PM\textsubscript{10}, PM\textsubscript{2.5}, NO\textsubscript{x}, and or VOCs, or (2) a project would cause an intersection to operate at or below LOS E (when project-related trips would exceed 2,000) and create a CO hotspot. (SD County 2007)

Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan does not authorize any specific development project. Development of future projects within the Specific Plan planning area would be subject to the City’s standard CEQA review process and would be required to assess project-specific emissions in relation to the screening-level thresholds and San Diego County guidelines as described above. Although no specific development projects would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed Specific Plan, the potential for a future project facilitated by the Specific Plan to result in operational emissions in excess of project-level thresholds cannot be determined. Future projects would be required to analyze project-specific and cumulative air quality impacts as part of the standard environmental review process and apply mitigation, if necessary. However, it cannot be determined at this time whether or not feasible mitigation would be available for every potential development project. Therefore, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact 4.1.D
Implementation of the Specific Plan would not place sensitive receptors or create a CO hotspot and would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants. Impacts would be less than significant.

Some populations are more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than the population at large; these populations are defined as sensitive receptors. Sensitive receptors include children, the elderly, the sick, and the athletic. Land uses associated with sensitive receptors include residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, athletic facilities, long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, and retirement homes. Pollutants of particular concern when relating to sensitive receptors include carbon monoxide, toxic air contaminants, and odors. Sensitive receptors within and near to the Specific Plan planning area include residential uses and schools.
According to the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Air Quality, a project would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations if: (1) the project would place sensitive receptors near or create a CO hotspot or (2) the project would result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants (TAC).

**Carbon Monoxide Hot Spots**
Areas that experience traffic congestion may experience the formation of locally high concentrations of CO, known as CO “hot spots.” According to the County of San Diego General Plan Update EIR, no monitoring station located within the SDAB has experienced an exceedance of either the 1-hour or 8-hour CO standard in more than 10 years. (SD County 2011).

In order to evaluate the potential for growth anticipated under the Specific Plan to result in CO hot spots, a review of the CO hot spots analysis conducted by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) as part of its request to the USEPA for redesignation as a CO attainment area is incorporated by reference (SCAQMD 2003). This analysis provides a model for other air quality districts, such as SDCAPCD, to use when determining whether a CO hot spot analysis should be required.

The SCAQMD CO hot spots analysis is summarized below.

In support of its redesignation request, the SCAQMD modeled the four most congested intersections identified in the air basin to demonstrate that no exceedances of the CO standard would occur. The four selected intersections, and the reasons for their inclusion in the CO hot spots analysis, are listed below.

1. Long Beach Boulevard and Imperial Highway - This location was selected due to its proximity to the Lynwood monitoring station, which consistently records the highest 8-hour CO concentrations in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) each year.
2. Wilshire Boulevard and Veteran Avenue - This is considered to be the most congested intersection in Los Angeles County, with an average daily traffic volume of 100,000 vehicles per day.
3. Highland Avenue and Sunset Boulevard - This is one of the most congested intersections in the City of Los Angeles.
4. Century Boulevard and La Cienega Boulevard - This is one of the most congested intersections in the City of Los Angeles.

The analysis demonstrated that even the most congested intersections in the SCAB would not experience a CO hot spot. The CO hot spots analysis for these intersections indicated that the average 1-hour CO concentrations predicted by the models would be no more than 7.7 ppm, which is 38.5 percent of the 1-hour CO CAAQS of 20 ppm.

A project traffic study was prepared to analyze build out traffic conditions within the Specific Plan planning area. As shown in the traffic study (Appendix D), none of the deficient facilities (i.e., LOS E or F) has an average daily traffic (ADT) volume greater than 100,000, which was the amount of traffic anticipated for the intersection of Wilshire Boulevard and Veteran Avenue. Therefore, build out of the Specific Plan is not anticipated to result in a CO hot spot. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Toxic Air Contaminants**
TACs are defined by the California Health and Safety Code as air pollutants which may cause of contribute to an increase in mortality or in serious illness, or which may pose a present or potential hazard to human health. The CARB established monitoring stations within San Diego County to estimate background excess cancer risks associated with exposure to ambient levels of TACs. Diesel particulate matter (DPM) was estimated to account for the greatest amount of risk and is composed of a complex mixture of substances emitted from diesel sources. Heavy-
duty trucks that utilize diesel fuel emit DPM, which is responsible for most of the airborne cancer risk from TACs in California (SD County 2011). The Specific Plan planning area currently consists of residential and commercial uses, which are not uses that are considered to contribute excessive TAC emissions. The proposed Specific Plan would not allow uses that would result in increased use trips by heavy-duty trucks such as industrial uses. In addition, there are no industrial uses located adjacent to the Specific Plan planning area and Poway Road is not a designated truck route. Therefore, implementation of the Specific Plan would not facilitate the placement of housing any uses or roadways that generate elevated levels of DPM.

Mitigation Measures

AQ-1

Future commercial development within the Specific Plan planning area shall implement feasible Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures subject to the review and approval of the Planning Division. Should it be determined that TDM measures would not be feasible for a specific development, written justification shall be submitted to the Planning Division as part of the City’s standard development and environmental review process.

TDM measures include, but are not limited to the following:

- Secure bicycle parking (racks, lockers, or bike station)
- Showers and lockers
- Site design that facilitates transit use, walking, and cycling. This includes transit stops, bike and pedestrian pathways, landscaping, benches and awnings, lighting, etc.
- Off-site amenities such as sidewalk improvements, bike network improvements, transit station improvements, improved transit service, transit shelters, roadway and streetscape improvements, intersection improvements, etc.
- On-site amenities that reduce the need to drive by requiring or encouraging a mix of uses (cafes, drug stores, groceries, banks, post office, services, gyms and childcare) into major developments so workers don’t need to use cars during the day.
- Parking maximums
- Unbundled parking
- Priority parking for HOVs
- Market rate parking

Level of Significance with Mitigation Incorporated

Impacts 4.1.B and 4.1.C would remain significant and unavoidable with adherence to existing regulation and implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and GHG-1.
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4.2 Biological Resources

This section describes potential impacts on biological resources associated with adoption and implementation of the proposed Poway Road Corridor Specific Plan. This section addresses the specific biological resource concerns identified by the CEQA Guidelines: Would development under the proposed Specific Plan have a substantial adverse effect on special-status species, sensitive natural habitat, protected wetlands, or wildlife or fish movement, or would it conflict with adopted policies or plans for protecting biological resources?

During the NOP comment period, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife submitted comments and recommendations to assist the City in identifying and/or mitigating the project’s significant, or potentially significant, direct and indirect impacts on fish and wildlife resources.

Background and Methods

MIG reviewed available background information to identify and characterize biological resources within the project area. This included assessing sensitive biological resources that have the potential to be present within the project area through a review of current database information. Available literature reviewed included the following sources:

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife’s (CDFW’s) California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) records (CDFW 2017b)
- California Native Plant Society’ (CNPS) Electronic Inventory (CNPS 2001, CNPS 2017)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s (USFWS’s) list Information for Project and Consultation (IPaC) (USFWS 2017a)
- USFWS’s National Wetlands Inventory (USFWS 2017b)
- Poway Road Corridor Specific Plan Amendment Initial Study (Appendix B of this EIR)
- Poway Comprehensive Plan: General Plan (Poway 1991a)

Vegetation Communities

Vegetation communities were identified through a brief site reconnaissance survey and review of Google Earth and available literature listed above. Communities are generally mapped and classified using *A Manual of California Vegetation* (Sawyer et al. 2009) and *Terrestrial Natural Communities of California* (Holland 1986). In some cases, it was necessary to identify variants of plant community types or nonvegetated areas that are not described in the literature. The *List of California Natural and Terrestrial Communities* (CDFG 2010) was consulted to determine if any rare or sensitive plant communities are present. In addition, plant communities were evaluated to determine if they are considered sensitive under federal and/or other State regulations and local policies.

Special-Status Species

A search of special-status species and sensitive natural community occurrence records from the project area and surrounding vicinity was conducted, including CNDDB and CNPS Electronic Inventory records for the Poway U.S. Geological Service (USGS) 7.5-minute quadrangle and the eight surrounding USGS quadrangles including Rancho Santa Fe, Del Mar, La Jolla, La Mesa, El Cajon, San Vicente Reservoir, San Pasqual, and Escondido, as well as a review of the USFWS IPaC species list for the project area. All species within five miles of the project area were considered to have some potential to occur within the project area. A list of special-status species known to occur or that have the moderate or high potential to occur was generated, based upon the species’ general habitat requirements in comparison to habitats known to be present in the project area. For the purposes of this evaluation, special-status species include those plants and animals listed, proposed for listing, or candidates for listing as
threatened or endangered by the USFWS or National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries) under the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA); those listed or proposed for listing as rare, threatened, or endangered by the CDFW under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA); plants occurring on the CNPS Inventory; and plants and animals designated as species of special concern or fully protected by the CDFW.

Sensitive Natural Communities
Sensitive natural communities include habitats such as riparian habitats, wetlands, and habitats for protected species. These communities are usually identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by federal or State agencies. Vegetation communities and wildlife habitats identified in the project area were evaluated to determine if they are considered sensitive by local, state, or federal agencies.

Environmental Setting
The project area is located along a 2.65-mile portion of Poway Road that runs between Oak Knoll Road and Garden Road in the City of Poway, California in the Poway USGS 7.5-minute quadrangle. Within the project area, Poway Road is an east/west corridor that connects to Interstate 15 approximately two miles west of the project area and to Highway 67 approximately three miles east of the project area. The project area experiences a Mediterranean climate characterized by hot, dry summers and cool, mild winters, with most precipitation occurring in the winter months.

The majority of the project area is developed with commercial, industrial, and residential uses. Approximately two percent of the land with the project area consists of vacant parcels. Two large creeks traverse or are close to the project area. Poway Creek is located directly south of the project area, and Rattlesnake Creek runs along Poway Community Park through the Town Center portion of the project area. In addition, several other channels and creeks are located within and in close proximity. The project area is located within the Poway Subarea Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP)/Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP) of the San Diego County Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) and the San Diego County Multiple Habitat Conservation Program (MHCP).

Existing Habitats/Vegetation Communities
The project area is a highly developed urban area with most of the land developed or disturbed. Trees and shrubs are primarily for urban landscaping and provide minor value to wildlife. Due to the developed urban setting, these plantings do not represent significant natural resource values or significant resources for native wildlife species. Small patches of typical nonnative annual grassland and weeds occur in remnant pockets of undeveloped ground and do not represent natural habitats or valuable resources. Some riparian vegetation is present and could support native riparian and special-status species. A detailed description of the habitats/vegetation communities in the project area follows. A map of the habitats/vegetation communities in the project area is depicted in Exhibit 4.2-1 (Vegetation Communities Map).
Developed
The majority of the project area (approximately 235 acres) is dominated by commercial/residential buildings, planted ornamentals, and paved areas. Vegetation in these areas consists primarily of nonnative tree and shrub species such as red ironbark (Eucalyptus sideroxylon), lemon-scented gum (Eucalyptus citriodora), red gum (Eucalyptus tereticornis), blue gum (Eucalyptus globulus), sweet gum (Liquidambar styraciflua), oleander (Nerium oleander), tree tobacco (Nicotiana glauca), pine trees (Pinus sp.), ash trees (Fraxinus sp.), olive trees (Olea europaea), bottlebrush (Callistemon citrinus), Mexican Palo verde (Parrinsonia aculeata), carob (Ceratonia siliqua), Brazilian pepper (Schinus terebinthifolius), Peruvian pepper (Schinus molle), silky oak (Grevillea robusta), jacaranda (Jacaranda mimosifolia), queen palm (Syagrus romanzoffiana), tree of heaven (Ailanthus altissima), iceplant (Carpobrotus edulis), Indian hawthorn (Rhaphiolepis indica), acacia (Acacia sp.), bird of paradise (Strelitzia reginae), aloe (Aloe sp.), and castor bean (Ricinus communis). Nonnative herbs and grasses found throughout this community include, but are not limited to, African daisy (Dimorphotheca sinuate), rosemary (Rosmarinus officinalis), cheat grass (Bromus tectorum), fountaingrass (Pennisetum setaceum), goldentop (Lamarckia aurea), yellow sweet clover (Melilotus officinalis), wild lettuce (Lactuca serriola), prickly sow-thistle (Sonchus asper), wild radish (Raphanus raphanistrum), agapanthus (Agapanthus africanus), and English ivy (Hedera helix).

Native species are occasional in the developed portion of the project area and include species such as California fan palm (Washingtonia filifera), coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia), western sycamore (Platanus racemosa), laurel sumac (Malosma laurina), horseweed (Erigeron canadensis), and western ragweed (Ambrosia psilostachya).

Disturbed
A single, approximately 2.7-acre lot within central portion of the project area has been recently disturbed and remains largely unvegetated. Vegetation within this area is sparse and consists primarily of weedy, nonnative, disturbance-adapted, and ruderal plant species such as red stemmed filaree (Erodium botrys), London rocket (Sisymbrium irio), cheeseweed (Malva parviflora), summer mustard (Hirschfeldia incana), and prickly sow-thistle.

Riparian
Two riparian corridors are present in the western and central portions of the project area. These communities include approximately 1.6 acres within the project area and are dominated by cattails (Typha sp.) adjacent to the active streams and riparian scrub woodlands along the banks. Other species commonly found throughout these communities include black willow (Salix gooddingii), arroyo willow (Salix lasiolepis), western sycamore (Platanus racemosa), California fan palm, laurel sumac (Malosma laurina), mulefat (Baccharis salicifolia), coyote brush (Baccharis pilularis), western ragweed (Ambrosia psilostachya), yerba mansa (Anemopsis californica), duckweed (Lemma sp.), alkali bulrush (Bolboschoenus maritimus), nightshade (Solanum sp.), spiny rush (Juncus acutus), and watercress (Nasturtium officinale).

Nonnative species are occasional in these communities and include giant reed (Arundo donax), Bermuda buttercups (Oxalis pes-caprae), fennel (Foeniculum vulgare), curly dock (Rumex crispus), ripgut (Bromus diandrus), cheat grass, and wild oats (Avena fatua).

Nonnative Grassland
A single, approximately 0.9-acre nonnative grassland is present within the western portion of the project area. This community is dominated by nonnative grasses and forbs such as cheat grass, red brome (Bromus madritensis ssp. rubens), ripgut, wild oats, goldentop (Euthamia sp.), artichoke thistle (Cynara cardunculus), yellow sweet clover (Melilotus officinalis), smooth cat’s ear (Hypochaeris glabra), red stemmed filaree, broad leaf filaree (Erodium botrys), red gum, summer mustard (Hirschfeldia incana), cheeseweed, London rocket, wild lettuce, and prickly sow-thistle. Native species are reclaiming portions of this community and include coyote brush, California buckwheat (Eriogonum fasciculatum), and pearly everlasting (Anaphalis margaritacea).
Common Wildlife
Wildlife within the project area is largely limited to species that are adapted to high levels of disturbance associated with the urban environment. General wildlife species documented onsite or within the vicinity of the project area include, but are not limited to, western fence lizard (Sceloporus occidentalis), mallard (Anas platyrhynchos), great egret (Ardea alba), great blue heron (Ardea herodias), California gull (Larus californicus), killdeer (Charadrius vociferous), yellow-rumped warbler (Setophaga coronate), western bluebird (Sialia mexicana), mourning dove (Zenaida macroura), Anna’s hummingbird (Calypte anna), western kingbird (Tyrannus verticalis), black phoebe (Sayornis nigricans), Say’s phoebe (Sayornis saya), northern mockingbird (Mimus polyglottos), western scrub-jay (Aphelocoma californica), hooded oriole (Icterus cucullatus), bushtit (Psaltriparus minimus), American crow (Corvus brachyrhynchos), common raven (Corvus corax), house sparrow (Passer domesticus), song sparrow (Melospiza melodia), California towhee (Pipilo crissalis), lesser goldfinch (Carduelis psaltria), and house finch (Carpodacus mexicanus).

Surface Waters and Wetlands
No wetlands were observed within the project area. Three creeks are located within the project area, including two unnamed tributaries to Poway Creek and Rattlesnake Creek, as shown in Exhibit 4.2-2 (Jurisdictional Resources Map). Rattlesnake Creek runs along Poway Community Park through the Town Center portion of the project area. Some of these creeks (Rattlesnake Creek) are maintained in a somewhat natural state and support native riparian vegetation.

Sensitive Plant Communities
No critical habitat is present in the project area. As discussed above, three creeks and their associated riparian habitat are present. These creeks are likely regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), CDFW, and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

Nonnative grassland is present in the project area and is considered a sensitive vegetation community under the Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP.

CDFW has identified several native plant communities that are rare and unique to California. While these communities do not necessarily have legal, protective status, impacts to these plant communities may be considered “significant” under CEQA. Sensitive plant communities identified in project area by CDFW include Southern Cottonwood Willow Riparian Forest (CDFW 2017b). Southern Cottonwood Willow Riparian Forest is located along Rattlesnake Creek and is regulated by the CDFW.

Special-Status Species
Based on a review of available databases and literature, it was determined that 26 special-status plant species have been documented within five miles of the project area and occur in habitats known to occur in the vicinity of the project area (Table 4.2-1), including riparian woodland and scrub and stream habitats (CNDB and CNPS 2017). Species known from habitats that do not occur in the project area were not included on the list of potentially present special-status plant species and were excluded from further evaluation. Special-status plant species with moderate potential to occur in the project area are discussed in more detail in Table 4.2-1 and include the following species:

- California adolphia (Adolphia californica)
- Decumbent goldenbush (Isocoma menziesii var. decumbens)
- Orcutt’s brodiaea (Brodiaea orcuttii)
- Robinson’s pepper-grass (Lepidium virginicum var. robinsonii)
- San Diego barrel cactus (Ferocactus viridescens)
- San Diego marsh-elder (Iva hayesiana)
- San Diego sagewort (Artemisia palmeri)
- Variegated dudleya (Dudleya variegata)
- Willowy monardella (Monardella viminea)
## Table 4.2-1
Special-Status Plant Species with Potential to Occur in the Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plants</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Habitat</th>
<th>Potential to Occur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California adolphia</td>
<td>Adolphia californica</td>
<td>2B.1</td>
<td>Found in substrates ranging from sandy/gravelly to clay within grassland, coastal sage scrub, or chaparral habitats from 45-740 meters.</td>
<td>Marginal suitable habitat for California adolphia is present within the non-native grassland habitat in the project area. There are 15 CNDDB occurrence records for this species within 5 miles of the project area. Moderate Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell’s liverwort</td>
<td>Geothallus tuberosus</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>Found in mesic coastal scrub and vernal pool habitat from 10-600 meters.</td>
<td>No suitable habitat for Campell’s liverwort is present in the project area. There is one CNDDB occurrence record for this species within 5 miles of the project area. Low Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedros Island oak</td>
<td>Quercus cedrosensis</td>
<td>2B.2</td>
<td>Found in closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral, and coastal scrub habitat from 130-975 meters.</td>
<td>No suitable habitat for Cedros Island oak is present in the project area. There is one CNDDB occurrence record for this species within 5 miles of the project area. Low Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coulter’s saltbush</td>
<td>Atriplex coulteri</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Found in alkaline or clay soils in coastal bluff scrub, coastal dunes, coastal scrub, and valley and foothill grassland habitat from 2-460 meters. Often found on ocean bluffs, ridgetops, as well as alkaline low places.</td>
<td>Marginal suitable habitat for Coulter’s saltbush may be present within the non-native grassland habitat in the project area. There is one CNDDB occurrence record for this species within 5 miles of the project area. Low Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decumbent goldenbush</td>
<td>Isocoma menziesii var. decumbens</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Found in coastal scrub and chaparral habitats from 1-915 meters. Occurs in sandy soils and is often found in disturbed sites.</td>
<td>Marginal suitable habitat for decumbent goldenbush is present within the disturbed and non-native grassland habitat in the project area. There are two CNDDB occurrence records for this species within 5 miles of the project area, including one on the east side of Community Road and south of Poway Creek, which is south of the project area. Moderate Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delicate clarkia</td>
<td>Clarkia delicata</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Often found in gabbro soils in cismontane woodland and chaparral habitats from 50-1,360 meters.</td>
<td>No suitable habitat for delicate clarkia is present in the project area. There is one CNDDB occurrence record for this species within 5 miles of the project area. Low Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar manzanita</td>
<td>Arctostaphylos glandulosa ssp. crassifolia</td>
<td>FE, 1B.1</td>
<td>Found in chaparral habitat in sandy coastal mesas and ocean bluffs from 30-365 meters.</td>
<td>No suitable habitat for Del Mar manzanita is present in the project area. There are 10 CNDDB occurrence records for this species within 5 miles of the project area. Low Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas baccharis</td>
<td>Baccharis vanessae</td>
<td>FT, CE, 1B.1</td>
<td>Found in chaparral and cismontane woodland habitats from 40-855 meters. Occurs on sandstone soils in steep, open rocky areas with chaparral associates.</td>
<td>No suitable habitat for Encinitas baccharis is present in the project area. There are three CNDDB occurrence records for this species within 5 miles of the project area. Low Potential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2-1
Special-Status Plant Species with Potential to Occur in the Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plants</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Habitat</th>
<th>Potential to Occur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long-spined spineflower</strong>&lt;br&gt; <em>Chorizanthe polygonoiddes var. longispina</em></td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Found in gabbroic clay in chaparral, coastal scrub, meadows and seeps,</td>
<td>No suitable habitat for long-spined spineflower is present in the project area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>valley and foothill grasslands, and vernal pool habitats from 30-1,540</td>
<td>There is one CNDDB occurrence record for this species within 5 miles of the project area. Low Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>meters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nuttall’s scrub oak</strong>&lt;br&gt; <em>Quercus dumosa</em></td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>Generally found in sandy soils near the coast in closed-cone coniferous</td>
<td>No suitable habitat for Nuttall’s scrub oak is present in the project area. There are 10 CNDDB occurrence records for this species within 5 miles of the project area, including an occurrence approximately 0.7 mile southwest of the intersection of Poway Road and Pomerado Road. Low Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>forest, chaparral, and coastal scrub habitats from 15-400 meters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orcutt’s brodiaea</strong>&lt;br&gt; <em>Brodiaea orcuttii</em></td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>Found in mesic clay habitats, including vernal pools, valley and foothill</td>
<td>Some suitable habitat for Orcutt’s brodiaea may be present in the riparian habitat in the project area. There are four CNDDB occurrence records for this species within 5 miles of the project area. Moderate Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>grasslands, closed-cone coniferous forests, cismontane woodlands,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>chaparral, and meadows and seeps from 30-1,615 meters. Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>associated with serpentine. Usually found in vernal pools and small</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>drainages.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Palmer’s goldenbush</strong>&lt;br&gt; <em>Ericameria palmeri var. palmeri</em></td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>Found in mesic sites on granitic soils, on steep hillsides in coastal</td>
<td>No suitable habitat for Palmer’s goldenbush is present in the project area. There is one CNDDB occurrence record for this species within 5 miles of the project area. Low Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>scrub and chaparral habitat from 5-625 meters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Palmer’s grapplinghook</strong>&lt;br&gt; <em>Harpagonella palmeri</em></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Found in clay soils in chaparral, coastal scrub, and valley and foothill</td>
<td>No suitable habitat for Palmer’s grapplinghook is present in the project area. There is one CNDDB occurrence record for this species within 5 miles of the project area. Low Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>grassland habitat from 20-955 meters. Often found in grassy areas with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>open shrubland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Robinson’s pepper-grass</strong>&lt;br&gt; <em>Lepidium virginicum var. robinsonii</em></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Found in dry soils in chaparral and coastal scrub habitat from 1-885</td>
<td>Suitable habitat for Robinson’s pepper-grass may be present in the riparian habitat in the project area. There are six CNDDB occurrence records for this species within 5 miles of the project area, including south of Poway Creek near the confluence with Rattlesnake Creek. Moderate Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>meters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Diego ambrosia</strong>&lt;br&gt; <em>Ambrosia pumila</em></td>
<td>FE, 1B.1</td>
<td>Found in sandy loam or clay soil (sometimes alkaline) in valleys in</td>
<td>Marginal suitable habitat for San Diego ambrosia is present in the non-native grassland and disturbed habitat in the project area. There is one CNDDB occurrence record within 5 miles of the project area. Low Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>chaparral, coastal scrub, and valley and foothill grassland habitats from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3-580 meters. Persists where disturbance has been superficial.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 4.2-1

**Special-Status Plant Species with Potential to Occur in the Project Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plants</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Habitat</th>
<th>Potential to Occur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego barrel cactus ((Ferocactus viridescens))</td>
<td>2B.1</td>
<td>Found in chaparral, coastal scrub, and valley and foothill grassland habitats from 3-490 meters. Often found on exposed, level, or south-sloping areas.</td>
<td>Marginal suitable habitat for San Diego barrel cactus is present in the disturbed habitat in the project area. There are 42 CNDDB occurrence records within 5 miles of the project area, including just north of the Plan area on Ring Road and approximately 0.5 mile southeast of the junction of Poway Road and Community Road. Moderate Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego button-celery ((Eryngium aristulatum var. parishii))</td>
<td>FE, CE, 1B.1</td>
<td>Found in vernal pools (i.e., San Diego mesa hardpan and claypan vernal pools and southern interior basalt flow vernal pools), coastal scrub, and valley and foothill grasslands from 15-880 meters. Usually surrounded by scrub.</td>
<td>No suitable habitat for San Diego button-celery is present in the project area. There is one CNDDB occurrence record for this species within 5 miles of the project area. Low Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego goldenstar ((Bloomeria clevelandii))</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>Found in chaparral, coastal scrub, valley and foothill grassland, and vernal pool habitats from 50-945 meters. Often in clay soils in mesa grasslands and scrub edges. Often on mounds between vernal pools in fine, sandy loam.</td>
<td>No suitable habitat for San Diego goldenstar is present in the project area. There are seven CNDDB occurrence records within 5 miles of the project area. Low Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego gumplant ((Grindelia hallii))</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Found in meadows, valley and foothill grasslands, chaparral, and lower montane coniferous forests from 185-1,745 meters. Frequently occurs in low moist areas in meadows.</td>
<td>No suitable habitat for San Diego gumplant is present in the project area. There is one CNDDB occurrence record for this species within 5 miles of the project area. Low Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego marsh-elder ((Iva hayesiana))</td>
<td>2B.2</td>
<td>Found in marshes, swamps, riverwashes, and playas from 1-430 meters.</td>
<td>Suitable habitat for San Diego marsh-elder is present in the riparian habitat in the project area. There are seven CNDDB occurrence records for this species within 5 miles of the project area. Moderate Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego sagewort ((Artemisia palmeri))</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Found in coastal scrub, chaparral, riparian forest, riparian woodland, and riparian scrub habitats from 15-915 meters. Typically found in drainages and riparian areas in sandy soil within chaparral and other habitats.</td>
<td>Suitable habitat for San Diego sagewort is present in the riparian habitat in the project area. There are five CNDDB occurrence records for this species within 5 miles of the project area. Moderate Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego thorn-mint ((Acanthomintha ilicifolia))</td>
<td>FT, CE, 1B.1</td>
<td>Endemic to active vertisol clay soils of mesas and valleys. Usually found on clay lenses within grassland or chaparral communities from 25-945 meters.</td>
<td>No suitable habitat for San Diego thorn-mint is present in the project area. There are six CNDDB occurrence records for this species within 5 miles of the project area. Low Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer holly ((Comarostaphylis diversifolia ssp. diversifolia))</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Found in chaparral and cismontane habitat from 30-945 meters. Sometimes found within chaparral habitats post-burn.</td>
<td>No suitable habitat for summer holly is present in the project area. There are two CNDDB occurrence records for this species within 5 miles of the project area. Low Potential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.2-1
**Special-Status Plant Species with Potential to Occur in the Project Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plants</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Habitat</th>
<th>Potential to Occur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thread-leaved brodiaea (Brodiaea filifolia)</td>
<td>FT, CE, 1B.1</td>
<td>Found in chaparral (openings), cismontane woodland, coastal scrub, playas, valley and foothill grassland, and vernal pool habitats from 15-1,020 meters. Usually associated with annual grassland and vernal pools. Often surrounded by shrubland habitats. Occurs in openings on clay soils.</td>
<td>No suitable habitat for thread-leaved brodiaea is present in the project area. There are two CNDDB occurrence records for this species within 5 miles of the project area. <strong>Low Potential</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variegated dudleya (Dudleya variegata)</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Found in rocky or clay soils in chaparral, coastal scrub, cismontane woodland, and valley and foothill grassland habitat from 3-580 meters. Sometimes associated with vernal pool margins.</td>
<td>Marginal suitable habitat for variegated dudleya is present in the non-native grassland and disturbed habitat in the project area. There are nine CNDDB occurrence records for this species within 5 miles of the project area, including south of Poway Creek and east of Community Road, which is south of the project area. <strong>Moderate Potential</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willowy monardella (Monardella viminea)</td>
<td>FE, CE, 1B.1</td>
<td>Found in coastal scrub, chaparral, riparian forest, riparian scrub, and riparian woodland habitat from 45-230 meters. Often found in canyons, in rocky and sandy locations, sometimes in washes or floodplains.</td>
<td>Suitable habitat for willowy monardella is present in the riparian habitat in the project area. There are ten CNDDB occurrence records for this species within 5 miles of the project area. <strong>Moderate Potential</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** California Natural Diversity Database, California Native Plant Society Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Information for Project and Consultation (IPaC); April 17, 2017.

**Status Codes:**

**Federal**
- FE: Federally-listed Endangered
- FT: Federally-listed Threatened

**State**
- CE: California-listed Endangered

**California Native Plant Society (CNPS)**
- Rank 1A – Presumed extinct in California
- Rank 1B – Rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere
- Rank 2A – Plants presumed extirpated in California, but more common elsewhere
- Rank 2B – Rare, threatened, or endangered in California, but more common elsewhere
- Rank 3 – Plants for which more information is needed – A review list
- Rank 4 – Plants of limited distribution – A watch list

**Additional threat ranks endangerment codes are assigned to each taxon or group as follows:**
- .1 – Seriously endangered in California (over 80% of occurrences threatened/high degree of immediacy of threat)
- .2 – Fairly endangered in California (20-80% occurrences threatened)
- .3 – Not very endangered in California (<20% of occurrences threatened or no current threats known)
4.2 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Special-Status Animal Species

Based upon a review of the CNDDB (CDFW 2017b) and the USFWS IPaC (USFWS 2017a), six bird, 10 mammal, five reptile, one amphibian, and one invertebrate special-status species are known or have potential to occur in the project area vicinity (Table 4.2-2). Several animal species that came up during the database searches of the project area and surrounding vicinity were eliminated from further consideration for varying reasons, including, but not limited to, absence of essential habitat requirements for the species and/or the site is outside of the species’ documented distribution and/or elevation range. Special-status animal species with moderate potential to occur in the project area are discussed in more detail in Table 4.2-2 and include the following species:

- Coastal whiptail (*Aspidoscelis tigris stejnegeri*)
- Coast horned lizard (*Phrynosoma blainvillii*)
- Red-diamond rattlesnake (*Crotalus ruber*)
- Least Bell’s vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus*)
- Western mastiff bat (*Eumops perotis californicus*)
- Western yellow bat (*Lasius xanthinus*)

The vegetation communities within the project area also support suitable nesting habitat for raptors and songbirds protected by the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and California Fish and Game Code. Planted shrubs and trees within landscaped portions of the project area may provide suitable nesting habitats for common bird species that are adapted to ambient noise levels associated with existing development. In addition, several avian species have potential to nest in shrubs and trees within the riparian habitat in the project area.

Vegetation communities in the project area also support roosting bats protected by the California Fish and Game Code. Planted shrubs and trees, as well as buildings, within the developed portion of the project area may provide suitable roosting habitat for bat species that are less sensitive to human disturbance associated with the urban environment. In addition, the trees, and shrubs within the riparian habitat in the project area could provide roosting habitat for numerous bat species, including some special-status species, such as western mastiff bat and western yellow bat.

Wildlife Corridors

Wildlife corridors refer to linkages between habitat areas that allow for movement of resident and migratory species and facilitate genetic interchange between populations. Corridors can consist of a sequence of stepping-stones across the landscape (discontinuous areas of habitat such as isolated wetlands and roadside vegetation), linear strips of vegetation and habitat (such as riparian corridors and ridge lines), or they may be parts of larger habitat areas selected for its known or likely importance to local wildlife. Maintaining the continuity of established wildlife corridors is important to preserve a species’ distribution potential and retain diversity among many wildlife populations.

Although located within the Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP, the project area is not located within the HCP mitigation area. Therefore, the project area is not considered to be a biological core and linkage area.

The project area and surrounding area are mostly developed; therefore, the majority of the project area does not function as a terrestrial wildlife movement corridor. Riparian habitat within the project area could function as an aquatic and terrestrial movement corridor. Riparian habitats often function as migration corridors because they provide food, water, and cover for a wide variety of wildlife species and often link habitats. However, due to the narrowness of the riparian corridor, the high levels of human disturbance surrounding the riparian corridor, and because the riparian corridor has been disturbed in locations within and surrounding the project area, the quality of the habitat as a migration corridor may be low.
Table 4.2-2
Special-Status Wildlife Species with Potential to Occur in the Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wildlife</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Habitat</th>
<th>Potential to Occur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INVERTEBRATES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego fairy shrimp (Branchinecta sandiegonensis)</td>
<td>FE</td>
<td>Endemic to San Diego and Orange County mesas. Requires vernal pool habitat.</td>
<td>No suitable habitat for San Diego fairy shrimp is present in the project area. There is one CNDDB occurrence record for this species within 5 miles of the project area. Low Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMPHIBIANS/REPTILES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California glossy snake (Arizona elegans occidentalis)</td>
<td>CSSC</td>
<td>Patchily distributed from the eastern portion of the San Francisco Bay, southern San Joaquin Valley, and the Coast, Transverse, and Peninsular ranges, south to Baja California. Found in a range of scrub and grassland habitats with loose or sandy soils.</td>
<td>Suitable habitat for California glossy snake is present in the non-native grassland habitat in the project area. However, given the urban development surrounding this habitat, which creates a barrier to movement, the habitat is likely low-quality for this species. There are two CNDDB occurrence records for this species within 5 miles of the project area. Low Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coast horned lizard (Phrynosoma blainvillii)</td>
<td>CSSC</td>
<td>Frequents a wide variety of habitats. Most common in lowlands along sandy washes with scattered low bushes. Requires open areas for sunning, bushes for cover, patches of loose soil for burial, and an abundant supply of ants and other insects.</td>
<td>Suitable habitat for coast horned lizard is present in the non-native grassland and disturbed habitat in the project area. However, given the urban development surrounding this habitat, which creates a barrier to movement, the habitat is likely fairly low-quality for this species. There are ten CNDDB occurrence records for this species within 5 miles of the project area. Moderate Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coastal whiptail (Aspidoscelis tigris stejnegeri)</td>
<td>CSSC</td>
<td>Found in deserts and semiarid areas with sparse vegetation and open areas. Also found in woodland and riparian areas. Ground where this species occurs may be firm soil, sandy, or rocky.</td>
<td>Suitable habitat for coastal whiptail is present in the non-native grassland, disturbed, and riparian habitat in the project area. There are three CNDDB occurrence records for this species within 5 miles of the project area. Moderate Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Red-diamond rattlesnake (Crotalus ruber)</td>
<td>CSSC</td>
<td>Found in chaparral, woodland, grassland, and desert areas from coastal San Diego County to the eastern slopes of the mountains. Occurs in rocky areas and dense vegetation. Needs rodent burrows, cracks in rocks or surface cover objects.</td>
<td>Suitable habitat for red-diamond rattlesnake is present in the non-native grassland and disturbed habitat in the project area. However, given the urban development surrounding this habitat, which creates a barrier to movement, the habitat is likely low-quality for this species. There are seven CNDDB occurrence records for this species within 5 miles of the project area. Moderate Potential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.2-2
Special-Status Wildlife Species with Potential to Occur in the Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wildlife</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Habitat</th>
<th>Potential to Occur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two-striped gartersnake <em>(Thamnophis hammondii)</em></td>
<td>CSSC</td>
<td>Found in coastal California from vicinity of Salinas to northwest Baja California. Occurs at elevations from sea level to about 7,000 feet. Highly aquatic. Found in or near permanent fresh water. Often found along streams with rocky beds and riparian growth. Suitable habitat for two-striped gartersnake is present in the riparian habitat in the project area. There is one CNDDB occurrence record for this species within 5 miles of the project area. <strong>Low Potential</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western spadefoot <em>(Spea hammondii)</em></td>
<td>CSSC</td>
<td>Occurs primarily in grassland habitats, but can be found in valley-foothill hardwood woodlands. Vernal pools are essential for breeding and egg-laying. No suitable habitat for western spadefoot is present in the project area. There are two CNDDB occurrence records for this species within 5 miles of the project area. <strong>Low Potential</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIRDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal cactus wren <em>(Campylorhynchus brunneicapillus sandiegensis)</em></td>
<td>CSSC</td>
<td>Occurs in southern California coastal sage scrub. Requires tall prickly pear (<em>Opuntia</em> sp.) cactus for nesting and roosting. No suitable habitat for coastal cactus wren is present in the project area. There are three CNDDB occurrence records for this species within 5 miles of the project area, including one south of Gate Drive in Poway; however, all three occurrences are thought to be extirpated. <strong>Low Potential</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal California gnatcatcher <em>(Polioptila californica californica)</em></td>
<td>FT, CSSC</td>
<td>Obligate, permanent resident of coastal sage scrub below 2,500 feet in Southern California. Requires low, coastal sage scrub in arid washes, on mesas and slopes. No suitable habitat for California coastal gnatcatcher is present in the Project area. There are 38 CNDDB occurrence records for this species within 5 miles of the project area, including north and southeast of the Pomerado Road and Poway Road intersection. Habitat within the vicinity of the project area has largely been removed by development. <strong>Low Potential</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Bell’s vireo <em>(Vireo bellii pusillus)</em></td>
<td>FE, CE</td>
<td>Summer resident of southern California in low riparian in vicinity of water or in dry river bottoms below 2,000 feet. Nests placed along margins of bushes or on twigs projecting into pathways, usually willow (<em>Salix</em> sp.), coyote bush (<em>Baccharis</em> sp.), mesquite (<em>Prosopis</em> sp.). Suitable habitat for least Bell’s vireo is present in the riparian habitat in the project area. There are two CNDDB occurrence records for this species within 5 miles of the project area, including south of the Poway Road and Community Road intersection where an individual was found nesting in mulefat near Poway Creek. <strong>Moderate Potential</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern willow flycatcher <em>(Empidonax traillii extimus)</em></td>
<td>FE, CE</td>
<td>Found in riparian woodlands in southern California. Requires shrubby riparian areas, often with standing or running water. Suitable habitat for southwestern willow flycatcher is present in the riparian habitat in the project area. There are no CNDDB occurrence records for this species within 5 miles of the project area. <strong>Low Potential</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 4.2-2
Special-Status Wildlife Species with Potential to Occur in the Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wildlife</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Habitat</th>
<th>Potential to Occur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tricolored blackbird (Agelaius tricolor)</strong></td>
<td>CSSC</td>
<td>Largely endemic to California. Highly colonial species, most numerous in Central Valley and vicinity. Requires open water, protected nesting substrate, and foraging areas with insect prey within a few kilometers of the colony. Nests in dense cattails (Typha sp.), riparian scrub, and other low dense vegetation. Forages in grasslands and agricultural fields.</td>
<td>Some suitable habitat for tricolored blackbird may be present in the riparian habitat in the project area. There is one CNDDB occurrence record for this species within 5 miles of the project area. <strong>Low Potential</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White-tailed kite (Elanus leucurus)</strong></td>
<td>FPS</td>
<td>Found along rolling foothills and valley margins with scattered oaks and river bottomlands or marshes next to deciduous woodland. Requires open grasslands, meadows, or marshes for foraging that are close to isolated, dense topped trees for nesting and perching.</td>
<td>Suitable habitat for white-tailed kite is present in the riparian habitat in the project area. There is one CNDDB occurrence record for this species within 5 miles of the project area. <strong>Low Potential</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAMMALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Big free-tailed bat (Nyctinomops macrotis)</strong></td>
<td>CSSC</td>
<td>Found in low-lying arid areas in southern California. Require high cliffs or rocky outcrops for roosting sites. Feeds principally on large moths.</td>
<td>No suitable habitat for big-free-tailed bat is present in the project area. There is one CNDDB occurrence record for this species within 5 miles of the project area. <strong>Low Potential</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dulzura pocket mouse (Chaetodipus californicus femoralis)</strong></td>
<td>CSSC</td>
<td>Found in a variety of habitats, including coastal scrub, chaparral, and grassland in San Diego County. Attracted to grass-chaparral edges.</td>
<td>Marginal quality suitable habitat for Dulzura pocket mouse is present in non-native grassland habitat the project area. There is one CNDDB occurrence record for this species within 5 miles of the project area. <strong>Low Potential</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mexican long-tongued bat (Choeronycteris mexicana)</strong></td>
<td>CSSC</td>
<td>Occasionally found in San Diego County, which is on the periphery of their range. Feeds on nectar and pollen of night-blooming succulents. Roosts in relatively well-lit caves, and in and around buildings.</td>
<td>Mexican long-tongued bat could roost within buildings located in the project area; however, this species is thought to be rare in San Diego County. There is one CNDDB occurrence record for this species within 5 miles of the project area. <strong>Low Potential</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northwestern San Diego pocket mouse (Chaetodipus fallax fallax)</strong></td>
<td>CSSC</td>
<td>Found in coastal scrub, chaparral, grasslands, sagebrush in western San Diego County. Occurs in sandy, herbaceous areas, usually in association with rocks or coarse gravel.</td>
<td>Marginal quality suitable habitat for northwestern San Diego pocket mouse is present in non-native grassland habitat the project area. There is one CNDDB occurrence record for this species within 5 miles of the project area. <strong>Low Potential</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pocketed free-tailed bat (Nyctinomops femorosaccus)</strong></td>
<td>CSSC</td>
<td>Found in a variety of arid areas in southern California, including pine-juniper woodlands, desert scrub, palm oasis, desert wash, desert riparian. Typically occurs in rocky areas with high cliffs.</td>
<td>Pocket free-tailed bat could roost within the palm trees or trees within the riparian habitat in the project area; however, no areas with rocks or high cliffs are present in the project area. There is one CNDDB occurrence record for this species within 5 miles of the project area. <strong>Low Potential</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 4.2-2
### Special-Status Wildlife Species with Potential to Occur in the Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wildlife</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Habitat</th>
<th>Potential to Occur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit <em>(Lepus californicus bennettii)</em></td>
<td>CSSC</td>
<td>Occurs in intermediate canopy stages of shrub habitats and open shrub/herbaceous and tree/herbaceous edges. Requires coastal sage scrub habitats in southern California.</td>
<td>Marginal quality suitable habitat for San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit is present in non-native grassland and disturbed habitat in the project area. There are three CNDDB occurrence records for this species within 5 miles of the project area, including in the vicinity of the intersection of Pomerado Road and Poway Road. <strong>Low Potential</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego desert woodrat <em>(Neotoma lepida intermedia)</em></td>
<td>CSSC</td>
<td>Found in coastal scrub of southern California from San Diego County to San Luis Obispo County. Prefers moderate to dense canopies. Particularly abundant in rock outcrops and rocky cliffs and slopes.</td>
<td>No suitable habitat for San Diego desert woodrat is present in the project area. There are three CNDDB occurrence records for this species within 5 miles of the project area. <strong>Low Potential</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsend’s big-eared bat <em>(Corynorhinus townsendii)</em></td>
<td>CSSC</td>
<td>Found throughout California in a wide variety of habitats. Most common at mesic sites. Roosts in the open, hanging from walls and ceilings. Extremely sensitive to human disturbance.</td>
<td>Suitable habitat for Townsend’s big-eared bat is present in the trees and buildings in the project area. However, given the urban nature of the project area, the quality of the habitat is greatly reduced. There is one CNDDB occurrence record for this species within 5 miles of the project area. <strong>Low Potential</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western mastiff bat <em>(Eumops perotis californicus)</em></td>
<td>CSSC</td>
<td>Occurs in many open, semi-arid to arid habitats, including conifer and deciduous woodlands, coastal scrub, grasslands, and chaparral. Roosts in crevices in cliff faces, high buildings, trees, and tunnels.</td>
<td>Western mastiff bat could roost within the trees and buildings in the project area. There is one CNDDB occurrence record for this species within 5 miles of the project area. <strong>Moderate Potential</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western yellow bat <em>(Lasiurus xanthinus)</em></td>
<td>CSSC</td>
<td>Found in valley foothill riparian, desert riparian, desert wash, and palm oasis habitats. Roosts in trees, particularly palms. Forages over water and among trees.</td>
<td>Western yellow bat could roost within the trees in the riparian habitat in the project area. There is one CNDDB occurrence record for this species within 5 miles of the project area. <strong>Moderate Potential</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** California Natural Diversity Database, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Information for Project and Conservation (IPaC); April 17, 2017.

**Status Codes:**

**Federal**
FE: Federally-listed Endangered
FT: Federally-listed Threatened
FC: Federal Candidate

**State**
CE: California-listed Endangered
CT: California-listed Threatened
CR: California-listed Rare
CPT: California Proposed Threatened
CFP: California Fully Protected
CSSC: California Species of Special Concern
Regulatory Setting

The following section identifies federal, State, and local environmental regulations that serve to protect sensitive biological resources relevant to the CEQA review process.

Federal

Federal Endangered Species Act

The Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) of 1973, as amended, provides the regulatory framework for the protection of plant and animal species (and their associated critical habitats), which are formally listed, proposed for listing, or candidates for listing as endangered or threatened under the FESA. The FESA has the following four major components: (1) provisions for listing species, (2) requirements for consultation with the USFWS and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries), (3) prohibitions against “taking” (i.e., harassing, harming, hunting, shooting, wounding, killing, trapping, capturing, or collecting, or attempting to engage in any such conduct) of listed species, and (4) provisions for permits that allow incidental “take.”

For plants, this statute pertains to removing, possessing, maliciously damaging, or destroying any endangered plant on federal land and removing, cutting, digging-up, damaging, or destroying any endangered plant on non-federal land in knowing violation of state law (16 U.S. Code 1538). Critical habitat is defined in Section 3(5)(A) of the FESA as “(i) the specific areas within the geographical area occupied by the species on which are found those physical or biological features (I) essential to the conservation of the species, and (II) which may require special management considerations or protection; and (ii) specific areas outside the geographical area occupied by the species upon a determination by the Secretary of Commerce or the Secretary of the Interior (Secretary) that such areas are essential for the conservation of the species.”

Both the USFWS and the NOAA Fisheries share the responsibility for administration of the FESA. Under Section 7 of the FESA, federal agencies are required to consult with the USFWS and/or NOAA Fisheries if their actions, including permit approvals or funding, could adversely affect an endangered species (including plants) or its critical habitat. Through consultation and the issuance of a biological opinion, the USFWS and/or NOAA Fisheries may issue an incidental take statement allowing take of the species that is incidental to another authorized activity provided the action will not jeopardize the continued existence of the species. Consultation would be triggered if a particular project affects wetlands or waters of the U.S., requiring the USACE to issue a 404 permit. Section 10 of FESA provides for issuance of incidental take permits to private parties provided a habitat conservation plan is developed.

Migratory Bird Treaty Act

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) (16 U.S. Code 703 et seq.), Title 50 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 10, prohibits taking, killing, possessing, transporting, and importing of migratory birds, parts of migratory birds, and their eggs and nests, except when specifically authorized by the Department of the Interior. As used in the act, the term “take” is defined as meaning, “to pursue, hunt, capture, collect, kill or attempt to pursue, hunt, shoot, capture, collect or kill, unless the context otherwise requires.” With a few exceptions, most birds are considered migratory under the MBTA. Disturbances that causes nest abandonment and/or loss of reproductive effort or loss of habitat upon which these birds depend would be in violation of the MBTA.

Clean Water Act Sections 404 and 401

The USACE and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulate the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States, including wetlands, under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S. Code 1344). Waters of the United States are defined in Title 33 CFR Part 328.3(a) and include a range of wet environments such as lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds. The lateral limits of jurisdiction in those waters may be divided into three categories – territorial seas, tidal waters, and non-tidal waters – and is determined depending on which type of
waters is present (Title 33 CFR Part 328.4(a), (b), (c)). Activities in waters of the United States regulated under Section 404 include fill for development, water resource projects (e.g., dams and levees), infrastructure developments (e.g., highways, rail lines, and airports) and mining projects. Section 404 of the Clean Water Act requires a federal permit before dredged or fill material may be discharged into waters of the United States, unless the activity is exempt from Section 404 regulation (e.g., certain farming and forestry activities).

Section 401 of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S. Code 1341) requires an applicant for a federal license or permit to conduct any activity that may result in a discharge of a pollutant into waters of the United States to obtain a water quality certification from the state in which the discharge originates. The discharge is required to comply with the applicable water quality standards. A Water Quality Certification or waiver pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act is required for Section 404 permit actions. The responsibility for the protection of water quality in California rests with the State Water Resources Control Board and its nine RWQCBs.

State

California Endangered Species Act
The CESA of 1970 (California Administrative Code Title 14, sections 670.2 and 670.51) generally parallels the main provisions of the FESA, but unlike its federal counterpart, the CESA also applies the take prohibitions to species proposed for listing (called “candidates” by the state). The CESA expanded upon the original NPPA and enhanced legal protection for plants, but the NPPA remains part of the California Fish and Game Code. Section 2080 of the California Fish and Game Code prohibits the taking, possession, purchase, sale, and import or export of endangered, threatened, or candidate species, unless otherwise authorized by permit or in the regulations. “Take” is defined in section 86 of the Fish and Game Code as “hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill.” The CESA allows for take incidental to otherwise lawful development projects. The CDFW implements NPPA and CESA. State lead agencies are required to consult with the CDFW to ensure that any action they undertake is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered or threatened species or result in destruction or adverse modification of essential habitat.

Native Plant Protection Act
The Native Plant Protection Act (NPPA) of 1977 (Fish and Game Code sections 1900-1913) was created with the intent to “preserve, protect and enhance rare and endangered plants in this state.” The NPPA is administered by the CDFW. The Fish and Game Commission has the authority to designate native plants as “endangered” or “rare” and to protect endangered and rare plants from take. The CESA provides further protection for rare and endangered plant species, but the NPPA remains part of the Fish and Game Code.

Fully Protected Species and Species of Special Concern
The classification of fully protected was the CDFW’s initial effort to identify and provide additional protection to those animals that were rare or faced possible extinction. Lists were created for fish, amphibian and reptiles, birds, and mammals. Most of the species on these lists have subsequently been listed under CESA and/or FESA. The Fish and Game Code sections (fish at §5515, amphibian and reptiles at §5050, birds at §3511, and mammals at §4700) dealing with fully protected species states that these species “...may not be taken or possessed at any time and no provision of this code or any other law shall be construed to authorize the issuance of permits or licenses to take any fully protected species” (CDFG 1988) although take may be authorized for necessary scientific research. This language makes the fully protected designation the strongest and most restrictive regarding the “take” of these species. In 2003, the code sections dealing with fully protected species were amended to allow the CDFW to authorize take resulting from recovery activities for state-listed species.

Species of special concern are broadly defined as animals not listed under the FESA or CESA, but which are nonetheless of concern to the CDFW because they are declining at a rate that could result in listing or historically
occurred in low numbers and known threats to their persistence currently exist. This designation is intended to result in special consideration for these animals by the CDFW, land managers, consulting biologist, and others, and is intended to focus attention on the species to help avert the need for costly listing under FESA and CESA and cumbersome recovery efforts that might ultimately be required. This designation also is intended to stimulate collection of additional information on the biology, distribution, and status of poorly known at-risk species, and focus research and management attention on them. Although these species generally have no special legal status, they are given special consideration under the CEQA during project review.

California Fish and Game Code Sections 3503 and 3513
According to Section 3503 of the California Fish and Game Code, it is unlawful to take, possess, or needlessly destroy the nest or eggs of any bird. Section 3503.5 specifically protects birds in the orders *Falconiformes* and *Strigiformes* (birds-of-prey). Section 3513 essentially overlaps with the MBTA, prohibiting the take or possession of any migratory non-game bird. Disturbance that causes nest abandonment and/or loss of reproductive effort (killing or abandonment of eggs or young) is considered “take” by the CDFW.

Fish and Game Code Section 4150
Pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 4150, “[a]ll mammals occurring naturally in California which are not game mammals, fully protected mammals, or fur-bearing mammals, are nongame mammals. Nongame mammals or parts thereof may not be taken or possessed except as provided in this code or in accordance with regulations adopted by the commission.”

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act
The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act imposes stringent controls on any discharges into the “waters of the State” (California Water Code § 13000 et seq.). Waters of the State are defined by the Porter-Cologne Act as “any surface water or groundwater, including saline waters, within the boundaries of the state.” Pursuant to Porter-Cologne, the State Water Resources Control Board has the ultimate authority over State water rights and water quality policy. However, Porter-Cologne also establishes nine RWQCBs to oversee water quality at the local/regional level. Projects that require a USACE permit, or fall under other federal jurisdiction, and have the potential to impact waters of the State are required to comply with the terms of the Water Quality Certification Program. However, under Porter-Cologne, the State retains authority to regulate discharges of waste into any waters of the State, regardless of whether the USACE has concurrent jurisdiction under section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Under these circumstances, the RWQCBs have the option to regulate such activities under its state authority in the form of Waste Discharge Requirements or Certification of Waste Discharge Requirements. The Plan falls under the jurisdiction of the Region 9 San Diego RWQCB.

California Fish and Game Code Section 1600-1616
Streams, lakes, and riparian vegetation, as habitat for fish and other wildlife species, are subject to jurisdiction by the CDFW under Sections 1600-1616 of the California Fish and Game Code. Any activity that will do one or more of the following: (1) substantially obstruct or divert the natural flow of a river, stream, or lake; (2) substantially change or use any material from the bed, channel, or bank of a river, stream, or lake; or (3) deposit or dispose of debris, waste, or other material containing crumbled, flaked, or ground pavement where it can pass into a river, stream, or lake generally require a 1602 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement. The term “stream”, which includes creeks and rivers, is defined in the California Code of Regulations (CCR) as follows: “a body of water that flows at least periodically or intermittently through a bed or channel having banks and supports fish or other aquatic life”. This includes watercourses having a surface or subsurface flow that supports or has supported riparian vegetation” (14 CCR 1.72). In addition, the term stream can include ephemeral streams, dry washes, watercourses with subsurface flows, canals, aqueducts, irrigation ditches, and other means of water conveyance if they support aquatic life, riparian vegetation, or stream-dependent terrestrial wildlife (CDFG 1994). Riparian is defined as “on, or pertaining to, the
banks of a stream”; therefore, riparian vegetation is defined as, “vegetation which occurs in and/or adjacent to a stream and is dependent on, and occurs because of, the stream itself” (CDFG 1994). Removal of riparian vegetation also requires a Section 1602 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement from the CDFW.

CDFW Sensitive Vegetation Communities
Sensitive vegetation communities are natural communities and habitats that are either unique in constituent components, of relatively limited distribution in the region, or of particularly high wildlife value. These communities may or may not necessarily contain special-status species. Sensitive natural communities are usually identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the CDFW or the USFWS. The CNDDDB identifies a number of natural communities as rare, which are given the highest inventory priority (Holland 1986; CDFW 2010). Impacts to sensitive natural communities and habitats must be considered and evaluated under the CEQA (CCR: Title 14, Div. 6, Chap. 3, Appendix G).

Other Sensitive Species
Plant species which may not be listed as endangered, threatened, candidate, or proposed species under FESA or CESA, but are still considered rare, are generally assigned a rarity code by the CNPS. The CNPS is a private plant conservation organization dedicated to the monitoring and protection of sensitive species in California. CNPS has compiled an inventory comprised of the information focusing on the geographic distribution and qualitative characterization of Rare, Threatened, or Endangered vascular plant species of California. Under CEQA, impacts analyses are mandatory for List 1 and 2 species, but not for all List 3 and 4 species as some do not meet the definitions of the Federal Native Plant Protection Act or the California Endangered Species Act; however, List 3 and 4 impacts to these species are generally considered in most CEQA analyses and are recommended by CNPS. The Inventory assigns plants to the following categories:

- 1A - Presumed extinct in California
- 1B - Rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere
- 2 - Rare, threatened, or endangered in California, but more common elsewhere
- 3 - Plants for which more information is needed – A review list
- 4 - Plants of limited distribution – A watch list

Additional endangerment codes are assigned to each taxon as follows:

- Seriously endangered in California (over 80% of occurrences threatened/high degree of immediacy of threat)
- Fairly endangered in California (20-80% occurrences threatened)
- Not very endangered in California (<20% of occurrences threatened or no current threats known)

Plants that are Rank 1A, 1B, and 2 of the CNPS Inventory consist of plants that may qualify for listing, and the CDFW, as well as other state agencies (e.g., California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection). As part of the CEQA process, such species should be fully considered, as they meet the definition of threatened or endangered under the NPPA and Sections 2062 and 2067 of the California Fish and Game Code. California Rare Plant Rank 3 and 4 species are considered to be plants about which more information is needed or are uncommon enough that their status should be regularly monitored. Such plants may be eligible or may become eligible for state listing, and CNPS and CDFW recommend that these species be evaluated for consideration during the preparation of CEQA documents (CNPS 2001).
Local

Poway Subarea Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan
The project area is located in the Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP area. The Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP was adopted in 1996 and is one of the first subarea plans to be implemented. The Poway Subarea lies in an area of overlap between two subregional NCCP plan areas: the San Diego County MSCP and the San Diego County MHCP. The Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP is recognized as a subarea by both these plans. The Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP serves as the project document for the protection and management of biologically effective, interconnected spaces in the City of Poway. The Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP is a framework for complying with State and federal endangered species regulations while accommodating future urban growth and infrastructure development. The Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP provides take authority for projects such as the City of Poway’s Capital Improvement Program, the Scripps Poway Parkway Extension, and other public projects planned by the City of Poway or potentially proposed in the future. A preserve system within the City of Poway has been designated as the Poway Mitigation Area as part of the HCP/NCCP.

Because of the highly developed setting, the project area is not considered to contain important wildlife linkages or critical habitat for regional species. As a result, the project area is not located within the Poway Mitigation Area. The proposed Specific Plan is covered by the Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP as a public project under “Projects Outside the Mitigation Area.”

City of Poway General Plan: Natural Resources Element
This element of the General Plan specifies objectives, policies, and programs to conserve and manage the City of Poway’s native plant and animal life. The following General Plan policies and strategies address biological resources in the City of Poway relevant to the Specific Plan:

Policy B Waterways: The natural character of creeks and channels should be maintained or restored to the greatest extent possible with consideration for maintaining adequate flood protection.
- Strategy 1: Development, including roads, should be set back from riparian corridors at a minimum distance of 50 feet or a sufficient distance as determined by a qualified biologist to avoid damage to these areas. These riparian corridors and associated buffer areas should be designated as permanent natural open space easements and the buffer areas should be vegetated with only the appropriate native species, as determined by a qualified biologist or native plant horticulturist.
- Strategy 4: Disturbances of natural water bodies and natural drainage systems caused by development, including roads, highways, and bridges shall be limited to the extent practicable.

Policy C Biological Resources: Wildlife and natural plants are valuable natural resources and should be preserved and protected.
- Strategy 2: Biological corridors shall be preserved in order to provide linkages for vegetative and wildlife communities between non-connective open space areas Special effort shall be made to acquire and preserve the two major wildlife corridors identified in the Detailed Biological Assessment and lands linking open space areas in Poway to open space areas in the region such as the Sycamore Canyon County Park and San Dieguito Regional Park.
- Strategy 3: Development should not disrupt habitats considered to be sensitive or the habitat of sensitive declining threatened rare or endangered species. An assessment performed by a qualified biologist shall be required in areas where the existence of a sensitive species is known or reasonably expected to be present.
• Strategy 7: Mitigation for significant impacts to biological resources in the form of preservation onsite and offsite or restoration shall be required. All preservation and restoration areas shall be dedicated as permanent biological open space.

• Strategy 9: Require biological monitoring during construction where there is the potential to impact sensitive biological resources. Construction monitoring shall be conducted by a qualified biologist and follow the guidelines outlines in the Detailed Biological Assessment to ensure that all construction practices consider the protection of sensitive biological resources both on and offsite.

• Strategy 13: Development proposals shall consider areas determined to be particularly valuable to wildlife as identified for each quadrant of the City in the Detailed Biological Assessment. Efforts shall be made to minimize encroachment into these areas.

• Strategy 14: Plant resources particularly large expanses of undisturbed natural areas, oak woodlands, riparian corridors, significant tree stands, and sensitive declining, threatened, and endangered species should be preserved through appropriate means such as buffering and dedicated open space.

• Strategy 15: Large tree stands comprised of oaks, sycamores, or eucalyptus should be retained and integrated into project designs. The understory in these stands should also be retained or enhanced with native species as deemed appropriate by a qualified biologist or native plant horticulturist. Areas preserved shall be designated as permanent natural open space.

• Strategy 16: A permit is required prior to the removal of any coast live oak, holly oak, California sycamore, or any tree within the public right of way.

City of Poway Tree Conservation Ordinance

The City of Poway Tree Removal Ordinance (Poway Municipal Code Title 12, Chapter 12.32 Urban Forestry, Section 12.32.110 Tree Removal Permit) protects trees growing on public property, within public rights-of-way, and on private properties, and requires a permit and evaluation for tree removals. The ordinance includes definitions and procedures pertaining to unauthorized tree removal and penalties, Tree Removal Permits, and tree replacement.

Poway Municipal Code

Title 17 of the Poway Municipal Code requires that:

All public projects and private development projects within the jurisdiction of the City that have the potential to adversely impact sensitive plant species, wildlife species, and associated natural habitats shall either demonstrate that any removal of habitat associated with the proposed development has been authorized by the California Department of Fish and Game and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or comply with the adopted Poway Subarea Habitat Conservation Plan, the companion implementing agreement, and the requirements thereof including the compensation mitigation strategy, mitigation ratios, and special development requirements.

Thresholds of Significance

The proposed project would have a significant impact if it would:

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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service;
Environmental Impacts

This section describes potential impacts on biological resources that could result from implementation of the proposed Specific Plan, and discusses components of the Specific Plan that would avoid or reduce those potential impacts. The section also recommends mitigation measures, as needed, to reduce significant impacts.

Impact 4.2.A

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not have a substantial adverse effect on special-status species with adherences to the Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP. Potential impacts to nesting birds and roosting bats would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Special-Status Species

The CNDDB (CDFW 2017) and USFWS IPaC (USFWS 2017a) identified several special-status plant and animal species that could occur in the project area and would be able to support special-status species (see Table 4.2-1 and 4.2-2, above). Without onsite reconnaissance and/or focused biological surveys, no definitive conclusions regarding suitable habitat for special-status species and thus the potential presence of special-status species within the project area can be made. At a minimum, each project application associated with the Specific Plan would require a preliminary assessment to determine the presence of any potential habitat area and if so, a biological resources report prepared by a qualified biologist.

Implementation of the Specific Plan would follow the guidelines set forth in the Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP. The Regulatory Setting requirements described above would be implemented within the framework of the HCP/NCCP. Because the HCP/NCCP is already an adopted plan that applies to the project area, it is considered a uniformly applicable development regulation implemented to avoid or reduce impacts on biological resources, and not a project-specific mitigation measure. As a result, implementation of the Specific Plan would have a less than significant impact on special-status species.

Nesting Birds

The Federal MBTA and California Fish and Game Code sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 protect migratory nesting birds. Although the Specific Plan does not specify which trees might be removed under individual projects facilitated by the Specific Plan, trees (potential nesting habitat) could be disturbed or removed by Specific Plan implementation. The possibility of removing trees that contain nests is identified here as a potentially significant impact. Any direct removal of trees or indirect disturbance by construction or operational activities during the nesting season that
causes nest abandonment and/or loss of reproductive effort (killing or abandonment of eggs or young) is considered a "take."

Specific Plan implementation could inadvertently result in the removal of existing trees containing nests or eggs of migratory birds, raptors, or bird species during the nesting season, which would be considered an "unlawful take" under the Federal MBTA and CDFW provisions protecting migratory and nesting birds (see Regulatory Setting above). To reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels, Mitigation Measure BIO-1 and BIO-2 have been included and would be applied to development projects. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 requires that where mature trees are present, construction-related activity occur outside of the avian nesting season. If construction occurs within the avian nesting season, nesting bird surveys would be required. Mitigation Measure BIO-2 requires the establishment of buffer areas and construction monitoring if active nests are located. With implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2, impacts would be less than significant.

Roosting Bats
The California Fish and Game Code section 4150 protects roosting bats. Although the Specific Plan does not specify which trees or buildings might be removed under individual projects facilitated by the Specific Plan, trees, and buildings (potential roosting habitat) could be disturbed or removed by Specific Plan implementation. Tree removal could result in the removal or disturbance of bat roost habitat and may result in impacts to bat populations if an occupied or perennial (but unoccupied) maternity or colony roost is disturbed or removed. The possibility of removing trees and buildings that contain bat roosts is identified here as a potentially significant impact. To reduce impacts to less than significant levels, Mitigation Measure BIO-3 has been included. Mitigation Measure BIO-3 requires a preconstruction survey for maternity or colony bat roosts where mature trees are present and/or where buildings are proposed to be removed. With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-3, impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Impact 4.2.B & C
Implementation of the Specific Plan would follow the guidelines set for in the Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP and would result in less than significant impacts to natural communities and wetlands. Impacts to riparian habitat would be less than significant with mitigation incorporation.

The project area falls within the boundaries of the Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP, which includes requirements for compensation to wetlands and nonnative grasslands in the project area. Implementation of the Specific Plan would follow guidelines set forth in the Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP. Because the HCP/NCCP is already an adopted plan that applies to the project area, it is considered a uniformly applicable development regulation implemented to avoid or reduce impacts on biological resources, and not a project-specific mitigation measure. In addition, projects associated with the Specific Plan would require a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement from the CDFW, a Nationwide Permit from the USACE, and a Water Quality Certification from the RWQCB if a development project would impact to wetlands or other water bodies. The project would meet the permit conditions identified by the agencies. As a result, implementation of the Specific Plan would have a less than significant impact on sensitive natural communities and wetlands.

Riparian habitat in the project area is maintained in a somewhat natural state and supports native riparian vegetation. New development that occurs adjacent to these habitats could impact biological resources by increasing noise, lighting, and nonnative species, and by reducing the habitat value for on-site and off-site wildlife populations. To reduce impacts to riparian habitat within the project area, Mitigation Measures BIO-4 and BIO-5 have been included. Mitigation Measure BIO-4 requires that a wetland delineation be performed prior to construction in areas within or near wetlands, creeks, or riparian habitat. Mitigation Measure BIO-5 requires that a buffer be implemented between
development and riparian/creek habitat. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-4 and BIO-5 would reduce this potentially significant impact to riparian habitat and associated species to a less than significant level.

**Impact 4.2.D**

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not interfere with the movement of any native or migratory fish or wildlife species. No impact would occur.

The project area is not located within any reported local or regional wildlife corridor. Given the developed nature of the surrounding properties, the project area would not serve as a meaningful wildlife corridor function, nor would it be likely to provide a native wildlife nursery site. As a result, no impact would occur.

**Impact 4.2.E**

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Impact would be less than significant.

Section 12.32.110 (Tree Removal Permit) of the City of Poway Municipal Code is an ordinance implemented to protect trees and to encourage the replacement of trees. These include both public trees—for example, in parks, public rights-of-way, parkways, and medians—as well as trees planted or preserved as part of private projects approved by the City of Poway. The ordinance was adopted by the City of Poway and is implemented as applicable. Under CEQA, the ordinance is considered a uniformly applicable development regulation implemented to avoid or reduce impacts on protected trees, and not a project-specific mitigation measure. Therefore, Specific Plan implementation would have a less than significant impact on protected trees.

**Impact 4.2.F**

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not conflict with the provisions of the Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP. No impact would occur.

The Specific Plan is covered by the Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP as a public project under “Projects Outside the Mitigation Area.” As a result, the Specific Plan is consistent with the Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP; no impact would occur.

**Mitigation Measures**

**BIO-1**

To avoid impacts to nesting birds and violation of State and federal laws pertaining to birds, on properties where mature trees are present, all construction-related activities (including but not limited to mobilization and staging, clearing, grubbing, vegetation removal, fence installation, demolition, and grading) should occur outside the avian nesting season (generally prior to February 1 or after August 31). If construction and construction noise occurs within the avian nesting season (from February 1 to August 31 or according to local requirements), all suitable habitats located within the project’s area of disturbance including staging and storage areas plus a 250-foot (passerines) and 1,000-foot (raptor nests) buffer around these areas shall be thoroughly surveyed, as feasible, for the presence of active nests by a qualified biologist no more than five days before commencement of any site disturbance activities and equipment mobilization. If project activities are delayed by more than five days, an additional nesting bird survey shall be performed. Active nesting is present if a bird is sitting in a nest, a nest has eggs or chicks in it, or adults are observed carrying food to the nest. The results of the surveys shall be documented. If it is determined that birds are actively nesting within the survey area, Mitigation Measure BIO-2 shall apply. Conversely, if the survey area is found to be absent of nesting birds, Mitigation Measure BIO-2 shall not be required.
BIO-2
If pre-construction nesting bird surveys result in the location of active nests, no site disturbance and mobilization of heavy equipment (including but not limited to equipment staging, fence installation, clearing, grubbing, vegetation removal, fence installation, demolition, and grading), shall take place within 250 feet of non-raptor nests and 1,000 feet of raptor nests, or as determined by a qualified biologist in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, until the chicks have fledged. Monitoring shall be required to insure compliance with the MBTA and relevant California Fish and Game Code requirements. Monitoring dates and findings shall be documented.

BIO-3
For development projects involving the removal of mature trees and existing buildings, a preconstruction survey for maternity (March 1 to August 1) or colony bat roosts (year-round) shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within seven days prior to activities that remove trees or structures. If an occupied maternity or colony roost is detected, CDFW shall be contacted about how to proceed. Typically, a buffer exclusion zone would be established around each occupied roost until bat activities have ceased. The size of the buffer would take into account:

- Proximity and noise level of project activities
- Distance and amount of vegetation or screening between the roost and construction activities
- Species-specific needs, if known, such as sensitivity to disturbance

Due to restrictions of the California Health Department, direct contact by workers with any bat is not allowed. The qualified bat biologist shall be contacted immediately if a bat roost is discovered during project construction.

BIO-4
Prior to construction in areas within or near wetlands, creeks, or riparian habitat, a qualified wetland scientist shall perform a wetland delineation sufficient to determine the extent of Waters of the U.S., Waters of the State, and stream and riparian habitat potentially jurisdictional under Section 404/401 of the Clean Water Act, Porter-Cologne Act, and Section 1600 of the California Fish and Game Code.

BIO-5
A setback buffer of at least 50 feet shall be implemented between development (e.g., parking lots, commercial uses) and riparian/creek habitat. Redevelopment of existing commercial uses shall incorporate a reduction of paved surfaces (e.g., parking lots) within 50 feet of creek/riparian habitat, to the extent feasible (CDFW 2017c).

Level of Significance with Mitigation Incorporated
Impacts 4.2.D, 4.2.E, and 4.2.F would be less than significant without the need for mitigation. Impacts 4.2.A, 4.2.B, and 4.2.C would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.
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4.3 CULTURAL AND TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

This section identifies the cultural and historical resources within the Specific Plan planning area and analyzes the potential for adverse impacts on these resources that could result from future development pursuant to Specific Plan directives.

The Initial Study (Appendix B) prepared for the proposed Specific Plan determined no impact to human remains would result. Therefore, impacts to human remains are not addressed here (see Initial Study in Appendix B).

Two comment letters relating to cultural and tribal cultural resources were received during the NOP comment period. The Native American Heritage Commission included brief summaries of AB 52 and SB 18 as well as recommendations for the preparation of cultural resource assessments and mitigation measures. The San Diego County Archaeological Society requested that they be placed on the EIR distribution list.

Environmental Setting

Prehistory

Prehistory is most easily discussed chronologically in terms of recognized cultural development. Several chronologies have been proposed for inland Southern California, the most widely accepted of which is Wallace’s four-part Horizon format, which was later updated and revised by Claude Warren (Wallace 1955) (Warren 1968). The following discussion is based on Warren’s sequence, but the time frames have been adjusted to reflect more recent archaeological findings, interpretations, and advances in radiocarbon dating.

Paleo-Indian Period (ca. 13,000 – 11,000 Years Before Present)

Little is known of Paleo-Indian peoples in inland Southern California, and the cultural history of this period follows that of North America in general. Based on new research from the Pacific Rim, it has been posited that modern humans settled islands of the eastern Pacific between 40,000 and 15,000 years ago. Evidence of coastal migration has also come from sites on islands off Alta and Baja California. All of these new findings have made the coastal migration theory gain credibility in recent times (Erlandson et al. 2007).

The timing, manner, and location of the Bering Strait crossing are a matter of debate among archaeologists, but the initial migration probably occurred as the Laurentide Ice Sheet melted along the Alaskan Coast and interior Yukon. The earliest radiocarbon dates from the Paleo-Indian Period in North America come from the Arlington Springs Woman site on Santa Rosa Island, located approximately 36 miles from the coast of California. Human remains discovered on the island date to approximately 13,000 years before present (Meltzer et al. 1997) (Johnson et al. 2002). Lifeways during the Paleo-Indian Period were characterized by highly mobile hunting and gathering. Prey included megafauna such as mammoth; technology included a distinctive flaked stone toolkit that has been identified across much of North America and into Central America. These earliest persons likely used some plant foods, but the Paleo-Indian toolkit recovered archaeologically does not include many tools that can be identified as designed specifically for plant processing.

The megafauna that appear to have been the focus of Paleo-Indian life went extinct during a warming trend that began approximately 10,000 years ago, and both the extinction and climatic change (which included warmer temperatures in desert valleys and reduced precipitation in mountain areas) were factors in widespread cultural change. Subsistence and social practices continued to be organized around hunting and gathering, but the resource base was expanded to include a wider range of plant and game resources. Technological traditions also became
more localized and included tools specifically for the processing of plants and other materials. This constellation of characteristics has been given the name “Archaic,” and it was the most enduring of cultural adaptations to the North American environment throughout this time period.

Pollen studies have not been conducted within the Poway area of San Diego County and thus cannot reveal early settlement patterns. However, studies in Santa Barbara and Ventura County indicate that the coastal plains supported a pine forest between approximately 12,000 and 8,000 years before today (Robbins-Wade 1990). After 8,000 ago, this natural environment was replaced by more open habitats, which supported oak and non-arboreal communities. The coastal sage scrub and chaparral environments of today appear to have become dominant 2,200 ago (Robbins-Wade 1990).

Archaic Period (ca. 11,000 – 3,500 YBP)
The earliest Archaic Period life in inland Southern California has been given the name San Dieguito tradition, after the San Diego area where it was first identified and studied (Warren 1968). Characteristic artifacts include stemmed projectile points, crescents and leaf-shaped knives, which suggest a continued subsistence, focus on large game, although not megafauna of the earlier Paleo-Indian period. Milling equipment appears in the archaeological record at approximately 7,500 years ago (Moratto 1984). Artifact assemblages within this equipment include basin milling stones and unshaped manos, projectile points, flexed burials under cairns, and cogged stones, and have been given the name La Jolla Complex (7,500 – 3,000 YBP). The transition from San Dieguito life to La Jolla life appears to have been an adaptation to drying of the climate after 8,000 YBP, which may have stimulated movements of desert peoples to the coastal regions, bringing milling stone technology with them. Groups in the coastal regions focused on mollusks, while inland groups relied on wild-seed gathering and acorn collecting.

Late Prehistoric Period
Cultural responses to environmental changes around 4,000 – 3,000 years ago included a shift to more land-based gathering practices. This period was characterized by the increasing importance of acorn processing, which supplemented the resources from hunting and gathering. The period after A.D. 1400 is identified as the San Luis Rey Complex (Meighan 1984). San Luis Rey I (A.D. 1400-1750) is associated with bedrock mortars and milling stones, cremations, small triangular projectile points with concave bases, and Olivella beads. The San Luis Rey II (A.D. 1750 – 1850) period is marked by the addition of pottery, red and black pictographs, cremation ums, steatite arrow straighteners, and non-aboriginal materials (Meighan 1954) (Keller and McCarthy 1989). Work at Cole Canyon and other sites in Southern California suggest that this complex and the ethnographically described life of the native people of the region were well established by at least 1,000 years ago (Keller and McCarthy 1989).

Ethnographic Context
Information presented in the California volume of the Handbook of North American Indians shows the Specific Plan planning area is located near the traditional territory of the Kumeyaay (also known as Kamia, Ipai, Tipai, and Diegueño) (Heizer 1978). This ethnographic group is described below.

At the time of European contact, the City of Poway was occupied by the Kumeyaay, a Yuman speaking people (Luomale 1978). The Kumeyaay ranged from the San Diego coastal region east to beyond Sand Hills and south into Baja California, the northern extent is the mouth of the San Luis Rey River. They lived in semi-sedentary villages, with temporary camps extending out from a centralized location. Tribal members identified themselves by their clan and settlement affiliation and did not recognize a tribal name.

Villages were organized around a clan chief and at least one or more assistant chiefs, who performed interclan ceremonies and advised on marriage proposals; their wisdom and knowledge of tribal customs directed village life and its activities. Clans were organized into patriloclal extended family groups in which heretical descent was based
on the male head of families. Village ceremonial structures were owned by the clan, and clan groups jointly harvested agave or pinon nuts that were shared communally (Luomale 1978).

The Kumeyaay were hunter-gatherers, with an emphasis placed on acorn procurement and processing, as well as the capture of rabbits and other small game that could be shared communally. The Kumeyaay were adept resource managers with a history of intensive plant management practices (Luomale 1978).

Stone tool kits were made from locally sourced raw materials, but obsidian—a highly prized volcanic glass used in precision tool making—was imported through a well-organized trading network. Flaked tool kits included projectile points, scrapers, and biface knives. Food processing equipment was created to exploit both marine and terrestrial resources that included bedrock mortars, grinding slicks, portable mortars, metates, manos, and pestles. The Kumeyaay were highly skilled in basket weaving, utilizing both coiled and twined construction methods. Some baskets were so tightly woven that they could carry water.

Cosmologically, the Kumeyaay practiced many forms of spiritualism with the assistance of shamans. These spiritual leaders neither were elected nor inherited their position (Luomale 1978). Important ceremonies included male and female puberty rites, the fire (cremation) ceremony, song singing rituals, and the yearly mourning ceremony.

**Historic Context**

The Poway valley was settled generally after 1850 and primarily after the Civil War. The diversity in architectural styles throughout the City include Mexican and Spanish-style adobe homes and barns inspired by these roots as well as prairie and pioneer style cottages, craftsman-style ranch houses, stick Victorian houses, and rock houses (Poway 1991).

Currently, no sites or structures within the Specific Plan planning area are listed as a California Historical Landmark, California Historical Resource, or on the National Register of Historic Place (State Parks 2017a) (State Parks 2017b) (NPS 2017). However, a parcel search through the County of San Diego Office of the Assessor’s database determined that 26 buildings or structures within the Specific Plan planning area are currently 45 years or older and thus should be examined for historical significance.

**Regulatory Framework**

Cultural resources are indirectly protected under the provisions of the Federal Antiquities Act of 1906 (16 U.S.C §§ 431 et seq.) and subsequent related legislation, regulations, policies, and guidance documents. The following summarizes the federal, state, and local regulatory frameworks related to the protection of cultural resources in California. Numerous laws and regulations require that federal, state, and local agencies consider the effects of a proposed project on cultural resources. These laws and regulations establish a process for compliance.

The National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) was established by the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 as "an authoritative guide to be used by federal, state, and local governments, private groups, and citizens to identify the Nation's cultural resources and to indicate what properties should be considered for protection from destruction or impairment.” The NRHP recognizes properties that are significant at the national, state, and local levels. To be eligible for listing in the NRHP, a resource must be significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture. Districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects of potential significance must also possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association. A property is eligible for the NRHP if it is significant under one or more of the following criteria:

- **Criterion A:** It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
Criterion B: It is associated with the lives of persons who are significant in our past.

Criterion C: It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction; represents the work of a master; possesses high artistic values; or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.

Criterion D: It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The following are resources not considered eligible for the NHRP unless they satisfy certain conditions: 1) cemeteries, birthplaces, or graves of historic figures; 2) properties owned by religious institutions or used for religious purposes; 3) structures that have been moved from their original locations; 4) reconstructed historic buildings; and 5) properties that are primarily commemorative in nature. In general, a resource must be at least 50 years of age to be considered for the NRHP unless it satisfies a standard of exceptional importance.

Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990

The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) of 1990 sets provisions for the intentional removal or inadvertent discovery of human remains and other cultural items from federal and tribal lands. It clarifies the ownership of human remains and sets forth a process for repatriation of human remains and associated funerary objects and sacred religious objects to the Native American groups claiming to be lineal descendants or culturally affiliated with the remains or objects. It requires any federally funded institution housing Native American remains or artifacts to compile an inventory of all cultural items within the museum or with its agency, and to provide a summary to any Native American tribe claiming affiliation.

California Environmental Quality Act

Pursuant to CEQA, a historical resource is a resource listed in, or eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). In addition, resources included in a local register of historic resources or identified as significant in a local survey conducted in accordance with state guidelines are also considered historic resources under CEQA, unless a preponderance of the facts demonstrates otherwise. According to CEQA, the fact that a resource is not listed in or determined eligible for listing in the CRHR or is not included in a local register or survey shall not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be a historic resource, as defined in California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5024.1.

CEQA applies to archaeological resources when the archaeological resource satisfies the definition of a historical resource or the archaeological resource satisfies the definition of a “unique archaeological resource.” A unique archaeological resource is an archaeological artifact, object, or site that has a high probability of meeting any of the following criteria:

1. The archaeological resource contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.
2. The archaeological resource has a special and particular quality, such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.
3. The archaeological resource is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines provides a set of sample questions that guide the evaluation of potential impacts with regard to cultural resources:

Would the project:
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5?

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

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

California Register of Historical Resources

Created in 1992 and implemented in 1998, the CRHR is “an authoritative guide in California to be used by state and local agencies, private groups, and citizens to identify the state’s historical resources and to indicate properties that are to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change.” Certain properties, including those listed in or formally determined eligible for listing in the NRHP and California Historical Landmarks (CHLs) numbered 770 and higher, are automatically included in the CRHR. Other properties recognized under the California Points of Historical Interest program, identified as significant in historic resources surveys, or designated by local landmarks programs may be nominated for inclusion in the CRHR. A resource, either an individual property or a contributor to a historic district, may be listed in the CRHR if the State Historical Resources Commission determines that it meets one or more of the following criteria, which are modeled on NRHP criteria:

Criterion 1: It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage.

Criterion 2: It is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.

Criterion 3: It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction; represents the work of an important creative individual; or possesses high artistic values.

Criterion 4: It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory.

Resources nominated to the CRHR must retain enough of their historic character or appearance to be recognizable as historic resources and to convey the reasons for their significance. It is possible that a resource whose integrity does not satisfy NRHP criteria may still be eligible for listing in the CRHR. A resource that has lost its historic character or appearance may still have sufficient integrity for the CRHR if, under Criterion 4, it maintains the potential to yield significant scientific or historical information or specific data. Resources that have achieved significance within the past 50 years also may be eligible for inclusion in the CRHR, provided that enough time has lapsed to obtain a scholarly perspective on the events or individuals associated with the resource.

California Historical Landmarks

California Historical Landmarks are buildings, structures, sites, or places that have anthropological, cultural, military, political, architectural, economic, scientific or technical, religious, experimental, or other value and that have been determined to have statewide historical significance by meeting at least one of the criteria listed below. The resource must also be approved for designation by the County Board of Supervisors or the City or Town Council in whose jurisdiction it is located, be recommended by the State Historical Resources Commission, or be officially designated by the Director of California State Parks. The specific standards in use now were first applied in the designation of CHL No. 770. CHLs No. 770 and above are automatically listed in the CRHR.

To be eligible for designation as a landmark, a resource must meet at least one of the following criteria:
California Points of Historical Interest

California Points of Historical Interest are sites, buildings, features, or events that are of local (city or county) significance and have anthropological, cultural, military, political, architectural, economic, scientific or technical, religious, experimental, or other value. Points of Historical Interest designated after December 1997 and recommended by the State Historical Resources Commission are also listed in the CRHR. No historic resource may be designated as both a landmark and a point. If a point is later granted status as a landmark, the point designation will be retired. In practice, the point designation program is most often used in localities that do not have a locally enacted cultural heritage or preservation ordinance.

To be eligible for designation as a point, a resource must meet at least one of the following criteria:

- The first, last, only, or most significant of its type within the local geographic region (city or county)
- Associated with an individual or group having a profound influence on the history of the local area
- A prototype of, or an outstanding example of, a period, style, architectural movement or construction or one of the more notable works or the best surviving work in the local region of a pioneer architect, designer, or master builder

Public Resources Code 5020.1(k)

Section 5020.1 (k) of the Public Resources Code defines a “local register of historical resources” as a list of properties officially designated or recognized as historically significant by a local government pursuant to a local ordinance or resolution.

Public Resources Code 5024.1(c)

Subsection (c) of PRC Section 5024.1 states that a resource meeting any of the following NRHP criteria may be listed as an historical resource in the California Register:

1) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage
2) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past
3) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values
4) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history

Public Resources Code 5097.9-5097.991 – Native American Heritage Commission

Section 5097.91 of the PRC established the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), whose duties include the inventory of places of religious or social significance to Native Americans and the identification of known graves and cemeteries of Native Americans on private lands. Under Section 5097.9 of the PRC, a State policy of
noninterference with the free expression or exercise of Native American religion was articulated along with a prohibition of severe or irreparable damage to Native American sanctified cemeteries, places of worship, religious or ceremonial sites or sacred shrines located on public property. Section 5097.98 of the PRC specifies a protocol to be followed when the NAHC receives notification of a discovery of Native American human remains from a county coroner. Section 5097.5 defines as a misdemeanor the unauthorized disturbance or removal of archaeological, historic, or paleontological resources located on public lands.

**Public Resources Code 21074 – Tribal Cultural Resources**

Section 21074 of the PRC defines a Tribal Cultural Resource (TCR) as either of the following:

a) “Tribal cultural resources” are either of the following:

1) Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following:
   A. Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources
   B. Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1

2) 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 Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe

b) A cultural landscape that meets the criteria of subdivision (a) is a tribal cultural resource to the extent that the landscape is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape

c) A historical resource described in Section 21084.1, a unique archaeological resource as defined in subdivision (g) of Section 21083.2, or a “nonunique archaeological resource” as defined in subdivision (h) of Section 21083.2 may also be a tribal cultural resource if it conforms with the criteria of subdivision (a)

**California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 2001**

Codified in the California Health and Safety Code Sections 8010–8030, the California Native American Graves Protection Act (NAGPRA) is consistent with the federal NAGPRA. Intended to “provide a seamless and consistent state policy to ensure that all California Indian human remains and cultural items be treated with dignity and respect," the California NAGPRA also encourages and provides a mechanism for the return of remains and cultural items to lineal descendants. Section 8025 established a Repatriation Oversight Commission to oversee this process. The act also provides a process for non–federally recognized tribes to file claims with agencies and museums for repatriation of human remains and cultural items.

**Senate Bill 18**

Senate Bill (SB) 18 (California Government Code, Section 65352.3) incorporates the protection of California traditional tribal cultural places into land use planning for cities, counties, and agencies by establishing responsibilities for local governments to contact, refer plans to, and consult with California Native American tribes as part of the adoption or amendment of any general or specific plan proposed on or after March 1, 2005. SB18 requires public notice to be sent to tribes listed on the Native American Heritage Commission’s SB18 Tribal Consultation list within the geographical areas affected by the proposed changes. Tribes must respond to a local government notice within 90 days (unless a shorter time frame has been agreed upon by the tribe), indicating whether they want to consult with the local government. Consultations are for the purpose of preserving or mitigating impacts to places, features, and objects described in Sections 5097.9 and 5097.993 of the Public Resources Code that may be affected by the proposed adoption or amendment to a general or specific plan.
Assembly Bill 52
Assemble Bill (AB) 52 specifies that a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, as defined, is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. AB 52 requires a lead agency to begin consultation with a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project, if the tribe requests in writing to the lead agency, to be informed by the lead agency of proposed projects in that geographic area and the tribe requests consultation, prior to determining whether a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report is required for a project. AB 52 specifies examples of mitigation measures that may be considered to avoid or minimize impacts on tribal cultural resources. The bill makes the above provisions applicable to projects that have a notice of preparation or a notice of negative declaration filed or mitigated negative declaration on or after July 1, 2015. AB 52 amends Sections 5097.94 and adds PRC Sections 21073, 21074, 21083.1, 21080.3.2, 21082.3, 21083.09, 21084.2, and 21084.3 relating to Native Americans.

Health and Safety Code, Sections 7050 and 7052
Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 declares that, in the event of the discovery of human remains outside a dedicated cemetery, all ground disturbances must cease and the county coroner must be notified. Section 7052 establishes a felony penalty for mutilating, disinterring, or otherwise disturbing human remains, except by relatives.

Penal Code, Section 622.5
Penal Code Section 622.5 provides misdemeanor penalties for injuring or destroying objects of historic or archaeological interest located on public or private lands but specifically excludes the landowner.

Integrity
To qualify for listing on the National Register or the California Register, a property must possess significance under one of the criteria and have historic integrity. The process of determining integrity is similar for both the California Register and the National Register. The same seven aspects of integrity—location, design, setting, material, workmanship, feeling and association—are used to evaluate a resource's eligibility for listing on the California Register and the National Register. Per the National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation, these seven characteristics are defined as follows:

- **Location** is the place where the historic property was constructed.
- **Design** is the combination of elements that create the form, plans, space, structure and style of the property.
- **Setting** addresses the physical environment of the historic property inclusive of the landscape and spatial relationship of the building.
- **Materials** refer to the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern of configuration to form the historic property.
- **Workmanship** is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history.
- **Feeling** is the property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular time period.
- **Association** is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.
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Poway General Plan EIR
The General Plan EIR Section 5.9 implements the following mitigation measure related to cultural, archaeological, and paleontological resources. Development within the City of Poway, including the Specific Plan planning area, is subject to the requirements laid out within these measures.

1. In undeveloped areas or areas that have not been previously surveyed, future development projects will not be allowed until a detailed archaeological/cultural survey and study have been conducted. Such surveys and studies are necessary to document the potential for the existence of sites that could be impacted by development. All surveys and studies shall be prepared in accordance with the City of Poway Archaeological/Historical Guidelines, which are contained in the City's CEQA Implementation Procedures.

2. In the development that any future cultural resource studies document either a prehistoric or historic site, then in accordance with Appendix K of CEQA, these resources will need to be further evaluated to determine their significance and the potential for significant impacts from proposed development. Potentially significant impacts to cultural resources should be mitigated through either preservation of the resource or data recovery programs of sufficient detail and scope to compensate for the loss of any significant site. Any site grading and excavation activity shall adhere to Appendix K of CEQA if resources are discovered on-site.

3. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a project applicant should present a letter to the City of Poway indicating that a qualified archaeologist has been retained to carry out an appropriate mitigation program. (A qualified archaeologist is defined as an individual with a MS or PhD in archaeology or geology who is familiar with archaeological procedures and techniques.)

4. A qualified archaeologist should be at any pregrade meeting to consult with grading and excavation contractors.

5. A paleontological monitor should be onsite at all times during the original cutting of previously undisturbed sediments of high potential geologic formations to inspect cuts for contained fossils. In the event that fossils are discovered in moderate potential formations, it may be necessary to increase the per/day field monitoring time. Conversely, if fossils are not being found then the monitoring should be reduced.

6. When fossils are found, a qualified paleontologist should recover them. In most cases, his fossil salvage can be completed in a matter of minutes. However, some fossil specimens (such as whole skeletons) may require an extended salvage time. In these instances, the archaeologist will be allowed to temporarily direct, divert, or halt grading to allow recovery of fossil remains in a timely manner. Because of the potential for the recovering of small fossil remains such as isolated mammal teeth, it may be necessary in certain instances to set up a screen-washing operation on the site.

7. Fossil remains collected during the monitoring and salvage portion of the mitigation program should be cleaned, sorted, and cataloged and deposited in a scientific institution with archaeological collections such as the San Diego Natural History Museum.

8. The City shall maintain a listing of significant prehistoric sites and document the locations of all open space easements that include archaeological sites. The City shall conduct research in an effort to determine where easements for archaeological sites are located, especially those easements which were “inherited” from the County of San Diego when the City was incorporated.
9. The City shall conduct a comprehensive survey to identify and evaluate historic structures and places in Poway.

10. A historian, as defined in the City Archaeological/Historical Guidelines in the General Plan Update, shall be consulted when any potentially historic structure could be impacted by a public or private project. The potentially important structure shall be evaluated according to City Ordinance 296. The Historian shall ensure that all pertinent information is gathered and presented to the City for review.

11. The City shall support community efforts to register local prehistoric and historic features that fulfill state or federal requirements.

12. Prior to the demolition of any historic structure, that structure shall be fully documented with plans, photographs, and an archaeological/architectural assessment. In the event that demolition is permitted for any historic structure within Categories A, B, or C as described in Ordinance 296, mitigation may be accomplished through the payment of a fee which would be applicable to the improvement of Old Poway Park. The amount of the fee will be determined by the Director of Planning Services.

13. Mitigation of impacts to significant or sensitive historic structures may be accomplished by moving the structure to a new location within the City. This location should be similar to the original site, depending upon the uniqueness of the original site.

14. The City shall develop standards for community design adjacent to historic structures to preserve the integrity of the structure and its surroundings.

City of Poway Municipal Code

Chapter 17.45 of the Poway Municipal Code designates the criteria for designation of a Poway historic district and landmark and regulates the demolition and removal of historic resources within the City. Local historic resources within the City of Poway are categorized as follows:

Section 17.45.030 Categorization

The City has conducted a preliminary historic/cultural resources inventory covering 33 sites in the City. In order to change the categorization of an identified resource, or to add a building, structure, place or object to the inventory, the following criteria for evaluating historic/cultural resources have been established.

A. Description of Categories. Four categories of resources are identified and classified A through D.

Category A: This category is reserved for those structures, buildings, sites, or objects of major significance. The resource must meet one or more of the following criteria:

   It is the site of, or reflects special elements or events of the City’s cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, engineering, or architectural history; or

   It is associated with persons or events important in regional, State, or national history; or

   It is a rare or particularly fine example of a certain architectural style or construction technique associated with a particular period of history; or

   It is the work or an architect, engineer, or designer who has substantially influenced regional, State, or national trends or the development of the North County region; or

   Owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristics, it represents an established feature of the neighborhood or City whose removal would adversely affect the appearance or spatial and design relationships of the area.
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Category B: Structures, buildings, sites, or objects in this category must have one of the following characteristics:

- It is associated with important persons, events, or eras in the City, regional, or State history;
- Its original design, architecture, aspect or function of the resource is significant but has been altered, affecting its integrity;
- It is a good (but not rare or particularly outstanding) example of certain style or construction technique, or of the work of a prominent architect, engineer, or designer.

Category C: Structures, buildings, sites, or objects in this category must have one of the following characteristics:

- It is a good example of a period of architecture design or construction; however, the design is more commonplace and there are many similar structures, buildings, sites or objects in the City;
- It is an important resource; however, substantial alterations have severely comprised its historic, cultural, or architectural significance.

Category D: Structures, buildings, sites, or objects in this category are:

- Built prior to 1940, and clearly not significant in terms of architectural style, appearance, design, construction, or association with important persons or events in City history.

B. Change of Category. Further research on any building, structure, site, or object may yield information on their roles in history. This information may warrant their inclusion in a different category.

Applications to change the categorization of an identified resource or to add a resource to the survey shall be submitted to the City Development Services Department. The application should contain information which provides justification for adding a historic/cultural resource to the survey or changing its category designation.

Thresholds of Significance

Cultural impacts resulting from implementation of the proposed Specific Plan may be considered significant if they cause any of the following:

- A substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5;
- A substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5; or
- Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

The proposed Specific Plan may have a significant impact on Tribal Cultural Resources if implementation of the Specific Plan would impact a resource:

- 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 Section 5020.1(k); or
- 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 Section 5024.1. In applying the
criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Environmental Impacts
Impacts 4.3.A & D

Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not result in a substantial adverse change in significance of a historical resource as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 or Public Resources Code 5020.1(k) with mitigation incorporated.

Historical resources include, but are not limited to, buildings, structures, roads, features, and/or objects that are over 45 years old or older that are listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources, listed in a Local Register, and/or designated as historically significant by a lead agency. No site within the Specific Plan planning area is listed as a California Historical Landmark or California Historical Resource, nor is listed in the National Register of Historic Places (State Parks 2017a) (State Parks 2017b) (NPS 2017).

The Poway General Plan indicates that the Specific Plan planning area is located within a high historically sensitive area. On March 10, 2017, MIG conducted a parcel search through the County of San Diego Office of the assessor's database and determined that 26 buildings or structures within the Specific Plan planning area are 45 years or older. Due to their age, CEQA requires that a site evaluation be prepared to determine potential historical status prior to adaptive reuse, removal, or demolition.

The proposed Specific Plan does not authorize any specific development activity and would therefore not result in any direct adverse impacts to any historical resource. Future development within the Specific Plan planning area would be subject to the goals and policies of the General Plan and the General Plan EIR mitigation measures related to the avoidance of impacts to historical resources where new development supplants existing development. Potentially significant impacts could occur if a structure meeting the definition of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA is damaged or destroyed as a result of future development. Adverse modification of historical resources may also occur if appropriate restoration methods are not implemented, thereby permanently altering the historical character of the resource. Impacts associated with the destruction or alteration of historical resources could affect a City’s sense of place and result in the loss of important information relevant to the City, the region, and/or State history.

General Plan EIR mitigation measures, detailed above, require the protection of historical resources and/or built environments during development, demolition, and/or alteration-related activities. Specifically, Mitigation Measure 10 requires that potential historical structures that would be impacted by a public or private development project be evaluated per City Ordinance 296 (Municipal Code Chapter 17.45). Should a historical structure categorized as A, B, or C per Municipal Code Chapter 17.45 categorization be demolished, Mitigation Measures 12 and 13 require payment of a fee to improve Old Poway Park or the re-location of the historical structure. To further ensure that future development within the Specific Plan planning area would not adversely change the significance of historic resources, Mitigation Measures CULT-1 through CULT-3 below will apply to all future development within the Specific Plan planning area. Mitigation Measure CULT-1 requires that a qualified architectural historian assess structures older than 45 years prior to their demolition, removal, or alteration. Mitigation Measure CULT-2 requires that, if feasible, existing historical resources be incorporated into new site design. Mitigation Measure CULT-3 requires that identified historical resources be documented per the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Architectural and Engineering Document.
By preventing and regulating demolition and/or alteration of historical and significant structures, ensuring that new development is compatible with historical resources, and ensuring that restoration of historical structures preserve the character of the resource, potential impacts to historical and/or significant resources would be less than significant. These measures operate concurrently with the extensive regulatory framework of federal, State, and local laws protecting historical and significant resources, as identified in this chapter. Impacts to historical resources would be less than significant through implementation of General Plan mitigation measures and Mitigation Measures CULT-1 through CULT-3.

**Impact 4.3.B**

Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource with mitigation incorporated.

Archaeological resources are the physical remains of past human activities and can be either prehistoric or historic origin. Archaeological sites are locations that contain evidence of human activity. Generally, a site is defined by a significant accumulation or presence of one or more of the following: food remains, waste from the manufacturing of tools, concentrations of alignments of stones, modification of rock surfaces, unusual discoloration or accumulation of soil, or human skeletal remains.

On February 9, 2017, MIG commissioned a Sacred Lands File (SLF) records search of the Specific Plan planning area through the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The search did not result in identification of any archaeological sites. The response letter from NAHC states that the absence of specific site information in the SLF does not indicate the absence of Native American cultural resources. The NAHC provided a list of tribes with cultural affiliations to the Specific Plan planning area to be contacted to receive specific knowledge of potential resources. Although there is no specific site information in the SLF, the City’s General Plan indicates that the Specific Plan planning area is located within a vicinity of high archaeological sensitivity. The proposed Specific Plan would not authorize any specific development and would therefore not result in any direct adverse impacts to any archaeological resources. However, the proposed Specific Plan supports road improvements, site planning, building, parking, and open space development which could result in the disturbance of soils at depths not previously disturbed by existing or past development.

As discussed above, the SLF search did not indicate any prehistoric sites located within the Specific Plan planning area. General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures 1 through 4, detailed above, require archaeological/cultural surveys, evaluation of potentially significant resources uncovered, and the retention of a qualified archaeologist to carry out a mitigation program. To further ensure proper identification, evaluation, and treatment of any archaeological resources that might be unearthed during earthmoving operations, Mitigation Measures CULT-4 through CULT-7 below will apply to all future development within the Specific Plan planning area. Mitigation Measure CULT-4 requires that a qualified archaeologist conduct an archaeological sensitivity training for construction personnel. Mitigation Measure CULT-5 requires that ground-disturbing activities cease in the event that a resource is uncovered to allow for a treatment plan to be carried out. Mitigation Measure CULT-6 requires that a qualified archaeologist conduct periodic archaeological resource spot checks throughout grading and earth-moving activities. Mitigation Measure CULT-7 requires that a report detailing monitoring services be prepared and submitted to confirm satisfactory completion and adherence to mitigation measures.

Implementation of General Plan EIR mitigation and Mitigation Measures CULT-4 through CULT-7 would ensure that impacts to archaeological resources due to future development would be less than significant.
Impact 4.3.C

Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not result in the direct or indirect destruction of a unique paleontological resource or geologic feature with mitigation incorporated.

Paleontological resources are the fossilized remains of organisms from prehistoric environments found in geologic strata. These resources are valued for the information they yield about the history of the earth and its past ecological settings. There are two types of resources: vertebrates and invertebrate. These resources are found in geologic strata conducive to their preservation, typically sedimentary formations. Paleontological sites are areas that show evidence of pre-human activity. Often, they are simply small outcroppings visible on the surface or sites encountered during grading. Geologic formations are the most important indicators of paleontological resources since they may contain important fossils.

The proposed Specific Plan would not authorize any specific development activity and therefore would not result in any direct adverse impacts to any paleontological resources. However, the proposed Specific Plan supports road improvements, site planning, building, parking, and open space development which could result in the disturbance of soils at depths not previously disturbed by existing or past development. Failure to survey a site and monitor earthmoving activities to ensure proper identification and recovery of paleontological resources could result in a significant impact to fossil resources due to the loss of information important to understanding pre-historic life and evolution.

According to the General Plan EIR, the Specific Plan planning area is primarily underlain by Quaternary Alluvium, defined broadly as alluvial fan deposits. These surface deposits are unlikely to contain significant vertebrate fossils in the uppermost layers since they represent environments of moving water and generally rocky surfaces. Excavations that extend down into older sedimentary deposits may uncover significant vertebrate fossil remains and, therefore, should be closely monitored to quickly and professionally collect any vertebrate fossil remains without impeding development.

General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures 5 through 7, detailed above, require that a paleontological monitor be present when disturbing previously undisturbed sediments. Also, the recovery, cataloging, and deposit of uncovered resources to a scientific institution are applicable to all development within the City of Poway. To further ensure proper identification, evaluation, and treatment of potential paleontological resources during earthmoving operations, Mitigation Measures CULT-8 and CULT-9 below will apply to all future development within the Specific Plan planning area. Mitigation Measure CULT-8 requires that ground-disturbing activities cease upon the uncovering of paleontological resources in order for a treatment plan to be implemented. Mitigation Measure CULT-9 requires that, as required, a report detailing monitoring services be prepared and submitted to confirm satisfactory completion and adherence to mitigation measures.

Implementation of General Plan mitigation and Mitigation Measures CULT-8 and CULT-9 would ensure that impacts to archaeological resources due to future development would be less than significant.

Impact 4.3.E

Implementation of the Proposed Specific Plan would not have a significant impact a tribal cultural resource as defined by Public Resources Code Section 5024.1(c) with mitigation incorporated.

As defined by Public Resources Code Section 21074, a Tribal Cultural Resource (TCR) is a significant resource as defined by PCR Section 5024.1(c), a site, feature, place, object, landscape, historical resource, unique archaeological resource, or nonunique archaeological resource that with cultural value to a California Native American tribe.
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The NAHC response to a SLF records search commissioned on February 9, 2017 stated that the absence of specific site information in the SLF does not indicate the absence of Native American cultural resources. The NAHC provided a list of tribes with cultural affiliations to the project area to be contacted to receive specific knowledge of potential resources. Although there is no specific site information in the SLF, a review of the City of Poway General Plan, as noted above, indicates that the Specific Plan planning area is located within a vicinity of high archaeological sensitivity. Despite the heavy disturbances from prior development activity that may have displaced or submerged archaeological resources relating to TCRs, the potential exists for the uncovering of TCRs during earthmoving activities associated with future development.

Although there was no indication of TCRs at the project site and the research and surveys conducted by MIG qualified archaeologists were negative for known or anticipated TCRs, AB 52 is clear in stating that it is the responsibility of the Public Agency (e.g. Lead Agency) to consult with Native American tribes early in the CEQA process to allow tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the appropriate level of environment review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to TCRs, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process (see PRC Section 2108.3.2). Specifically, government-to-government consultation may provide “tribal knowledge” of the Specific Plan planning area that can be used in identifying TCRs that cannot be obtained through other investigative means.

Government-to-government consultation pursuant to AB 52 was initiated on March 29, 2017. Letters providing notification of the proposed project and were sent to two tribes who have requested notification and consultation with any project within Poway under AB 52. On April 19, 2017, a response was received from the Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians identifies the Specific Plan planning area as being outside of their traditional use area. Therefore, the Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians defer to consultation to other tribes.

The proposed Specific Plan would not authorize any specific development activity and would therefore not result in any direct adverse impacts to any tribal cultural resources. However, the proposed Specific Plan supports road improvements, site planning, building, parking, and open space development which could result in the disturbance of soils at depths not previously disturbed by existing or past development. General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures 1 through 4, detailed above, require archaeological/cultural surveys, evaluation of potentially significant resources uncovered, and the retention of a qualified archaeologist to carry out a mitigation program. To further ensure proper identification, evaluation, and treatment of any archaeological and tribal cultural resources unearthed during earthmoving operations, Mitigation Measures CULT-4 through CULT-7 have been incorporated and are applicable to all future development within the Specific Plan planning area.

Mitigation Measures

CULT-1
Adhere to the Secretary of the Interior’s Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings. Prior to the demolition, removal, or alteration of a structure that is more than 45 years old, a qualified professional architectural historian shall make a recommendation to the City as to whether the project fully adheres to the Secretary of Interior’s Standards and any specific modifications to do so.

CULT-2
Incorporate identified existing historical resources into the proposed new site design. Prior to the demolition, removal, or alteration of a structure identified as or that qualifies for listing as a historical resource, project applicants shall evaluate the potential for incorporation of a portion of the resource into the proposed site design. Applicants
shall retain a professional historic architect who meets the qualifications set forth by the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications and Standards to incorporate a portion of the identified historical resource.

CULT-3
Document any identified historic resource prior to the demolition, removal, or alteration that would cause a loss of integrity and/or loss of continued eligibility. This documentation shall be completed by project applicants, and the documentation shall adhere to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation. The level of documentation shall be proportionate with the level of significance of the resource.

CULT-4
Conduct archaeological sensitivity training for construction personnel. Project applicants shall retain a qualified professional archaeologist who meets U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications and Standards, to conduct an Archaeological Sensitivity Training for construction personnel prior to commencement of excavation activities. The training session shall be carried out by a cultural resource professional with expertise in archaeology who meets the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Processional Qualifications and Standards. The training session would include a handout and focus on how to identify archaeological resources that may be encountered during earthmoving activities and the procedures to be followed in such an event, those duties of archaeological monitors, and, the general steps a qualified professional archaeologist shall follow in conducting a salvage investigation if one is necessary.

CULT-5
Cease ground-disturbing activities and implement treatment plan if archaeological resources are encountered. In the event that archaeological resources are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, ground-disturbing activities shall be halted or diverted away from the vicinity of the find so that the find can be evaluated. A buffer area of at least 50 feet shall be established around the find where construction activities would not be allowed to continue until a qualified archaeologist has examined the newly discovered artifact(s) and has evaluated the area of the find. Work should be allowed to continue outside of the buffer area. All archaeological resources unearthed by project construction activities shall be evaluated by a qualified professional archaeologist, who meets the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications and Standards. Should the newly discovered artifacts be determined to be prehistoric, Native American Tribes/individuals shall be contacted and consulted and Native American construction monitoring should be initiated. The developer and City shall coordinate with the archaeologist to develop an appropriate treatment plan for the resources. The plan may include implementation of the archaeological data recovery excavations to address treatment of the resource along with subsequent laboratory processing and analysis.

CULT-6
Conduct periodic archaeological resources spot checks during grading and earth-moving activities in younger alluvial sediments. Project applicants shall retain a qualified professional archaeologist who meets the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications and standards to conduct periodic archaeological spot checks beginning at depths below two feet to determine if construction excavations have exposed or have a high probability of exposing archaeological resources. After the initial archaeological spot check, further periodic checks would be conducted at the discretion of the qualified archaeologist. If the qualified archaeologist determines that construction excavations have exposed or have a high probability of exposing archaeological artifacts, construction monitoring for archaeological resources would be required. Developers shall retain a qualified archaeological monitor who would work under the guidance and direction of a professional archaeologist, who meets the qualifications set forth by the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications and Standards. The archaeological monitor shall be present during all construction excavations (e.g., grading, trenching, or clearing/grubbing) into non-fill younger Pleistocene alluvial sediments. Multiple earth-moving construction activities may require multiple
archaeological monitors. The frequency of monitoring shall be based on the rate of excavation and grading activities, proximity to known archaeological resources, the materials being excavated (native versus artificial fill soils), the depth of excavation, and if found, the abundance and type of archaeological resources encountered. Full-time monitoring could be reduced to part-time inspections if determined adequate by the project archaeologist.

CULT-7
Prepare report upon completion of monitoring services. The archaeological monitor, under the direction of a qualified professional archaeologist who meets the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications and Standards, shall prepare a final report at the conclusion of archaeological monitoring. The report shall be submitted to the Applicant, the South Coastal Information Center, the City, and representatives of other appropriate or concerned agencies to signify the satisfactory completion of the project and required mitigation measures. The report shall include a description of resources unearthed, if any, evaluation of the resources with respect to the California Register and CEQA, and treatment of the resources.

CULT-8
Conduct paleontological sensitivity training for construction personnel. The Applicant shall retain a professional paleontologist, who meets the qualifications set forth by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology, shall conduct a Paleontological Sensitivity Training for construction personnel prior to commencement of excavation activities. The training would include a handout and would focus on how to identify paleontological resources that may be encountered during earthmoving activities, and the procedures to be followed in such an event; the duties of paleontological monitors; notification and other procedures to follow upon discovery of resources; and, the general steps a qualified professional paleontologist would follow in conducting a salvage investigation if one is necessary.

CULT-9
Conduct periodic paleontological spot checks during grading and earth-moving activities. The Applicant shall retain a professional paleontologist, who meets the qualifications set forth by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology, shall conduct periodic Paleontological Spot Checks beginning at depths below six feet to determine if construction excavations have extended into older Pleistocene alluvial deposits. After the initial Paleontological Spot Check, further periodic checks would be conducted at the discretion of the qualified paleontologist. If the qualified paleontologist determines that construction excavations have extended into the Puente Formation or into older Pleistocene alluvial deposits, construction monitoring for Paleontological Resources would be required. The Applicant shall retain a qualified paleontological monitor, who would work under the guidance and direction of a professional paleontologist, who meets the qualifications set forth by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology. The paleontological monitor shall be present during all construction excavations (e.g., grading, trenching, or clearing/grubbing) into older Pleistocene alluvial deposits. Multiple earth-moving construction activities may require multiple paleontological monitors. The frequency of monitoring shall be based on the rate of excavation and grading activities, proximity to known paleontological resources and/or unique geological features, the materials being excavated (native versus artificial fill soils), and the depth of excavation, and if found, the abundance and type of paleontological resources and/or unique geological features encountered. Full-time monitoring can be reduced to part-time inspections if determined adequate by the qualified professional paleontologist.

CULT-10
Cease ground-disturbing activities and implement treatment plan if paleontological resources are encountered. In the event that paleontological resources and or unique geological features are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, ground-disturbing activities shall be halted or diverted away from the vicinity of the find so that the find can be evaluated. A buffer area of at least 50 feet shall be established around the find where construction activities shall not be allowed to continue until appropriate paleontological treatment plan has been approved by the Applicant and the City. Work shall be allowed to continue outside of the buffer area. The Applicant
and City shall coordinate with a professional paleontologist, who meets the qualifications set forth by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology, to develop an appropriate treatment plan for the resources. Treatment may include implementation of paleontological salvage excavations to remove the resource along with subsequent laboratory processing and analysis or preservation in place. At the paleontologist’s discretion, and to reduce construction delay, the grading and excavation contractor shall assist in removing rock samples for initial processing.

**CULT-11**

*Prepare report upon completion of monitoring services.* Upon completion of the above activities, the professional paleontologist shall prepare a report summarizing the results of the monitoring and salvaging efforts, the methodology used in these efforts, as well as a description of the fossils collected and their significance. The report shall be submitted to the Applicant, the City, San Diego Natural History Museum, and representatives of other appropriate or concerned agencies to signify the satisfactory completion of the project and required mitigation measures.

**Level of Significance with Mitigation Incorporated**

Impacts 4.3.A through 4.A.E would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.
4.4 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

This section analyzes greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and the proposed Specific Plan’s contribution to global climate change. See Appendix E for modeling outputs.

Environmental Setting
The environmental topic at hand involves “climate change,” defined as the distinct change in measures of climate over a long period of time. Climate change can result from natural processes and human activities. Natural changes in the climate can be caused by indirect processes such as changes in the earth’s orbit around the sun or direct changes within the climate system itself (i.e. changes in ocean circulation). Human activities can affect the atmosphere through emissions of gases and changes to the planet's surface. Emissions affect the atmosphere directly by changing its chemical composition, while changes to the land surface indirectly affects the atmosphere by changing the way the earth absorbs gases from the atmosphere. The term “climate change” is preferred over the term “global warming” because “climate change” conveys the fact that other changes can occur beyond just average increase in temperatures near the earth’s surface.

“Greenhouse gases” result in the atmospheric phenomenon aptly known as the “greenhouse effect.” Human activities and natural events emit greenhouse gases (GHGs) that include carbon dioxide (CO$_2$), methane (CH$_4$), nitrous oxide (N$_2$O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF$_6$). Concentrations of carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide in the atmosphere have increased over 36 percent, 148 percent, and 18 percent, respectively, since the year 1750. The primary cause of the rise in concentrations is argued to be human activity.

GHGs behave differently in the atmosphere and contribute to climate change in different ways. Some gases have more potential to reflect infrared heat back towards the earth while some persist in the atmosphere longer than others. To equalize the contribution of GHGs to climate change, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) devised a weighted metric to compare all greenhouse gases to carbon dioxide. The weighting depends on the lifetime of the gas in the atmosphere and its radiative efficiency. As an example, over a time horizon of 100 years, emissions of nitrous oxide will contribute to climate change 298 times more than the same amount of emissions of carbon dioxide, while emissions of HFC-23 would contribute 14,800 times more than the same amount of carbon dioxide. The lifetime of the GHG represents how many years the GHG will persist in the atmosphere. The GWP of the GHG represents the GHG’s relative potential to induce climate change as compared to carbon dioxide.

Climate Change and California
The 2009 California Climate Adaptation Strategy prepared by the California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA) identifies anticipated impacts to California through extensive modeling efforts. General climate changes in California indicate that: (CNRA 2009)

- California is likely to get hotter and drier as climate change occurs with a reduction in winter snow, particularly in the Sierra Nevada.
- Some reduction in precipitation is likely by the middle of the century.
- Sea levels will rise up to an estimated 55 inches.
- Extreme events such as heat waves, wildfires, droughts, and floods will increase.
- Ecological shifts of habitat and animals are already occurring and will continue to occur.

It should be noted that changes are based on the results of several models prepared under different climatic scenarios; therefore, discrepancies occur between the projections and the interpretation.
Baseline Conditions
The Specific Plan planning area is currently developed and supports a variety of commercial, institutional, and residential uses. Based on default emissions data for energy and water use in the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) and total average daily trip data provided in the project traffic study, annual GHG emissions are estimated at 121,413.33 metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO$_2$E).

Regulatory Framework
International Regulation and the Kyoto Protocol
In 1988, the United Nations established the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to evaluate the impacts of global warming and to develop strategies that nations could implement to curtail global climate change. In 1992, the United States joined other countries around the world in signing the United Nations’ Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) agreement with the goal of controlling greenhouse gas emissions. As a result, the Climate Change Action Plan was developed to address the reduction of GHGs in the United States. The plan currently consists of more than 50 voluntary programs for member nations to adopt.

Federal Regulation and the Clean Air Act
Coinciding 2009 meeting in Copenhagen, on December 7, 2009, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued an Endangerment Finding under Section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act, opening the door to federal regulation of GHGs. The Endangerment Findings notes that GHGs threaten public health and welfare and are subject to regulation under the Clean Air Act. To date, the EPA has not promulgated regulations on GHG emissions, but it has already begun to develop them.

Title 24 Energy Standards
The California Energy Commission first adopted Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings in 1978 in response to a legislative mandate to reduce energy consumption in the state. Although not originally intended to reduce GHG emissions, increased energy efficiency, and reduced consumption of electricity, natural gas, and other fuels would result in fewer GHG emissions from residential and nonresidential buildings subject to the standard. The standards are updated periodically to allow for the consideration and inclusion of new energy efficiency technologies and methods. The latest revisions were adopted in 2008 and became effective on January 1, 2010.

Part 11 of the Title 24 Building Standards Code is referred to as the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen Code). The purpose of the CALGreen Code is to “improve public health, safety and general welfare by enhancing the design and construction of buildings through the use of building concepts having a positive environmental impact and encouraging sustainable construction practices in the following categories: (1) planning and design; (2) energy efficiency; (3) water efficiency and conservation; (4) material conservation and resource efficiency; and (5) environmental air quality.” The CALGreen Code is not intended to substitute or be identified as meeting the certification requirements of any green building program that is not established and adopted by the California Building Standards Commission (CBSC). The CBSC has released the 2016 California Green Building Standards Code on its website. Unless otherwise noted in the regulation, all newly constructed buildings in California are subject of the requirements of the CALGreen Code.

CALGreen contains both mandatory and voluntary measures. For non-residential land uses, there are 39 mandatory measures including, but not limited to, exterior light pollution reduction, wastewater reduction by 20 percent, and commissioning of projects over 10,000 square feet. Two tiers of voluntary measures apply to non-residential land uses, for a total of 36 additional elective measures.
California’s Building Energy Efficiency Standards are updated on an approximately three-year cycle. The 2013 standards will continue to improve upon the 2008 standards for new construction of, and additions and alterations to, residential and nonresidential buildings. The 2013 Building Energy Efficiency Standards are 25 percent more efficient than previous standards for residential construction and 30 percent better for non-residential construction (CEC 2013). The standards, which took effect on January 1, 2014, offer builders better windows, insulation, lighting, ventilation systems and other features that reduce energy consumption in homes and businesses. The code has been updated with the 2016 Code effective as of January 1, 2017. The 2016 standards are 28 percent more efficient for residential construction and five percent more efficient for non-residential construction in comparison to 2013 standards (CEC 2017).

Assembly Bill 32
In September 2006, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed AB 32, the California Climate Solutions Act of 2006. AB 32 requires that statewide GHG emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by the year 2020. This reduction will be accomplished through an enforceable statewide cap on GHG emissions that will be phased in starting in 2012. To effectively implement the cap, AB 32 directs CARB to develop and implement regulations to reduce statewide GHG emissions from stationary sources. AB 32 specifies that regulations adopted in response to AB 1493 should be used to address GHG emissions from vehicles. However, AB 32 also includes language stating that if the AB 1493 regulations cannot be implemented, then CARB should develop new regulations to control vehicle GHG emissions under the authorization of AB 32.

While local government operations were not accounted for in achieving the 2020 emissions reduction, local land use changes are estimated to result in a reduction of five million metric tons of carbon monoxide equivalent (MMTCO\textsubscript{2}e), which is approximately three percent of the 2020 GHG emissions reduction goal. In recognition of the critical role local governments will play in successful implementation of AB 32, CARB is recommending GHG reduction goals of 15 percent of 2006 levels by 2020 to ensure that municipal and community-wide emissions match the state’s reduction target. According to the Measure Documentation Supplement to the Scoping Plan, local government actions and targets are anticipated to reduce vehicle miles by approximately two percent through land use planning, resulting in a potential GHG reduction of two MMTCO\textsubscript{2}e (or approximately 1.2 percent of the GHG reduction target).

Scoping Plan
The CARB Scoping Plan is the comprehensive plan to reach the GHG reduction targets stipulated in AB 32. The key elements of the plan are to expand and strengthen energy efficiency programs, achieve a statewide renewable energy mix of 33 percent, develop a cap-and-trade program with other partners in the Western Climate Initiative (includes seven states in the United States and four territories in Canada), establish transportation-related targets, and establish fees (CARB 2008). CARB estimates that implementation of these measures will reduce GHG emissions in the State by 174 MMTCO\textsubscript{2}e by 2020; therefore, implementation of the Scoping Plan will meet the 2020 reduction target. In a report prepared on September 23, 2010, CARB indicates that 40 percent of the reduction measures identified in the Scoping Plan have been secured (CARB 2010). The cap-and-trade program began on January 1, 2012 after CARB completes a series of activities that deal with the registration process, compliance cycle, and tracking system; however, covered entities will not have an emissions obligation until 2013 (CARB 2017). CARB is currently working on the low carbon fuel standard where public hearings and workshops are currently being conducted. In August 2011, the Scoping plan was reapproved by the CARB Board with the program’s environmental documentation.

The CARB prepared the First Update to the Scoping Plan (Update) with a draft made available for public review on February 10, 2014. The Update to the Scoping Plan builds upon the 2008 Scoping Plan with new strategies and recommendations. The Update identifies opportunities to leverage existing and new funds to further drive GHG emission reductions through strategic planning and targeted low carbon investments. The Update defines CARB’s
climate change priorities for the next five years and sets the groundwork to reach post-2020 goals set forth in Executive Orders S-3-05 and B-16-2012. The Update highlights California’s progress toward meeting the 2020 GHG emission reduction goals defined in the 2008 Scoping Plan. It also evaluates how to align the State’s long-term GHG reduction strategies with other State policy priorities for water, waste, natural resources, clean energy, transportation, and land use. A draft Environmental Analysis (EA) was released for a 45-day public review period on March 14, 2014. After considering public comments and Board direction, the final First Update, summary of comments received on the draft EA, and CARB’s responses to those comments were released on May 15, 2014. The First Update to the Scoping Plan was approved by the Board on May 22, 2014.

The draft 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan Update is currently available for public review and is scheduled for final approval in June 2017. The 2017 Scoping Plan update identifies an increased need for coordination among state, regional, and local governments to realize the potential for GHG emissions reductions that can be gained from local land use decisions. The update notes that emissions reductions targets set by more than one hundred local jurisdictions in the state could realize emissions reductions up to 45 MMTCO₂E by 2020 and 83 MMTCO₂E by 2050. The 2017 Scoping Plan update includes a recommended plan-level efficiency threshold of six metric tons or less per capita by 2030 and no more than two metric tons by 2050.

**California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines**

CEQA Guideline § 15064.4(a) states that “a lead agency shall have discretion to determine, in the context of a particular project, whether to: (1) Use a model or methodology to quantify greenhouse gas emissions from a project, and which model or methodology to use...; or (2) Rely on a qualitative analysis or performance based standards.” Also amended were CEQA Guidelines Sections 15126.4 and 15130, which address mitigation measures and cumulative impacts respectively. Greenhouse gas mitigation measures are referenced in general terms, but no specific measures are championed. The revision to the cumulative impact discussion requirement (Section 15130) simply directs agencies to analyze greenhouse gas emissions in an EIR when a project’s incremental contribution of emissions may be cumulatively considerable, however it does not answer the question of when emissions are cumulative considerable.

Section 15183.5 permits programmatic greenhouse gas analysis and later project-specific tiering, as well as the preparation of Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plans. Compliance with such plans can support determination that a project’s cumulative effect is not cumulatively considerable, according to proposed Section 15183.5(b).

CEQA emphasizes that the effects of greenhouse gas emissions are cumulative, and should be analyzed in the context of CEQA’s requirements for cumulative impacts analysis (See CEQA Guidelines Section 15130[f]).

Section 15064.4(b) of the CEQA Guidelines provides direction for lead agencies for assessing the significance of impacts of greenhouse gas emissions:

1. The extent to which the project may increase or reduce greenhouse gas emissions as compared to the existing environmental setting;
2. Whether the project emissions exceed a threshold of significance that the lead agency determines applies to the project; or
3. The extent to which the project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions. Such regulations or requirements must be adopted by the relevant public agency through a public review process and must include specific requirements that reduce or mitigate the project’s incremental contribution of greenhouse gas emissions. If there is substantial evidence that the possible effects of a particular project are still cumulatively considerable notwithstanding compliance with the adopted regulations or requirements, an EIR must be prepared for the project.
CEQA provides for the streamlined environmental review of infill projects pursuant to Guidelines Section 15183.3. Infill projects must comply with the performance standards identified in Appendix M of the Guidelines and be consistent with the land use designation and zoning requirements for the project site. This option of streamlined environmental review will be applied primarily to non-residential development considering residential development will be exempt from further environmental review. Projects that meet the performance standards of Appendix M and do not result in any new environmental impacts will require no further environmental review.

Eligibility for this exemption is established through the following:

1. Minimum 75 percent of site perimeter is adjacent to qualified urban uses or was previously developed
2. Meets the performance standards of Appendix M of the CEQA Guidelines, namely:
   a. Incorporate renewable energy
   b. All site and/or water contamination shall be remediated
   c. Comply with local standards regarding residential units and proximity to major roadway

In addition, residential units must meet one of the following conditions:

a. Travel less than per capita regional VMT
b. Be located within one-quarter mile of major transit stop
c. Include low-income housing

Service and retail commercial uses may be eligible if it is located within a “low vehicle travel area” or within the proximity to 1,800 households. Similarly, office buildings are eligible if located in a low vehicle travel area or is within one-quarter mile of a major transit stop.

Thresholds of Significance
Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan may be considered significant if it would result in the following:

A. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment; or
B. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

In July 2016, the County of San Diego released climate change analysis guidance to assist in the project-level analysis of GHG emissions for discretionary projects. Although climate change is a cumulative impact, the County recognizes that not every individual project that emits GHG would contribute a significant cumulative impact on the environment. Therefore, pursuant to the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) white paper on evaluating and addressing GHG (CAPCOA 2008), an annual 900 MTCO$_2$e screening level is recommended by the County. It is assumed that projects of the same type or smaller than those listed below would not exceed 900 MTCO$_2$e per year, and would have a less than significant impact (SD County 2016a). However, the applicability of screening criteria can be evaluated on a project-by-project basis to determine if there is enough evidence to suggest that a project would result in greater than 900 MTCO$_2$e per year.

- Single Family Residential – 50 units
- Apartments/Condominiums – 70 units
- General Commercial Office Space – 35,000 square feet
- Retail Space – 11,000 square feet
- Supermarket/Grocery – 6,300 square feet
The County recognizes and recommends the efficiency metric to determine significance. The County recommends a quantitative GHG analysis for project emissions at year 2020 and build-out year (if post-2020). For projects that would be operational on or before 2020, significance is determined by an efficiency metric of 4.9 MTCO\textsubscript{2}e per service population per year. Service population refers to the project’s residents and/or employees. This efficiency metric is based on the AB 32 GHG reduction target and GHG emissions inventory prepared for CARB’s 2008 Scoping Plan. Land use driven sectors in the 1990 GHG inventory were identified and separated to tailor the inventory to land use projects, which include residential, commercial/retail, and mixed use. The adjusted 1990 emissions (286.7 MMTCO\textsubscript{2}e) was divided by the projected 2020 service population (59,130,546) for an efficiency metric of 4.9 MTCO\textsubscript{2}e for the year 2020. The County recognizes that GHG emissions need to be reduced at an annual average rate of 5.2 percent between 2020 and 2050 to meet long-range GHG reduction goals.

For project-level and focused programmatic proposals, based on guidance provided by the Association of Environmental Professionals (AEP) Climate Change Committee, a narrower emissions inventory is used that does not include emissions sources by which the project has no means or nexus to reduce emissions or whereby the emissions source is not relevant to the project (e.g., emissions from cargo ships in a community with no port). Therefore, this methodology has been utilized to determine the significance of Specific Plan build out.

Regarding typical land use projects, the greatest source of emissions that cannot effectively be reduced directly are from mobile sources. Vehicle emissions and feasible, affectable reduction strategies must be formulated at the State and federal levels and implemented by vehicle and parts manufacturers to improve technological efficiencies. Local land use decisions have some part in reducing mobile source emissions through reductions in vehicle miles traveled and through the strategic approval of industrial projects that generate high volumes of truck traffic. These gains, however, are less than the achievements realized by technological improvements and are generally inconsequential in terms of project efficiency to meet per capita standards or business-as-usual reduction requirements. Using this approach, the State’s 1990 emissions inventory for the land use sector is 267 MMTCO\textsubscript{2}e. The 1990 emissions inventory without inclusion of passenger or light-duty vehicle emissions is 158 MMTCO\textsubscript{2}e. The 1990 emissions inventory without on-road vehicle sources is 129 MMTCO\textsubscript{2}e. (AEP 2016) These translate to respective year 2020 efficiency standards of 4.7, 2.8, and 2.3. The breadth of efficiency standards under varying scenarios are summarized in Table 4.4-1 (Project-Level Efficiency Standards).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Year</th>
<th>Service Population (millions)</th>
<th>Emissions (MTCO\textsubscript{2}e) Per Service Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>56.45</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>61.53</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035*</td>
<td>63.37</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>70.71</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AEP 2016
* Calculated linearly to identify path of “substantial progress”
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Environmental Impacts
Impact 4.4.A
Implementation of the Specific Plan would not generate greenhouse gas emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment with mitigation incorporated.

Short-Term Emissions
Short-term GHG emissions would result from construction and installation activities as new development or redevelopment projects are proposed over the life of the Specific Plan. GHG emissions would be released by equipment used for demolition, grading, paving, building construction, and architectural coating activities. Construction activities are short term and cease to emit GHGs upon completion, unlike operational emissions that are continuous year after year until operation of the use ceases. Because of this difference, construction emissions are amortized over 20 to 30 years at the project level. At the program level, construction emissions are disparate in comparison to operational emissions such that they do not influence global climate change.

Long-Term Emissions
Future development activities would result in continuous GHG emissions from mobile, area, and operational sources. Mobile sources include vehicle trips to and from the Specific Plan planning area that would result primarily in emissions of CO\textsubscript{2} with minor emissions of methane and nitrous oxide. Regarding energy demand, the most significant GHG emission from natural gas usage would be methane. Electricity usage by a project and indirect usage of electricity for water and wastewater conveyance would result primarily in emissions of CO\textsubscript{2}. Disposal of solid waste would result in emissions of methane from the decomposition of waste at landfills coupled with CO\textsubscript{2} emission from the handling and transport of solid waste. These sources combine to define the long-term GHG emissions inventory for build out of the Specific Plan.

Program-Level Evaluation
Evaluation of GHG emissions from the Specific Plan planning area is accomplished through evaluating the ratio of areawide, cumulative emissions to the population served by the program to the ratio of statewide emissions to the state population for land use sources identified in the state emissions inventory. This ratio is known as an “efficiency standard” as it normalizes disparate values to comparable indices of relative emissions levels. Bulk emissions are divided by the “service population,” so called because only those directly accommodated by the project are accounted for (e.g., residents and employees).

The proposed Specific Plan is estimated to provide housing for up to 3,456 additional residents and up to 360 additional employees (see Section 4.9, Population and Housing, of this EIR), for a total net increase of 3,816 service population over existing conditions. Emissions from build out of the Specific Plan planning area were modeled to determine annual operational GHG emissions from the Specific Plan planning area at the 18-year horizon (2035).

Project net GHG emissions would result in an efficiency of 2.1 MTCO\textsubscript{2}e for the net increase in population and employment (without consideration of emissions reductions). Efficiency standards calculations are included in Table 4.4-2 (Specific Plan Net Greenhouse Gas Emissions). To show “substantial progress” towards achieving the AB 32 target in year 2050, the project must achieve an efficiency of 1.1 MTCO\textsubscript{2}e by year 2035; thus, the GHG emissions are potentially significant and mitigation factors need to be evaluated to further reduce project net emissions increases.
Table 4.4-2
Specific Plan Net Greenhouse Gas Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Total (MTCO2e)</th>
<th>Vehicle Emissions (MTCO2e)</th>
<th>Adjusted (MTCO2e)</th>
<th>SP (persons)</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>206,208.03</td>
<td>183,894.29</td>
<td>22,313.75</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>121,413.33</td>
<td>107,241.76</td>
<td>14,171.57</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Increase</td>
<td>84,794.71</td>
<td>76,652.53</td>
<td>8,142.18</td>
<td>3,816</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reduction Measures

The net increase in GHG emissions resulting from build out of the Specific Plan planning area would be partially offset by design features of the Specific Plan and regulatory requirements meant to reduce GHG emissions from development projects, either directly or as a secondary benefit of another mitigating factor. The Specific Plan largely supports commercial and mixed-use development in an urbanized area; thus, the project includes land use design elements that would reduce GHG emissions.

The use of wood-burning fireplaces releases greater amounts of air pollution—indoors and outdoors—than heaters and fireplaces using other fuels. Wood smoke contains air pollutants that could reduce the blood’s ability to supply oxygen to body tissues (CO), impair the respiratory system and its ability to fight infection (NOx), injure the lungs and make breathing difficult (VOC), cause cancer (benzene and formaldehyde), and aggravate a number of respiratory illnesses (particulate matter) (APCD 2017c). As of March 9, 2009, the Southern California Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) prohibits the installation of wood-burning devices such as stoves and fireplaces in new residential developments. According to SCAQMD, gas fireplaces result in approximately 99 percent fewer particulate matter emissions (SCAQMD 2017). The SDCAPCD, as of April 2017, does not prohibit the installation of wood-burning devices in new residential developments. However, due to the levels of indoor and outdoor emissions of pollutants generated by wood-burning devices, Mitigation Measure GHG-1 has been included. Mitigation Measure GHG-1 prohibits future development within the Specific Plan planning area from installing wood-burning fireplaces. Therefore, the natural gas hearth measure has been activated in CalEEMod.

Furthermore, regulatory requirements associated with the State CALGreen requirements would further reduce GHG emissions. GHG emissions reductions are summarized below as modeled using CalEEMod per the CAPCOA Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures handbook (CAPCOA 2010).

Energy Efficiency

Future development would be subject to increased Title 24 energy efficiency requirements. CalEEMod defaults assume compliance with 2008 California Building Energy Efficiency Standards. According to the Impact Analysis on California’s 2013 Building Energy Efficiency Standards report prepared by California Energy Commission (CEC), compliance with 2013 standards reduced electricity use by 23.3 percent compared to 2008 standards (CEC 2013). 2016 Title 24 standards went into effect on January 1, 2017. According to the CEC, new residential developments built to 2016 standards are 28 percent more efficient than homes built to 2013 standards, and nonresidential developments are five percent more efficient (CEC 2017). The model was adjusted to account for a 23.3 percent exceedance of 2008 Title 24 efficiency standards to meet 2013 standards, coupled with an additional five percent exceedance of 2013 standards to meet 2016 standards, resulting in a total exceedance of 28.3 percent (Measure BE-1). Because the CEC estimates that residential uses built to 2016 standards would be 28 percent more efficient than homes built to 2013 standards, the additional five percent efficiency represents a conservative analysis.
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Water Demand Efficiency
Pursuant to CALGreen requirements, indoor water demand must be reduced by a minimum of 20 percent. This requirement was applied to the project using default reduction factors provided in CalEEMod (Measure WUW-1).

Proposed landscaping would be designed to be water efficient in accordance with State and county water-efficient landscape requirements. Because no specific development is proposed, total landscaping at build out and estimated water use is not available. According to the Specific Plan land use regulations, minimum required landscaping for all land use districts is 10 percent of the total site area. Assuming that 10 percent of the Specific Plan planning area would be landscaped, the California Department of Water Resources Statewide Integrated Water Management Water Budget Workbook was utilized to calculate maximum applied water allowance and estimated total water use. Pursuant to Poway Municipal Code Chapter 17.41, all landscaping within the City must be of low water use type with a plant factor of 0.3. The maximum applied water allowance was calculated at 20,665,340 gallons, with an estimated total water use of 12,474,049 gallons. Use of water efficient landscaping would result in approximately 40 percent reduction of landscape water usage (Measure WUW-3).

Proposed landscaping would include a number of water-efficient irrigation features. These may include automatic irrigation controllers, separate turf and shrub irrigation, and separate hydrozones. The CalEEMod default reduction of 6.1 percent was applied to account for improved irrigation efficiency (Measure WUW-4).

Solid Waste Diversion
Pursuant to the State Integrated Waste Management Act (AB 939) and the mandatory commercial recycling requirement of AB 32 (effective January 2012), the Specific Plan planning area is assumed to recycle a minimum of 50 percent of its solid waste (Measure SW-1). Recycling helps reduce GHG emissions by reducing solid waste transportation demand and decomposition of solid waste in landfills.

Reduced Greenhouse Gas Inventory
Design features, regulatory requirements, and Mitigation Measure GHG-1 would reduce GHG emissions by 4,140.09 MTCO$_2$e per year, resulting in an annual net output of 4,001.09 MTCO$_2$e GHG emissions and a mitigated efficiency of 1.0 MTCO$_2$e per SP. Table 4.4-3 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduced Inventory) summarizes the project GHG inventory with design features, regulatory requirements, and Mitigation Measure GHG-1 incorporated. The GHG emissions to service population ratio of 1.0 that would result upon build out of the proposed Specific Plan planning area is less than the State efficiency standard of 1.1 identified for year 2035 showing substantial progress towards the AB 32 year 2050 GHG emissions target. Impacts would be less than significant with implementation of design features and regulatory requirements.

| Table 4.4-3  
Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduced Inventory |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net Proposed</td>
<td>Reductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MTCO$_2$e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>1,752.57</td>
<td>-1,120.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>4,897.68</td>
<td>-1,233.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>622.02</td>
<td>-1,138.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water/Wastewater</td>
<td>869.91</td>
<td>-647.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,142.18</strong></td>
<td><strong>-4,140.09</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Service Population</td>
<td>3,816</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emissions per SP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact 4.4.B

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. Impacts would be less than significant.

CARB's Scoping Plan identifies strategies to reduce California’s GHG emissions in support of AB 32. Many of the strategies identified in the Scoping Plan are not applicable to local development projects or plans, such as long-term technological improvements to reduced emissions from vehicles. Some measures are applicable and supported by the proposed Specific Plan, such as energy efficiency. Finally, while some measures are not directly applicable, the proposed Specific Plan would not conflict with their implementation. Reduction measures are grouped into 18 action categories (CARB 2008). The following summarizes these measures and the project's consistency with those measures. As summarized, the Specific Plan would not conflict with any of the provisions of the Scoping Plan and in fact supports five of the action categories through energy efficiency, water conservation, and recycling. Impacts would be less than significant when accounting for project design features and implementation of regulatory requirements.

1. **California Cap-and-Trade Program Linked to Western Climate Initiative Partner Jurisdictions.** Implement a broad-based California cap-and-trade program to provide a firm limit on emissions. Link the California cap-and-trade program with other Western Climate Initiative Partner programs to create a regional market system to achieve greater environmental and economic benefits for California. Ensure California’s program meets all applicable AB 32 requirements for market-based mechanisms.

   *Not Applicable.* These programs involve capping emissions from electricity generation, industrial facilities, and broad scoped fuels. Caps do not directly affect residential or commercial uses.

2. **California Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Standards.** Implement adopted Pavley standards and planned second phase of the program. Align zero-emission vehicle, alternative and renewable fuel and vehicle technology programs with long-term climate change goals.

   *Not Applicable.* This is a statewide measure establishing vehicle emissions standards.

3. **Energy Efficiency.** Maximize energy efficiency building and appliance standards, and pursue additional efficiency efforts including new technologies, and new policy and implementation mechanisms. Pursue comparable investment in energy efficiency from all retail providers of electricity in California (including both investor-owned and publicly owned utilities).

   *Consistent.* Development within the Specific Plan planning area would be subject to a variety of building, water, and solid waste efficiencies consistent with CALGreen requirements.

4. **Renewable Portfolio Standards.** Achieve 33 percent renewable energy mix statewide.

   *Not Applicable.* Establishes the minimum statewide renewable energy mix.

5. **Low Carbon Fuel Standard.** Develop and adopt the Low Carbon Fuel Standard.

   *Not Applicable.* Establishes reduced carbon intensity of transportation fuels.


   *Not Applicable.* Establishes fleet-wide emissions reduction targets and measures applicable to vehicle manufacturing and maintenance throughout the state.
7. **Vehicle Efficiency Measures.** Implement light-duty vehicle efficiency measures.

   *Not Applicable.* Identifies measures such as minimum tire-fuel efficiency, lower friction oil, and reduction in air conditioning use.

8. **Goods Movement.** Implement adopted regulations for the use of shore power for ships at berth. Improve efficiency in goods movement activities.

   *Not Applicable.* Identifies measures to improve goods movement efficiencies such as advanced combustion strategies, friction reduction, waste heat recovery, and electrification of accessories.

9. **Million Solar Roofs Program.** Install 3,000 megawatts of solar-electric capacity under California’s existing solar programs.

   *Consistent.* Sets goals for use of solar systems throughout the State. The Specific Plan supports installation of solar systems as part of the streamlining procedures outlined in the CEQA Guidelines.

10. **Medium- and Heavy-Duty Vehicles.** Adopt medium- (MD) and heavy-duty (HD) vehicle efficiencies. Aerodynamic efficiency measures for HD trucks pulling trailers 53-feet or longer that include improvements in trailer aerodynamics and use of rolling resistance tires were adopted in 2008 and went into effect in 2010. Future, yet to be determined improvements, includes hybridization of MD and HD trucks.

   *Not Applicable.* Medium-duty and heavy-duty trucks and trailers would serve the auto-related and larger-scale commercial uses operating within the Specific Plan area. Any such vehicles will be required to comply with efficiency measures put in place by State and federal agencies.

11. **Industrial Emissions.** Require assessment of large industrial sources to determine whether individual sources within a facility can cost-effectively reduce greenhouse gas emissions and provide other pollution reduction co-benefits. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions from fugitive emissions from oil and gas extraction and gas transmission. Adopt and implement regulations to control fugitive methane emissions and reduce flaring at refineries.

   *Not Applicable.* These measures are applicable to large industrial facilities (>500,000 MTCO2e/yr) and other intensive uses such as refineries.

12. **High Speed Rail.** Support implementation of a high speed rail system.

   *Not Applicable.* Supports increased mobility choice.

13. **Green Building Strategy.** Expand the use of green building practices to reduce the carbon footprint of California’s new and existing inventory of buildings.

   *Consistent.* Development within the Specific Plan planning area would be subject to a variety of building, water, and solid waste efficiencies consistent with CALGreen requirements.

14. **High Global Warming Potential Gases.** Adopt measures to reduce high global warming potential gases.

   *Not Applicable.* The future development within the proposed Specific Plan planning area would not be a substantial source of high global warming potential emissions and would comply with any future changes in air conditioning, fire protection suppressant, and other requirements.

Consistent. Future land uses would be required to recycle a minimum of 50 percent from construction activities and operations per State requirements.

16. **Sustainable Forests.** Preserve forest sequestration and encourage the use of forest biomass for sustainable energy generation. The 2020 target for carbon sequestration is 5 million MTCO2e per year.

   *Not Applicable.* The Specific Plan planning area is not forested and implementation of the Specific Plan would not result in the loss of any forest land.

17. **Water.** Continue efficiency programs and use cleaner energy sources to move and treat water.

   Consistent. Future development proposals would include use of low-flow fixtures and efficient landscaping per State and local requirements.

18. **Agriculture.** In the near-term, encourage investment in manure digesters and at the five-year Scoping Plan update determine if the program should be made mandatory by 2020.

   *Not Applicable.* The Specific Plan planning area does not contain any existing or planned agricultural use.

**Mitigation Measures**

**GHG-1**
The installation of wood-burning devices such as fireplaces, stoves, and heaters shall be prohibited at new residential development within the Specific Plan planning area.

**Level of Significance with Mitigation Incorporated**
Impact 4.4.A would be less than significant with incorporation of Mitigation Measure GHG-1.
4.5 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The presence of site contamination was evaluated for properties within the Specific Plan planning area through evaluation of Government Code 65962.5, and the results are discussed in this section. Impacts related to wildland fires are also evaluated.

The Initial Study (Appendix B) identified less than significant impacts related to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions; and hazardous emissions near schools. The Initial Study also determined that no impact would occur related to proximity to private or public airport operations. Therefore, these issues are not examined in this section.

Environmental Setting

Site Contamination

Hazardous Waste and Substance Sites
Based on a review of the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) EnviroStor database, no sites within the Specific Plan planning area are listed as hazardous waste and substance sites.

Underground Storage Tanks
Based on a review of the GeoTracker database, three leaking underground storage tank (LUST) sites occur within the Specific Plan planning area, as listed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). No cases of LUST sites have been recorded within one-quarter mile outside of the Specific Plan planning area. Table 4.5-1 (LUST Cleanup Sites) lists the LUST sites located within the Specific Plan planning area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Global ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCO #1735</td>
<td>T0607300943</td>
<td>12805 Poway Road</td>
<td>Open – Remediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poway, CA 92064</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent-X</td>
<td>T0607300884</td>
<td>13044 Poway Road</td>
<td>Open – Eligible for Closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poway, CA 92064</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobil 18-E8T</td>
<td>T0607301462</td>
<td>13556 Poway Road</td>
<td>Open – Verification Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poway, CA 92064</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SWRCB GeoTracker, 2017

Hazardous Solid Waste Disposal Sites
Based on a review of a list of solid waste disposal sites identified by the SWRCB, no sites within or adjacent to the Specific Plan planning area listed are listed as hazardous solid waste disposal sites.

Cease and Desist Order (CDO)/Cleanup and Abatement Order (CAO)
Based on a review of a list of “active” CDOs and CAOs, no sites located within or adjacent to the Specific Plan planning area are currently subject to a CDO or a CAO as issued by the SWRCB.
Hazardous Waste Facilities
Based on a review of a list of hazardous waste facilities subject to corrective action pursuant to Section 25187.5 of the Health and Safety Code, as identified by DTSC, no sites developed with a hazardous waste facility occur within the Specific Plan planning area.

Wildland Fires
According fire hazard severity maps published by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Prevention and the City of Poway GIS database, nine parcels totaling approximately 7.06 acres at the westernmost portion of the Specific Plan planning area are located within an area susceptible to wildland fires. Also properties southeast of the Specific Plan planning area are adjacent to areas with wildland fire risks (see Exhibit 4.5-1, Fire Hazard Areas).

Regulatory Framework
Underground Tank Regulations
Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 16 (Underground Tank Regulations) of the California Code of Regulations identifies the regulations applicable to new and existing underground storage tanks. These regulations establish monitoring, maintenance, reporting, abatement, and closure procedures for all underground storage tanks in the State. These regulations are administered by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region.

California Government Code Section 65962.5 “Cortese List” Statute
The provisions in Government Code § 65962.5 are commonly referred to as the “Cortese List.” The list, or a site’s presence on the list, has bearing on the local permitting process, as well as on compliance with CEQA. Government Code § 65962.5 was originally enacted in 1985, and per subsection (g), the effective date of the changes called for under the amendments to this section was January 1, 1992. While Government Code § 65962.5 makes reference to the preparation of a “list,” many changes have occurred related to web-based information access since 1992, and this information is now largely available on the Internet sites of the responsible organizations.

Subsection 65962.5 (A)
The Department of Toxic Substances Control is required to compile and update least annually, and is required to submit to the Secretary for Environmental Protection, a list of the following:

The Department of Toxic Substances Control shall compile and update as appropriate, but at least annually, and shall submit to the Secretary for Environmental Protection, a list of all of the following:

1. All hazardous waste facilities subject to corrective action pursuant to Section 25187.5 of the Health and Safety Code.
2. All land designated as hazardous waste property or border zone property pursuant to Article 11 (commencing with Section 25220) of Chapter 6.5 of Division 20 of the Health and Safety Code.
3. All information received by the Department of Toxic Substances Control pursuant to Section 25242 of the Health and Safety Code on hazardous waste disposals on public land.
4. All sites listed pursuant to Section 25356 of the Health and Safety Code.
5. All sites included in the Abandoned Site Assessment Program

Subsection 65962.5 (B)
The State Department of Health Services is required to compile and update at least annually, and to submit to the Secretary for Environmental Protection, a list of all public drinking water wells that contain detectable levels of
organic contaminants and that are subject to water analysis pursuant to Section 116395 of the Health and Safety Code.

**Subsection 65962.5 (C)**
The State Water Resources Control Board is required to compile and update at least annually, and to submit to the Secretary for Environmental Protection, a list of the following:

1. All underground storage tanks for which an unauthorized release report is filed pursuant to Section 25295 of the Health and Safety Code.
2. All solid waste disposal facilities from which there is a migration of hazardous waste and for which a California regional water quality control board has notified the Department of Toxic Substances Control pursuant to subdivision (e) of Section 13273 of the Water Code.
3. All cease and desist orders issued after January 1, 1986, pursuant to Section 13301 of the Water Code, and all cleanup or abatement orders issued after January 1, 1986, pursuant to Section 13304 of the Water Code, that concern the discharge of wastes that are hazardous materials.

**Subsection 65962.5 (D)**
The local enforcement agency, as designated pursuant to Section 18051 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, is required to compile and update at least annually, and to submit to the California Integrated Waste Management Board, a list of solid waste disposal facilities from which there is a known migration of hazardous waste. The California Integrated Waste Management Board is required to compile the local lists into a statewide list, which is submitted to the Secretary for Environmental Protection and made available to any person who requests the information.

**Subsection 65962.5 (E)**
The Secretary for Environmental Protection is required to consolidate the information and distribute it in a timely fashion to each city and county in which sites on the lists are located. The secretary also must distribute the information to any other person upon request.

**Poway General Plan**
The General Plan Public Safety Element includes the following policies and implementation measures pertaining to hazards and wildland fire impacts.

**Goal VII.** It is the goal of the City of Poway to provide a safe and healthy environment for the residents of Poway.

**Policy B – Fire Protection.**

1. Encourage the development, implementation and public awareness of the fire prevention programs.
2. Implement programs to reduce quantity of combustible vegetative materials in the City to reduce wildland fire hazards including a brush management program subject to approval by the City.
3. Continue the use of the Weed Abatement Program and a fire buffer program along heavily traveled roads through thinning, disking or controlled burning, subject to air quality standards. Brush, but not trees, should be cleared from both sides of major arterials.
4. The existing rows of eucalyptus trees should be trimmed periodically, and combustible vegetative materials at the tree base should be periodically removed.
5. All provided development shall satisfy the minimum structural fire protection standards contained in the adopted editions of the Uniform Fire and Building Codes; however, where deemed appropriate the City shall enhance the minimum standards to provide optimum protection.

6. Fire protection requirements shall be expanded where structural and/or capital improvements cannot adequately protect the community from property damage or potential loss of life.

7. Study the feasibility of regulations requiring the installation of a sprinkler system at the time of construction of new residential structures and in conjunction with expansion or substantial interior remodeling of existing structures.

8. Require fire retardant roofing materials based upon the type of construction in and outside of high fire hazard areas.

9. Enforce the fire control requirements of the City’s landscape standards.

10. In order to minimize fire hazards, the Poway Fire Department shall routinely be involved in the review of development applications. Consideration shall be given to adequate emergency access, driveway widths, turning radii, fire hydrant locations and needed fire flow requires.

11. Advocate and support State legislation which would provide tax incentives encouraging the repair or demolition of structures which are classified as high fire hazards.

12. The construction of public facilities and transportation corridors shall be consistent with the adopted standards of the Uniform Building Code and Uniform Fire Code.

The General Plan EIR Section 5.12 includes the following mitigation measure related fire hazard. All development is subject to this requirement.

7. Fire retardant roofing materials based on the type of construction in and outside of high fire hazards shall be required for all new development or redevelopment.

Poway Municipal Code
Chapter 15.24 of the Municipal Code adopts by reference the 2016 California Fire Code, excluding 103, and including Appendix Chapter 4 and Appendices B, F, and I, as published by the International Code Council, except those portions that are deleted, modified, or amended by Chapter 15.24 of the Poway Municipal Code.

Chapter 15.24 of the Poway Municipal Code amends the 2016 California Fire Code to include the requirement of a Fire Protection Plan (FPP) as part of the approval process for development projects when the project is located within a wildland-urban interface fire area. The FPP shall address water supply, vehicular and emergency apparatus access, travel time to nearest serving fire station, structural ignitability, structure setback, ignition-resistive building features, fire protection systems and equipment, impacts to existing emergency services, and defensible space and vegetation management.

Other revisions to the California Fire Code related to setback requirements and fuel modification are detailed in Chapter 15.24 of the Poway Municipal Code.

Thresholds of Significance
Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan may be considered significant if it would result in the following:
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A. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, it creates a significant hazard to the public or the environment; or

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

Environmental Impacts

Impact 4.5.A

No property within the Specific Plan planning area is identified as a hazardous waste and substance site, is a known hazardous solid waste disposal site, is subject to a cease and desist order or cleanup and abatement order, or is a hazardous waste facility. Implementation of the Specific Plan would not create a significant hazard related to leaking underground storage tanks. Impacts would be less than significant.

As discussed above, no property within the Specific Plan planning area is identified on the Cortese List that includes hazardous waste and substance sites listed by the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), hazardous soil waste disposal sites as listed by the SWRCB, Cease and Desist Order or a Cleanup and Abatement Order sites as issued by the SWRCB, or hazardous waste facilities subject to corrective action by the DTSC.

The GeoTracker database identifies three LUST sites within the Specific Plan planning area as follows.

The RENT-X site is eligible for closure as of July 17, 2015. The required public notice for 60-day comment period was distributed in August, 2016. Development or redevelopment of site Rent-X site may occur during the life of the proposed Specific Plan. Should redevelopment or development of this site be proposed, the instance of LUSTs have been remediated such that the tanks are no longer leaking and that any contamination does not exceed actionable levels.

The ARCO is in open remediation as of July 16, 2004. Semi-annual monitoring was conducted in December, 2016, and a report prepared by ARCADIS U.S. was submitted in January, 2017. Groundwater hydrocarbon concentrations were found to be similar to previous sampling events, and ARCADIS recommended continued groundwater monitoring and sampling. A vapor intrusion and human health risk screening report was prepared by ARCADIS in December, 2016. Based on results of sampling analysis, carcinogenic risks for off-site residential and commercial property do not exceed unacceptable health risk. Therefore, ARCADIS recommended that no additional human health risk assessment be performed for this site.

The Mobil site is undergoing semi-annual verification groundwater monitoring as of March 11, 1998. According to SWRCB Geotracker information, a 2007 Corrective Action Report recommended no additional assessment or active remediation and no further action for unauthorized release. However, the site is still undergoing groundwater monitoring to evaluate trends and concentrations for application of low threat closure.

Should the LUST case for the ARCO site and the Mobil site remain open during future proposed redevelopment, the project proponent would be required to ensure that demolition and earthmoving activity would not result in the accidental release of hazardous materials. Further study would be required to determine if development activity in the affected area would result in any risk of exposure to hazardous vapors or groundwater. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not authorize any specific development. Future development within the Specific Plan planning area would be subject to the City’s standard environmental review process. During this process, review of updated SWQCB’s LUST information would determine if the ARCO, Mobil, or any newly designated LUST sites would result in potentially significant impacts and mitigation measures would be implemented, if necessary.
Impact 4.5.B

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. Impacts would be less than significant.

The Specific Plan planning area is completely urbanized and is surrounded by development. According to fire hazard severity maps published by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Prevention and the City of Poway GIS database, nine parcels totaling approximately 7.06 acres at the westernmost portion of the Specific Plan planning area are located within an area susceptible to wildland fires and in close proximity to wildland fire risk to southeast of the Specific Plan planning area (see Exhibit 4.5-1, Fire Hazard Areas).

The proposed Specific Plan identifies the long-term vision and objectives for land use development and public improvements along a 2.65-mile portion of Poway Road between Oak Knoll Road and Garden Road. Development capacity of the proposed Specific Plan would result in additional residential units and non-residential square footage beyond current conditions and projected development capacity under the current land use designations. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would provide development capacity for up to an additional 1,148 dwelling units and up to 260,000 non-residential square feet. Build out of the Specific Plan planning area would result in increased development intensity within and in close proximity to wildland fire risk areas.

The Poway General Plan includes policies aimed at reducing risk to loss, injury, and death through a weed abatement program, removal of combustible vegetative materials, use of fire retardant roofing materials, and implementation of standards contained in the Uniform Fire and Building Codes. The Poway Municipal Code adopts the 2016 California Fire Code (CFC), which includes the requirement of a Fire Protection Plan as part of the approval process for development projects that are within a wildland-urban interface fire area. Part 2 of the California Building Code (CBC) includes standards for building construction materials. All materials used shall be fire-retardant, ignition-resistant, and safeguard against the intrusion of flames resulting from small ember and short-term direct flame contact exposure. In addition to the use of fire-retardant and ignition-resistant materials, the CBC includes guidelines for ventilation, windows, decking. Future development within the Specific Plan planning area that is subject to wildland fires or located within a wildfire-urban interface would be subject to the regulations as detailed in the CBC. Compliance with CBC regulations and implementation of General Plan policies would ensure that impacts related to wildland fires would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures
None required.

Level of Significance with Mitigation Incorporated
Not applicable.
4.6 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

This section examines potential project impacts associated with depletion of groundwater supplies, interference with groundwater recharge, and decrease in groundwater levels. This section also discusses impacts related to placing housing or structures within a 100-year flood hazard zone.

The Initial Study (Appendix B) analysis indicates that no impacts would result related to alteration of on-site drainage patterns and associated runoff, degradation of water quality, levee or dam failure, or inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Therefore, these are not analyzed in the EIR.

A comment letter in response to the NOP was submitted by the City of San Diego. The Transportation and Storm Water Department, Storm Water Division requested that the EIR address applicable provisions of the Los Peñasquitos Watershed Management Area Water Quality Improvement Plan and the San Diego Storm Water Standards and Design Manual. Therefore, although impacts related to water quality standards and stormwater drainage capacity were determined to have less than significant and no impact, respectively, by the Initial Study, these impacts are addressed here.

Environmental Setting

Water Quality

The Los Peñasquitos Watershed Management Area (WMA) encompasses approximately 94 square miles of urban land and undeveloped open space extending from the Los Peñasquitos Lagoon beyond Highway 67 to the east. According to the San Diego County General Plan EIR, impacts to the WMA include surface water quality degradation, beach closures, sedimentation, habitat degradation and loss, invasive species, and eutrophication. Urban runoff, sewage spills, dredging, landfill leachate, and natural sources are factors that may be impairing water quality within the WMA.

Beneficial Uses

Beneficial uses of a water body are designated in the Basin Plan under the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) in accordance with regulations contained in 40 CFR 131. Poway Creek and Rattlesnake Creek are in close proximity and or run through the Specific Plan area. Existing and potential beneficial uses for Poway Creek and Rattlesnake Creed include the following:

- **Agricultural Supply** – Includes uses of water for farming, horticulture, or ranching including, but not limited to, irrigation, stock watering, or support of vegetation for range grazing.

- **Industrial Service Supply** – Includes uses of water for industrial activities that do not depend primarily on water quality including, but not limited to, mining, cooling water supply, hydraulic conveyance, gravel washing, fire protection, or oil well re-pressurization.

- **Contact Water Recreation** – Include uses of water for recreational activities involving body contact with water, where ingestion of water is reasonably possible. These uses include, but are not limited to, swimming, wading, water-skiing, skin and SCUBA diving, surfing, white water activities, fishing, or use of natural hot springs.

- **Non-contact Water Recreation** – Includes the uses of water for recreational activities involving proximity to water, but not normally involving body contact with water, where ingestion of water is reasonably
possible. These uses include, but are not limited to, picnicking, sunbathing, hiking, beachcombing, camping, boating, tidepool and marine life study, hunting, sightseeing, or aesthetic enjoyment in conjunction with the above activities.

- **Warm Freshwater Habitat** – Includes uses of water that support warm water ecosystems including, but not limited to, preservation or enhancement of aquatic habitats, vegetation, fish or wildlife, including invertebrates.

- **Cold Freshwater Habitat** – Includes uses of water that support cold water ecosystems including, but not limited to, preservation or enhancement of aquatic habitats, vegetation, fish or wildlife, including invertebrates.

- **Wildlife Habitat** – Includes uses of water that support terrestrial ecosystems including, but not limited to, preservation and enhancement of terrestrial habitats, vegetation, wildlife (e.g., mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, invertebrates), or wildlife water and food sources.

**Groundwater**

According to the 2015 Urban Water Management Plan for Poway, the geology of Poway does not include any large alluvial aquifers that could support efficient groundwater extraction and recharge. Due to the minimal amount of groundwater present, 99 percent of the City’s water supply is imported from the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA), which is supplied by transfer water from the Imperial Irrigation District (IID) and imported water from the Metropolitan Water District (MWD). Table 4.6-1 (Current and Planned Water Supply for Poway) summarizes the approximate amount of water supplied by each source in acre-feet per year (AFY). The estimated supply from each source is estimated through the year 2040.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Supply</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Projected&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imported Water&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>8,712&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>13,356</td>
<td>14,306</td>
<td>14,482</td>
<td>14,557</td>
<td>15,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycled Water&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Poway 2015 UWMP

1. Purchased raw water from SDCWA
2. Purchased recycled water from the City of San Diego
3. Represents total volume imported from SDCWA, not total volume distributed to customers.
4. Purchased water based on projected available per the SDCQA UWMP. Recycled water supply based on the agreement with the City of San Diego.

Private water wells are present within the undeveloped areas of eastern Poway where access to the municipal water system is not available and for domestic and agricultural irrigation use. The City does not monitor the amount of water that is pumped from private wells.

**100-Year Flooding**

The 100-year flood is also known as the base flood, which has a one percent chance of being equaled or exceeded in any given year. Several creeks and streams run through and adjacent to the Specific Plan planning area. The Federal Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) is the official map distributed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) that delineates the Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHAs). According to FEMA flood maps and the City of Poway GIS mapping system, portions of the Specific Plan planning area located adjacent to creeks and streams are subject to 100-year flooding (see Exhibit 4.6-1, Flood Hazard Areas). The 100-year floodway identifies the floodway of a channel or stream plus any adjacent floodplain areas that
must be kept free of encroachment so that the 100-year flood can occur without substantial increases in flood heights.

Regulatory Framework
The following section provides information regarding regulatory programs currently in effect and applicable to the proposed project. This section does not purport to list all regulations relevant to hydrology and water quality issues; however, it does outline major programs that are applicable to the proposed project.

Clean Water Act
The Clean Water Act (CWA) is the cornerstone of surface water quality protection in the United States. The CWA does not deal directly with groundwater or with water quantity issues. The statute employs a variety of regulatory and non-regulatory tools to sharply reduce direct pollutant discharges (known as “point sources”) into waterways, finance municipal wastewater treatment facilities, and manage polluted runoff, the principal nonpoint source. These tools are employed to achieve the broader goal of restoring and maintaining the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the nation’s waters so that they can support “the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife and recreation in and on the water.” Evolution of CWA programs over the last decade has included a shift from a program-by-program, source-by-source, and pollutant-by-pollutant approach to more holistic watershed-based strategies. Under the watershed approach, equal emphasis is placed on protecting healthy waters and restoring impaired ones.

Major CWA programs include water quality standards, anti-degradation policy, waterbody monitoring and assessment, total maximum daily loads (TMDLs), the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program for point sources, Section 319 program for nonpoint sources, Section 401 State water quality certification, and the State revolving loan fund (SRF).

Water pollutants under the CWA are categorized as conventional, toxic, and nonconventional. The five conventional pollutants, as defined by the CWA, are as follows:

Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD): BOD is the amount of oxygen utilized by decomposition of organic material over a specific time period (for the purposes of water quality a measure is taken over five days and is known as BOD5). Although natural organic sources occur in waterbodies, the amount of oxidizing aerobic bacteria can increase significantly due to discharges of wastewater and urban runoff such as lawn fertilizer. Increased oxygen use in waterbodies can result in the death of native aquatic species because the aerobic bacteria decreases natural oxygen levels in the waterbody. This can lead to infiltration and less oxygen dependent organisms and species.

Total Suspended Solids (TSS): TSS represents the amount of solids within a waterbody that are suspended or not settled. TSS can represent the amount of turbidity in a water body and is measured by filtering solids from a water sample and measuring its weight. High TSS levels in a waterbody can lead to numerous problems. High TSS can block sunlight from reaching the bottom of a waterbody and therefore result in the inability for bottom dwelling plants to photosynthesize. This can not only lead to floral death but faunal death as well due to the decreased levels of oxygen resulting from reduced plant life. Increased TSS levels can lead to increased water temperature because suspended particles absorb heat from sunlight and therefore can also lead to decreased oxygen levels because warmer water holds less dissolved oxygen.

pH: pH is the measurement of the hydrogen ion concentration in a waterbody. A pH measurement of seven is neutral while less than seven becomes increasingly acidic and greater than seven becomes increasingly base on a scale of zero to fourteen. The balance of pH in a waterbody is important to maintain natural biological functions.
and prevent pollution. Generally, waterbodies maintain pH levels by neutralizing increases and decreases through naturally occurring dissolved chemicals in the water. This is known as the waterbody’s buffering capacity, or ability to withstand changes in pH. Increasing and decreasing pH levels affects the ability for solids to dissolve in the waterbody known as its solubility. Changes in pH change the way a waterbody absorbs nutrients and minerals and therefore affects the ability for aquatic life to synthesize them. Changes in pH can also increase pollutant loads. For example, heavy metals increase in toxicity to lower pH levels because they become more soluble in the waterbody. pH readings approaching approximately two or twelve are considered hazardous.

**Fecal coliform:** Fecal coliform is a harmless bacterium that lives inside the digestive systems of humans and other warm-blooded animals that aids in the digestion process. The presence of this bacterium in a waterbody is an indicator that the waterbody has been contaminated by humans or other animal waste (fecal matter). These wastes have the potential to carry harmful bacteria and viruses that can lead to disease and potentially death.

**Oil and grease:** Oil and grease has high surface tension and are not soluble in water so it forms a film on the surface of a waterbody, also known as “sheen.”

The CWA also establishes a list of toxic pollutants known as primary pollutants. Currently, this list includes 126 hazardous chemicals and toxics. Finally, various nonconventional pollutants are established such as chlorine and ammonia. Important toxic and nonconventional pollutants and other water quality indicators are discussed here.

**1,2-Dibromo-3-Chloropropane (DBCP):** DBCP is a colorless chemical that was commonly used as a pesticide until the late 1970s and early 1980s. Use as a pesticide was the most common source of this contaminant until use as a pesticide was banned by the US in 1979. Small amounts of the chemical are still produced for industrial processes. The chemical can also be used as a fire retardant. Men exposed to DBCP may experience decreased sperm counts and after prolonged exposure may become unable to father children. The chemical can also cause headaches, nausea, lightheadedness, and fatigue and is also considered to be carcinogenic.

**Nitrate-Nitrogen (Nitrates):** Nitrogen-oxygen chemical units that combine with various organic and inorganic compounds that when ingested convert to nitrates. Excessive ingestion of nitrates can lead to serious illness, including death, especially in infants. This is a result of the bonding capabilities of nitrates to impair oxygen-carrying capabilities in the blood. Long term exposure can also result in diuresis (increased urine production by the kidney) and hemorrhaging of the spleen. Primary contamination occurs from potassium nitrate and ammonium nitrate in fertilizer but may also be caused by organic nitrates in human sewage and livestock manure.

**Pathogens:** Pathogen is a general term for disease-causing bacteria, viruses, and protozoan that are transmitted to people when they consume untreated or inadequately treated water. Health effects vary depending on the pathogen but can vary from simple stomachache to severe, life threatening diseases. Pathogens may be ubiquitous to a waterbody or may be introduced through exposure of a waterbody to human or animal wastes.

**Total Dissolved Solids (TDS):** Is a measurement that indicates the total dissolved organic and inorganic materials in a water source. This is not a primary water quality standard because it does not result in primary health effects. High TDS result in unpleasant odor, taste, and brackish water and therefore is considered a secondary water quality standard because it is based on aesthetic circumstances.

**Trichloroethylene/Perchloroethylene (TCE/PCE):** TCE or PCE is a chlorinated solvent (volatile organic carbon or VOC) used for metal degreasing and as an ingredient in adhesives, paint removers, correction fluid, and spot removers. Primary sources for TCE/PCE contamination are direct discharges from industrial operations utilizing
the compound and from leaching from Superfund and disposal sites. The chemical is commonly used in dry cleaning operations. The chemical is considered to be carcinogenic and acts as a central nervous system depressant that may cause nausea, confusion, dizziness, and unconsciousness after prolonged exposure. Chronic exposure to TCE/PCE may result in toxic effects to the liver and kidneys.

Nonpoint sources (NPS) of pollution emanate from diffuse sources, such as snowmelt running over an undeveloped countryside, or street runoff coming from numerous paved areas, rooftops, yards and other urbanized surfaces. Section 319 of the 1987 amendments to the Clean Water Act (33 USC 466 et seq.) established the framework for reducing water pollution from nonpoint source activities. Section 319 requires each state to prepare a Nonpoint Source Management Plan and to conduct an assessment of the impact nonpoint sources have on the state’s waterbodies. In response to these requirements, State Regional Water Quality Control Board (SRWQCB) adopted the Nonpoint Source Management Plan (NPSMP) in 1988 and the Water Quality Assessment in 1990. The NPSMP establishes a statewide policy for managing nonpoint source inputs to California’s waters. The NPSMP received was upgraded in January 2000 when the 15-year Nonpoint Source Program Strategy and Implementation Plan was adopted.

Implementation of the NPSMP has been delegated to the nine RWCQBs, with the SWRCB acting as the monitoring and enforcement agency. This ultimately leads to the City’s requirements to control NPS sources. The primary means by which the City implements the NPSMP is through the requirements of its municipal separate stormwater system (MS4) permit and by requiring preparation of SWQMPs by project proponents for new development and significant redevelopment projects. The City is also required to comply with waste discharge requirements for its wastewater treatment plant as issued by the San Diego RWQCB. Compliance with these requirements are the primary means by which the City complies with the NPSMP program and are consistent with the SWRCB’s Policy for Implementation and Enforcement of the Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program.

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act
The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, enacted in 1969, authorizes the SWRCB to adopt, review, and revise policies for all waters of the state (including both surface and ground waters) and directs the RWQCBs to develop region-specific Basin Plans. Section 1310 of the California Water Code also authorizes the SWRCB to adopt water quality control plans on its own initiative. The purpose of these plans is to designate beneficial uses of the region’s surface and ground waters, designate water quality objectives for the reasonable protection of those uses, and establish an implementation plan to achieve the objectives.

National Pollution Discharge Elimination System
In California, the SWRCB and its RWQCBs administer the NPDES permit program. The NPDES permit system was established in the CWA to regulate both point source discharges and nonpoint source discharges to surface waters of the U.S. The NPDES program consists of characterizing receiving water quality, identifying harmful constituents, targeting potential sources of pollutants, and implementing a comprehensive stormwater management program. Construction and industrial activities are typically regulated under statewide general permits that are issued by the SWRCB. The RWQCB also issues Waste Discharge Requirements that serve as NPDES permits under the authority delegated to the RWQCBs, under the CWA. In November 1990, under Phase I of the urban runoff management strategy, the EPA published NPDES permit application requirements for municipal, industrial, and construction stormwater discharges. With regard to municipalities, the permit application requirements were directed at jurisdictions owning or operating municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s) serving populations of 100,000 or more, or contributing significant pollutants to waters of the U.S. Such municipalities were required to obtain coverage under a NPDES municipal stormwater permit as well as to develop and implement an urban runoff management program to reduce pollutants in urban runoff and stormwater discharges.
Low Impact Development

The State of California adopted sustainability as a core value for all California Water Boards’ activities and programs on January 20, 2005. Low Impact Development (LID) practices benefit water supply and contribute to water quality protection by taking a different approach to development and using site design and stormwater management to maintain the site’s pre-development runoff rates and volumes. The amount of impervious surface, infiltration, water quality, and infrastructure costs can all be addressed by LID techniques, tools, and materials. LID practices include bioretention facilities or rain gardens, grass swales and channels, vegetated rooftops, rain barrels, cisterns, vegetated filter strips, and permeable pavements.

National Flood Insurance Act

The National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 requires the identification of floodplain areas and establishment of flood-risk zones within those areas. FEMA administers the programs and coordinates with communities to establish effective floodplain management standards. FEMA identifies areas of known flood hazards via preparation of Federal Insurance Rate Maps.

Poway General Plan EIR

The General Plan EIR Section 5.2 implements the following mitigation measure related to development within the 100-year floodplain and storm drainage. Development within the City of Poway, including the Specific Plan planning area, is subject to the requirements laid out within these measures.

3. Development within the 100-year floodplain is prohibited unless the following conditions are met:
   - All structures must be raised one foot above the flood level.
   - Information certifying the 100-year flood level must be submitted by a qualified civil or hydrological engineer.
   - All-weather access must be provided to all developments for divisions of land, residential units, commercial buildings, manufacturing buildings, or public buildings.
   - Information certifying that no upstream or downstream changes to the 100-year floodplain will occur must be submitted by a qualified civil or hydrological engineer.

5. To prevent increased flooding with Poway, all new land divisions and commercial developments shall be reviewed to determine the feasibility of storm drainage detention. Should the project increase the storm drainage runoff by ten percent or more, the differential storm drainage runoff shall be detained to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. This does not preclude the City from requiring storm drainage detention for projects which do not exceed a 10 percent differential increase in storm drainage.

Poway Municipal Code

Chapter 13.09 of the Poway Municipal Code establishes requirements for discharges into the stormwater conveyance system, receiving waters, and the environment; protects, to the maximum extent practicable, life, property, receiving waters, aquatic life, and the environment from loss, injury, degradation, or damage by discharges from within the City’s jurisdiction; protects the stormwater conveyance system from damage; and meets the requirements of State and federal law and the MS4 Permit. Best Management Practices (BMP) are required for any person engaged in activities which may result in discharges to the stormwater conveyance system; this includes undertaking all measures to reduce the risk of nonstormwater discharges and pollutant discharges.
Chapter 16.103 of the Poway Municipal Code requires that priority development projects comply with the provisions of the City of Poway Local Standard Urban Stormwater Management Plan (SUSMP), which includes: a) identifying pollutants and conditions of concern; b) Establishing stormwater BMPs; c) LID and site design BMPs, including LID integrated management practices; d) source control BMPs; e) treatment control BMPs; f) hydromodification; and g) operations and maintenance of stormwater facilities.

Chapter 16.88 of the Poway Municipal Code provides standards of construction in all areas of special flood hazard, detailed below:

A. Anchoring.
   1. All new construction and substantial improvements shall be anchored to prevent flotation, collapse or lateral movement of the structure resulting from hydrodynamic and hydrostatic loads, including the effects of buoyancy.
   2. All manufactured home units shall meet the anchoring standards of PMC 16.88.040.

B. Construction Materials and Methods. All new construction and substantial improvement shall be constructed:
   1. With flood-resistant materials as specified in FEMA Technical Bulletin TB 2-93, and utility equipment resistant to flood damage;
   2. Using methods and practices that minimize flood damage;
   3. With electrical, heating, ventilation, plumbing and air conditioning equipment and other service facilities that are designed and/or located so as to prevent water from entering or accumulating within the components during conditions of flooding; and if
   4. Within zones AH or AO, so that there are adequate drainage paths around structures on slopes to guide floodwaters around and away from proposed structures.

C. Elevation and Floodproofing.
   1. Residential construction, new or substantial improvement, shall have the lowest floor including basement:
      a. In an AO zone, elevated at least one foot above the highest adjacent grade of the depth number specified in feet on the FIRM, or elevated at least two feet above the highest adjacent grade if no depth number is specified, or as determined by the Floodplain Administrator.
      b. In an A zone, elevated to at least one foot above the base flood elevation; said base flood elevation shall be determined by one of the methods in PMC 16.86.030(B), or as determined by the Floodplain Administrator.
      c. In all other zones, elevated at least one foot above the base flood elevation, or as determined by the Floodplain Administrator.
   2. Nonresidential construction, new or substantial improvement, shall either be elevated to conform with subsection (C)(1) of this section or together with attendant utility and sanitary facilities:
      a. Be floodproofed below the elevation recommended under subsection (C)(1) of this section so that the structure is watertight with walls substantially impermeable to the passage of water;
b. Have structural components capable of resisting hydrostatic and hydrodynamic loads and effects of buoyancy; and

c. Be certified by a registered professional engineer or architect that the standards of this chapter are satisfied. Such certification shall be provided to the Floodplain Administrator.

3. All new construction and substantial improvement with fully enclosed areas below the lowest floor (excluding basements) that are usable solely for parking of vehicles, building access or storage, and which are subject to flooding, shall be designed to automatically equalize hydrostatic flood forces on exterior walls by allowing for the entry and exit of floodwater. Designs for meeting this requirement shall follow the guidelines in FEMA Technical Bulletins TB 1-93 and TB 7-93, and must exceed the following minimum criteria:

   a. Have a minimum of two openings having a total net area of not less than one square inch for every square foot of enclosed area subject to flooding. The bottom of all openings shall be no higher than one foot above grade. Openings may be equipped with screens, louvers, valves, or other coverings or devices provided that they permit the automatic entry and exit of floodwater; or

   b. Be certified by a registered professional engineer or architect.

4. Manufactured homes shall also meet the standards in PMC 16.88.040

Thresholds of Significance
Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan may be considered significant if it would:

A. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements;

B. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted);

C. 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;

D. Place housing within a 100-year hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map; or

E. Place a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows

Environmental Impacts
Impact 4.6.A

Future development facilitated by the Specific Plan would not result in the violation of any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Impacts would be less than significant.

Future development within the Specific Plan planning area would be subject to the provisions of the NPDES to protect downstream water quality pursuant to the Clean Water Act. Discharges into stormwater drains or channels from construction sites of one acre or larger are regulated by the General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity (Order 2009-0009-DWQ as amended by 2010-0014-DWQ and 2012-0006-DWQ) issued by the SWRCB. The General Permit was issued pursuant to NPDES regulations of the U.S.
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), as authorized by the Clean Water Act. Compliance with the General Permit involves developing and implementing a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) specifying best management practices (BMPs) that a project would use to minimize pollution of stormwater. The SWPPP BMPs would follow the guidelines set forth by the SWRCB.

On May 8, 2013, the SRWQCB, San Diego Region, adopted an updated NPDES Municipal Permit, Order No. R9-2013-0001, as amended by Order No. R9-2015-0001 and Order No. R9-2015-0100 to regulate discharges to storm water conveyance systems within San Diego County. The City of Poway’s Jurisdictional Runoff Management Program implements a variety of BMP requirements, water quality monitoring, educational outreach efforts, municipal maintenance procedures, inspection and enforcement programs, and water quality monitoring procedures. Proponents of future projects within the Specific Plan planning area would be required to comply with NPDES permit and Jurisdictional Runoff Management Program requirements through the preparation and implementation of a SWPPP and Erosion Control Plan for construction activities. The City implements NPDES requirements through Municipal Code Chapter 13.09 (Stormwater Management and Discharge Control) and its Jurisdictional Runoff Management Program. Impacts to water quality due to construction activities would be less than significant with implementation of existing regulations.

Operationally, the Jurisdictional Runoff Management Program and Poway Municipal Code Chapter 13.09 require that future development and uses incorporate post-construction BMPs into their designs as outlined by the City of Poway’s Local Standard Urban Stormwater Management Plan (SUSMP) (Municipal Code Chapter 16.103). The Jurisdictional Runoff Management Program identifies the City’s minimum BMP requirements as: 1) source control BMPs including storm drain stenciling and signage, properly designated and covered material and trash storage areas, and the use of efficient irrigation systems; 2) LID BMPs providing retention, slow runoff, minimization of impervious footprint, directing runoff into landscaping, and promoting water conservation; 3) provide buffer zones for natural water bodies; 4) implement requirements outlined in the Municipal Code and the City’s BMP Manual during grading and construction activities; 5) submittal of proof of ongoing long term maintenance for all structural post-construction BMPs. Applications for future development would be required to submit: 1) checklist for new development and redevelopment projects; 2) grading plan checklist; 3) post-construction BMP plan (water quality technical report or Stormwater Quality Management Plan); 4) Operation and Maintenance Plan; and 5) hydrology and hydraulics study.

The Los Peñasquitos Watershed Management Area Water Quality Improvement Plan (WQIP), revised in February 2016, aims to protect, preserve, enhance, and restore water quality of receiving water bodies through an adaptive planning and management process that identifies the highest priority water quality conditions within the watershed and implementation of strategies to address them. Ongoing strategies include implementation of water conservation programs, maintenance and improvements of municipal storm water sewer systems, inspections to identify and prevent pollution at any source, stabilization of Rattlesnake Creek to reduce sediment loading, restoration, maintenance, and installation of BMPs, restoration of salt marsh habitat in the Los Peñasquitos Lagoon, and the development and implementation of a “Green Infrastructure Policy.” The WQIP also includes strategies to be implemented by 2016, 2020, 2022, and 2035. The potential impacts to water quality resulting from operation of future development within the Specific Plan planning area would be less than significant with implementation of existing regulations.

**Impact 4.6.B**

Future development facilitated by the Specific Plan would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. Impacts would be less than significant.
Significant impacts may occur if future development within the Specific Plan planning area would result in depleted groundwater supplies or hinder recharge of groundwater by increasing impervious surfaces, hinder percolation of drainage into subsurface aquifers, or alter existing spreading grounds.

Future development may impact groundwater recharge by increasing impervious surfaces that could hinder percolation of drainage into subsurface aquifers. Today, the Specific Plan planning area is largely built out, with many impervious surfaces in the form of existing structures and paving. New development would be subject to low impact development techniques that would limit impermeable surfaces, including bioretention facilities or rain gardens, grass swales and channels, vegetated rooftops, rain barrels, cisterns, vegetated filter strips, and permeable pavements. Therefore, future development facilitated by the Specific Plan is expected to reduce impervious surface coverage through redevelopment activity. As a result, no significant increase in impervious surfaces would occur that could hinder percolation of drainage into subsurface aquifers.

Future development could also impact groundwater recharge if existing spreading grounds are altered (e.g., developed upon) without construction of replacement facilities. Additionally, drainage may be directed away from its natural source where it may be deposited in other water bodies. The Specific Plan planning area does not contain any properties that serve as groundwater recharge areas. Therefore, future development would not interfere with the recharge of groundwater supplies and would not result in alterations to groundwater recharge areas.

Impacts associated with depleted groundwater supplies include increased demand on out-of-region water resources and the energy and cost associated with the importing of other resources. The lowering of aquifer and groundwater levels in an area can cause existing wells and pumps to become non-functional because they are not designed to extract water below certain depths.

Future development facilitated by the Specific Plan would require additional water resources. However, due to the minimal amount of groundwater present in Poway, 99 percent of the City’s water supply is imported from the SDCWA, which is supplied by transfer water from the IID and imported water from the MWD. The SDCWA entered into an agreement with the IID to receive Colorado River water that has been conserved by Imperial Valley farmers who voluntarily participate in the program. MWD’s water supply consists primarily of water from the State Water Project (SWP) and the Colorado River. Because new development within the Specific Plan planning area would not rely on groundwater resources, future development would not result in the extraction of groundwater; thus, the proposed project would not result in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table that would impact the production rate of pre-existing wells. Impacts to groundwater supplies would be less than significant.

**Impact 4.6.C**

Future development facilitated by the Specific Plan would not 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. Impacts would be less than significant.

The Specific Plan planning area is fully urbanized. Remaining pervious surfaces consist of landscaped areas, park space, and roadway medians. Pursuant to NPDES requirements and current focus on LID standards, no increase in stormwater runoff from any development within the Specific Plan planning area would be permitted. Any calculated increase in stormwater runoff, as identified in a future project’s WQMP, would be required to be absorbed and/or retained on site.

With regard to sources of polluted runoff, the City’s Jurisdictional Regional Management Plan and requirements for post-construction BMPs, as described above, would ensure that project construction and operation would not result in increased polluted runoff. Therefore, no increase in stormwater runoff or increased polluted runoff could occur, and
4.6 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

storm drain capacity and water quality within the Specific Plan planning area, the City of Poway, or downstream areas would not be impacted. Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact 4.6.D & E

Implementation of requirements set forth in the California Building Code, required by FEMA, and in City design and construction requirements related to flooding would ensure that future development within the 100-year flood hazard area would be less than significant.

According to FEMA flood maps and the City of Poway GIS mapping system, portions of the Specific Plan planning area located adjacent to creeks and streams are subject to 100-year flooding (see Exhibit 4.6-1, Flood Hazard Areas). The 100-year floodway identifies the floodway of a channel or stream plus any adjacent floodplain areas that must be kept free of encroachment so that the 100-year flood can occur without substantial increases in flood heights.

The City of Poway implements the requirements of the California Building Code (CBC) (Chapter 15.04 of the Poway Municipal Code). CBC guidelines include flood proofing to consist of finished floor elevation at heights above mapped flood elevations and a minimum of two access routes for emergency egress and regress.

The Poway Municipal Code, through Chapter 16.88, provides standards and requirements for the development of residential and non-residential use within designated flood areas. All new construction within a flood hazard area is required to be anchored to prevent flotation, collapse, or lateral movement of the structure and is required to utilize Class 4 and/or Class 5 flood resistant materials, as specified in FEMA Technical Bulletin TB 2-93. Class descriptions of materials are shown in Table 4.6-2 (Class Descriptions of Materials). Acceptable (Class 4 and Class 5) materials for walls and ceilings include, but are not limited to, glass, sprayed polyurethane insulation, metal partitions, wood framing, and steel with waterproof adhesives. Other flood-proofing measures may require the use of paints, membranes, or mortar to reduce water seepage through walls; installation of water-tight doors, bulkheads, and shutters; installation of flood water pumps in structures; and proper modification and protection of all electrical equipment, circuits, and appliances so that the risk of electrocution or fire is eliminated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NFIP</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Class Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Highly resistant to floodwater damage, including damage caused by moving water. These materials can survive wetting and drying and may be successfully cleaned after a flood to render them free of most harmful pollutants. Materials in this class are permitted for partially enclosed or outside uses with essentially unmitigated flood exposure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Resistant to floodwater damage from wetting and drying, but less durable when exposed to moving water. These materials can survive wetting and drying and may be successfully cleaned after a flood to render them free of most harmful pollutants. Materials in this class may be exposed to and/or submerged in floodwaters in interior spaces and do not require special waterproofing protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Resistant to clean water damage, but not floodwater damage. Materials in this class may be submerged in clean water during periods of flooding. These materials can survive wetting and drying, but may not be able to be successfully cleaned after floods to render them free of most harmful pollutants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Not resistant to clean water damage. Materials in this class are used in predominantly dry spaces that may be subject to occasional water vapor and/or slight seepage. These materials cannot survive the wetting and drying associated with floods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not resistant to clean water damage or moisture damage. Materials in this class are used in spaces with conditions of complete dryness. These materials cannot survive the wetting and drying associated with floods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4.6-3
CLASS DESCRIPTIONS OF MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NFIP</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Class Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Source: FEMA Technical Bulletin 2-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Floodwater is assumed to be considered “black” water; black water contains pollutants such as sewage, chemicals, heavy metals, or other toxic substances that are potentially hazardous to humans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Moving water is defined as water moving at low velocities of 5 feet per second (fps) or less. Water moving at velocities greater than 5 fps may cause structural damage to building materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Some materials can be successfully cleaned of most of the pollutants typically found in floodwater. However, some individual pollutants such as heating oil can be extremely difficult to remove from uncoated concrete. These materials are flood damage-resistant except when exposed to individual pollutants that cannot be successfully cleaned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Clean water includes potable water as well as “gray” water; gray water is wastewater collected from normal uses (laundry, bathing, food preparation, etc.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the use of flood-proof building materials, the Poway Municipal Code requires that uses within an A flood zone be elevated at least one foot above the base flood elevation or as determined by the Floodplain Administrator. The design of structures subject to flooding shall be designed pursuant to the guidelines in FEMA Technical Bulletins 1-93 and 7-93 to ensure that exterior walls allow for the entry and exit of floodwater. With implementation of requirements set forth by the CBC, FEMA, and the City of Poway, future development within flood hazard areas would be designed and developed to minimize risk related to flooding. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

Level of Significance with Mitigation Incorporated

Not applicable.
4.7 Land Use and Planning
This section analyzes project consistency with the Poway Subarea Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan of the San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program.

The Initial Study determined that new goals and development standards in the Specific Plan would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project, nor would the Specific Plan physically divide an established community. Therefore, these issues are not discussed in this section.

Environmental Setting
The Specific Plan planning area is located in the Poway Subarea Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP) area. The Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP was adopted in 1996 and is one of the first subarea plans to be implemented. The Poway Subarea lies in an area of overlap between two subregional NCCP plan areas (i.e., the San Diego County MSCP and the San Diego County MHCP). The Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP is recognized as a subarea by both these plans. The Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP serves as the planning document for the protection and management of biologically effective, interconnected spaces in the City of Poway. The Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP is a framework for complying with State and federal endangered species regulations while accommodating future urban growth and infrastructure development. The Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP provides take authority for projects such as the City of Poway’s Capital Improvement Program, the Scripps Poway Parkway Extension, and other public projects planned by the City of Poway or potentially proposed in the future. A preserve system within the City has been designated as the Poway Mitigation Area as part of the HCP/NCCP. Because of its highly developed setting, the Specific Plan planning area (project area) is not considered to contain important wildlife linkages or critical habitat for regional species. As a result, the project area is not located within the Poway Mitigation Area. The proposed Specific Plan is covered by the Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP as a public project under “Projects Outside the Mitigation Area.”

The HCP/NCCP has been incorporated by reference into the City’s General Plan; all public and private projects relying upon permits granted in conjunction with the HCP/NCCP are required to maintain consistency with the HCP/NCCP.

Thresholds of Significance
Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan may be considered significant if it would result in the following:

A. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

Environmental Impacts
Impact 4.7.A
The proposed Specific Plan would not conflict with implementation of the Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP. No impact would occur.

The Specific Plan planning area is built out and largely urbanized. Therefore, the Specific Plan planning area is not considered to contain important wildlife linkages or critical habitat for regional species. As a result, the Specific Plan planning area is not located within the Poway Mitigation Area. As discussed in Section 4.2, the Specific Plan is covered by the Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP as a public project under “Projects Outside the Mitigation Area.” As a result, the Specific Plan is consistent with the Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP; no impact would occur.
Mitigation Measures
None required.

Level of Significance with Mitigation Incorporated
Not applicable.
4.8 NOISE

This section describes the existing and future noise environment within the Specific Plan planning area and assesses whether implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would result in substantial noise impacts.

The Initial Study prepared for the proposed Specific Plan determined that the Specific Plan planning area is not within the noise contours of any public airport or private air strip. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan therefore would not expose people residing or working within two miles of a public airport or in the vicinity of a private airstrip to excessive noise levels. These impacts have not been analyzed in this EIR.

Defining Noise

“Sound” is a vibratory disturbance created by a moving or vibrating source and is capable of being detected. “Noise” is defined as sound that is loud, unpleasant, unexpected, or undesired and may therefore be classified as a more specific group of sounds. The effects of noise on people can include general annoyance, interference with speech communication, sleep disturbance and, in the extreme, hearing impairment.

The Production of Sound

Sound has three properties: amplitude and amplitude variation of the acoustical wave (loudness), frequency (pitch), and duration of the noise. Despite the ability to measure sound, human perceptibility is subjective, and the physical response to sound complicates the analysis of its impact on people. People judge the relative magnitude of sound sensation in subjective terms such as “noisiness” or “loudness.”

Measuring Sound

Loudness (sound pressure level) is described in logarithmic units of ratios of sound pressures to a reference pressure, squared. These units are called bels. To provide a finer description of sound, a bel is subdivided into 10 decibels, abbreviated dB. Since decibels are logarithmic units, sound pressure levels cannot be added or subtracted by ordinary arithmetic means. For example, if one automobile produces a sound pressure level of 70 dB when it passes an observer, two cars passing simultaneously will not produce 140 dB. Rather, they would combine to produce 73 dB. This same principle can be applied to other traffic quantities as well. In other words, doubling the traffic volume on a street or the speed of the traffic will increase the traffic noise level by three dB. Conversely, halving the traffic volume or speed will reduce the traffic noise level by three dB. A three dB change in sound is the beginning at which humans generally notice a barely perceptible change in sound, and a five dB change is generally readily perceptible (Caltrans 2013a). In addition to sound pressure levels, the frequency or pitch of a sound also has a substantial effect on how humans will respond.

The A-weighted sound pressure level (dB[A]) is the sound pressure level, in decibels, as measured on a sound level meter using the A-weighted filter network. The A-weighting filter de-emphasizes the very low and very high frequency components of the sound, placing greater emphasis on those frequencies within the sensitivity range of the human ear. Table 4.8-1 (Typical A-Weighted Noise Levels) displays a range of noise levels associated with common indoor and outdoor activities.
### Table 4.8-1
**Typical A-Weighted Noise Levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outdoor Activities</th>
<th>dB(A) Noise Level</th>
<th>Indoor Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jet flyover at 1,000 feet</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Rock Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas lawnmower at 3 feet</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel truck at 50 feet at 50 mph</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise urban area, daytime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas lawnmower, 100 feet</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy traffic at 3 feet</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet urban daytime</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Dishwasher in next room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet urban area nighttime</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Theater, large conference room (background)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet suburban nighttime</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet rural nighttime</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Bedroom at night, concert hall (background)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Broadcast/recording studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Caltrans 2013*

### Standards for Noise Equivalent

Noise consists of pitch, loudness, and duration; therefore, a variety of methods for measuring noise have been developed. According to the California General Plan Guidelines for Noise Elements, the following are common metrics for measuring noise (Caltrans 2013b).

**Leq (Equivalent Energy Noise Level):** The sound level corresponding to a steady-state sound level containing the same total energy as a time-varying signal over given sample periods. Leq is typically computed over 1-, 8-, and 24-hour sample periods.

**CNEL (Community Noise Equivalent Level):** The average equivalent A-weighted sound level during a 24-hour day, obtained after addition of five decibels to sound levels in the evening from 7:00 PM to 10:00 PM and after addition of ten decibels to sound levels in the night from 10:00 PM to 7:00 AM.

**Ldn (Day-Night Average Level):** The average equivalent A-weighted sound level during a 24-hour day, obtained after the addition of 10 decibels to sound levels in the night after 10:00 PM and before 7:00 AM.

CNEL and Ldn are utilized for describing ambient noise levels because they account for all noise sources over an extended period of time and account for the heightened sensitivity of people to noise during the night. Leq is better utilized for describing specific and consistent sources because of the shorter reference period.
Federal and State agencies have established noise and land use compatibility guidelines that use averaging approaches to noise measurement. The State Department of Aeronautics and the California Commission on Housing and Community Development have adopted the CNEL.

**Distance from a Noise Source**
For each doubling of distance from a point noise source, the sound level will decrease by 6 dBA. In other words, if a person is 100 feet from a machine, and moves to 200 feet from that source, sound levels will drop approximately 6 dBA. For each doubling of distance from a line source, like a roadway, noise levels are reduced by 3 to 5 decibels, depending on the ground cover between the source and the receiver.

Noise barriers can provide approximately a 5 dBA CNEL noise reduction. (Additional reduction may be provided with a barrier of appropriate height, material, location, and length). A row of buildings provides up to 5 dBA CNEL noise reduction, with a 1.5 dBA CNEL reduction for each additional row up to a maximum reduction of approximately 10 dBA. The exact degree of noise attenuation depends on the nature and orientation of the structure and intervening barriers.

**Vibration and Groundborne Noise**
Vibration is the movement of mass over time. It is described in terms of frequency and amplitude and unlike sound; there is no standard way of measuring and reporting amplitude. Vibration can be described in units of velocity (inches per second) or discussed in decibel (dB) units to compress the range of numbers required to describe vibration. Vibration impacts to buildings are generally discussed in terms of peak particle velocity (PPV) that describes particle movement over time (in terms of physical displacement of mass). For purposes of this analysis, PPV will be used to describe all vibration for ease of reading and comparison. Vibration can impact people, structures, and sensitive equipment (Caltrans 2013b). The primary concern related to vibration and people is the potential to annoy those working and residing in the area. Vibration with high enough amplitudes can damage structures (such as crack plaster or destroy windows). Groundborne vibration can also disrupt the use of sensitive medical and scientific instruments such as electron microscopes. Common sources of vibration within communities include construction activities and railroads.

Groundborne vibration generated by construction projects is usually highest during pile driving, rock blasting, soil compacting, jack hammering, and demolition-related activities. Next to pile driving, grading activity has the greatest potential for vibration impacts if large bulldozers, large trucks, or other heavy equipment are used.

**Environmental Setting**

**Existing Ambient Noise Levels**
Short-term noise measurements were conducted to identify the ambient noise within the Poway Road corridor. An American National Standards Institute (ANSI Section SI4 1979, Type 1) Larson Davis model LxT sound level meter was used to monitor existing ambient noise levels. The noise meter was programmed in “slow” mode to record noise levels in A-weighted form. The microphone height was set at five feet. Eight 10-minute daytime noise measurements were taken on March 29, 2017.

Ambient noise levels are a composite of noise from all sources, near and far. In this context, the ambient noise level constitutes the normal or existing level of environmental noise at a given location. Measurement locations are shown in Exhibit 4.8-1 (Noise Measurement Locations).
 Ambient noise levels are presented in Table 4.8-2 (Ambient Noise Levels). Ambient noise levels within the Specific Plan area consist of noise from vehicular traffic and pedestrian activity. An emergency vehicle with an active siren drove past Location #3 while the measurement was being taken.

**TABLE 4.8-2**
**AMBIENT NOISE LEVELS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Location Description</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Noise Level (dBA)</th>
<th>Leq</th>
<th>Lmax</th>
<th>Lmin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Southwest corner of Pomerado Road and Oak Knoll Road</td>
<td>2:35 PM – 2:45 PM</td>
<td>10 Minutes</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pomerado road between Robinson Boulevard and Poway Road at the northern entrance to CVS parking</td>
<td>3:01 PM – 3:11 PM</td>
<td>10 Minutes</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Northwest corner of Poway Road and Ridgedale Drive</td>
<td>3:24 PM – 3:34 PM</td>
<td>10 Minutes</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>103.4</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Southwest corner of Poway Road and Carriage Road</td>
<td>3:42 PM – 3:52 PM</td>
<td>10 Minutes</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bowron Road between Poway Road and Civic Center Drive at residential entrance south of Evan's Tire</td>
<td>4:18 PM – 4:28 PM</td>
<td>10 Minutes</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Northwest corner of Poway Road and Community Road</td>
<td>4:37 PM – 4:47 PM</td>
<td>10 Minutes</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Midland Road north of Poway Road between Wal-Mart and US Post Office</td>
<td>5:02 PM – 5:12 PM</td>
<td>10 Minutes</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Southeast corner of Poway Road and Olive Tree Lane</td>
<td>5:21 PM – 5:31 PM</td>
<td>10 Minutes</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Noise measurements taken on Wednesday March 29, 2017 by MIG.*

**Existing Traffic Noise Levels**

Existing traffic noise levels were computed using Version 2.5 of the Traffic Noise Model (TNM) published by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The model uses traffic volume, vehicle mix, vehicle speed, and roadway geometry to compute equivalent noise levels for each of the time periods used in the calculation of CNEL. Weighting these noise levels and summing them results in the CNEL for the traffic projections used. CNEL contours are found by calculating distances to the 55, 60, 65, and 70 CNEL contours assuming a reduction of 6 dB with every doubling of distance. For roadway analysis, worst-case assumptions about future motor vehicle traffic and noise levels have been made and were incorporated in the modeling effort. Specifically, calculations do not assume natural or artificial shielding nor do they assume reflection from existing or proposed structures or topography.

Traffic volumes and estimated speeds were used with TNM to estimate the noise levels in terms of CNEL. Existing traffic volumes and fleet mix were obtained from the traffic study prepared by Chen Ryan Associates. Design speed of each roadway was utilized to provide worst-case noise. The distances to the CNEL contours for the roadway are shown in Table 4.8-3 (Existing Traffic Noise Levels). Existing traffic noise contours are shown in Exhibit 4.8-2 (Existing Traffic Noise Contours).
Exhibit 4.8-2 Existing Traffic Noise Contours
Poway Road Corridor Specific Plan
City of Poway, California
TABLE 4.8-3 EXISTING TRAFFIC NOISE LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>dBA CNEL at 100 ft</th>
<th>Distance to CNEL Contour from Centerline of Roadway (Feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55 dBA</td>
<td>60 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway Road</td>
<td>Between Francis Terrace and Oak Knoll Road</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Oak Knoll Road and Pomerado Road</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Pomerado Road and Ridgedale Road</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Ridgedale Road and Silver Lake Drive</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Silver Lake Drive and Carriage Road</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Carriage Road and Tarascan Drive</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Civic Center Drive and Bowron Road</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Bowron Road and Community Road</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Community Road and Midland Road</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Midland Road and Gate Drive</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Gate Drive and Garden Road</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Garden Road and Match Point Drive</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomerado Road</td>
<td>Between Poway Road and Robison Boulevard</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Poway Road and Oak Knoll Road</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Center Drive</td>
<td>Between Poway Road and Civic Center Drive</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowron Road</td>
<td>Between Poway Road and Civic Center Drive</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Road</td>
<td>Between Hilleary Place and Poway Road</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Poway Road and Civic Center Drive</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Civic Center Drive and Hillside Village</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Road</td>
<td>Between Poway Road and Claire Drive</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Traffic noise level (dBA CNEL) modeled at 100 feet from the roadway segment centerline.

Regulatory Framework

Federal Regulations

Federal Noise Control Act of 1972

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Office of Noise Abatement and Control was originally established to coordinate federal noise control activities. After its inception, EPA’s Office of Noise Abatement and Control issued the Federal Noise Control Act of 1972, establishing programs and guidelines to identify and address the effects of noise on public health, welfare, and the environment. In response, the EPA published information on Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety (Levels of Environmental Noise). The Levels of Environmental Noise recommended that the Ldn should not exceed 55 dBA outdoors or 45 dBA indoors to prevent significant activity interference and annoyance in noise-sensitive areas.

In addition, the Levels of Environmental Noise identified five dBA as an “adequate margin of safety” for a noise level increase relative to a baseline noise exposure level of 55 dBA Ldn (i.e., there will not be a noticeable increase in adverse community reaction with an increase of five dBA or less from this baseline level). The EPA did not promote these findings as universal standards or regulatory goals with mandatory applicability to all communities, but rather as advisory exposure levels below which there would be no risk to a community from any health or welfare effect of noise.
In 1981, EPA administrators determined that subjective issues such as noise will be better addressed at more localized levels of government. Consequently, in 1982 responsibilities for regulating noise control policies were transferred to State and local governments. However, noise control guidelines and regulations contained in EPA rulings in prior years remain in place by designated federal agencies, allowing more individualized control for specific issues by designated federal, State, and local government agencies.

**Federal Transit Administration**

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has developed methodology and significance criteria to evaluate incremental noise impacts from surface transportation modes (i.e., on road motor vehicles and trains) as presented in *Transit Noise Impact and Vibration Assessment* (FTA Guidelines). These incremental noise impact criteria are based on EPA findings and subsequent studies of annoyance in communities affected by transportation noise. The FTA extended the EPA’s five dBA incremental impact criterion to higher ambient levels. As baseline ambient levels increase, smaller and smaller increments are allowed to limit expected increases in community annoyance. For example, in residential areas with a baseline ambient noise level of 50 dBA CNEL, a less than five dBA increase in noise levels will produce a minimal increase in community annoyance levels, while at 70 dBA CNEL, only one dBA increase could be accommodated before a significant annoyance increase will occur.

**Vibration Standards**

The FTA provides guidelines for maximum-acceptable vibration criteria for different types of land uses. Groundborne vibration and noise levels associated with various types of construction equipment and activities are summarized in Table 4.8-4 (Reference Vibration Source Amplitudes for Construction Equipment). Table 4.8-5 (Groundborne Vibration and Noise Impact Criteria) shows the FTA’s maximum acceptable vibration standard for human annoyance in residences where people normally sleep is 80 VdB (less than 70 vibration events per day).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Reference PPV at 25 ft (in/sec)</th>
<th>Approximate Vibration Level (VL) at 25 ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pile Driver (impact)</td>
<td>1.518 (upper range)</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.844 (typical)</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pile Driver (sonic)</td>
<td>0.734 (upper range)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.170 (typical)</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clam shovel drop (slurry wall)</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydromill</td>
<td>0.008 in soil</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slurry wall</td>
<td>0.017 in rock</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibratory roller</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoe Ram</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large bulldozer</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caisson drill</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loaded trucks</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackhammer</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small bulldozer</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Pile driver amplitude varies greatly based on equipment type and size.*

*Source: FTA 2006*
### TABLE 4.8-5
**GROUNDBORNE VIBRATION AND NOISE IMPACT CRITERIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Groundborne Vibration Impact Levels (VdB)</th>
<th>Groundborne Noise Impact Levels (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequent Events ¹</td>
<td>Infrequent Events ²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1: Buildings where low ambient vibration is essential for interior</td>
<td>65 VdB ³</td>
<td>65 VdB ³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vibrations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2: Residences and buildings where people normally sleep</td>
<td>72 VdB</td>
<td>80 VdB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3: Institutional land uses with primarily daytime use</td>
<td>75 VdB</td>
<td>83 VdB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Frequent Events – more than 70 vibration events per day
² Infrequent Events – fewer than 70 vibration events per day
³ This criterion limit is based on levels that are acceptable for more moderately sensitive equipment such as optical microscopes.

Source: FTA 2006

The FTA and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) have compiled the data from numerous studies related to vibration and have developed standards for human perception and building damage. The FTA's maximum acceptable vibration standard for human annoyance is 78 VdB at nearby vibration-sensitive land uses (FTA 2006). The Caltrans maximum vibration level standard is 0.2 in/sec PPV for the prevention of structural damage to typical residential buildings (Caltrans 2013b).

### State Regulations

#### California Environmental Quality Act

CEQA requires lead agencies to consider noise impacts. Under CEQA, lead agencies are directed to assess conformance to locally established noise standards or other agencies' noise standards, measure and identify the potentially significant exposure of people to or generation of excessive noise levels, measure and identify potentially significant permanent or temporary increase in ambient noise levels, and measure and identify potentially significant impacts associated with air traffic.

#### California Noise Control Act of 1973

Sections 46000-46080 of the California Health and Safety Code, known as the California Noise Control Act of 1973, find that excessive noise is a serious hazard to public health and welfare and that exposure to certain levels of noise can result in physiological, psychological, and economic damage. It also finds that there is a continuous and increasing bombardment of noise in the urban, suburban, and rural areas. The California Noise Control Act declares that the State of California has a responsibility to protect the health and welfare of its citizens by the control, prevention, and abatement of noise. It is the policy of the State to provide an environment for all Californians free from noise that jeopardizes their health or welfare.

#### California Noise Insulation Standards (CCR Title 24)

In 1974, the California Commission on Housing and Community Development adopted noise insulation standards for multi-family residential buildings (Title 24, Part 2, California Code of Regulations). Title 24 establishes standards for interior room noise (attributable to outside noise sources). The regulations also specify that acoustical studies must be prepared whenever a residential building or structure is proposed to be located near an existing or adopted freeway route, expressway, parkway, major street, thoroughfare, rail line, rapid transit line, or industrial noise source,
and where such noise source or sources create an exterior CNEL (or Ldn) of 60 dBA or greater. Such acoustical analysis must demonstrate that the residence has been designed to limit intruding noise to an interior CNEL (or Ldn) of 45 dBA or below (California's Title 24 Noise Standards, Chap. 2-35).

State of California General Plan Guidelines 2003
Although not adopted by law, the State of California General Plan Guidelines 2003, published by the California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) (OPR Guidelines), provides guidance for the compatibility of projects within areas of specific noise exposure. The OPR Guidelines identify the suitability of various types of development relative to a range of outdoor noise levels and provide each local community some flexibility in setting local noise standards that allow for the variability in community preferences. Findings presented in the Levels of Environmental Noise Document (EPA 1974) influenced the recommendations of the OPR Guidelines, most importantly in the choice of noise exposure metrics (i.e., Ldn or CNEL) and in the upper limits for the normally acceptable outdoor exposure of noise-sensitive uses.

The OPR Guidelines include a Noise and Land Use Compatibility Matrix which identifies acceptable and unacceptable community noise exposure limits for various land use categories. Where the “normally acceptable” range is used, it is defined as the highest noise level that should be considered for the construction of the buildings which do not incorporate any special acoustical treatment or noise mitigation. The “conditionally acceptable” or “normally acceptable” ranges include conditions calling for detailed acoustical study or construction mitigation to reduce interior exposure levels prior to the construction or operation of the building under the listed exposure levels.

California Department of Transportation
According to the Caltrans vibration manual, large bulldozers, vibratory rollers (used to compact earth), and loaded trucks utilized during grading activities can produce vibration, and depending on the level of vibration, could cause annoyance at uses within the project vicinity or damage structures. Caltrans has developed a screening tool to determine if vibration from construction equipment is substantial enough to impact surrounding uses.

The Caltrans vibration manual establishes thresholds for vibration impacts on buildings and humans. These thresholds are summarized in Tables 4.8-6 (Vibration Damage Potential Threshold Criteria) and 4.8-7 (Vibration Annoyance Potential Threshold Criteria).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Integrity</th>
<th>Maximum PPV (in/sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely fragile historic buildings, ruins, ancient monuments</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragile buildings</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic and some older buildings</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older residential structures</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New residential structures</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern industrial and commercial structures</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Caltrans 2013*
TABLE 4.8-7
VIBRATION ANNOYANCE POTENTIAL THRESHOLD CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Response</th>
<th>PPV Threshold (in/sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barely perceptible</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctly perceptible</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly perceptible</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severely perceptible</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Caltrans 2013

Local Standards
City of Poway Municipal Code
Section 8.08.040 and 8.08.100 of the Poway Municipal Code establishes sound level limits within the City regulations on construction equipment, respectively. These sections are presented below.

8.08.040 Sound Level Limits.

Unless a variance has been applied for and granted pursuant to this chapter, it is unlawful for any person to cause or allow the creation of any noise to the extent that the one-hour average sound level, at any point on or beyond the boundaries of the property on which the sound is produced, exceeds the applicable limits set forth below, except that construction noise level limits shall be governed by PMC 8.08.100:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone or Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Applicable Limit One-Hour Average Sound Level (In decibels)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OS-RM, OS, OS/1du, RR-A, RR-B, RR-C, RS-2, RS-3, RS-4, RS-7, and Specific Plan, PRD and PC regulations with a density of 11 dwelling units or less per acre</td>
<td>10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. 40 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF, RA, RC, MHP, and Specific Plan, PRD and PC regulations with a density of 11 or more dwelling units per acre</td>
<td>7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. 55 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. 50 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPC, MU, CO, CN, CB, CG, TC, A/GC and HC</td>
<td>7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. 60 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. 55 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRE, SC, LI, LI/S and IP</td>
<td>Anytime 70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sound level limit at a location on a boundary between two zoning districts is the arithmetic mean of the respective limits for the two districts.
Fixed location public utility distribution or transmission facilities located on or adjacent to a property line shall be subject to the noise level limits of this section, measured at or beyond six feet from the boundary of the easement upon which the equipment is located.

8.08.100 Construction Equipment.

Except for emergency work, it is unlawful for any person, including the City, to operate any single or combination of powered construction equipment at any construction site, except as outlined in subsections A and B of this section:

A. It is unlawful for any person, including the City, to operate any single or combination of powered construction equipment at any construction site before 7:00 a.m. or after 5:00 p.m. on Mondays through Saturdays or at any time on a Sunday or holiday except as provided below. For purposes of this section, “construction” does not include minor home repairs, lawn mowing, gardening and similar types of routine maintenance as identified in PMC 8.08.170(D).

1. The City Engineer may permit, in writing, the use of powered construction equipment during specific hours before 7:00 a.m. or after 5:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday, or any time on a Sunday or holiday, if he or she determines that such operations are not detrimental to the health, safety, or welfare of the surrounding community, that the conduct of the activity is limited by the nature of the work, and that it is in the best interest of the public to perform the work outside of normal hours and days of work.

2. A residential property owner constructing a single-family residence, or constructing an addition to, or otherwise modifying, a single-family residence for personal occupancy may operate powered construction equipment on Sundays or holidays between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. in compliance with the requirements of subsection B of this section; provided, that:

   a. The type of equipment used is limited to handheld construction equipment or equipment powered by small electrical motors, including, but not limited to, small cement mixers, table saws, and similar small equipment; and

   b. The construction is not carried out for profit or livelihood. Upon request of the City, a property owner shall provide documentation, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Services, of personal occupancy of the residence, or the intent to personally occupy the residence.

B. No such equipment, or combination of equipment regardless of age or date of acquisition, shall be operated so as to cause noise at a level in excess of 75 decibels for more than eight hours during any 24-hour period when measured at or within the property lines of any property which is developed and used either in part or in whole for residential purposes. These sound levels shall be corrected for time duration in accordance with the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Duration in 24 Hours</th>
<th>Decibel Level Allowance</th>
<th>Total Decibel Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 15 Minutes</td>
<td>+15</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 30 Minutes</td>
<td>+12</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 1 Hour</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 2 Hours</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the event that lower noise limit standards are established for construction equipment pursuant to State or Federal law, said lower limits shall be used as a basis for revising and amending the noise level limits specified in subsection B of this section.

**Poway General Plan**

The General Plan EIR Section 5.10 establishes the following mitigation measure related to noise. Development within the City of Poway, including the Specific Plan planning area, is subject to these measures.

3. Manufacturing service land uses adjacent to residential land uses shall include a buffer zone or noise attenuation wall to reduce outside noise levels at the property line to 60 CNEL.

6. The City of Poway shall ensure a safe and pleasant acoustical environment for the residents of Poway through site planning, zoning regulations, architectural design standards, and building construction regulations.

**Thresholds of Significance**

Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan may be considered significant if it would result in the following:

A. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies;

B. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels;

C. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project; or

D. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

**Environmental Impacts**

**Impact 4.8.A, C, & D**

Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not result in exceedance of standards or the significant permanent increase in ambient noise levels related to traffic noise. Also, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not result in the exceedance of standards or the temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels above levels related to construction noise. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Construction-Related Noise**

Over the long term, the Specific Plan would facilitate construction projects within the Specific Plan planning area. These projects could occur on any property and affect adjacent uses, including residential, commercial, and mixed-use areas. Thus, this analysis can only address potential impacts generally.
Construction activities would generate a variety of noise levels associated with different kinds of construction equipment and the location of staging, construction, storage, and access routes. Demolition, grading, paving, landscaping, and building construction processes involve equipment and vehicles that are known to produce intrusive levels of noise. This would result in temporary increases in local noise levels near active construction sites that could adversely affect neighboring land uses, particularly where sensitive receptors are located. Construction activity generates noise that potentially has a short-term impact on ambient noise levels and can reach high levels that have the potential to impact nearby sensitive land uses.

Construction noise impacts on adjacent land uses would be dependent upon a number of factors specific to a project. Some of the factors include proximity to sensitive land uses, time of day, intervening barriers, level of construction (e.g., number and type of construction equipment that is operating simultaneously), and the duration of the project's construction phase. Worst-case examples of construction noise at 50 feet are presented in Table 4.8-8 (Maximum Construction Equipment Noise Levels). The peak noise level for most of the equipment that would be used during construction is in the range of 74 to 90 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. Noise levels for each doubling of distance would be 6 dBA less. For example, at 200 feet, the peak construction noise levels range from 62 to 78 dBA. Future construction projects would be subject to noise ordinance regulations that limit the hours and days of construction activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Noise Level (Lmax) at 50 Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backhoe</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain Saw</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compactor (ground)</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressor (air)</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Mixer Truck</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Pump Truck</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Saw</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dozer</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drill Rig Truck</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drum Mixer</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dump Truck</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavator</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front End Loader</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generator</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grader</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackhammer</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man Lift</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paver</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumps</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scraper</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractor</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welder/Torch</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: FHWA, 2017*
According to Section 8.08.100 of the Poway Municipal Code, construction activity is prohibited between the hours of 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. on Mondays through Saturdays and at any time on Sundays and holidays unless otherwise permitted by the City Engineer in writing. Construction activity occurring within the allowable timeframe (7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Mondays through Saturdays) is not allowed to exceed 75 dBA for more than eight hours within any 24-hour period when measured at or within a residential property.

The proposed Specific Plan would not authorize any specific construction activity. Potential construction noise would be assessed in conjunction with the City’s review of site-specific noise impact analyses on a case-by-case basis. In addition to noise ordinance requirements, the City may impose other measures, such as erecting noise barriers, to protect adjacent uses from excessive construction noise. Compliance with Chapter 8.08 of the Poway Municipal Code and implementation of project-specific mitigation when necessary would reduce construction noise impacts to less than significant at the project level.

Traffic Noise Levels

Future population and employment growth within the Specific Plan area would result in increased traffic and the need for roadway and intersection improvements necessary to maintain desired levels of service. Increases in traffic could result in permanent increases in ambient noise levels due to increasing traffic volumes. Roadway noise levels could increase to beyond the levels considered acceptable for the adjacent land uses, as defined by the Poway Municipal Code.

As part of the Specific Plan process, an inventory of existing land uses was compiled and future land uses associated with future development under proposed land use conditions was defined. Traffic noise levels at 100 feet from roadway segment centerlines were modeled utilizing the FHWA Traffic Noise Model (TNM) Version 2.5. Distances to 55, 60, 65, and 70 dBA CNEL noise contours under 2035 Specific Plan build out conditions were calculated and shown in Table 4.8-9 (Specific Plan Build out Traffic Noise Contours) and Exhibit 4.8-3 (Specific Plan Build out Traffic Noise Contours). Traffic noise levels identified represent conservative potential noise exposure. In reality, noise levels may vary from those represented, as the calculations do not assume natural or artificial shielding nor do they assume reflection from existing or proposed structures or topography. Intervening structures of other noise-attenuating obstacles between a roadway and a receptor may reduce roadway noise levels at the receptor.

Table 4.8-10 (Future 2035 CNEL Noise Level Increase) shows the noise increases due to future development facilitated by build out of the proposed Specific Plan compared to existing conditions. Noise levels at 100 feet from the centerline of roadway segments were calculated based on average daily traffic volumes and fleet mix provided by the Specific Plan traffic study prepared by Chen Ryan Associates.
### Table 4.8-9
**Specific Plan Build Out Traffic Noise Contours**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>dBA CNEL at 100 ft</th>
<th>Distance to CNEL Contour from Centerline of Roadway (Feet)</th>
<th>55 dBA</th>
<th>60 dBA</th>
<th>65 dBA</th>
<th>70 dBA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poway Road</strong></td>
<td>Between Francis Terrace and Oak Knoll Road</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>519 292 164 108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Oak Knoll Road and Pomerado Road</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>495 279 157 114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Pomerado Road and Ridgedale Road</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>507 285 160 111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Ridgedale Road and Silver Lake Drive</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>484 272 153 116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Silver Lake Drive and Carriage Road</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>462 260 146 122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Carriage Road and Tarascan Drive</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>507 285 160 111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Civic Center Drive and Bowron Road</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>519 292 164 108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Bowron Road and Community Road</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>531 299 168 106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Community Road and Midland Road</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>525 295 166 107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Midland Road and Gate Drive</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>638 359 202 114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Gate Drive and Garden Road</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>582 327 184 104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Garden Road and Match Point Drive</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>398 224 126 141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pomerado Road</strong></td>
<td>Between Poway Road and Robison Boulevard</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>610 343 193 108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Poway Road and Oak Knoll Road</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>617 347 195 110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civic Center Drive</strong></td>
<td>Between Poway Road and Civic Center Drive</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>124 143 254 452</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bowron Road</strong></td>
<td>Between Poway Road and Civic Center Drive</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>106 188 335 596</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Road</strong></td>
<td>Between Hilleary Place and Poway Road</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>447 251 141 126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Poway Road and Civic Center Drive</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>457 257 145 123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Civic Center Drive and Hillside Village</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>507 285 160 111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Garden Road</strong></td>
<td>Between Poway Road and Claire Drive</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>305 172 104 184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Traffic noise level (dBA CNEL) modeled at 100 feet from the roadway segment centerline.
According to Caltrans, a three-dBA change in sound is the beginning at which humans generally notice a barely perceptible change in sound, a five-dBA change is generally readily perceptible, and a 10-dBA increase is perceived by most people as a doubling of the existing noise level (Caltrans 2013a). Due to the existing and proposed urban setting of the project area, a readily perceptible change in noise (five dBA) would be the appropriate threshold to determine significant increases in traffic noise. Based on results of the model, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not result in readily perceptible increases in traffic noise.

The proposed Specific Plan designates commercial and mixed uses along the corridor. The proposed Specific Plan would not authorize any specific construction. Potential increases in noise levels along existing and proposed roadways would be assessed in conjunction with the City’s review of site-specific noise impact analyses. The Specific Plan Design Guidelines requires that noise-attenuating protection be provided for noise-sensitive uses. Therefore, future site planning would account for noise levels and potential attenuating devices. In addition, development of future residential uses would be required to meet Title 24 noise insulation standards, achieving an interior noise level not to exceed 45 dBA with windows closed. All windows, doors, and insulation are required to meet Title 24 sound transmission class standards to reach allowable exterior-to-interior noise levels. Build out of the Specific Plan is not anticipated to occur at once; therefore, increases in traffic noise would not reach perceptible levels at once. As development occurs, a gradual increase in traffic noise would occur. Impacts would be less than significant.

### Table 4.8-10
**Future 2035 CNEL Noise Level Increase**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Traffic Noise at 100 ft from Centerline (dBA)</th>
<th>Increase (dBA)</th>
<th>Sig?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poway Road</td>
<td>Between Francis Terrace and Oak Knoll Road</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Oak Knoll Road and Pomerado Road</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Pomerado Road and Ridgedale Road</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Ridgedale Road and Silver Lake Drive</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Silver Lake Drive and Carriage Road</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Carriage Road and Tarascan Drive</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Civic Center Drive and Bowron Road</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Bowron Road and Community Road</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Community Road and Midland Road</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Midland Road and Gate Drive</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Gate Drive and Garden Road</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Garden Road and Match Point Drive</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomerado Road</td>
<td>Between Poway Road and Robison Boulevard</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Poway Road and Oak Knoll Road</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Center Drive</td>
<td>Between Poway Road and Civic Center Drive</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowron Road</td>
<td>Between Poway Road and Civic Center Drive</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Road</td>
<td>Between Hilleary Place and Poway Road</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Poway Road and Civic Center Drive</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Civic Center Drive and Hillside Village</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Road</td>
<td>Between Poway Road and Claire Drive</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact 4.8.B

Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or noise. Impacts would be less than significant.

Pile drivers and rock blasting are generally the primary cause of construction-related vibration impacts. Such construction methods are employed on a limited basis, on sites where there are extensive layers of very hard materials that must be loosened and/or penetrated to achieve the grading plan and place foundation supports. Additional noise impacts could occur where heavy machinery is required to break up large, hard rocks into smaller fragments. The need for such methods is determined through site-specific geotechnical investigations that identify the subsurface materials within the grading envelope, along with the construction methods recommended to handle the types of materials that are found.

Occasionally, large bulldozers and loaded trucks can create perceptible vibration at close proximity; however, they generally do not cause vibration that could cause structural or cosmetic damage. Construction equipment and activities are categorized by the nature of the vibration it produces. Equipment or activities typical of continuous vibration include excavation equipment, static compaction equipment, vibratory pile drivers, and pile-extraction equipment. Equipment or activities typical of transient (single-impact) or low-rate repeated impact vibration include impact pile drivers, blasting, and crack-and-seat equipment. High-rate repeated impact vibrations are common of jackhammers and pavement breakers. Table 4.8-11 (Common Construction Vibration) summarizes the peak particle velocity (PPV) at 25 feet for common construction equipment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>PPV (in/sec) at 25 feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crack-and-Seat Operations</td>
<td>2.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibratory Roller</td>
<td>0.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Bulldozer</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caisson Drilling</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loaded Trucks</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackhammer</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Bulldozer</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Caltrans 2013b

Vibration varies widely with distance and intensity. Vibration from earthmovers and haulers have no potential to damage buildings after ten feet, while vibration from blasting activities can damage structures up to 115 feet away. Common mitigation for impact pile drivers include jetting, pre-drilling, use of cast-in-place, or auger cast piles, use of non-displacement piles, and use of pile cushioning. Vibration can be reduced from breaking of concrete and other materials through use of hydraulic crushers, saws, or rotary rock-cutting heads, hydraulic splitters, and chemicals instead of using hydraulic breakers.

Building construction has the potential to generate perceptible vibration levels that sensitive receptors within 20 feet from the operation of heavy equipment. Given that vibration levels dissipate rapidly with distance, and that homes along streets and intersections are typically more than 20 feet away from the street edge, residential land uses adjoining roadway and intersection improvement projects would not likely be subject to distinctly perceptible vibration levels over extended periods of time.

The proposed Specific Plan does not authorize any construction or other land altering activity that could result in construction-related vibration. Potential vibration due to future construction activities would be assessed in...
conjunction with the City’s routine review of site-specific geotechnical studies and the recommended grading and foundation design measures. This would occur in the project planning process, prior to project approval, for projects subject to review under CEQA, and this would provide an adequate mechanism to require special measures to mitigate potentially significant vibration impacts of the proposed Specific Plan. Impacts resulting from construction-generated groundborne vibration noise would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures
None required.

Level of Significance with Mitigation Incorporated
Not applicable.
4.9 POPULATION AND HOUSING

This section identifies existing population, employment, and housing statistics for the City of Poway, and analyzes the potential impacts that could result from implementation of the proposed Specific Plan at build out conditions.

The Initial Study prepared for the proposed Specific Plan determined that no impact would result related to displacement of existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, these impacts have not been further analyzed in this EIR.

Environmental Setting

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) is the agency responsible for developing and adopting regional growth forecasts for San Diego County. The San Diego Forward Regional Plan was adopted in October 2015 by SANDAG. The Regional Plan combines big-picture vision for how the region would grow over 35 years. Appendix J of the Regional Plan, Regional Growth Forecast, represents the best assessment of the changes anticipated for the region and its communities. According to SANDAG, the Regional Growth Forecasts are meant to help policy-makers and decision-makers prepare for the future (SANDAG 2015). The Regional Growth Forecasts are the basis for the population, housing, and employment forecasts within the County.

Population

According to the United States Census American Community Survey, the City of Poway had an estimated population of 49,484 persons in 2015 (Census 2017). As of January 1, 2016, the California Department of Finance (DOF) estimated the City of Poway population to be 50,103 persons (DOF 2016). SANDAG’s Regional Growth Forecast projects that Poway will have a population of 53,149 persons by the year 2050. See Table 4.9-1 (Regional Growth Forecast Summary) for SANDAG projections on population, housing, and employment. The Specific Plan planning area currently includes 251 housing units. At an estimate of 3.01 persons per household, the Specific Plan planning area is estimated to support a population of approximately 756 persons (Census 2017).

Employment

According to SANDAG’s Regional Growth Forecast, Poway had an estimated employment base of 30,851 in the year 2012. The Regional Growth Forecast projects that the Poway employment base will increase to 37,173 by the year 2050, a 20 percent increase. The Specific Plan planning area currently includes approximately 2,432,000 square feet of nonresidential development that supports employment. According to employment estimate data provided by regional data, existing nonresidential use within the Specific Plan planning area account for approximately 245 jobs (Keyser Marston 2016).

Housing

According to DOF, Poway has an estimated 16,864 housing units as of January 1, 2016 (DOF 2016). The Regional Growth Forecast projects that the number of households in Poway citywide will increase to 17,839 in 2050, which represents an additional 975 units (SANDAG 2015). This forecast does not reflect growth accommodated by the amended Specific Plan (and it cannot be readily determined whether the forecast accounts for the number of units allowed by the existing Specific Plan). Currently, 251 housing units exist within the Specific Plan planning area.
### Table 4.9-1

**Regional Growth Forecast Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2050</th>
<th>Change (2012 to 2050)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>48,382</td>
<td>50,026</td>
<td>53,062</td>
<td>53,149</td>
<td>4,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>30,851</td>
<td>34,010</td>
<td>35,708</td>
<td>37,173</td>
<td>6,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>16,545</td>
<td>16,855</td>
<td>17,685</td>
<td>17,839</td>
<td>1,294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SANDAG, 2015

### Thresholds of Significance

Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan may be considered significant if it would result in the following:

A. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, proposing new homes and business) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).

### Environmental Impacts

**Impact 4.9.A**

The proposed Specific Plan would provide housing development capacity that would increase residential growth potential beyond accounted for in current regional plans and the current Specific Plan; however, the growth would occur within an area that SANDAG’s *Regional Comprehensive Plan* has designated as a Smart Growth Town Center. Thus, growth would occur consistent with regional growth policies. The Specific Plan would not indirectly induce population by extending infrastructure into an area that is not currently served. Impact would be less than significant.

### Population and Housing

The forecasted growth anticipated in the *Regional Comprehensive Plan* reflects local general plans, economic and demographic trends, capacity for housing, and accessibility to jobs and transportation. The Regional Growth Forecast, however, does not allocate beyond what is allowed for by any jurisdiction’s general plan (SANDAG 2015). The Poway General Plan was certified in 1991 and has not been updated since. Therefore, although the Regional Growth forecast takes into account economic and demographic trends, capacity for housing, and accessibility to jobs and transportation, and the capacity of the City’s current General Plan land use plan limits that projected growth. Since the General Plan’s certification in 1991, economic and demographic trends, capacity for housing and accessibility to jobs and transportation has evolved. Therefore, the growth forecast projected by SANDAG for Poway does not reflect population trends and local pressures for new and different kinds of development that has occurred in Poway in more recent years (and specifically, since the 1991 General Plan was adopted).

The Specific Plan planning area currently has 251 residential units. The proposed Specific Plan would support 1,399 total residential units at build out, representing a net increase of up to 1,148 residential units. Based on an average of 3.01 persons per household in Poway, as estimated by DOF, the Specific Plan planning area could provide housing capacity for an increase of up to 3,456 residents, resulting in a city-wide population of 53,559 (DOF 2016). The SANDAG *Regional Growth Forecast* projects an estimated population of 53,062 in Poway by the year 2035 and 53,149 by the year 2050. Based on the current and projected numbers, build out of the proposed Specific Plan would provide housing supply for 497 more residents than projected by SANDAG for 2035.

According to DOF, the City of Poway had a housing stock of 16,864 as of January 1, 2016. SANDAG’s *Regional Growth Forecast* projects that the number of households in Poway will increase to 17,685 by the year 2035 and 17,839 in 2050. Build out of the proposed Specific Plan would provide capacity for up to 1,148 additional housing
units within the Specific Plan planning area, resulting in a total housing supply city-wide of up to 18,012 units. Based on the current and projected numbers, build out of the proposed Specific Plan would provide 327 more housing units than projected by SANDAG for 2035.

Although build out of the Specific Plan would provide for more housing and population capacity than projected by SANDAG for Poway, the central portion of the Specific Plan planning area has been designated as a Smart Growth area by SANDAG (SANDAG 2015). Smart Growth areas are locations where SANDAG has identified existing, planned, and potential higher-density mixed-use development, resulting in more housing and jobs near existing and planned public transit. The Specific Plan planning area has been identified as a Smart Growth place type of Town Center, which would consist of minimum target densities of 20 dwelling units per acre and 30 employees per acre (SANDAG 2014). Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan densities are consistent with the Smart Growth strategies to provide mixed-use and higher-density development in urbanized areas that are served by existing public transportation.

As stated above, the Regional Growth Forecast does not allocate housing and population capacity beyond what is allowed for by any jurisdiction’s general plan. However, consistent with SANDAG’s Smart Growth vision for the county, the Specific Plan provides for increased growth potential within Poway’s central core. Further, the Specific Plan planning area is currently served by existing service and utility systems and a regional transportation network that has sufficient capacity to accommodate growth associated with the proposed Specific Plan. Specific Plan implementation would not include the extension of any service, utility, or transportation system to areas not currently being served and would therefore not induce indirect growth. Upon implementation of the proposed Specific Plan, General Plan land use designations for the Specific Plan planning area would reflect Specific Plan land uses and densities and would be considered in future growth projection efforts. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Employment
The proposed Specific Plan would facilitate an increase in commercial square footage that would generate employment growth. Build out of the proposed Specific Plan would result in a net increase of up to 260,000 square feet of nonresidential use (retail, office, restaurants, and auto related). According to the economic benefits analysis prepared for the Specific Plan, build out could result in a net increase of approximately 360 jobs (Keyser Marston 2016). According to SANDAG's Regional Growth Forecast, Poway had an estimated employment base of 30,851 in 2012. The Regional Growth Forecast projects the Poway employment base will increase to 35,708 by the year 2035 and 37,173 by the year 2050. The estimated net increase of 360 jobs at Specific Plan build out would provide employment opportunities within the City and would be well within the projected employment growth for Poway. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures
None required.

Level of Significance with Mitigation Incorporated
Not applicable.
4.10 Transportation and Traffic

This section analyzes traffic impacts at intersections within the Specific Plan planning area and assesses project consistency with congestion management strategies. This discussion is based on the traffic impact analysis prepared by Chen Ryan Associates, attached as Appendix D. The impact analysis included documentation of facilities, demand, safety, transit routes, stops, amenities, roadway conditions, level of service, and arterial analyses. Level of Service (LOS) is defined as a qualitative measure of operating conditions within a traffic stream, and/or passengers. LOS is often described in terms of factors such as speed, travel time, freedom to maneuver, comfort and convenience, and safety. (Caltrans 2010)

As discussed in the Initial Study (Appendix B), impacts related to emergency access and conflicts with alternative transportation options were found to be less than significant. The Initial Study also concluded that the proposed project would have no impacts with regard to air traffic patterns.

A comment letter was received from the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) during the NOP comment period. SANDAG provided a list of transportation demand management strategies and resources for additional information.

Environmental Setting

Existing Circulation Network

The roadway classifications of major roadways within the study area, as identified by the City of Poway General Plan Transportation Master Element (Poway 2010), are described below.

Major Arterials

The main function of Major Arterials is to provide a high level of mobility for through traffic, with restricted access to adjacent properties. These roadways generally serve trips consisting of several miles, provide linkages between major activity centers within the community, connect regional roadways, and serve pass-through trips. Adequate mobility levels are ensured by providing high design standards that include four travel lanes, medians, controlled access, Class II bicycle lanes (marked on pavement), no parking, and design speeds of 45 miles per hour (mph) to 55 mph. Roadway design speeds may differ from posted speed limits; as such, design speeds will general be referred to as a design speed to differentiate these values from those of posted speed limits. The following are Major Arterials within the Specific Plan planning area.

Poway Road

Within the study area, Poway Road is an east-west four-lane roadway with a landscaped raised median. Poway Road serves as a connection between State Route 67 (SR-67) and Interstate 15 (I-15) and runs through the City’s main commercial area. Poway Road has a posted speed limit of 35 mph and a paved width of 80 feet, with the exception of the roadway segment between Community Road and Midland Road, where the paved width is 92 feet. Sidewalks and Class II bicycle facilities are present on both sides of the roadway. Parking is prohibited on both sides of the roadway within the Specific Plan planning area.

Pomerado Road

Within the study area, Pomerado Road is a north-south divided four-lane roadway. Pomerado Road provides a major connection between residential areas to the north and office/industrial areas in the southern part of Poway. Pomerado Road has a posted speed limit of 45 mph and a paved width of 78 feet. Sidewalks and Class II bicycle facilities are present on both sides of the roadway. Parking is prohibited on both sides of the roadway within the Specific Plan planning area.
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Community Road
Within the study area, Community Road is a north-south divided four-lane roadway that serves as a connection between the central residential areas of the City with the office/industrial uses in the South Poway Business Park. Community Road has a posted speed limit of 35 mph and a paved width that varies between 80 feet and 95 feet. Sidewalks and Class II bicycle facilities are present on both sides of the roadway within the study area. Parking is prohibited on both sides of the roadway.

Collectors and Local Collectors
The City’s Collector street system is designed to provide mobility and access, as well as connections between local/residential streets and arterials. Collector streets generally serve shorter trips connecting local and major facilities or within neighborhoods and design speeds of 25 miles per hour mph. Collector roadways can have either four or two lanes of travel, with design characteristics consistent with their role. Generally, on-street parking is present on both sides of the roadway, and bicycle facilities are not present on the roadway.

Garden Road
Within the study area, Garden Road is an east-west undivided two-lane Collector. Garden Road connects Poway Road’s commercial core to the residential neighborhood to the southeast. Garden Road has a posted speed limit of 35 mph and a paved width of 50 feet. Sidewalks and Class II bicycle facilities are present on both sides of the roadway. Parking is permitted on both sides of the roadway within the Specific Plan planning area.

Carriage Road
Within the study area, Carriage Road is a north-south two-lane Collector with a raised median north of Poway Road and a striped median south of Poway Road. Carriage Road has a posted speed limit of 30 mph and a paved width of 64 feet north of Poway Road and of 54 feet south of Poway Road. Sidewalks and Class II bicycle facilities are present on both sides of the roadway. Parking is permitted along Carriage Road within the Specific Plan planning area.

Oak Knoll Road
Within the study area, Oak Knoll Road is an east-west undivided two-lane Local Collector. Oak Knoll Road has a posted speed limit of 30 mph and a paved width of 40 feet. Sidewalks are present on both sides of the roadway; there are no bicycle lanes. Parking is permitted on both sides of the roadway within the Specific Plan planning area.

Silver Lake Drive
Within the study area, Silver Lake Drive is a north-south two-lane Local Collector. Silver Lake Drive has a posted speed limit of 25 mph and a paved width of 50 feet. Sidewalks are present on both sides of the roadway; there are no bicycle lanes. Parking is generally permitted along Silver Lake Drive within the Specific Plan planning area.

Local Roadways
The following local roadways have not been classified by the March 2010 Transportation Master Element (TME). The previous TME was adopted by the Poway City Council in 1991. Transportation systems in Poway have traditionally been automobile-oriented; as such, many roadway improvements have been identified in the March 2010 TME. Local roadways are not evaluated in the March 2010 TME. They are identified descriptively as roadways that serve smaller collectors that connect collector roadways to each other.

Civic Center Drive
Within the study area, Civic Center Drive is a north-south two-lane local street. Civic Center Drive provides access to Poway Civic Center and Poway Library. Civic Center Drive has a posted speed limit of 25 mph and a paved width of 48 feet. Sidewalks and Class II bicycle facilities are present on both sides of the roadway. Parking is permitted on both sides of the roadway within the Specific Plan planning area.
Bowron Road
Within the study area, Bowron Road is a north-south local street. Bowron Road provides a connection between Poway Road, Poway Community Park, and Valley Elementary School. Bowron Road has a posted speed limit of 25 mph and a paved width of 40 feet. Sidewalks are present on both sides of the roadway, but Class II bicycle facilities are only present on the west side of the roadway. Parking is permitted on both sides of the roadway within the Specific Plan planning area.

Pedestrian Level of Service
Pedestrian Level of Service (LOS) was evaluated along the Poway Road Corridor using the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) multi-modal LOS methodology. Table 4.10-1 (Existing Pedestrian LOS) summarizes existing pedestrian LOS along Poway Road during the morning and evening peak hours. As shown in Table 4.10-1, all roadway segments operate at acceptable LOS D or better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>A.M.</th>
<th>P.M.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway Road</td>
<td>Oak Knoll Road to Pomerado Road</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pomerado Road to Silver Lake Drive</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silver Lake Drive to Carriage Road</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carriage Road to Tarascan Drive</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tarascan Drive to Community Road</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Road to Midland Road</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midland Road to Gate Drive</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gate Drive to Garden Road</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Chen Ryan Associates, 2017

Bicycle Level of Service
Table 4.10-2 (Existing Bicycle Level of Service) summarizes existing bicycle LOS along Poway Road segments for the morning and evening peak hours. As shown in Table 4.10-2, the following segments on Poway Road operate at substandard bicycle LOS:

- Pomerado Road between Silver Lake Drive – Westbound A.M. and P.M.
- Carriage Road between Civic Center Drive – Eastbound A.M. and P.M.
- Community Road between Tarascan Drive – Westbound A.M.
- Tarascan Drive between Community Road – Westbound A.M. and P.M., Eastbound P.M.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>A.M.</th>
<th>P.M.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway Road</td>
<td>Oak Knoll Road to Pomerado Road</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pomerado Road to Silver Lake Drive</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silver Lake Drive to Carriage Road</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carriage Road to Tarascan Drive</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tarascan Drive to Community Road</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Road to Midland Road</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midland Road to Gate Drive</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gate Drive to Garden Road</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Chen Ryan Associates, 2017
Transit LOS

The San Diego Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) provides bus service to the City of Poway residents, with a number of stops along Poway Road. The following transit routes serve the Specific Plan planning area.

- Route 944 – Runs east to west between the Sabre Springs Transit Station and the Garden Road/Floral Avenue stop connecting the Sabre Springs community and southeast Poway via Sabre Springs Parkway, Poway Road, Neddie Avenue, Bowdoin Road, and Floral Avenue.
- Route 945 – Runs north to south between the Rancho Bernardo Transit Station and the Temple/Midland stop connecting Poway’s commercial area and the Rancho Bernardo community via Temple Street, Brighton Avenue, Adrian Street, Midland Road, Poway Road, Pomerado Road, Rancho Bernardo Road, Bernardo Center Drive, Duenda Road, and West Bernardo Drive.
- Route 945A – Runs counterclockwise between the Midland Road/Poway Road, the Pomerado Road/Espola Road stop, and back to the Midland Road/Poway Road stop connecting Poway’s commercial corridor and northern Poway via Midland Road, Aubrey Street, Community Road, Twin Peaks Road, Espola Road, Pomerado Road, Poway Road, and Midland Road.

Table 4.10-3 (Existing Transit LOS) summarizes existing transit LOS along Poway Road for A.M. and P.M. peak hours. As shown in Table 4.10-3, all transit segments operate at LOS D or better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>A.M.</th>
<th>P.M.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway Road</td>
<td>Oak Knoll Road to Pomerado Road</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pomerado Road to Silver Lake Drive</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silver Lake Drive to Carriage Road</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carriage Road to Tarascan Drive</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tarascan Drive to Community Road</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Road to Midland Road</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midland Road to Gate Drive</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gate Drive to Garden Road</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Chen Ryan Associates, 2017

Intersection LOS

Existing intersection level of service (LOS) during the A.M. and P.M. peak hours are summarized in Table 4.10-4 (Existing Peak Hour Intersection LOS). As shown, all study intersections currently operate under acceptable LOS D or better.

Signalized Intersection Analysis

The signalized intersection analysis utilized in the traffic study conforms to the operational analysis methodology outlined in the 2010 HCM, Transportation Research Board Special Report 209 (HCM 2010). This method defines LOS in terms of delay or more specifically, average control delay per vehicle (seconds/vehicle).

The 2010 HCM methodology sets 1,900 passenger-cars per hour per lane as the ideal saturation flow rate at signalized intersections based upon the minimum headway that can be sustained between departing vehicles at a
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Signalized intersection. The service saturation flow rate, which reflects the saturation flow rate specific to the study facility, is determined by adjusting the ideal saturation flow rate for lane width, on-street parking, bus stops, pedestrian volume, traffic composition (or percentage of heavy vehicles), and shared lane movements (e.g., through and right-turn movements sharing the same lane). The LOS criteria used for this technique are described in Table 4.10-5 (Signalized Intersection LOS HCM Operational Analysis Method).

Table 4.10-4
Existing Peak Hour Intersection LOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection Control</th>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>A.M. Peak Hour</th>
<th>P.M. Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg. Delay (sec)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Avg. Delay (sec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Poway Road / Oak Knoll Road</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Poway Road / Pomerado Road</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Poway Road / Silver Lake Drive</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Poway Road / Carriage Road</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Poway Road / Tarascan Drive–Civic Center Drive</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Poway Road / Community Road</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Poway Road / Midland Road</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Poway Road / Gate Drive</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Poway Road / Garden Road</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Civic Center Drive / Civic Center Drive</td>
<td>AWSC</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Civic Center Drive / Bowron Road</td>
<td>AWSC</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Civic Center Drive / Community Road</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Chen Ryan Associates, 2017

Notes:
AWSC = All-way stop control

Table 4.10-5
Signalized Intersection LOS HCM Operational Analysis Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Control Delay Per Vehicle (seconds)</th>
<th>Level of Service Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 10.0</td>
<td>LOS A occurs when the volume-to-capacity ratio is low and either progression is exceptionally favorable or the cycle length is very short. If it is due to favorable progression, most vehicles arrive during the green indication and travel through the intersection without stopping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1 – 20.0</td>
<td>LOS B occurs when the volume-to-capacity ratio is low and either progression is highly favorable or the cycle length is short. More vehicles stop than with LOS A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.1 – 35.0</td>
<td>LOS C occurs when progression is favorable or the cycle length is moderate. The number of vehicles stopping is significant, although many vehicles still pass through the intersection without stopping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.1 – 55.0</td>
<td>LOS D occurs when the volume-to-capacity ratio is high and either progression is ineffective or the cycle length is long. Many vehicles stop and individual cycle failures are noticeable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.1 – 80.0</td>
<td>LOS E occurs when the volume-to-capacity ratio is high, progression is unfavorable, and the cycle length is long. Individual cycle failures are frequent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 80.0</td>
<td>LOS F occurs when the volume-to-capacity ratio is very high, progression is very poor, and the cycle length is long. Most cycles fail to clear the queue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HCM 2010

According to the SANTEC/ITE and the City of Poway General Plan Land Use and Transportation guidelines, LOS D generally represents the upper limit of satisfactory operations.
Unsignalized Intersection Analysis
Unsignalized intersections, including two-way and all-way stop controlled intersections, were analyzed using the 2010 HCM unsignalized intersection analysis methodology. The LOS for a two-way stop-controlled intersection is determined by the computed or measured control delay and is defined for each minor movement. The LOS for an all-way stop controlled intersection is determined by the computed or measured average control delay of all movements. The LOS for a side-street stop controlled intersection is determined by the computed or measured delay of the worst approach. Table 4.10-6 (LOS Criteria for Stop Controlled Unsignalized Intersections) summarizes the LOS criteria for unsignalized intersections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Control Delay (sec/veh)</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 10.0</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1 – 15.0</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1 – 25.0</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.1 – 35.0</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.1 – 50.0</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 50.0</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HCM 2010

Regulatory Framework

Congestion Management Program
State Proposition 111, passed by voters in 1990, established a requirement that urbanized areas prepare and regularly update a Congestion Management Program (CMP), which is a party of the San Diego Association of Government’s (SANDAG) Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). SANDAG has been designated as the Transportation Management Area (TMA). The purpose of the CMP is to monitor the performance of the region’s transportation system, develop programs to address near-term and long-term congestion, and to better integrate transportation and land use planning. The San Diego region has elected to be exempt from the State CMP and, as a result, the Poway City Council has adopted a resolution electing to be exempt from the State CMP in 2009. SANDAG has been abiding by the federal requirement to ensure the region’s continued compliance with the federal congestion management. San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan meets the requirements by incorporating the following federal congestion management process: performance monitoring and measurement of the regional transportation system, multi-modal alternatives and non-single occupancy vehicle analysis, the provision of congestion management tools, and integration with the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) process.

Regional Transportation Plan
SANDAG has been abiding by the federal requirement to ensure the region’s continued compliance with the federal congestion management by incorporating the federal congestion management process in the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The RTP is the long-range transportation plan for the San Diego region and includes a variety of strategies to enhance regional transportation systems management, as well as new techniques related to both improving performance monitoring and information and services to regional transportation systems users.
Thresholds of Significance

Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan may be considered significant if it would result in the following:

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

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

Pedestrian LOS

Pedestrian LOS is a measure of the pedestrian’s experience at intersections and on street links between the intersections. Pedestrian LOS is a function of the following number of variables:

- Lateral separation between pedestrians and vehicular traffic
- Width of sidewalk
- Speed and makeup of the vehicular traffic
- Difficulty of crossing arterial
- Right-turn on red
- Permissive left-turn during “walk” phase
- Delay waiting to cross at signal
- Intersection crossing distance
- Cross-street vehicular traffic volume and speed

Bicycle LOS

Bicycle LOS is a weighted combination of the bicyclist’s experience at intersections and on street links between the intersections. Bicycle LOS is a function of the following five variables:

- Lateral separation between bicycles and vehicular traffic
- Speed and makeup of the vehicular traffic
- Pavement conditions
- Directional vehicular traffic volumes
- Intersection crossing distances

Transit LOS

Transit LOS is based on a combination of the user’s experience while accessing the transit system, while waiting for transit service, and while riding on transit. The access experience is represented by the pedestrian LOS score while the pedestrian is accessing a bus stop. This score is specific to the direction of travel along a street. The waiting and riding experiences are combined into a transit wait/ride score. The transit wait/ride score is a function of the average headway between transit vehicles and the perceived travel time.

The following variables are used to determine the transit LOS:

- Frequency of service
- Mean speed
- Load factors (number of passengers compared to number of seats)
- Quality of pedestrian access to transit stops
Transit stop amenities

Intersection LOS

The following assumptions were utilized in conduction of all intersection LOS analyses:

- Pedestrian Calls per Hour: Obtained from existing pedestrian counts
- Heavy Vehicle Factor: A two percent heavy vehicle factor was assumed for all intersections within the study area
- Peak Hour Factor: Obtained from existing peak hour counts
- Signal Timing: Obtained from existing signal timing plans (as of December 2014)

Environmental Impacts

Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan includes the following mobility improvements that would be implemented as the corridor redevelops and have been assumed in the project traffic study.

Pedestrian

- Implement enhanced high visible pedestrian crosswalks at all intersections along the corridor
- Install countdown pedestrian signal heads at all signalized intersections within the corridor
- Provide a new signalized pedestrian crossing point between Bowron Road and Community Road, potentially at a driveway location for future development
- Removal of the northbound free right-turn movement from the Community Road/Poway Road intersection would mitigate the conflicts present when turning vehicles approach the intersection at the same time as pedestrians are present

Bicycle

- Install the planned buffered bicycle lanes as an interim approach to eventually install one-way Class IV Cycle Tracks on each side of the roadway along the entire length of the study corridor when funding sources are identified and appropriate budget is allocated
- Include bicycle parking requirements for all new projects within the corridor
- Removal of the northbound free right-turn movement from the Community Road/Poway Road intersection would mitigate the conflicts present when turning vehicles approach the intersection at the same time as cyclists are present
- Reduced roadway travel lane widths from 14 feet to 11 feet to provide the right-of-way for planned buffered bicycle lanes and eventual one-way Class IV Cycle Track bicycle facilities

Transit

- No changes to transit facilities are proposed as part of this project. However, the City of Poway should work with MTS/SANDAG to monitor transit ridership as the corridor develops. Station amenities and route adjustments should be implemented as needed.

Auto

- Optimize signal timing and coordination within the corridor, including the implementation of adaptive signal timing, which uses technology to optimize traffic flows based on real-time traffic conditions
- As properties are redeveloped, limit the number of vehicular driveways and conflict points along Poway Road

Pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and vehicular transportation facilities would operate at acceptable levels of service (LOS) under Specific Plan build out conditions. The proposed mobility improvements would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy and would not conflict with County congestion management strategies. Impacts would be less than significant.

The Federal Highway Administration 23 CFR Section 450.320 requires that congestion management be addressed through analysis of multi-modal performance and metropolitan-wide strategies. The project traffic study (Appendix D) provides a multi-modal analysis for pedestrian, transit, and bicycle facilities where the multi-modal LOS is evaluated based on the user’s perception of the quality of the environment or systems while using these modes. Additionally, the project traffic study analyzed intersection LOS to identify any potential deficiencies in vehicular travel under Specific Plan build out conditions. Build out performance of roadway segments for pedestrian, transit, and bicycle facilities and performance of intersections for vehicular travel are summarized below.

Pedestrian LOS

Table 4.10-7 (Specific Plan Build out Pedestrian LOS) summarizes pedestrian LOS along Poway Road under Specific Plan build out conditions during the A.M. and P.M. peak hours. Pedestrian LOS is a measure of the pedestrian’s experience at intersections and on street links between the intersections. As shown in Table 4.10-7, all studied roadway segments are anticipated to operate at acceptable LOS. Pedestrian LOS would improve with Specific Plan implementation, as lateral separation between pedestrians and vehicular traffic would occur, width of sidewalk and or pedestrian walkways would increase, and proposed signalized pedestrian crossing with high-visibility would be implemented, and the pedestrian/auto conflict at northbound Community Road would be eliminated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>A.M.</th>
<th>P.M.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway Road</td>
<td>Oak Knoll Road to Pomerado Road</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pomerado Road to Silver Lake Drive</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silver Lake Drive to Carriage Road</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carriage Road to Tarascan Drive</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tarascan Drive to Shopping Center Driveway</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shopping Center Driveway to Community Road</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Road to Midland Road</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midland Road to Gate Drive</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gate Drive to Garden Road</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Chen Ryan Associates, 2017

Bicycle LOS

Table 4.10-8 (Specific Plan Build Out Bicycle LOS) summarizes bicycle LOS along Poway Road under Specific Plan build out conditions during the A.M. and P.M. peak hours. As shown in Table 4.10-8, all studied roadway segments are anticipated to operate at acceptable LOS.
### Table 4.10-8
**Specific Plan Build Out Bicycle LOS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>A.M.</th>
<th>P.M.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway Road</td>
<td>Oak Knoll Road to Pomerado Road</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pomerado Road to Silver Lake Drive</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silver Lake Drive to Carriage Road</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carriage Road to Tarascan Drive</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tarascan Drive to Shopping Center Driveway</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shopping Center Driveway to Community Road</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Road to Midland Road</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midland Road to Gate Drive</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gate Drive to Garden Road</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Chen Ryan Associates, 2017

### Transit LOS

Table 4.10-9 (Specific Plan Build Out Transit LOS) summarizes transit LOS along Poway Road under Specific Plan build out conditions during the A.M. and P.M. peak hours. As shown in Table 4.10-9, all roadway segments are anticipated to operate at acceptable LOS.

### Table 4.10-9
**Specific Plan Build Out Transit LOS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>A.M.</th>
<th>P.M.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway Road</td>
<td>Oak Knoll Road to Pomerado Road</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pomerado Road to Silver Lake Drive</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silver Lake Drive to Carriage Road</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carriage Road to Tarascan Drive</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tarascan Drive to Shopping Center Driveway</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shopping Center Driveway to Community Road</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Road to Midland Road</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midland Road to Gate Drive</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gate Drive to Garden Road</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Chen Ryan Associates, 2017

### Intersection LOS

Table 4.10-10 (Specific Plan Build Out Peak Hour Intersection LOS) summarizes intersection LOS at build out of the Specific Plan. As shown in Table 4.10-10, all studied intersections would operate at acceptable LOS D or better with implementation of the proposed Specific Plan.
Table 4.10-10
Specific Plan Build Out Peak Hour Intersection LOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Intersection Control</th>
<th>A.M. Peak Hour</th>
<th>P.M. Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avg. Delay</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(sec)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Poway Road / Oak Knoll Road</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Poway Road / Pomerado Road</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Poway Road / Silver Lake Drive</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Poway Road / Carriage Road</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Poway Road / Tarascan Drive–Civic Center Drive</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Poway Road / Community Road</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Poway Road / Midland Road</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Poway Road / Gate Drive</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Poway Road / Garden Road</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Civic Center Drive / Civic Center Drive</td>
<td>AWSC</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Civic Center Drive / Bowron Road</td>
<td>AWSC</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Civic Center Drive / Community Road</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Poway Road / Shopping Center Driveway</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Chen Ryan Associates, 2017
Notes:
AWSC = All-way stop control

Conclusions Regarding All LOS Measurements

Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan does not authorize any specific development project. Development of future projects within the Specific Plan planning area would be subject to the City’s standard CEQA review process, and applicants would be required to assess impacts to vehicular, pedestrian, bicycle, and transit mobility within the project area and implement improvements if deemed necessary to maintain acceptable LOS. The proposed Specific Plan Mobility chapter includes overarching mobility policies and design considerations for future development within the Specific Plan planning area. As development occurs within the Specific Plan planning area, Specific Plan policies and design considerations would ensure that intersection operations would maintain an acceptable multi-modal LOS D or better.

One of the overarching mobility policies in the proposed Specific Plan is to coordinate signal timing to synchronize traffic movement and manage the progression speed and flow of traffic along Poway Road. As future vehicular travel demand changes throughout the implementation of the Specific Plan, improved coordination of signal timing between successive intersections would help facilitate the movement of vehicles most efficiently. In addition, the Specific Plan encourages the implementation of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) to improve multi-modal mobility by facilitating efficient movement of vehicles, pedestrians, transit, bicycles, and emergency vehicles.

As shown in Tables 4.10-7 through 4.10-10, pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and vehicular LOS along Poway Road are anticipated to operate at acceptable levels with implementation of the proposed Specific Plan. Additionally, with implementation of proposed Specific Plan mobility policies and design considerations, Specific Plan implementation would not conflict with County congestion management strategies. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures
None required.
Level of Significance with Mitigation Incorporated

Not applicable.
4.11 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

This section analyzes the availability of infrastructure capacity for water and wastewater services to meet the needs of the proposed project and each system’s current and future obligations. As identified in the Initial Study, no impacts related to storm drains were identified, and impacts related to compliance with federal, State, and local solid waste regulations and landfill capacity were determined to be less than significant. Therefore, these topics are not analyzed here.

Environmental Setting

Wastewater

The existing local wastewater collection system is owned and operated by the City. On May 2, 2006, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) adopted Wastewater Discharge Requirements Order #2006-0003-DWQ. This Order requires enrollees who own or operate sanitary sewer systems greater than one mile in length to collect and convey untreated or partially treated sewer water to a publicly owned treatment works facility. The Order also requires implementation of a Sewer System Management Plan (SSMP) that includes policies to provide proper and efficient management, operation, and maintenance of sanitary sewer systems. The City of Poway approved the City of Poway SSMP on October 16, 2007 and has undergone two self-audits in November 16, 2011 and June 27, 2013.

According to the Poway SSMP, the City owns and operates approximately 185 miles of sewer mains, 3.4 miles of force mains, and five lift stations. One percent of the collection system sewer lines consist of pipes that are less than six inches in diameter, 79 percent consist of pipes eight inches in diameter, 17 percent consist of pipes that are nine to 18 inches in diameter, and three percent consist of pipes that are 19 to 36 inches in diameter (Poway 2013). Exhibit 4.11-1 (Sewer System) depicts the existing sewer system within the Specific Plan planning area.

Wastewater in the City of Poway is collected via the sewer system described above and conveyed to and treated by the City of San Diego at the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant (PLWTP). The PLWTP is a chemically enhanced primary treatment plant. The PLWTP serves approximately 2.2 million residents in a 450-square mile area. The PLWTP currently treats approximately 175 million gallons of wastewater per day (MGPD) and has a treatment capacity of 240 MGPD (San Diego 2017). According to the Poway Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), 924 acre-feet (AF) of wastewater was collected from the City of Poway to be treated at PLWTP, which averages 824,932 GPD (Poway 2016).

Discharge of treated wastewater from the PLWTP into the Pacific Ocean is regulated by a joint permit issued by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Order No. R9-2009-0001 establishes modified secondary treatment requirements for discharge in accordance with the federal Clean Water Act. Wastewater treatment processes at the PLWTP include (San Diego 2015a):

- Mechanical self-cleaning climber screens to remove rags, paper, and other flotable material from the raw wastewater
- Chemical addition to enhance settling and achieve at least 80 percent removal of suspended solids
- Aerated grit removal including grit tanks, separators and washers
- Sedimentation where flocculated solids (sludge) settle to the bottom of the sedimentation tanks and scum floats to the surface
- Sludge and scum removal facilities
- Effluent disinfection
- Final effluent screening
- Anaerobic digestion of waste solids
4.11 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

**Water Supply**

Water supply within the City of Poway is delivered by the City Public Works Department. Water sources consist of imported and recycled water. According to the City’s 2015 UWMP, 99 percent of the water supply is imported from the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA), which is delivered to Poway via SDCWA’s First San Diego Aqueduct from Lake Skinner in Riverside County (Poway 2016). Table 4.11-1 (Current and Planned Water Supply for Poway) summarizes the approximate amount of water supplied by each source in acre-feet per year (AFY) during the normal year scenario. The estimated supply from each source is estimated through the year 2040.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Supply</th>
<th>Current 2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imported Water(^1)</td>
<td>8,712(^3)</td>
<td>13,356</td>
<td>14,306</td>
<td>14,482</td>
<td>14,557</td>
<td>15,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycled Water(^2)</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected(^4) 2015</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imported Water(^1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycled Water(^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Poway 2016*

1. Purchased raw water from SDCWA
2. Purchased recycled water from the City of San Diego
3. Represents total volume imported from SDCWA, not total volume distributed to customers.
4. Purchased water based on projected available per the SDCWA UWMP. Recycled water supply based on the agreement with the City of San Diego.
5. Reasonably available volume

**San Diego County Water Authority**

The SDCWA service area encompasses approximately 951,000 acres that extends from Mexico to the south to Orange and Riverside Counties to the north, and from the Pacific Ocean to the west to the foothills to the east. The SDCWA was created for the primary purpose of supplying imported water to San Diego County for wholesale distribution to its member agencies, which includes the City of Poway (SD County 2016b). The City of Poway purchases raw, untreated water from SDCWA, which is supplied by transfer water from the Imperial Irrigation District (IID) and imported water from the Metropolitan Water District (MWD) (SD County 2016b). To diversify regional supplies, SDCWA is actively involved in the development of seawater desalination. Water supplies are discussed in greater detail below.

**Imperial Irrigation District (IID)**

The IID delivers an annual entitlement of approximately 3.1 million AFY of water to approximately one-half million acres for agricultural, municipal, and industrial use, not including transfer obligations to jurisdictions such as the City of Poway. According to the Imperial Integrated Region Water Management Plan (IRWMP), IID depends solely on water from the Colorado River and distributes water for non-agricultural use to seven municipalities, one private water company, and two community water systems for treatment to potable standards (Imperial Water 2012). In November of 1922, an interstate agreement between seven basin states and Mexico—the Colorado River Compact—was signed to manage distribution of water from the river. The Colorado River Compact gives each basin perpetual rights to 7.5 million AFY annually.

In 1998, SDCWA entered into a Water Conservation and Transfer Agreement with IID in which SDCWA received 100,000 AF in 2015. Pursuant to the agreement, the volume of transfer increases annually until it reaches 200,000 AFY by 2021 (SD County 2016b). SDCWA is expected to receive 190,000 AF of water from IID by the year 2020 and 200,000 AFY by the year 2021 through the term of the 45-year agreement.

In 2003, the agreement was amended to include the terms of the Quantification Settlement Agreement, in which SDCWA contracted to receive an additional 77,700 AFY of conserved water from projects that lined portions of the...
All-American Canal and Coachella Canal over a term of 110 years. The SDCWA could receive up to an additional 4,850 AFY depending on environmental requirements from the Coachella Canal lining project. The 2015 UWMP for SDCWA assumes that 2,500 AFY of this additional allocation would be available for a total supply of 80,200 AFY under the Quantification Settlement Agreement.

**Metropolitan Water District**

MWD’s service area encompasses approximately 5,200 square miles and includes portions of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, and Ventura counties. The primary purpose of MWD is to provide a supplemental supply of water for domestic and municipal uses at wholesale rates to its member public agencies (MWD 2016). Primary water supply consists of imported water from the State Water Project and the Colorado River.

The State Water Project Aqueduct is owned by the State of California and operated by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR). With a contract for water executed in 1960, MWD is one of 29 agencies with long-term contracts for water service from DWR. MWD holds a contract for 1,911,000 AFY of water from the State Water Project.

The Colorado River Aqueduct, owned and operated by MWD, has a capacity of 1.2 million AFY. MWD is entitled to 550,000 AFY of water from the Colorado River. Under current programs, MWD’s Colorado River Aqueduct supply capabilities exceed 1.2 million AFY under the average year, single dry year, and multiple dry year scenarios.

According to SDCWA, a total supply of 136,002 AFY is projected for the year 2020 and gradually increases to 248,565 AFY by the year 2040 (SD County 2016b).

**Carlsbad Desalination Plant**

The Carlsbad Desalination Plant develops water and wastewater infrastructure and is owned and operated by Poseidon, a private investor. The plant is located at the Encina Power Station in Carlsbad and began operations in December, 2015. With the planned closure of the Encina Power Station, the desalination plant will require changes to the existing intake and discharge operations to transition into a stand-alone plant. With this transition, the plant has the potential to increase production capacity from 56,000 AFY to 61,600 AFY. This increase is expected to be available prior to 2025 (SD County 2016b). It is estimated that 50,000 AFY of desalinated water from the plant would be supplied to SDCWA.

**Water Treatment and Distribution**

Poway purchases raw, untreated water from SDCWA. Water is then treated to meet State and federal drinking water requirements at the City’s Berglund Water Treatment Plant (WTP) prior to distribution to the service area. The Berglund WTP has a daily treatment capacity of 24 MGPD and typically produces an average of 10.5 MGPD based on 2014 demands (Poway 2016). The City’s potable water distribution system includes approximately 267 water mains, 18 pressure zones, one 10-million-gallon clearwell, and 18 storage tank reservoirs, which range in capacity from 200,000 gallons to 2.5 million gallons (Poway 2016). Exhibit 4.11-2 (Water Line Map) depicts the existing water distribution system within the Specific Plan planning area.
Federal Safe Drinking Water Act
The Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA), originally passed by Congress in 1974, protects public health by regulating the nation's public drinking water supply. The law was amended in 1986 and 1996 and requires many actions to protect drinking water and its sources, including rivers, lakes, reservoirs, springs, and ground water wells. SDWA authorizes the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to set national health-based standards for drinking water to protect against both naturally occurring and man-made contaminants that may be found in drinking water. The EPA, states, and water purveyors then work together to make sure that these standards are met. A number of threats challenge drinking water quality. Improperly disposed of chemicals, animal wastes, pesticides, human wastes, wastes injected deep underground, and naturally occurring substances can all contaminate drinking water. Likewise, drinking water that is not properly treated or disinfected, or which travels through an improperly maintained distribution system, may also pose a health risk. Originally, SDWA focused primarily on treatment as the means of providing safe drinking water at the tap. The 1996 amendments recognize source water protection, operator training, funding for water system improvements, and public information as important components of safe drinking water.

Federal Clean Water Act (CWA)
The EPA established primary drinking water standards in the Clean Water Act Section 304. States are required to ensure that potable water retailed to the public meets these standards. Standards for a total of 81 individual constituents have been established under the Safe Drinking Water Act as amended in 1986. The EPA may add additional constituents in the future. State primary and secondary drinking water standards are promulgated in California Code of Regulations (Sections 64431-64501). Secondary drinking water standards incorporate non-health risk factors including taste, odor, and appearance.

California Safe Drinking Water Act
Enacted in 1976, the California Safe Drinking Water Act is codified in Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations. Potable water supply is managed through local agencies and water districts, the State Department of Water Resources (DWR), the Department of Health Services, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), EPA, and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. Water right applications are processed through the SWRCB for properties claiming riparian rights or requesting irrigation water from state or federal distribution facilities. The DWR manages the State Water Project (SWP) and compiles planning information on supply and demand within the state.

SB 610 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15155
SB 610 enacted Sections 10910-10915 of the State Water Code, to require a local land use authority to consult with the local water purveyor to prepare or obtain a water supply assessment (WSA) prior to completing an environmental impact assessment for a specified water demand project, defined below. Section 15155 of the State CEQA Guidelines was added to directly incorporate these water code provisions into the CEQA process.

- A proposed residential development of more than 500 dwelling units
- A proposed shopping center or business establishment employing more than 1,000 persons or having more than 500,000 square feet of floor space
- A proposed commercial office building employing more than 1,000 persons or having more than 250,000 square feet of floor space
- A proposed hotel or motel, or both, having more than 500 rooms
- A proposed industrial, manufacturing, or processing plant, or industrial park planned to house more than 1,000 persons, occupying more than 40 acres of land, or having more than 650,000 square feet of floor area
- A mixed-use project that includes one or more of the projects specified in this subdivision
- A project that would demand an amount of water equivalent to, or greater than, the amount of water required by a 500-dwelling unit project
If a public water system has fewer than 5,000 service connections, then a project is defined as any proposed residential, business, commercial, hotel or motel, or industrial development that would account for an increase of 10 percent or more in the number of the public water system’s existing service connections, or a mixed-use project that would demand an amount of water equivalent to, or greater than, the amount of water required by residential development that would represent an increase of 10 percent or more in the number of the public water system’s existing service connections.

The proposed Specific Plan does not require preparation of a WSA because it is a program-level document. Future development meeting these requirements would be required to prepare a WSA.

**Urban Water Management Plans**

Pursuant to Section 10610 et. al. of the California Water Code (Urban Water Management Planning Act), any water district servicing 3,000 or more customers or providing over 3,000 acre-feet of water per year is required to prepare an Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). The analysis contained in a UWMP is designed to ensure the appropriate level of reliability in its service to meet the needs of its customers in normal, dry, and multiple-dry years. Normal and dry years refer to categories of projected water supply in times of regular rainfall and in times of drought. UWMPs must be updated every five years on years ending with zero and five. The Act describes the contents of a UWMP as follows:

- Description of service area including current climate and population and project populations estimates in five-year increments over 20 years
- Description of existing and planned water supply over the same five-year increments including groundwater and surface water resources
- Water supply reliability and methods to compensate for shortages during dry years
- Opportunities for long-term and short-term water exchange or transfer
- Description of water use and demand estimates based on land use for past, current, and projected quantities
- Description of current and planned projects and programs designed to meet the service needs of the customer base
- Description of opportunities for use of desalinated water
- Preparation of a staged water shortage contingency plan for up to a 50 percent shortage over three years
- Information on use and opportunities for use of recycled water

**Poway General Plan**

General Plan EIR Section 5.12 implements the following mitigation measures related to water supply and wastewater services. Development within the City of Poway, including the Specific Plan planning area, is subject to the requirements laid out within these measures (Poway 1991).

**Water**

1. All new construction shall be required to include appropriate water conserving measures including low-flow fixtures, water-conserving appliances, and low volume irrigation systems and to provide water conservation offsets.
2. The City shall encourage the use of low volume irrigation systems where feasible
3. The City shall encourage existing construction to retrofit with appropriate water conserving appliances and low volume irrigation systems.

4. The extension of water service facilities, such as transmission lines or pumps to accommodate new development projects should be limited to one-quarter mile across an undeveloped area.

5. The dedication, construction, and maintenance of pumps, transmission, and storage facilities to service new developments and expand the City’s water system capacity should be reviewed with each new development application.

6. Commercial car washes are required to use recycled water.

7. The City shall encourage and promote water conservation techniques and awareness within the community.

8. The use of drought-tolerant landscaping materials and xeriscape design principals is highly encouraged.

9. The City shall develop and implement a water reclamation master plan and implementation service area distribution system master plan to define, encourage, and develop the use of reclaimed water in Poway.

10. All new construction in areas proposed for service by reclaimed water shall be pre-plumbed to readily accept reclaimed water for landscape irrigation.

11. Reclaimed water shall be used wherever its use is economically justified, technically feasible, and consistent with legal requirements, preservation of public health, safety, and welfare, and environmentally desirable. Reclaimed water uses may include landscape irrigation, filling of artificial lakes, industrial processes and agricultural production.

**Wastewater**

1. Land uses and development review applications that are inconsistent with the capability of any public service agency to provide cost-effective service shall not be approved.

2. The number of dwelling units in the City shall be limited to those which can be adequately served by public services for facilities.

3. Sewage treatment capacity shall be available prior to the approval of any new development application which requires community sewer service.

4. Wastewater treatment system expansions should be designed to maintain the current level of service.

5. Wastewater transmission lines or pumping facilities to accommodate new development projects should not be extended over undeveloped areas.

**Poway Municipal Code**

Chapter 8.94 of the Poway Municipal Code implements the City’s Water Conservation Plan which encourages efficient water use, discourages wasteful water use practices, and establishes water use efficiency measures. The water use efficiency measures that are encouraged at all times as listed in Section 8.94.040 of the Municipal Code are as follows:

1. Do not wash down paved surfaces, including but not limited to sidewalks, driveways, parking lots, tennis courts, or patios, except when necessary to alleviate safety or sanitation hazards.
2. Do not allow water waste from inefficient landscape irrigation, such as runoff, low head drainage, or overspray and do not allow water flows onto nontargeted areas, such as adjacent property, nonirrigated areas, hardscapes, roadways, or structures.

3. Irrigate residential and commercial landscapes before 10:00 a.m. and after 6:00 p.m. only.

4. Use only a hand-held hose equipped with a positive shut-off nozzle or bucket to water landscaped areas, including trees and shrubs located on residential and commercial properties that are not irrigated by a landscape irrigation system.

5. Irrigate nursery and commercial grower’s products before 10:00 a.m. and after 6:00 p.m. only. Watering is permitted at any time using a hand-held hose equipped with a positive shut-off nozzle, a bucket, or when a drip/micro-irrigation system/equipment is used. Irrigation of nursery propagation beds is permitted at any time. Water for livestock is permitted at any time.

6. Use only recirculated water to operate ornamental fountains.

7. Wash vehicles only using a bucket and a hand-held hose with positive shut-off nozzle, mobile high pressure/low volume wash system, or at a commercial site that recirculates (reclaims) water on site. Do not wash vehicles during hot conditions when additional water is required due to evaporation.

8. Offer guests in hotels, motels, and other commercial lodging establishments the option of not laundering towels and linens daily.

9. Do not use single-pass cooling equipment in new commercial applications, including, but not limited to, air conditioners, air compressors, vacuum pumps, and ice machines.

10. Use a water recirculation system for commercial conveyor car washes and all new commercial laundry systems.

11. Run only fully loaded dishwashers and washing machines.

12. Repair all water leaks within five days of notification by the City of Poway, unless other arrangements are made with the City Manager.

13. Use recycled or non-potable water for construction purposes when available to the fullest extent possible when available.

Section 8.94.050 of the Municipal Code implements additional measures upon declaration of Water Shortage Response conditions. These measures are as follows:

During a Level 1 Water Shortage Watch condition, in addition to the measures listed in PMC 8.94.040, the following measures are applicable on a voluntary basis to increase the water use efficiency, unless made mandatory by action of the City Council:

a. Reset irrigation clocks as necessary to water once per week in winter, and not more than three times per week in summer.

b. Add water to maintain the level of water in swimming pools and spas only when necessary (to ensure proper operation of the pool filter). A cover shall be installed on all single-family residential pools and spas.

c. Serve the refill water in restaurants and other food service establishments only upon request.
During a Level 2 Water Shortage Watch Alert, the water use efficiency measures identified in PMC 8.94.040 and at Level 1 Water Shortage Watch are mandatory for all persons using City of Poway water in addition to the following mandatory conservation measures:

a. Landscape watering shall be conducted only in conformance with landscape watering schedules and restrictions for commercial and residential properties approved by the City Manager. The watering schedule and restrictions may address factors such as how many days during the week, which days of the week, the amount of time per watering station, and other pertinent details. Watering of landscaped areas that are not irrigated by a landscape irrigation system shall be subject to the same watering schedule and restrictions, using a bucket, hand-held hose with positive shut-off nozzle, or low-volume non-spray irrigation.

b. All leaks shall be repaired within 72 hours of notification by the City of Poway, unless other arrangements are made with the City Manager.

c. If the mandatory reduction level is less than 15 percent, ornamental fountains or similar decorative water features shall not be operated for more than six hours per day. If the mandatory reduction level is more than 15 percent, ornamental fountains shall not be operated unless reclaimed water is used.

d. If the mandatory reduction level is less than 15 percent, pool covers shall be encouraged but not required. If the mandatory reduction level is more than 15 percent, pool covers shall be required.

All persons using City of Poway water shall comply with Level 1 Water Shortage Watch and Level 2 Water Shortage Alert water conservation practices during a Level 3 Water Shortage Critical condition and shall also comply with the following additional mandatory conservation measures:

a. Landscape watering shall be conducted only in conformance with landscape watering schedules and restrictions for commercial and residential properties approved by the City Manager, which may be further, restricted from the Level 1 requirements. The watering schedule and restrictions may address factors such as how many days during the week, which days of the week, the amount of time per watering station, and other pertinent details. Watering of landscaped areas that are not irrigated by a landscape irrigation system shall be subject to the same watering schedule and restrictions, using a bucket, hand-held hose with positive shut-off nozzle, or low-volume non-spray irrigation.

b. Vehicles shall not be washed except at commercial carwashes that recirculate water, or by high pressure/low volume wash systems.

c. Emptying and refilling of swimming pools and spas is prohibited unless approved by the City Manager.

d. All leaks shall be repaired within 48 hours of notification by the City of Poway unless other arrangements are made with the City Manager.

All persons using City of Poway water shall comply with conservation measures required during Level 1 Water Shortage Watch, Level 2 Water Shortage Alert, and Level 3 Water Shortage Critical conditions during a Level 4 Water Shortage Response Emergency condition and shall also comply with the following additional mandatory conservation measures:

a. Do not irrigate landscape, except crops and landscape products of commercial growers and nurseries. This restriction shall not apply to the following categories of use (unless the City of
4.11 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Poway has determined that recycled water is available and may be lawfully applied to the use to the fullest extent possible:

i. Maintenance of trees and shrubs that are watered on the same schedule set forth at Level 3 by using a bucket, hand-held hose with a positive shut-off nozzle, or low-volume non-spray irrigation;

ii. Maintenance of existing landscaping necessary for fire protection as specified by the Poway Fire Marshal;

iii. Maintenance of existing landscaping for erosion control, as determined by the City Manager;

iv. Maintenance of plant materials identified to be rare or essential to the well-being of rare animals, as determined by the City Manager;

v. Maintenance of landscaping within active playing fields, day care centers, and school grounds; provided, that such irrigation does not exceed two days per week according to the schedule established by the City Manager;

vi. Water for livestock; and

vii. Public works projects and actively irrigated environmental mitigation projects.

b. All leaks must be repaired within 24 hours of notification by the City of Poway unless other arrangements are made with the City Manager.

Thresholds of Significance

Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan may be considered significant if implementation would:

A. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board;

B. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects;

C. Not have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed; or

D. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments.

Environmental Impacts

Impacts 4.11.A, B, & D

Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not result in the exceedance of wastewater treatment requirements of the Water Quality Control Board. The wastewater treatment plant would have adequate capacity to serve projected demand within the project area. The project would not require construction of new water, wastewater treatment, or sanitary sewer facilities. Impact would be less than significant.

Wastewater Treatment

Future development within the Specific Plan planning area guided by the proposed Specific Plan could affect RWQCB treatment standards by increasing wastewater production. Wastewater in Poway is collected via the sewer
system and conveyed to and treated by the City of San Diego PLWTP. As noted above, the PLWTP currently treats approximately 175 million MGPD and has a treatment capacity of 240 MGPD (San Diego 2017).

Future development within the Specific Plan planning area is anticipated to consist of infill development on vacant parcels and focused private redevelopment activity on underutilized properties. Residential and commercial development proposals that would occur over the life of the Specific Plan could not individually result in wastewater treatment violations because these types of projects would not discharge sufficient wastewater volumes or constituents such that the wastewater treatment plant requires modified wastewater discharge requirements WDRs.

According to the City of San Diego, annual increases in sewer rates fund necessary sewer system upgrades, which include improvements to the PLWTP. Wastewater treatment requirements are administered by the RWQCB. Future projects constructed and operated within the Specific Plan planning area would be incrementally responsible for payment of fees and adherence to any special requirements for discharging grey and black waters such that discharge to the WTP can properly produce effluent discharges that are within acceptable quality tolerances for discharge into the Pacific Ocean, as regulated by the California RWQCB, San Diego Region and the EPA.

The City of San Diego Sewer Design Guide provides guidance for calculating sewer flow utilizing an equivalent population rate of 80 gallons per capita per day (gpcd) (San Diego 2015b). To estimate per capita wastewater flow for non-residential uses, Table 1-1 of the Sewer Design Guide provides density conversion factors for commercial/hotel, office, and school/public uses based on assumed equivalent population per net acre of building area. As a conservative analysis, the highest equivalent population for commercial/hotel use has been utilized to calculate maximum wastewater generation. As discussed in Section 4.9 of this EIR, an average of 3.01 persons per household in the City of Poway is estimated by the Department of Finance (DOF 2016). Table 4.11-2 (Wastewater Generation) summarizes calculated existing and proposed wastewater generation within the Specific Plan planning area. It is estimated that build out of the Specific Plan planning area would generate an additional 308,913 gallons of wastewater per day.

The PLWTP currently treats approximately 175 MGPD and has a treatment capacity of 240 MGPD (San Diego 2017). In 2015, the City of Poway generated approximately 824,932 GPD (Poway 2016). Based on anticipated demand for wastewater treatment and remaining treatment capacity at PLWTP, impacts to wastewater treatment associated with implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would be less than significant.
Poway Sewer Facilities
Wastewater collected within the City of Poway is conveyed for water treatment by sewer facilities owned and operated by the City of Poway. Exhibit 4.11-1 (Sewer System) shows the existing sewer system within the Specific Plan planning area. The Specific Plan planning area is served by a sewer system consisting of wastewater mains between four and 30 inches in diameter that were installed between 1958 and the late 2000s. Build out of the proposed Specific Plan would result in increased wastewater generation to be conveyed to PLWTP for treatment. The Specific Plan planning area is currently built out and served by existing sewer facilities. According to the City's Sewer System Management Plan, Poway budgets approximately $500,000 per fiscal year for the rehabilitation and replacement of wastewater system deficiencies (Poway 2013). Additionally, the City manages public infrastructure and facilities under a multi-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP) where funds are deposited for use on construction of public improvements. All future development within the Specific Plan planning area would be subject to the payment of connection fees and would be subject to review on a project-by-project basis by the Public Works Department to determine adequacy of existing facilities. Therefore, impacts to sewer facilities would be less than significant.

Poway Water Facilities
Imported water is treated at the Berglund WTP, which has a daily treatment capacity of 24 MGPD and typically produces an average of 10.5 MGPD based on 2014 demands (Poway 2016). Water is then conveyed to users in the City of Poway via approximately 267 water mains. Exhibit 4.11-2 (Water Line System) depicts the existing water distribution system within the Specific Plan planning area. The Specific Plan planning area is served by water mains between six and 10 inches in diameter that were installed between 1954 and the early 1990s. The Specific Plan planning area is currently built out and served by existing water conveyance facilities. The City's Public Works Department manages public infrastructure and facilities under a multi-year CIP where funds are deposited for use on construction of public improvements. All future development within the Specific Plan planning area would be subject to the payment of connection fees and would be subject to review on a project-by-project basis by the Public Works Department to determine adequacy of existing facilities. However, based on a remaining treatment and conveyance capacity of approximately 13.5 MGPD, sufficient capacity exists within the City’s water treatment and conveyance system to serve the Specific Plan planning area at build out. Therefore, impacts to water distribution facilities would be less than significant.

Impact 4.11.C
Sufficient water supplies are available to serve future development within the project area. No new or expanded entitlements would be needed. Impact would be less than significant.

Over the long term, population and employment growth within the Specific Plan planning area would likely require expanded water supplies to meet increased demand. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan could result in significant impacts if it would demand water supplies beyond current entitlements. Future development within the Specific Plan planning area would likely be limited to restoration and renovation of existing structures and potential for adaptive reuse; however, some new construction could also occur. Water demand from residential and commercial uses would not require increases in trunk width, extension of conveyance lines, or specially treated water to serve the Specific Plan planning area because the Specific Plan planning area is currently built out and served by existing facilities.

The City of Poway provides water to the Specific Plan planning area. The City receives its waters from the SDCWA, which imports water from IDD and MWD, which use water from the State Water Project and the Colorado River. The water supply and demand assessment performed in Poway's 2015 UWMP is based on SDCWA’s conservative analysis including only “verifiable” supplies. According to SDCWA, verifiable supplies are those that have reached a...
level of certainty in their availability. Projected demand would increase over time and is based on anticipated growth in the region.

See Table 4.11-3 (Supply and Demand Comparison) for a comparison of projected supply and demand totals over the normal year, single dry year, and multiple dry year scenarios.

According to the UWMP, SDCWA has the right to purchase additional supplies from MWD in the years where local supplies are insufficient to meet demands. Therefore, it was determined that, based on existing entitlements, there would be sufficient supply to meet demands under the normal year, single dry year, and multiple dry year scenarios, with the exception of the third dry year in the years 2035 and 2040. The City anticipates that conservation efforts and increased use of recycled water would compensate for that supply deficit, which the City has proven an ability to do, demonstrate by the reduced demand by 24 percent between the years of 2012 and 2015 (Poway 2016).

As discussed in the UWMP and detailed above under the Regulatory Framework, the City’s Water Conservation Plan (adopted by the Poway City Council as Municipal Code Chapter 8.94) identifies four stages of water shortage contingency planning. Up to 10 percent reduction in demand is required under Level 1 (Water Shortage Watch), up to 20 percent reduction in demand is required under Level 2 (Water Shortage Alert), up to 40 percent reduction in demand is required under Level 3 (Water Shortage Critical), and greater than 40 percent reduction in demand is required under Level 4 (Water Shortage Emergency). With implementation of water conservation measures as required by the Poway Municipal Code as listed above, water demand under dry years could be reduced to levels resulting in zero supply deficit.

**Table 4.11-3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supply and Demand Comparison</th>
<th>Normal Year</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>14,001</td>
<td>14,951</td>
<td>15,127</td>
<td>15,202</td>
<td>15,678</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>11,342</td>
<td>11,620</td>
<td>11,889</td>
<td>11,909</td>
<td>11,909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Surplus</td>
<td>2,659</td>
<td>3,331</td>
<td>3,238</td>
<td>3,293</td>
<td>3,769</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Dry Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>11,715</td>
<td>11,896</td>
<td>12,070</td>
<td>12,066</td>
<td>12,098</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>11,715</td>
<td>11,896</td>
<td>12,070</td>
<td>12,066</td>
<td>12,098</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Deficit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Dry Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Dry Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>11,667</td>
<td>11,847</td>
<td>12,021</td>
<td>12,043</td>
<td>12,042</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>11,667</td>
<td>11,847</td>
<td>12,021</td>
<td>12,043</td>
<td>12,042</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Deficit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Dry Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>12,195</td>
<td>12,383</td>
<td>12,565</td>
<td>12,581</td>
<td>12,587</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>12,195</td>
<td>12,383</td>
<td>12,565</td>
<td>12,581</td>
<td>12,587</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Deficit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Dry Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>12,743</td>
<td>12,940</td>
<td>13,130</td>
<td>12,651</td>
<td>12,036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>12,743</td>
<td>12,940</td>
<td>13,130</td>
<td>12,147</td>
<td>13,152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Deficit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-496</td>
<td>-1,115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation &amp; Recycled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>1,116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply Deficit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Poway 2016

According to the UWMP, Poway’s water use for the year 2015 was 8,737 AF. The proposed Specific Plan could support a net increase of 1,148 residential units. Based on an average of 3.01 persons per household in the City of
Poway as estimated by the DOF, the proposed project could result in an increase of up to 3,456 residents (DOF 2016). Based on a 2015 per capita water use of 160 gallons per capita per day (GPCD) (per capita water usage as calculated in the 2015 UWMP is based on Poway population), build out of the proposed Specific Plan would result in an increase in water demand of 552,960 GPD (620 AFY). Although the per capita water usage rate of 160 GPCD applies to residential population, which uses the largest volume of water in the City at approximately 69 percent, the rate has been applied to the increase in nonresidential users. As discussed in Section 4.9, build out of the Specific Plan planning area would result in approximately 360 new jobs/employees that would demand 57,600 GPD (0.18 AFY) for a total increase in water demand of 620.18 AFY. As summarized in Table 4.11-3, the City of Poway has sufficient supply capacity to serve future development within the Specific Plan planning area.

The proposed Specific Plan does not contain policies or programs that would conflict with existing policies and standards designed to conserve water. The proposed Specific Plan supports green building and sustainable building practices that would support water conservation efforts. Based on existing water supplies and existing and potential future water conservation efforts, impacts related to the need for new or expanded water supplies would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

**Level of Significance with Mitigation Incorporated**

Not applicable.
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5.0 Alternatives

Purpose

Pursuant to Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines, this chapter discusses a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project that would attain most of the main objectives of the project while avoiding or substantially lessening one or more of the significant environmental effects that would occur as a result of construction and operation of future development within the Specific Plan planning area. An examination of such alternatives is intended to foster informed decision-making and public participation in the examination of the project’s environmental merits and disadvantages.

Rationale for Alternative Selection

An EIR is not required to consider alternative that are infeasible, unreasonable, or overly speculative. The CEQA Guidelines do not set a standard for the number of alternatives that must be addressed. Instead, the CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR describe a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that would foster informed decision-making and public participation. The range of alternatives is determined on a case-by-case basis depending on the unique characteristics of the project location, the project objectives, the environmental setting, and the potentially significant impacts that are associated with the project. Accordingly, the specific criteria established by the CEQA Guidelines, and used in this EIR, for the selection of a reasonable range of alternatives for the project area whether it:

A. Accomplishes most of the project’s main objectives, which are to:

1. Create a distinct and vibrant Town Center with a mix of commercial and residential uses supported by civic uses that would de-emphasize automobile-accessible uses in favor of pedestrian-focused linkages and uses.
2. Provide a balanced mix of uses along the Poway Road Corridor to include residential, office, and retail uses.
3. Implement a Complete Street concept for Poway Road to improve multimodal access including enhanced bicycle lanes and pedestrian crossings.
4. Provide capacity for at least an additional 200,000 square feet of high-quality, non-residential projects that would generate aesthetic improvements and renovations for existing businesses and create opportunities for new businesses on infill sites that are either vacant, underutilized, or publicly owned.
5. Provide capacity for at least 1,000 residential units of high-quality multi-family housing, mixed-use residential, lofts, and townhomes that would meet the regional housing demand for a diverse mix of income levels.

B. Avoids or substantially reduces one or more of the significant environmental effects associated with the project.

Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

4.1.B Implementation of the Specific Plan would not result in any direct violations of any air quality standards. However, future development facilitated by the Specific Plan could result in significant and unavoidable construction and/or operational criteria pollutant emissions.
Future development facilitated by the Specific Plan could result in cumulative construction and operational emissions. Impacts are significant and unavoidable.

Alternatives Selection

Five alternatives were screened to determine which alternatives should be further analyzed in the EIR. The screening process considered how the alternatives relate to the project objectives and the ability of the alternatives to reduce the adverse environmental impacts associated with the project. The alternatives considered are described below.

Alternative 1 - No Project

According to Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, the evaluation of alternatives in an EIR shall include a no project scenario, defined as "... what is reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services." Alternative 1 would provide for development within the Specific Plan planning area consistent with existing regulations (i.e., the current Poway Road Specific Plan). Build out projections of the Specific Plan planning area with implementation of the current Poway Road Specific Plan assumes a maximum residential density of 20 units per acre and realistic redevelopment of underutilized non-residential areas. Build out under the current Poway Road Specific Plan could result in a total of 651 residential units and 2,976,000 nonresidential square feet (an increase of 264 residential units and 524,746 square feet relative to existing conditions).

Alternative 2 - Couplet Plan

This alternative considers a reconfiguration of Poway Road through the Town Center district. This alternative plan divides Poway Road between Carriage Road and Community Road into two separate one-way roadways (in either direction) approximately 400 feet apart. New development would be allowed between the two roadways. To accommodate the realignment of Poway Road in this manner, existing development south of Poway Road as it exists today would need to be demolished.

Alternative 3 - Alternative Location

This alternative assumes that the scale and operational characteristics of the proposed project would remain the same; therefore, an alternative location would need to be able to support 235 acres of contiguous development along a 2.65-mile corridor and potentially could result in greater impacts that the proposed project.

Alternative 4 - Reduced Development Potential

This alternative involves a reduced development alternative that could potentially reduce or avoid significant impacts associated with long-term implementation of the Specific Plan. Air quality impacts were found to be significant and unavoidable. For this alternative, a 50 percent decrease in overall development potential within the Opportunity Areas has been used to avoid this impact.

Alternative 5 - No Residential Development

This alternative involves a development alternative that does not include any new residential units. Elimination of residential development potential could result in fewer new trips and thus traffic-related noise and air pollutant emissions. This alternative does not meet all objectives of the proposed project.

Objectives Screening

The five alternatives were screened for consistency with project objectives and the ability to avoid one or more significant impacts associated with the project. With five project objectives, any alternative meeting three or more of
the objectives is considered to meet most of the objectives. Three of the alternatives were found to meet most of the project objectives. The alternatives that either do not meet most of the project’s alternatives or would not reduce significant impacts were not considered for further evaluation. Table 5-1 (Objectives Screening) summarizes the screening results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Achieve Objectives?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Project</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couplet Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Locations</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Development Potential</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Residential Development</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental Impact Screening**

The alternatives were screened to determine if they could reduce or avoid one or more significant impacts identified above. Table 5-2 (Impact Screening) summarizes the screening results. A detailed discussion of the impact screening is provided herein. Table 5-3 (Summer Criteria Pollutant Emissions) summarizes the net daily criteria pollutant emissions from each alternative (only summer emissions have been included for sake of comparison). Table 5-4 (Daily Trips) summaries daily trip generation from each alternative as modeled utilizing CalEEMod default trip generation.

**Table 5-2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Significant and Unavoidable Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Project</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couplet Plan</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Locations</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Development Potential</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Residential Development</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Alternative Impact:*
- Less than Project Impact
= Similar to Project Impact

**Table 5-3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOX</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Specific Plan</td>
<td>1,840.43</td>
<td>424.59</td>
<td>2,679.43</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>612.82</td>
<td>395.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Project</td>
<td>709.72</td>
<td>540.39</td>
<td>1,489.13</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>476.98</td>
<td>215.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couplet Plan</td>
<td>1,840.43</td>
<td>424.59</td>
<td>2,679.43</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>612.82</td>
<td>395.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Locations</td>
<td>1,840.43</td>
<td>424.59</td>
<td>2,679.43</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>612.82</td>
<td>395.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Development Potential</td>
<td>56.84</td>
<td>-163.02</td>
<td>-537.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>23.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Residential Development</td>
<td>-353.09</td>
<td>348.47</td>
<td>-161.61</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>198.86</td>
<td>12.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Daily Trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Conditions</td>
<td>154,329</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Specific Plan</td>
<td>219,886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 No Project</td>
<td>238,864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Couplet Plan</td>
<td>219,886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Alternative Locations</td>
<td>219,886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Reduced Development Potential</td>
<td>135,869</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 No Residential Development</td>
<td>212,892</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternatives Rejected

**Alternative 2 - Couplet Plan**

The Couplet Plan would meet all project objectives because the same number of dwelling units and commercial space would be provided. Because under Alternative 2, the same land use plan would be applied, resulting in roughly the same net new development potential, Alternative 2 would generate about the same number of vehicle trips as the proposed project. Therefore, significant and unavoidable air quality impacts would not be reduced or avoided. In addition, the Couplet Plan would require that existing buildings and other improvements south of Poway Road, as they exist today, would be removed to provide right-of-way for the southern eastbound alignment of Poway Road proposed by the Couplet Plan. The City determined that the costs involved with business relocation, demolition activities, the capital costs of constructing the couplet, and all associated administrative and legal costs would be extraordinary. Therefore, although this alternative would meet all project objectives, the Couplet Plan would not reduce significant and unavoidable air quality impacts. Also, the City considers this alternative to be financially impractical.

**Alternative 3 - Alternative Locations**

Based on the review of vacant parcels and parcel assemblages within the City, no similar opportunity corridor exists in Poway. Poway Road uniquely includes a mix of uses along a 2.65-mile stretch of arterial roadway, together with a cluster of civic uses. Moreover, the Town Center designation, which serves as the central activity area of the Specific Plan built around the existing location of civic uses on City land, is unique to the Specific Plan planning area and would not be replicated at any other location within the City given the investments already made into the civic core. Therefore, this alternative was rejected due to lack of actual alternative locations. This alternative would not meet most project objectives. Hypothetically, if an alternative location were available, this alternative would result in similar impacts as the proposed project except that those impacts would be transferred to another part of the City.

**Alternative 5 - No Residential Development**

This alternative assumes that no new residential development would be allowed. Because this alternative would not include up to a maximum 1,148 net new residential units within the Specific Plan planning area, replacing existing low-intensity commercial uses, daily trips could be reduced, resulting potentially in reduced impacts related to traffic, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, traffic-related noise, and demands on utilities and service systems. Further, elimination of additional residential units would avoid significant unavoidable impacts related to cumulative operational air quality emissions. This alternative would not meet a majority of the project objectives because it would not provide for new residential development opportunities and the ability to create a true mixed-use corridor. Also,
the City's General Plan Housing Element calls for development of residential units on key sites along the corridor to achieve both local and regional housing goals. Therefore, although this alternative might result in reduced environmental impacts and the avoidance of significant unavoidable cumulative air quality impacts, this alternative would not meet key project objectives and has been rejected.

Alternatives Selected for Analysis

Alternative 1 - No Project
The No Project alternative would not meet the specific project objectives of allowing for the addition of up to 1,148 residential units. Also, this alternative would not result in the implementation of a Complete Street concept for Poway Road intended to improve multi-modal access, including enhanced bicycle lanes and pedestrian crossings. Alternative 1 was selected for evaluation because of the CEQA mandate; however, it would not reduce significant and unavoidable air quality impacts due to the increased non-residential square footage associated with this alternative.

Alternative 4 - Reduced Development Potential
This alternative would meet most of the project objectives, as it would provide the same types of uses and services, but at a reduced scale. It would not meet the objective of providing development capacity for the addition of at least 200,000 square feet of nonresidential development or at least 1,000 residential units because of the reduced size. Reducing the project size by 50 percent could avoid most or all significant and unavoidable impacts resulting from the project. Because Alternative 4 meets most of the project objectives and could reduce or avoid significant and unavoidable air quality impacts, it was selected for further analysis.

Comparison of Impacts
The following compares the general impacts from Alternative 1 and Alternative 4 to project-related impacts to determine which would result in the fewest environmental impacts. Table 5-5 (Alternative Impact Comparison Summary) summarizes the comparison of alternatives to the project’s environmental impacts.
### Table 5-5
Alternative Impact Comparison Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural and Forestry</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology and Soils</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology and Water Quality</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and Planning</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Resources</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population and Housing</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Traffic</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal Cultural Resources</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities and Service Systems</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Impact:**
- N No Impact
- L Less than Significant Impact
- M Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
- S Significant and Unavoidable Impact

**Alternative Impact:**
- - Less than Project Impact
- = Similar to Project Impact
- + Greater than Project Impact

---

**Alternative 1 - No Project Comparison**

**Increased Impacts**

Alternative 1 would result in continued development consistent with the existing Poway Road Specific Plan. Build out of the existing Specific Plan planning area would result in more nonresidential square footage than the proposed project with a similar amount of residential. Therefore, the following impacts would be increased with continued implementation of the existing Poway Road Specific Plan.

- **Aesthetics:** Impacts related to light/glare would increase due to the increased lighting and potential glare-inducing materials (glazed windows).
- **Air Quality:** Although criterial pollutant emissions would be lower than the proposed project, NOX emissions at build out of Alternative 1 would be greater than the project.
- **Greenhouse Gas Emissions:** Greenhouse gas emissions related to commercial uses would be increased.
- **Noise:** Increases in non-residential-related traffic noise would be increased.
- **Transportation and Traffic:** Average daily tips associated with Alternative 1 would be increased when compared to the proposed project due to the increased non-residential square footage.

Impacts associated with light and glare would be increased due to the potential for increased non-residential square footage under this Alternative.
Similar Impacts
According to the Initial Study prepared for the project, no impacts to the following resources would occur because these resources do not exist within the Specific Plan planning area:

- Agricultural
- Forestry
- Mineral

The Specific Plan planning area is not located within the influence area of any airport. Therefore, the following impacts would not occur under the project as proposed or under Alternative 1:

- Airport operations - safety
- Airport noise

Alternative 1 would result in the continued implementation of the existing Poway Road Specific Plan, with potentially equal residential development as the proposed Specific Plan and increased nonresidential development potential. Similar design guidelines and land use regulations would apply within the same Specific Plan planning area. Therefore, the following impacts would be similar under Alternative 1.

- **Aesthetics:** The visual character resulting from implementation of Alternative 1 and the proposed project would be similar due to design standards and architectural treatment requirements.
- **Air Quality:** Neither the project nor Alternative 1 would result in odors as they would not accommodate uses that typically generate noxious odors.
- **Biological Resources:** Impacts to biological resources would be the same because the potential development under Alternative 1 could result in activity that would impact the habitat and species identified in the Specific Plan planning area for the project.
- **Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources:** Impacts to cultural and tribal cultural resources would be the same because both the project and Alternative 1 would require construction activities with the potential to impact potential historic resources and buried cultural and tribal cultural resources.
- **Geology and Soils:** Geotechnical considerations would be similar because both the project and Alternative 1 would result in development within the same Specific Plan planning area.
- **Hazards and Hazardous Materials:** Risk of upset due to the use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials would be comparable to the project. Emergency evacuation and accessibility plans would not change. No increased exposure of people or structures to wildfire potential would occur.
- **Hydrology and Water Quality:** Impacts related to on- and off-site hydrological considerations would be similar because future development under Alternative 1 would be constructed and operated at comparable scale relative to development under the proposed Specific Plan.
- **Land Use and Planning:** Neither the project nor Alternative 1 would divide a community because development would occur within the same Specific Plan planning area.

Reduced Impacts
Virtually all impacts related to the project would be reduced or remain equal to the proposed Specific Plan by not altering the baseline conditions identified in Alternative 1. The No Project alternative would mean that the existing regulatory conditions would continue to be applied, which would allow for redevelopment of properties, but without density and intensity incentives to encourage mixed-use development and a greater variety of residential development. In addition, roadway improvements to improve mobility for pedestrians and bicyclists would not occur. However, the following impacts would be reduced under Alternative 1:

- **Air Quality:** Estimated emissions for criteria pollutants except NOx would be reduced.
Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Greenhouse gas emissions related to residential development would be reduced.

Noise: Increases in residential-related traffic noise would be decreased.

Population and Housing: Population generation would be decreased.

Public Services: Population increases under Alternative 1 would be reduced and thus demand on public services would be reduced.

Recreation: Population increases under Alternative 1 would be reduced and thus demand on recreation facilities would be reduced.

Utilities and Service Systems: Due to reduced population, the demand for water, sewer, storm drain, and solid waste infrastructure would be reduced.

Alternative 4, Reduced Development Potential

Similar Impacts

According to the Initial Study prepared for the project, no impacts to the following resources would occur because these resources do not exist within the Specific Plan planning area:

- Agricultural
- Forestry
- Mineral

The Specific Plan planning area is not located within the influence area of any airport. Therefore, the following impacts would not occur under the project as proposed or under Alternative 4:

- Airport operations - safety
- Airport noise

Alternative 4 would result in the implementation of a Specific Plan with reduced development potential. Similar design guidelines and land use regulations would apply within the same Specific Plan planning area. Therefore, the following impacts would be similar under Alternative 4:

- Aesthetics: The visual character resulting from implementation of Alternative 4 and the proposed project would be similar due to comparable design standards and architectural treatment.
- Air Quality: Neither the project nor Alternative 4 would result in odors as they would not accommodate uses that typically generate noxious odors.
- Biological Resources: Impacts to biological resources would be the same because the potential development under Alternative 4 could result in activity that would impact the habitat and species identified in the Specific Plan planning area for the project.
- Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources: Impacts to cultural and tribal cultural resources would be the same because both the project and Alternative 4 would require construction activities with the potential to impact potential historic resources and buried cultural and tribal cultural resources.
- Geology and Soils: Geotechnical considerations would be similar because both the project and Alternative 4 would result in development within the same Specific Plan planning area.
- Land Use and Planning: Neither the project nor Alternative 4 would divide a community because development would occur within the same Specific Plan planning area and impacts related to General Plan consistency would be the same because the same entitlements and amendments would be required to implement the project and Alternative 4.
Reduced Impacts
Alternative 4 would result in the implementation of a Specific Plan with reduced development potential. Reduced development potential could result in fewer vehicle trips and development at a reduced scale. Therefore, the following impacts would be reduced under Alternative 4:

- **Aesthetics**: Impacts related to scenic vistas, scenic resources, and light/glare would decrease concurrently with the reduction in intensity and density because this alternative would be constructed at a reduced massing, density, and intensity when compared to the proposed project.
- **Air Quality**: As discussed previously, a 50 percent reduction in development potential would avoid significant and unavoidable operational air quality impacts. Construction-related criteria pollutant emissions (at the regional level) would be reduced due to reduced construction activities.
- **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**: The potential for the use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials and wastes and associated risk of upset would be reduced because future development under Alternative 4 would occur at a reduced scale relative to development facilitated by the proposed Specific Plan.
- **Hydrology and Water Quality**: Impacts related to on- and off-site hydrological considerations would be reduced because future development under Alternative 4 would be constructed and operated at a reduced scale relative to development under the proposed Specific Plan.
- **Population and Housing**: Alternative 4 would reduce impacts related to population and employment because it would reduce the number of potential new dwelling units and nonresidential square footage relative to the proposed project.
- **Public Services**: Compared to the proposed project, Alternative 4 would result in fewer new residents and reduced demand on public services and recreation and park services.
- **Noise**: Construction-related noise impacts would be reduced due to reduced construction activity.
- **Recreation**: The reduction in development potential would result in fewer new residents using recreational facilities.
- **Transportation and Traffic**: Traffic impacts and traffic-related and periodic operational noise would be lower based on the reduction in development potential.
- **Utilities and Service Systems**: Alternative 4 would reduce demand on utilities and service systems due to the reduced potential for population growth and new commercial space.

Environmentally Superior Alternative
Alternative 1 would result in a number of increased impacts due to the increased nonresidential development potential. Alternative 4 is considered to be the environmentally superior alternative because it would result in the fewest environmental impacts when compared to the project.
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6.0 Analysis of Long-Term Effects

CEQA requires examination of the cumulative, growth-inducing, energy consumption, and long-term impacts of proposed projects. This chapter addresses these issues as related to Specific Plan implementation.

Cumulative Impacts

The CEQA Guidelines (Section 15355) define a cumulative impact as “two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts.” An environmental impact report must discuss the cumulative impacts of a project when the project’s incremental impacts are cumulatively considerable (CEQA Guidelines Section 15130[a]). An impact is considered cumulatively considerable when “the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects” (Section 15065[a][3]). “The discussion of cumulative impacts shall reflect the severity of the impacts and the likelihood of occurrence, but the discussion need not provide as great detail as is provided for the effect attributable to the proposed project alone” (Section 15130[b]). According to Section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines, an environmental impact report must describe and analyze cumulative impacts only if the impact is significant and the project’s incremental effect is cumulatively considerable.

Section 15130(b) (1) of the CEQA Guidelines identifies two methods to determine the scope of related projects for cumulative impact analysis:

1. **List-of-Projects Method**: A list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency.

2. **Summary-of-Projections Method**: A summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document or in a prior environmental document that has been adopted or certified, which described or evaluated regional or area-wide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact. Any such planning document shall be referenced and made available to the public at a location specified by the lead agency.

Because of the long-term scope of the proposed Specific Plan, the appropriate method for cumulative impact analysis is the Summary-of-Projections method. This method is appropriate because the projections would serve as a guide to determine if the Specific Plan is consistent with the long-term population, employment, and household projections of the region. If the proposed Specific Plan is generally consistent with regional projections, then it would also generally be consistent with regional efforts to address environmental problems such as air quality and traffic. Furthermore, predicting a list of probable future projects over the 18-year implementation period (through 2035) of the proposed Specific Plan is not realistic or feasible.

In support of the San Diego Forward Regional Plan, the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) developed a series of projections utilizing a comprehensive analysis of fertility, mortality, migration, demographic trends, and local policies (such as land use plans). The Regional Growth Forecast provides population, housing, and employment forecasts for local jurisdictions within San Diego County and are summarized in Table 6-1 (SANDAG Regional Growth Forecast).
Table 6-1
SANDAG Regional Growth Forecast - Poway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 6-1</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2050</th>
<th>Change (2012 to 2050)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (persons)</td>
<td>48,382</td>
<td>50,026</td>
<td>53,062</td>
<td>53,149</td>
<td>4,767 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment (job positions)</td>
<td>30,851</td>
<td>34,010</td>
<td>35,708</td>
<td>37,173</td>
<td>6,322 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing (dwelling units)</td>
<td>16,545</td>
<td>16,855</td>
<td>17,685</td>
<td>17,839</td>
<td>1,294 (8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SANDAG, 2015

Air Quality
The Specific Plan planning area lies within the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB). Therefore, analyzing cumulative air quality impacts for federal and State criteria pollutant standards are assessed within this area designation. The immediate vicinity of the Specific Plan planning area is the context for localized trends of criteria pollutants and toxic emissions. As discussed in Section 4.1, Build out of the Specific Plan could result in significant cumulative long-term emissions impacts. However, proposed mixed-use/higher-density development policies would implement an important regional strategy to encourage more compact urban/infill development, which helps reduce total vehicle trips and average trip distances. This development type would help reduce vehicle emissions. The City would continue to evaluate short-term, construction-related impacts and long-term impacts for discretionary land use projects so that best available control measures can be applied, where warranted, to minimize the effects of individual development projects. Long-term emissions generated by development facilitated by the Specific Plan could interfere with attainment of San Diego County Air Pollution Control District standards. Therefore, long-term cumulative air quality impacts on the region due to implementation of the Specific Plan would remain potentially significant and unavoidable and would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to those impacts despite the adoption of mitigation measures.

Biological Resources
The context for assessing cumulative biological resource impacts is consistent with the Poway Subarea Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP) evaluation criteria. As discussed in Section 4.2, the Specific Plan planning area does not contain important wildlife linkages or critical habitat for regional species and is therefore not located within the Poway Mitigation Area. The proposed Specific Plan is covered by the Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP as a public project under “Projects Outside the Mitigation Area” and would not conflict with implementation of the HCP/NCCP. Although the project would not conflict with the implementation of the Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP, future redevelopment within the project area may impact nesting birds, roosting bats, and riparian habitat. Therefore, Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-5 have been incorporated to ensure impacts are minimized. The project would not result in adverse cumulative impacts to biological resources with mitigation incorporation.

Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources

Historic Resources
The spatial context for assessing cumulative impacts to historic resources is the presence of any native, subsurface soil in the state based on the definition of significant resources defined in Section 15064.5(a)(3)(A) of the State CEQA Guidelines where such resources could have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage.

The proposed Specific Plan planning area is built out, with 26 buildings or structures identified as 45 years or older as of 2017. No site within the Specific Plan planning area is listed as a California Historical Landmark, California Historical Resource, or the National Register of Historic Place. Should one of these building be reclassified with a
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historical designation in the future, Mitigation Measures CULT-1, CULT-2, and CULT-3 have specifically been identified to ensure that proper steps are taken should a potential historic structure be proposed for demolition or substantial alteration. All future projects within the Specific Plan planning area would be subject to mitigation. These mitigation measures would ensure that historic resources and the knowledge and significance they hold are not lost to future development. Cumulative impacts related to the loss of historic resources would be less than significant.

Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources
The context for assessing local cumulative impacts includes the traditional homeland of the tribes listed as having potential cultural affiliations to the Specific Plan planning area by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and tribes requesting project notification as part of the AB 52 consultation process. A significant cumulative impact would occur if construction projects collectively destroyed archaeological and tribal cultural resources that provide prehistoric and historic cultural information to the extent that such information would be permanently lost pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

The Specific Plan planning area is built out and has been previously disturbed and heavily affected by past uses, specifically construction of structures and associated improvements. Mitigation Measures CULT-4, CULT-5, CULT-6, and CULT-7 have been incorporated to ensure that proper steps are taken should potential archaeological and/or tribal materials be uncovered. All future projects would be subject to General Plan policies and mitigation related to archaeological resources. This would ensure that archaeological resources are not lost to long-term development. Cumulative impacts related to the loss of archaeological and tribal cultural resources would be less than significant with implementation of existing regulations and mitigation.

Paleontological Resources
The context for assessing cumulative impacts to buried paleontological resources is the presence of any native, subsurface soil in which paleontological resources have the potential to occur. A significant impact would occur if construction projects collectively destroyed paleontological resources that provide prehistoric information to the extent that such information would be permanently lost. Most likely surficial and near-surface paleontological resources in the Specific Plan planning area would have been destroyed or recovered as a result of past development and redevelopment. Mitigation Measures CULT-8, CULT-9, CULT-10, and CULT-11 have been incorporated to reduce impacts to any resources uncovered during future development activity; therefore, cumulative impacts related to the loss of paleontological resources would be less than significant.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions
Climate change is inherently a cumulative impact due to its global effects. Development facilitated by the proposed Specific Plan would include activities that emit greenhouse gases over the short and long term. While one project would not cause global climate change, individual projects would contribute cumulatively to greenhouse gas emissions that result in climate change. The evaluation of the proposed Specific Plan contained in Section 4.4 determined that build-out of the Specific Plan would be consistent with Scoping Plan efficiency standards with implementation of existing regulations and Mitigation Measure GHG-1. In addition, implementation of the Specific Plan would not conflict with statewide, long-term planning goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, the Specific Plan would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts related to climate change.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials
Hazardous Materials Sites
The context for evaluating site contamination is generally limited to individual sites. There is potential for contamination to spread through soil and groundwater pathways to surrounding properties; however, such conditions would be a result of past activities, not as a result of adoption of the Specific Plan. Considering that existing cases of
leaking underground storage tanks are currently either eligible for closure or are taking steps toward closure, adoption of the Specific Plan could not contribute considerably to on- or off-site cumulative public or environmental exposure to hazardous materials. No cumulatively considerable impacts would occur.

Wildfire
The context for assessing cumulative wildfire hazards exists wherever the urban environment interfaces with wildlands. Cumulative wildfire impacts could occur as development in fire hazard areas increases, not only because the number of people and structures exposed to wildfires is increasing, but also because increased density supports the spreading of wildfires. The Specific Plan planning area is located in an urbanized area with approximately seven acres of the westernmost portion of the Specific Plan planning area located within an area susceptible to wildland fires. This area is currently developed with commercial uses that are built to standards of previous iterations of the California Building Code (CBC). The Specific Plan land use plan envisions continued commercial use of this area. All development within this area would be subject to the standards of the current codes at the time of project development. The 2016 CBC, adopted by the City of Poway, requires that all materials used be fire-retardant and ignition-resistant and that structures are safeguarded against the intrusion of flames. Future development within this area would be subject to updated standards of the CBC and would have access to any upgraded fire-retardant and ignition-resistant materials available at the time of development. Therefore, implementation of the Specific Plan would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts related to wildfires.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Drainage and Water Quality
Future development within the Specific Plan planning area and the region would include a variety of land use forms, street improvements, and impervious surfaces that could increase the volume of urban runoff that would need to be captured and discharged into the City’s municipal storm drain system, the County’s regional flood control facilities, and ultimately the Pacific Ocean.

Future development within the Specific Plan planning area would be subject to the provisions of the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), Poway’s Jurisdictional Runoff Management Program (JRMP), and the Los Peñasquitos Watershed Management Area Water Quality Improvement Plan (WQIP).

Discharges into stormwater drains or channels from construction sites of one acre or larger are regulated by the General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity issued by the State Water Quality Control Board. Compliance with the General Permit involves developing and implementing a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) specifying best management practices (BMPs) that a project would use to minimize pollution of stormwater. Poway’s JRMP implements a variety of BMP requirements, water quality monitoring, educational outreach efforts, municipal maintenance procedures, inspection and enforcement programs, and water quality monitoring procedures and requires the preparation of an Erosion Control Plan during construction and incorporation of post-construction BMPs. The Los Peñasquitos WQIP includes ongoing strategies and strategies to be implemented by 2016, 2020, 2022, and 2035 for the protection, preservation, enhancement, and restoration of water quality of receiving water bodies.

The Specific Plan planning area is currently built out and contains impervious surfaces. With regard to stormwater runoff, NPDES, JRMP, and WQIP requirements and the current focus on Low Impact Development (LID) standards would not permit any increase in stormwater runoff from any development within the Specific Plan planning area. Any calculated increase in stormwater runoff, as identified in a future project’s WQMP, would be required to be absorbed and/or retained on site.

Future development within the Specific Plan planning area, City, and surrounding area would be subject to applicable standards and regulations as required by the NPDES, JRMP, and the WQIP and LID standards. Implementation of
Groundwater Supplies
The context for assessing impacts to groundwater resources is the physical and service expanse of the groundwater basin and the extent to which the project would deplete supplies or hinder the recharge of groundwater. The Specific Plan planning area is built out and is not utilized for groundwater recharge. Therefore, the impact of future development within the Specific Plan planning area on groundwater recharge would not be cumulatively considerable.

Approximately 99 percent of Poway’s municipal water supply relies on imported water from the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA), which is supplied by transfer water from the Imperial Irrigation District (IID) and imported water from the Metropolitan Water District (MWD). Water imported from the IID and WMD consist of supply from the Colorado River. Therefore, the City does not rely on groundwater resources and Specific Plan implementation would not result in the depletion of groundwater resources due to increased demand. Impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

Flooding
The context for assessing flooding impacts is in those areas subject to 100-year floods in and around the Specific Plan planning area. This is particularly relevant if structures are constructed in the floodplain and 100-year flood waters are changed or redirected to areas where flooding previously did not exist. Portions of the Specific Plan planning area along creeks and streams running through the Town Center area and along portions of the southern Specific Plan planning area boundary are subject to 100-year flooding. These areas are currently developed with commercial and residential uses built to the standards of previous iterations of the CBC. Future development in these areas would be built pursuant to current CBC standards utilizing flood resistant materials as required by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the City of Poway. In addition, LID standards prohibit any increase in stormwater runoff from any development, and the Poway Municipal Code requires that development within an A Flood Zone be elevated at least one foot above the base flood elevation. Therefore, future reuse and redevelopment within the Specific Plan planning area would not redirect flood waters or result in increased flooding impacts.

Land Use and Planning
The context for assessing cumulative biological resource impacts is consistency with the Poway Subarea Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP) evaluation criteria. As discussed in Section 4.2, the Specific Plan planning area is not considered to contain important wildlife linkages or critical habitat for regional species and is therefore not located within the Poway Mitigation Area. The proposed Specific Plan is covered by the Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP as a public project under “Projects Outside the Mitigation Area” and would not conflict with implementation of the HCP/NCCP. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts related to consistency with the Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP.

Noise
Construction Noise and Vibration
The context for assessing cumulative short-term construction-related noise and vibration impacts is the combination of nearby construction activities occurring concurrently with development of a specific project site. Cumulative impacts would occur where the cumulative effects of project construction and construction in the project vicinity cause the level of noise and vibration thresholds to be exceeded, thereby potentially impacting the health and quality of life of persons in the project vicinity. As discussed in Section 4.8, construction noise and vibration would be analyzed and addressed on a project-by-project basis and mitigation would be applied as necessary. Implementation
of the proposed Specific Plan would not approve any specific development and would therefore not result in cumulatively considerable construction noise and vibration impacts.

Stationary Noise
Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not generate new stationary noise sources outside of the Specific Plan planning area and would not, therefore, result in cumulatively considerable noise impacts involving stationary noise sources.

Traffic Noise
Additional traffic volumes associated with future development within the Specific Plan planning area would combine with regional traffic on major, inter-jurisdictional roads and highways leading to Poway, which would contribute to cumulative effects involving roadway noise. The level of traffic noise attributable to the Specific Plan trips that would occur outside the Specific Plan planning area would increase incrementally over time as development occurs (the Specific Plan horizon year is 2035) and would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative changes in roadway noise levels in the context of regional traffic growth.

Population and Housing
Rates of growth would occur in response to a variety of regional and national socioeconomic factors, including birth rates, migration from other states and other counties, land values, employment opportunities, interest rates, housing supply, demand and pricing, and broad regional and national economic conditions. Growth forecasts have been developed by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG). By itself, the proposed Specific Plan would not induce substantial growth elsewhere within the region. The Specific Plan would accommodate up to 1,148 new dwelling units and up to 260,000 square feet of new commercial space. The additional residential units planned for by the proposed Specific Plan would accommodate employees of additional jobs created within the Specific Plan planning area. Although increases in population and housing could be greater than anticipated by SANDAG, the City of Poway would be providing sufficient housing to accommodate increases in population and employment, all within its borders. Therefore, with consideration of other long-range plans and regional projections, the proposed Specific Plan would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on population, housing, and employment.

Transportation and Traffic
Cumulative circulation and Congestion Management Program impacts through the year 2035 (the Specific Plan horizon year) are analyzed in Section 4.10 and identified as less than significant. San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan incorporates performance monitoring and measurement of the regional transportation system, multimodal alternatives and non-single occupancy vehicle analysis, the provision of congestion management tools, and integration with the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) process to meet the federal congestion management process. Section 4.10 includes analysis of pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and vehicular Level of Service (LOS) within the Specific Plan planning area. The Specific Plan planning area circulation network is anticipated to operate at acceptable LOS for all modes of transportation under year 2035 conditions. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts.

Utilities and Service Systems
The context for assessing cumulative impacts on utilities and service systems varies depending on the service area and capacity of the utility, which may vary from the Specific Plan planning area, San Diego County, or (in terms of water) even statewide. Long-term maintenance and potential expansion of water, wastewater, and sewer facilities would be required as the region continues to grow and existing infrastructure ages. All utility providers currently impose development impact fees, connection fees, and service fees designed to maintain and incrementally expand
infrastructure to meet existing and growing demand. Future development in the Specific Plan vicinity and throughout the region would be subject to such fees in accordance with applicable ordinances and service master plans.

With regard to water supply, the Urban Water Management Plans (UWMP) for the City of Poway, San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA), Metropolitan Water District (MWD), and the Imperial Integrated Regional Water Management Plan for the Imperial Irrigation District indicate that there would be sufficient supply available to serve the City of Poway during a normal year, single dry year, and two- dry year scenario. Potential deficits during a third dry year by the year 2035 and 2040 due to future growth could be accommodated by water savings resulting from implementation of Poway’s Water Conservation Plan (adopted by the Poway City Council as Municipal Code Chapter 8.94). Therefore, the proposed Specific Plan has been determined to result in less than significant impacts related to water supply and would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on water supply.

Growth-Inducing Impacts

Pursuant to Section 15126.2(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the contents of an EIR must address the growth-inducing impacts of a project, as follows:

Growth-inducing impacts of the proposed project. Discuss the ways in which the project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included in this are projects which would remove obstacles to population growth (a major expansion of a waste water treatment plant might, for example, allow more construction in services areas). Increase in the population may tax existing community service facilities, requiring construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. Also, discuss the characteristics of some projects which may encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively. It must not be assumed that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

Growth-inducing effects include ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. A common example is a major infrastructure project or road extension that provides urban service capabilities to currently undeveloped areas, thus removing an obstacle to population growth.

The proposed project includes housing and commercial components that would accommodate future residential and employment growth, as identified in Section 4.9 of this EIR. The proposed project does not include the upgrading or extension of any utility, roadway, or other service to any areas where such does not currently exist.

The SANDAG Regional Growth Forecast projects an estimated population of 53,062 and a housing supply of 17,685 units by the year 2035. Based on current and projected numbers, the anticipated residents and housing units that could be accommodated by build-out of the Specific Plan would be greater than projected by SANDAG. The additional residential units planned for by the proposed Specific Plan would accommodate employees of additional jobs created within the Specific Plan planning area.

Although build-out of the Specific Plan would provide for more housing and population capacity than projected by SANDAG for Poway, the central portion of the Specific Plan planning area has been designated as a Smart Growth area by SANDAG (SANDAG 2015). Smart Growth areas are locations where SANDAG has identified existing, planned, and potential higher-density mixed-use development, resulting in more housing and jobs near existing and planned public transit. The Specific Plan planning area has been identified as a Smart Growth place type of Town Center, which would consist of minimum target densities of 20 dwelling units per acre and 30 employees per acre (SANDAG 2014). Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan densities are consistent with the Smart Growth strategies to provide mixed-use and higher-density development in urbanized areas that are served by existing public
transportation. Consistent with SANDAG’s Smart Growth vision for the county, the Specific Plan provides for increased growth potential within Poway’s central core. Further, the Specific Plan planning area is currently served by existing service and utility systems and a regional transportation network that has sufficient capacity to accommodate growth associated with the proposed Specific Plan. Specific Plan implementation would not include the extension of any service, utility, or transportation system to areas not currently being served and would therefore not induce indirect growth. Upon implementation of the proposed Specific Plan, General Plan land use designations for the Specific Plan planning area would reflect Specific Plan land uses and densities and would be considered in future growth projection efforts. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not result in significant growth-inducing impacts.

Energy Conservation

This energy conservation analysis has been prepared pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 21100(b) (3) and Appendix F of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. The purpose of this analysis is to assess the short- and long-term energy demand of the proposed Specific Plan, identify proposed and required conservation measures, and assess the extent to which the Specific Plan would conserve energy. Project energy demand would not be wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary if it does not increase energy demand over typical construction and operating requirements.

Appendix F of the State CEQA Guidelines states that the goal of assessing energy conservation in a project is to ensure the wise and efficient use of energy. Energy efficiency is achieved by decreasing energy consumption, decreasing reliance on fossil fuels, and increasing reliance on renewable energy sources. The guidelines for analysis of energy conservation provided in Appendix F of the State CEQA Guidelines are provided herein.

CEQA Appendix F: Energy Conservation

I. Introduction

The goal of conserving energy implies the wise and efficient use of energy. The means of achieving this goal include:

(1) decreasing overall per capita energy consumption,
(2) decreasing reliance on fossil fuels such as coal, natural gas and oil, and
(3) increasing reliance on renewable energy sources.

In order to assure that energy implications are considered in project decisions, the California Environmental Quality Act requires that EIRs include a discussion of the potential energy impacts of proposed projects, with particular emphasis on avoiding or reducing inefficient, wasteful and unnecessary consumption of energy (see Public Resources Code section 21100(b)(3)). Energy conservation implies that a project’s cost effectiveness be reviewed not only in dollars, but also in terms of energy requirements. For many projects, cost effectiveness may be determined more by energy efficiency than by initial dollar costs. A lead agency may consider the extent to which an energy source serving the project has already undergone environmental review that adequately analyzed and mitigated the effects of energy production.

II. EIR Contents

Potentially significant energy implications of a project shall be considered in an EIR to the extent relevant and applicable to the project. The following list of energy impact possibilities and potential conservation measures is designed to assist in the preparation of an EIR. In many instances, specific items may not apply
or additional items may be needed. Where items listed below are applicable or relevant to the project, they should be considered in the EIR.

A. Project Description may include the following items:

1. Energy consuming equipment and processes which will be used during construction, operation and/or removal of the project. If appropriate, this discussion should consider the energy intensiveness of materials and equipment required for the project.

2. Total energy requirements of the project by fuel type and end use.

3. Energy conservation equipment and design features.

4. Identification of energy supplies that would serve the project.

5. Total estimated daily vehicle trips to be generated by the project and the additional energy consumed per trip by mode.

B. Environmental Setting may include existing energy supplies and energy use patterns in the region and locality.

C. Environmental Impacts may include:

1. The project’s energy requirements and its energy use efficiencies by amount and fuel type for each stage of the project including construction, operation, maintenance and/or removal. If appropriate, the energy intensiveness of materials may be discussed.

2. The effects of the project on local and regional energy supplies and on requirements for additional capacity.

3. The effects of the project on peak and base period demands for electricity and other forms of energy.

4. The degree to which the project complies with existing energy standards.

5. The effects of the project on energy resources.

6. The project’s projected transportation energy use requirements and its overall use of efficient transportation alternatives.

D. Mitigation Measures may include:

1. Potential measures to reduce wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary consumption of energy during construction, operation, maintenance and/or removal. The discussion should explain why certain measures were incorporated in the project and why other measures were dismissed.

2. The potential of siting, orientation, and design to minimize energy consumption, including transportation energy, increase water conservation and reduce solid waste.

3. The potential for reducing peak energy demand.

4. Alternate fuels (particularly renewable ones) or energy systems.

5. Energy conservation which could result from recycling efforts.

E. Alternatives should be compared in terms of overall energy consumption and in terms of reducing wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary consumption of energy.
F. Unavoidable Adverse Effects may include wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary consumption of energy during the project construction, operation, maintenance and/or removal that cannot be feasibly mitigated.

G. Irreversible Commitment of Resources may include a discussion of how the project preempts future energy development or future energy conservation.

H. Short-Term Gains versus Long-Term Impacts can be compared by calculating the project’s energy costs over the project’s lifetime.

I. Growth Inducing Effects may include the estimated energy consumption of growth induced by the project.

Energy Demand
Short-term energy demand would result from development construction facilitated by the proposed Specific Plan. This would include energy demand from worker and vendor vehicle trips and construction equipment usage. Long-term energy demand would result from operation of various development types (land uses) facilitated by the Specific Plan. This would typically include energy demand from vehicle trips, electricity and natural gas usage, and water and wastewater conveyance. This section describes the energy needs of these activities.

Construction Activities
Future development facilitated by the Specific Plan would result in short-term energy demand during demolition, site preparation, grading, building construction, paving, and painting activities associated with new development. Energy demand results from equipment use and worker, vendor, and hauling trips.

Operational Activities
Future development facilitated by the Specific Plan would result in long-term energy demand from mobile sources, electricity and natural gas use, and water and wastewater conveyance.

Mobile Sources
Mobile source energy demand primarily is associated with individual vehicle energy demand, primarily gasoline and diesel fuel, as well as electricity for electric vehicles. Mobile source energy demand is also associated with public transportation, such as buses and trains running on natural gas, diesel fuel, or electricity. Of all operational energy demands, the proposed Specific Plan seeks to reduce the energy demand of mobile sources through improved land use and multi-modal circulation network planning to reduce reliance on individual vehicles and promote use of public transportation, as well as non-motorized transportation such as walking and biking. By seeking to reduce the amount of individual vehicle usage, the proposed Specific Plan would achieve reductions in mobile source operational energy demand.

Employees, vendors, customers, and residents of the additional commercial and residential uses would result in the generation of vehicle trips to and from the Specific Plan planning area. Vehicle trips from the Specific Plan planning area were estimated utilizing CalEEMod. Fuel consumption by operation-related vehicles would depend on the number of trips and the length of the trip. Operational trip type, trip length, and fleet mix were generated in CalEEMod from data provided by CARB and SCAQMD.

Gasoline fuel economy is estimated at 38.7 miles per gallon (mpg) in 2017 based on estimates prepared by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and is projected to improve each year (CARB 2008b). Although no specific development is proposed at this time, fuel economy for the year 2017 has been utilized to provide a worst-case analysis. Should future development activity occur in years following 2017, fuel efficiency would be improved. Fuel efficiency for diesel-fuel vehicles is estimated using data provided by the National Highway Traffic Safety
Administration (NHTSA) for the adopted national medium- and heavy-duty vehicle fuel consumption standard (EPA and NHTSA 2011).

Annual operational fuel demand was calculated as follows:

\[
\text{Fuel}_{TT} = \frac{\text{TVM}}{\text{Economy}}
\]

Where:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Fuel} & = \text{Total Annual Fuel Demand (gallons)} \\
\text{TVM} & = \text{Total Annual Vehicle Miles} \\
\text{Economy} & = \text{Fuel Economy of Vehicle Fleet (miles/gallon)}
\end{align*}
\]

Calculations for total annual mobile source fuel consumption under existing conditions and at Specific Plan build out are provided in Table 6-2 (Net Mobile Source Demand – Gasoline) and Table 6-3 (Net Mobile Source Demand - Diesel). Mobile sources at full build-out of the Specific Plan would require approximately 2,315,816 additional gallons of gasoline per year and 1,030,380 additional gallons of diesel per year.

### Table 6-2
**Net Mobile Source Demand - Gasoline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trip Type</th>
<th>Annual Vehicle Miles (Miles/Year)</th>
<th>Fuel Economy (Miles/Gallon)</th>
<th>Total Demand (Gallons/Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXISTING CONDITIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Commercial-Customer</td>
<td>147,176,055</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>3,802,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Commercial-Work</td>
<td>45,340,337</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>1,171,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Home-Shop</td>
<td>673,680</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>17,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Home-Work</td>
<td>1,490,697</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>38,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5,030,511</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPECIFIC PLAN BUILD-OUT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Commercial-Customer</td>
<td>203,373,732</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>5,255,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Commercial-Work</td>
<td>68,865,516</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>1,779,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Home-Shop</td>
<td>3,754,895</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>97,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Home-Work</td>
<td>8,308,704</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>214,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Build-out Operational Gasoline Demand (gal)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>7,346,327</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Operational Gasoline Demand (gal)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>+2,315,816</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6-3
**Net Mobile Source Demand - Diesel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trip Type</th>
<th>Annual Vehicle Miles (Miles/Year)</th>
<th>Fuel Economy (Miles/Gallon)</th>
<th>Total Demand (Gallons/Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXISTING CONDITIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial-Non Work</td>
<td>44,115,652</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>1,996,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Home-Other</td>
<td>1,419,029</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>64,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Existing Operational Diesel Demand (gal)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,060,393</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIESEL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6-4
Net Mobile Source Demand - Diesel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trip Type</th>
<th>Annual Vehicle Miles (Miles/Year)</th>
<th>Fuel Economy (Miles/Gallon)</th>
<th>Total Demand (Gallons/Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial-Non Work</td>
<td>60,396,846</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>2,732,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Home-Other</td>
<td>7,909,247</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>357,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Build-out Diesel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build-out Operational Diesel Demand (gal)</td>
<td>3,090,773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Operational Diesel Demand (gal)</td>
<td>+1,030,380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Electricity and Natural Gas Use

Electricity and natural gas would be required to provide energy to future residential and commercial uses for indoor and outdoor lighting, office equipment, building cooling and heating, kitchen operations, and water heating. All new development and redevelopment would be subject to current California Building Code (CBC) requirements for building energy efficiency as adopted by the Poway Municipal Code (Chapter 15.22 [Green Building Code]). Energy demand was estimated using CalEEMod default calculations without consideration of CBC efficiency requirements. Annual existing and Specific Plan build-out energy demand is summarized in Table 6-4 (Direct Energy Demand). Build-out of the Specific Plan would result in net increases in demand of 12,005,420 kilowatt hours per year (kWh/yr) of electricity and 17,893,473 thousand British Thermal Units per year (kBTU/yr) of natural gas without consideration of CBC efficiencies.

Table 6-5
Direct Energy Demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Electricity Demand kWh/yr</th>
<th>Natural Gas Demand kBTU/yr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Conditions</td>
<td>29,838,554</td>
<td>14,643,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan Build-out</td>
<td>41,843,974</td>
<td>32,537,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Operational Demand</td>
<td>+12,005,420</td>
<td>+17,893,473</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Water and Wastewater

Electricity would indirectly be required to treat and convey water to, and convey wastewater away from, development facilitated by the proposed Specific Plan. Pursuant to the Water Conservation in Landscaping Act and the City’s landscape efficiency standards (Poway Municipal Code Chapter 17.41 [Landscape Efficiency Standards]) and CALGreen building code requirements, outdoor water use and conservation would continue to be regulated for new development. Water demand was estimated using CalEEMod default calculations without consideration of efficiencies required pursuant to CALGreen requirements for indoor and outdoor water demand reductions.

Electricity for water-related energy is estimated using the California Energy Commission (CEC) *Refining Estimates of Water-Related Energy Use in California* (CEC 2006).

Indirect energy demand for water and wastewater purposes is calculated as follows:

\[
\text{Indirect}_{W} = (D_{W} \times \text{Supply}) + (D_{W} \times \text{Treat}) = (D_{W} \times \text{Distribute})
\]

Where:
Indirect electricity demand for water and wastewater treatment and conveyance under existing conditions and Specific Plan build-out without consideration of efficiencies is detailed in Table 6-5 (Indirect Electricity Demand). At Specific Plan build-out, net increase in water and wastewater treatment and conveyance would require approximately 2,198,432 (kilowatt-hour per year) kWh/yr of electricity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>MGY</th>
<th>Supply</th>
<th>Treat</th>
<th>Distribute</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXISTING CONDITIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>320.48</td>
<td>9,727</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>3,560,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>89.08</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,911</td>
<td>170,232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>MGY</th>
<th>Supply</th>
<th>Treat</th>
<th>Distribute</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPECIFIC PLAN BUILD-OUT BUILD-OUT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>498.97</td>
<td>9,727</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>5,543,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>201.83</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,911</td>
<td>385,697</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Indirect Demand (kWh/yr) 3,730,804

Specific Plan Build-Out Indirect Demand (kWh/yr) 5,929,236

Net Indirect Demand (kWh/yr) 2,198,432

**Energy Conservation**

Future developments within the Specific Plan planning area would be subject to State water efficiency regulations pursuant to the California Building Code (CBC), which would reduce long-term project energy demand. These requirements would reduce wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy over the long term.

**California Building Code**

Future residential development facilitated by the proposed Specific Plan would be subject to Section 4.303 (Indoor Water Use) and Section 4.304 (Outdoor Water Use) and future nonresidential development would be subject to Section 5.303 (Indoor Water Use) and Section 5.304 (Outdoor Water Use) which regulate efficient water use. Pursuant to the CBC CALGreen requirements, future development would be required to meet applicable California Plumbing Code standards for plumbing fixtures and fittings, establish minimum water flow rates, and comply with applicable standards related to landscape irrigation for outdoor water use (CA Building Standards Commission 2017).

Part 11 of the Title 24 Building Standards Code is referred to as the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen Code). The purpose of the CALGreen Code is to "improve public health, safety and general welfare by enhancing the design and construction of buildings through the use of building concepts having a positive environmental impact and encouraging sustainable construction practices in the following categories: (1) Planning and design; (2) Energy efficiency; (3) Water efficiency and conservation; (4) Material conservation and resource efficiency; and (5) Environmental air quality." The CALGreen Code is not intended to substitute or be identified as meeting the certification requirements of any green building program that is not established and adopted by the
California Building Standards Commission (CBSC). The CBSC has released the 2016 California Green Building Standards Code on its website. Unless otherwise noted in the regulation, all newly constructed buildings in California are subject of the requirements of the CALGreen Code.

City of Poway Municipal Code
The Poway Municipal Code implements CALGreen requirements via Chapter 15.22 (Green Building Code) and supports landscape efficiency standards via Chapter 17.41. Chapter 17.41 requires that all landscaping within the City be of low water use type with a plant factor of 0.3.

Conclusion
The conservation of energy would result from implementation of the CBC, Poway Municipal Code, and General Plan and Specific Plan goals seeking to reduce individual vehicle use and water use. With implementation of existing regulations and policies, as well as policies within the Specific Plan, energy demand for future development facilitated by the proposed Specific Plan would not be wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary.
7.0 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

CEQA Guidelines Section 15128 requires a statement indicating the reason that various potential impacts are determined not to be significant and therefore are not discussed in the EIR. The Initial Study and NOP were sent to agencies on the City’s standard distribution list on March 13, 2017. The public comment period on the NOP ran from March 13, 2017 through April 12, 2017. The Initial Study prepared for the project determined that the impacts listed below would not occur or would be less than significant. Therefore, these topics have not been further analyzed in this EIR. Please refer to Appendix B (Initial Study) for explanations of the basis for these conclusions.

Aesthetics
- Scenic Vista – Less than Significant Impact
- Scenic Resources – No Impact
- Visual Character – Less than Significant Impact
- Light and Glare – Less than Significant Impact

Concerns related to views of the surrounding mountains were raised at the public scoping meeting held on March 22, 2017. From the Specific Plan planning area, views of Iron Mountain, Van Dam Peak, and the hillsides to the south are visible. However, existing development and landscaping and variations in topography obstruct views of these mountains substantially. Existing buildings within the Specific Plan planning area are one to two stories in height. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan largely would continue this development pattern, with building heights allowed up to three stories/40 feet within the Town Center and Mixed Use districts. As demonstrated in Exhibit 3-3 (Photographic Survey), views of the surrounding hillsides are most visible when looking straight along a public roadway. Implementation of the Specific Plan would not result in any realignment or closures of public roadways that would remove existing vantage points of the surrounding hillsides. The Specific Plan implements development standards and limits on height that would ensure that views would not be substantially reduced from existing conditions. Therefore, the Initial Study determined that impacts related to scenic vistas and resources would be less than significant.

Agricultural and Forest Resources
- Farmland Mapping and Monitoring – No Impact
- Agricultural Use/Williamson Act – No Impact
- Timberland – No Impact
- Loss or conversion of forest land – No Impact
- Conversion of farmland or forestland – No Impact

Air Quality
- Odors – No Impact

Cultural Resources
- Human Remains – Less than Significant Impact
Geology and Soils
- Fault Rupture – Less than Significant Impact
- Seismic Ground Shaking – Less than Significant Impact
- Seismic-related Ground Failure – Less than Significant Impact
- Landslides – No Impact
- Soil Erosion/Loss of Topsoil – Less than Significant Impact
- Unstable Geologic Unit or Soil – Less than Significant Impact
- Expansive Soil – Less than Significant Impact
- Septic Tanks – No Impact

Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Release of Hazardous Materials – Less than Significant Impact
- Hazardous Emissions within ¼-mile of School – Less than Significant Impact
- Airport Planning – No Impact
- Private Airstrip – No Impact
- Emergency Planning – No Impact

Hydrology and Water Quality
- Water Quality Standards – Less than Significant Impact
- Drainage Patterns – No Impact
- Runoff – No Impact
- Degrade Water Quality – No Impact
- Failure of Levee or Dam – No Impact
- Inundation by Seiche, Tsunami, Mudflow – No Impact

Land Use and Planning
- Division of Communities – No Impact
- Conflicts with Applicable Plan, Policy, or Regulation – Less than Significant Impact

Mineral Resources
- Availability of Mineral Known Mineral Resource – No Impact
- Locally Important Resource Recovery Site – No Impact

Noise
- Airport Noise – No Impact
- Private Airstrip – No Impact
7.0 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

Population and Housing
- Displacement of Housing – No Impact
- Displacement of People – No Impact

Public Services
- Fire Protection – Less than Significant Impact
- Police Protection – Less than Significant Impact
- Schools – Less than Significant Impact
- Parks – Less than Significant Impact
- Other Public Facilities – Less than Significant Impact

A comment letter from the Poway Unified School District (Poway USD) was received during the NOP public comment period (see Appendix A). The letter included an estimate of the number of students that could be generated at build out of the Specific Plan, and reported the design capacity and projected 2021-2022 enrollment at Poway USD schools. Poway USD states that possible overcrowding of schools may occur based on the projected capacity of elementary schools without implementation of mitigation. As discussed in the Initial Study (Appendix B), schools are funded through the payment of development impact fees pursuant to the Leroy F. Green School Facilities Act (AB 2926) and would be paid prior to issuance of building permits. According to AB 2926, payment of developer fees constitutes adequate mitigation related to impacts to school facilities. Therefore, the Initial Study determined that impacts to schools were less than significant.

Recreation
- Deterioration of Existing Facilities – Less than Significant Impact
- Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities – Less than Significant Impact

Transportation and Traffic
- Air Traffic Patterns – No Impact
- Hazardous Design Features – No Impact
- Emergency Access – Less than Significant Impact
- Alternative Transportation – Less than Significant

Utilities and Service Systems
- Storm Water Drainage – No Impact
- Landfill Capacity – Less than Significant Impact
- Solid Waste Regulation – Less than Significant Impact
8.0 PREPARATION TEAM

Lead Agency
City of Poway
Development Services Department
13325 Civic Center Drive
Poway, California 92064
858.668.4600

Contact: Joseph Lim, City Planner

Consultants to the Lead Agency

Environmental Review
MIG, Inc.
1500 Iowa Avenue, Suite 110
Riverside, California 92507
951.787.9222
www.migcom.com

Laura Stetson, Principal
John Kanlund, Associate Environmental Analyst
Christopher Purtell, Senior Archaeologist
Hayden Agnew-Wieland, Environmental Analyst
Katherine Zamora, Project Technician

Traffic
Chen Ryan Associates
3900 Fifth Avenue, Suite 210
San Diego, California 92103
619.784.1113
www.chenryanmobility.com

Stephen Cook, PE, Senior Traffic Engineer
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