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PROJECT LOCATION: Immediately adjacent to and west of Sabre Springs Parkway between Carmel Mountain Express Drive and Ted Williams Parkway (State Route 56) in the Community of Sabre Springs within the City of San Diego

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The proposed project consists of the construction of a parking structure and associated improvements within the Sabre Springs/Peñasquitos Transit Center. The Sabre Springs/Peñasquitos Transit Center is presently characterized by an approximately 4-acre paved park-and-ride facility that accommodates 150 surface parking spaces; transit amenities including bus shelters, benches, and bike storage; and temporary buildings associated with the I-15 Corridor Express Lanes (Managed Lanes) Project. The parking structure would be limited to four stories above existing grade and would be located in the southern portion of the transit center, adjacent to Carmel Mountain Express Drive and Sabre Springs Parkway. The new transit center would accommodate a minimum of 630 parking spaces in a combination of structure and surface parking.

A new Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) loop with eight bus bays and transit-related furnishings such as bus shelters and benches would be located in the northern portion of the site adjacent to Ted Williams Parkway. Circulation within the transit center would be revised to accommodate the new parking structure. An unnamed paved driveway that currently bisects the transit center would be removed. A second paved driveway that runs adjacent to Chicarita Creek along the western perimeter of the project site would be dedicated to the City of San Diego. Landscaping would be installed throughout the newly configured transit center. Security lighting would be installed within the parking structure and replaced where appropriate to provide adequate lighting during early morning and night-time hours. Solar panels (i.e. solar trees) may be installed on the top floor of the parking structure.

Project construction is expected to commence in summer 2011 and would continue for approximately 12 months. Staging of construction equipment and materials storage for the proposed parking structure would be located on-site within the limits of the existing transit center. During project construction, the transit center is planned to be closed to accommodate staging and construction and to limit hazards to public safety.

FINDINGS:

SANDAG finds that the Sabre Springs/Peñasquitos I-15 Transit Center Parking Structure Project will not result in a significant effect on the environment for the following reasons:

a. The proposed project would be compatible with existing on-site and surrounding land uses.

b. The proposed project would not result in significant impacts to scenic resources or vistas. Implementation of mitigation measures listed below would reduce potentially significant impacts to the area’s visual character and on surrounding uses to below a level of significance.

c. The proposed project would comply with San Diego Air Pollution Control District rules, ordinances, and regulations, including, Rule 55, Fugitive Dust Control, which specifies best available control measures to prevent, reduce, or mitigate particulate matter emissions generated from construction activities. The proposed project would not violate any air quality standard, or substantially contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation.
d. The proposed project would not result in potentially significant impacts to sensitive animal and plant species, sensitive vegetation communities, jurisdictional areas (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and California Department of Fish and Game), or spread of invasive plant species. Implementation of mitigation measures listed below would reduce associated impacts related to biological resources to below a level of significance.

e. The proposed project would not result in impacts to local historical resources, cultural resource, or to paleontological resources.

f. The proposed project would be consistent with the goals and policies of applicable land use plans including the 2030 San Diego Regional Transportation Plan, City of San Diego General Plan (Mobility Element), and Sabre Springs Community Plan.

g. The proposed project would comply with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) guidelines for municipal storm water runoff in accordance with the State Water Resources Control Board Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ (Caltrans), San Diego RWQCB Order No. R9-2007-0001, and/or water quality guidelines adopted by local jurisdictions.

h. The proposed project would create potentially significant short-term noise impacts during construction. Implementation of mitigation measures listed below would reduce noise impacts to a level of less than significant.

i. The proposed project would not create a substantial increase in traffic on area roadways that would impair the performance of the circulation system. Mitigation measures listed below would reduce short-term impacts on available parking and transit service related to closure of the transit center during construction.

j. The proposed project would not result in direct or indirect project-level significant impacts to agriculture and forestry resources, air quality, cultural resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources, population and housing, public services, recreation, and utilities and service systems.

k. The proposed project could contribute to cumulative effects associated with air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and traffic. The project’s contribution, however, would not be cumulatively considerable.

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Implementation of project-specific mitigation measures identified below would reduce potentially significant impacts to below a level of significance.

Aesthetics

AESTHETIC-1: To minimize potential visual impacts from the project, trees or other landscaping removed through project implementation shall be replaced in kind. New landscaping shall be consistent with the Community Design Element and other elements of the Sabre Springs Community Plan. If trees or other vegetation within the transit center is removed and cannot be replaced, the architectural design of the structure shall be enhanced to improve aesthetics. Enhanced architectural design features shall also be considered in combination with new or replacement landscaping.
Biological Resources

BIOLOGY-1: A qualified biologist shall review the plant palette during preparation of the final landscape plans to confirm that invasive exotic species will not be planted in areas adjacent to Chicarita Creek.

BIOLOGY-2: All tree removals shall be conducted during the non-breeding season (September through February) to avoid direct impacts to nesting birds. If tree removals are scheduled during the breeding season, a qualified ornithologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey of all trees to be removed to determine if any contain active nests. The preconstruction survey shall be conducted within 15 days prior to the start of work from March through May (since there is higher potential for birds to initiate nesting during this period), and within 30 days prior to the start of work from June through August. If active nests are found, the ornithologist shall determine an appropriately sized buffer around the nest in which no work shall be allowed until the young have successfully fledged. The size of the nest buffer shall be determined by the biologist in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game, and would be based to a large extent on the nesting species and its sensitivity to disturbance.

Noise

NOISE-1: Construction equipment and supplies shall be located in staging areas that shall create the greatest distance possible between construction-related noise sources and noise sensitive receivers (Evening Creek Apartments) nearest the project area. This information shall be specified on all grading, excavation and construction plans.

Transportation/Traffic

TRAFFIC-1: During construction, it is recommended that signage be posted to direct existing transit center users to the alternate park and ride facilities nearby. Sign verbiage shall remind drivers of alternative bus transit access locations, the location of alternate park and ride facilities, operable routes, and hours of operation. Signage shall also indicate that parking is prohibited at adjacent office/retail parking lots or on residential streets as posted.

THE INITIAL STUDY PREPARED FOR THIS PROJECT IS ATTACHED.

Form Prepared By:

Rob Rundle, Principal Planner
SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101
Phone: (619) 699-6949; E-mail: ru@sandag.org

Signature: 11-3-10
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I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Sabre Springs/Peñasquitos I-15 Transit Center Parking Structure

Lead agency name and address: San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

Contact person and phone number: Rob Rundle, Principal Planner
Phone: (619) 699-6949; E-mail: rru@sandag.org

Project Location:
Immediately adjacent to and west of Sabre Springs Parkway between Carmel Mountain Express Drive and Ted Williams Parkway (State Route 56) in the Community of Sabre Springs within the City of San Diego (See Figure 1, Regional Map and Figure 2, Vicinity Map).

Project sponsor’s name and address: The same as lead agency.

General plan description: Specialty Commercial

Zoning: Community Commercial (CC-2-3)

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project consists of the construction of a parking structure and associated improvements within the Sabre Springs/Peñasquitos Transit Center. The Sabre Springs/Peñasquitos Transit Center is presently characterized by an approximately 4-acre paved park-and-ride facility that accommodates 150 surface parking spaces; transit amenities including bus shelters, benches, and bike storage; and temporary buildings associated with the I-15 Corridor Express Lanes (Managed Lanes) Project. The parking structure would be limited to four stories above existing grade and would be located in the southern portion of the transit center, adjacent to Carmel Mountain Express Drive and Sabre Springs Parkway. The new transit center would accommodate a minimum of 630 parking spaces in a combination of structure and surface parking.

A new Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) loop with eight bus bays and transit-related furnishings such as bus shelters and benches would be located in the northern portion of the site adjacent to Ted Williams Parkway. Circulation within the transit center would be revised to accommodate the new parking structure. An unnamed paved driveway that currently bisects the transit center would be removed. A second paved driveway that runs adjacent to Chicarita Creek along the western perimeter of the project site would be dedicated to the City of San Diego. Landscaping would be maintained or replaced throughout the newly configured transit center. Security lighting would be installed within the parking structure and maintained or replaced where appropriate to provide adequate lighting during early morning and night-time hours. Solar panels (i.e. solar trees) may be installed on the top floor of the parking structure.

Project construction is expected to commence in summer 2011 and would continue for approximately 12 months. Staging of construction equipment and materials storage for the proposed parking structure would be located on-site within the limits of the existing transit center (see Figure 3, Aerial Photograph). During project construction, the transit center is planned to be closed to accommodate staging and construction and to limit hazards to public safety.
Proposed on-site improvements are shown in Figure 4, Project Site Plan and Site Section.

**Surrounding land uses and setting:**

Surrounding land uses in the project vicinity include SR-56 and the Direct Access Ramp (DAR) to I-15; Carmel Mountain Ranch Community Park and commercial retail to the north and northeast of SR-56; Sabre Springs Parkway and multi-family residential homes (Evening Creek Apartments) to the east; single-family residential homes to the southeast; Carmel Mountain Express Drive, neighborhood shopping, and office buildings to the south; an open space easement traversed by Chicarita Creek and two six-story office buildings with an associated three-level parking structure and I-15 to the west. The site is predominantly level at an elevation of approximately 540 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) with the exception of narrow segments of slope located at the east and north ends of the site. The project site and surrounding area is located in the northern portion of the Sabre Springs Community Planning Area.

**Objective of the project:**

There is a need for additional vehicle parking spaces at the Sabre Springs/Peñasquitos I-15 Transit Center to meet future demand associated with a high-frequency express bus system - Bus Rapid Transit - along the I-15 corridor. The proposed project seeks to satisfy the need for additional parking at the transit center and support the overall vision of the I-15 Managed Lanes Project.

**Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financial approval, or participation agreements):**

SANDAG is the Lead Agency under CEQA and is responsible for reviewing and approving this Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Study. Permits and approvals from the following Responsible Agencies under CEQA also would be required for the proposed project. Additional permits may be required from agencies upon review of construction documents.

**State Water Resources Control Board/Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)**

- National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Activity Permit

**Technical studies prepared for this report and included in the Appendix:**

A. Technical Air Quality Analysis prepared by Entech Consulting Group, July 2010.


**Other Environmental Reviews Referenced in this report and included in the Appendix:**

F. Sabre Springs Transit Center – Final Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration, prepared for Metropolitan Transit Development Board by Helix Environmental Planning, Inc., October 21, 2002 (State Clearinghouse No. 2002011064)
Figure 2, Project Vicinity Map (Source: DEA)
SITE PLAN:

630 SPACES (MINIMUM) IN ANY COMBINATION OF STRUCTURE AND SURFACE PARKING.
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LIMIT OF WORK

Figure 4, Project Site Plan and Site Section (Source: DEA and Gensler)
VIEW OF SITE WITHOUT PROJECT FROM EAST OF SABRE SPRINGS PARKWAY:

VIEW OF SITE WITH PROJECT FROM EAST OF SABRE SPRINGS PARKWAY:

VIEWPOINT LOCATION AND DIRECTION:

Figure 5, Project Visual Simulation (Source: DEA and Gensler)
III. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>☐ Aesthetics</th>
<th>☐ Agriculture and Forestry</th>
<th>☐ Air Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Biological Resources</td>
<td>☐ Cultural Resources</td>
<td>☐ Geology/Soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>☐ Hydrology/Water Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Land Use/Planning</td>
<td>☐ Mineral Resources</td>
<td>☐ Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Population/Housing</td>
<td>☐ Public Services</td>
<td>☐ Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Transportation/Traffic</td>
<td>☐ Utilities/Service Systems</td>
<td>☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation that follows:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature: [Signature] Date: 11-3-10
Printed Name: Rob Rumble For: SANDAG
V. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

This section evaluates the potential environmental effects of the proposed project using the environmental checklist from the State CEQA Guidelines as amended. The definitions of the response column headings include:

- “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an impact may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

- “Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must described the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced).

- “Less Than Significant Impact” applies where the project creates no significant impacts.

- “No Impact” applies where a project does not create an impact in that category. “No Impact” answers do not require an explanation if they are adequately supported by the information sources cited by the lead agency which show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved. A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards.
1. AESTHETICS: Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Scenic vistas are usually associated with vantage points looking out over a section of urban or natural area that provides a geographic orientation not commonly available. Examples of scenic vistas might include an urban skyline, valley, mountain range, ocean or views of other water bodies. The project site is presently used as a transit facility which is not designated as a scenic vista. Off-site views generally encompass surrounding residential and commercial development as well as upland views of Chicarita Creek. Distant hillside views associated with Black Mountain Open Space Park in the neighboring community of Rancho Peñasquitos, and Van Dam Peak, which is associated with designated public open space and the City of San Diego’s Multiple Species Habitat Planning (MSHP) area, can be seen to the west and south of the site, respectively. Although these views are not expressly designated as scenic vistas in either the City of San Diego General Plan or Sabre Springs Community Plan, they do provide a geographic reference and panoramic view. Since elevations north and east of the project area are higher than those areas south and west of the site, easterly and northerly facing views are limited.

Figure 5, Project Visual Simulation, depicts the change in visual quality that would occur with project implementation. The viewpoint shown in Figure 5 was selected because it represents the view that would be experienced by residences located east of Sabre Springs Parkway. Residential viewers typically have both high frequency and duration for viewing the project; therefore, they have high viewer sensitivity to any changes to their usual view. Views into the project area from office buildings west of Chicarita Creek and south of Evening Creek Drive, as well as views from residential uses and commercial development south of the site, would not change significantly due to distance separation, street median and perimeter landscaping, intervening topography, and the structure’s low profile.

As shown in the visual simulation, the project would introduce a new structure to the transit center that would replace existing views characterized by surface parking and construction trailers. Although the proposed structure would encroach on distant views of Carmel Mountain, distant hillside views, which are currently partially blocked by the grove of mature eucalyptus trees located on the eastern perimeter of the transit center as well as landscaping in the median of Sabre Springs Parkway, is expected to remain relatively unaltered. Upland views of Chicarita Creek would also not change significantly from present conditions. These views would remain screened by tree branches and landscaping and would also be partially unavailable due to sight distance separation. The stand of mature eucalyptus trees located on-site is not within the project footprint. Although these trees are intended to remain, some trees may be removed to accommodate construction of the proposed project. These trees are not considered scenic resources or part of a scenic vista and their removal would be offset by proposed landscaping as discussed in 1.c below.

The proposed project could encroach into south facing views of Van Dam Peak and the MSHP area from SR-56 highway travelers. However, since the project area is at a lower elevation (approximately 30 feet) than SR-56 and Ted Williams Parkway, the majority of the proposed project would be obstructed from view and would not create a significant visual impact.

Given the topography of the surrounding area relative to on-site elevations, landscaping in the project vicinity, and the low profile of the proposed structure, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

b. No Impact. There are no officially designated scenic highways in the vicinity of the project. The proposed project would occur within the limits of an existing transit center, which does not contain scenic resources. The project would not affect any historic buildings. Therefore, no impacts to scenic resources would occur.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

c. Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. The proposed use of the site would not change from existing on-site uses. Although project implementation would introduce a new visual element to the site, the bulk and scale of the proposed parking structure would be compatible with the look and feel of nearby human development, which is characterized by low- and mid-rise commercial buildings, multi-family residential apartments, and perimeter landscape features. Visual impacts on the surrounding area would be minimized since the project site sits at a lower elevation, obstructing views of the proposed project. Project setbacks, retention of mature trees and/or replacement landscaping, would also help to soften the visual impact of the structure on the site’s existing visual character. Removal of mature trees could potentially degrade the visual quality of the site and its surroundings. Therefore, to reduce potential significant impacts to the existing visual character of the site and on surrounding uses, the following mitigation is required:

AESTHETIC-1: To minimize potential visual impacts from the project, trees or other landscaping removed through project implementation shall be replaced in kind. New landscaping shall be consistent with the Community Design Element and other elements of the Sabre Springs Community Plan. If trees or other vegetation within the transit center is removed and cannot be replaced, the architectural design of the structure shall be enhanced to improve aesthetics. Enhanced architectural design features shall also be considered in combination with new or replacement landscaping.

Visual impacts to surrounding properties that sit at a lower elevation than the project (single-family development southeast of the transit center) would be significantly reduced by median landscaping on Sabre Springs Parkway and on surrounding properties, and proposed landscaping, which would provide a vegetation screen. Overall, the proposed project elements are compatible with on-site uses and the surrounding environment. Mitigation would reduce potential significant impacts to a level of less than significant.

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

d. Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. Existing sources of light and glare characterized by parking lot security lighting are present within the transit center. Headlights from vehicles entering and exiting the transit center during early morning and nighttime hours also contribute to on-site sources of light and glare. Light from street lamps, traffic on Sabre Springs Parkway, and security lighting at nearby office buildings also contribute to ambient light conditions in the vicinity of the project. New sources of light are expected from vehicle headlights entering and exiting the parking structure and the use of security lighting during early morning and nighttime hours. These new sources of light and glare would result in a subtle increase in nighttime lighting levels over existing conditions. The Evening Creek Apartments, located immediately east of Sabre Springs Parkway, would be most affected by an increase in nighttime lighting levels at the site. These residences are located approximately 200 feet east of the project site and are situated at a higher elevation than the transit center. Median landscaping on Sabre Springs Parkway, mature vegetation, and implementation of mitigation discussed above, would conceal new sources of light and glare associated with the proposed project. Intervening topography would also prevent any light
spillover from being cast down on nearby residential uses (See Figure 4, Project Site Plan and Site Section). Moreover, security lighting proposed within the parking structure would be directional and/or shielded to minimize spillover and associated glare effects onto surrounding land uses. In addition, the proposed structure would not be built with a highly reflective material. For these reasons, the proposed project is not expected to shed substantial light onto adjacent, light-sensitive property or land uses, and is not expected to emit a substantial amount of ambient light into the nighttime sky above existing conditions.

Solar trees may be installed on the roof of the parking structure, which could contribute to daytime glare. However, solar paneling would be oriented and/or shielded to minimize glare into adjacent uses as well as coated with anti-reflective material, which would significantly reduce daytime glare. Overall, new sources of light and glare would not be significant due to existing ambient nighttime lighting conditions, intervening vegetation and topography, and elements of the project design.

2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:
In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

a. No Impact. According to the California Department of Conservation’s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, no Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Unique Farmland land uses are located within or adjacent to the project site. The proposed project is located in a developed, mixed-use area and has been completely developed with impervious surfaces and zoned for commercial uses. No agricultural resources exist on-site. Therefore, no impacts related to loss of farmland would occur.

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

b. No Impact. The proposed project site does not contain agricultural resources, is not zoned for agricultural uses, and is not the subject of a Williamson Act contract. Impacts to agricultural resources would not occur.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section...
c. No Impact. The project site is currently developed and zoned for commercial and other urban development. Adjacent property (Chicarita Creek and the area north of Ted Williams Parkway) is zoned AR-1-1 (Agricultural-Residential). No forest land occurs within or adjacent to the project site. No impacts to forest land would occur.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. No Impact. The project site and adjacent areas do not contain forest land. Impacts to forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use would not occur.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. No Impact. No Farmland or forest land is present in the project vicinity. No project related changes to the existing environment would result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural uses or forest land to non-forest uses.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. No Impact. The project site is located within the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB), the boundaries of which are coincident with San Diego County. The San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) is the agency responsible for administering state and federal air quality laws in the SDAB. Air quality plans applicable to the SDAB include the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) and applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The RAQS and SIP outline the APCD's plans and control measures designed to attain state and federal air quality standards. The RAQS and SIP rely on information provided by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and SANDAG such as mobile and area source emissions and projected growth in the county, to project future emissions and develop emission reduction strategies through regulatory controls. CARB's mobile-source emission projections and SANDAG growth projections are based on population, vehicle trends, and land use plans developed by local and regional agencies. Projects that propose development consistent with growth anticipated by the applicable general plan(s) would be consistent with the RAQS and applicable portions of the SIP. In regard to transportation-related projects, such as the proposed project, their emissions are accounted for within the RAQS and SIP if the projects are listed in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The proposed project is listed in the 2030 San Diego RTP (“Transit Parking Structures” in Table A.4- Major Transit Expenditures - Revenue Constrained Plan, page A-14) and therefore is accounted for in the RAQS and SIP. The project would not conflict or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans. Associated impacts would not occur.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
b. Less Than Significant Impact. Under the federal Clean Air Act of 1970 and its subsequent amendments, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) established the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for criteria pollutants, including carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO$_2$), nitrogen dioxide (NO$_2$), ozone (O$_3$), particulate matter of less than 10 microns in size (PM$_{10}$), particulate matter of less than 2.5 microns in size (PM$_{2.5}$), and lead (Pb). Projects in the SDAB with daily emissions that exceed any of the following emission thresholds shown in Table 1, SDAB Emissions Significance Thresholds, are recommended by the SDAB to be considered significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Pollutant</th>
<th>Total Emissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pounds per Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Oxides (NO$_x$)</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur Oxides (SO$_x$)</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respirable Particulate Matter (PM)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) No numerical emission thresholds for ROG were established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2. Therefore, for this analysis the assumed threshold for ROG was set to the same value as NO$_x$.

Source: Entech 2010

Construction Emissions

The principle sources of pollutant emissions during construction are fugitive dust and construction equipment engine exhaust. To predict emission levels associated with construction, it was assumed that best available control measures (BACM) to control fugitive dust and equipment exhaust generation will be implemented during construction. BACMs include: 1) application of soil stabilizers to inactive areas; 2) terminate soil disturbance when winds exceed 25 mph; 3) stabilize previously disturbed areas if subsequent construction is delayed; 4) control of dust during equipment loading/unloading; 5) cover all stock piles with tarps if left undisturbed for more than 72 hours; and 6) reduction of speed on unpaved surfaces to 15 mph. Exhaust emission control measures include: 1) limit allowable idling to five minutes for trucks and heavy equipment; 3) utilize equipment whose engines are equipped with diesel oxidation catalysts if available; and 4) utilize diesel particulate filters on heavy equipment where feasible.

To estimate construction impacts, the Air Resource Board’s URBEMIS 2007 computer model was utilized to calculate emissions from the construction schedule and equipment list shown in Table 2, Construction Schedule and Equipment Fleet. Estimated emissions generated during construction are presented in Table 3, Estimated Construction Emissions.
As shown below in Table 3, the emissions of criteria pollutants would be below the applicable significant thresholds. Construction emissions would also be temporary and would be localized within the immediate project vicinity. In addition, Caltrans’ Standard Specifications pertaining to dust control and dust palliative requirement is required to be a part of all construction contracts and should effectively reduce and control emission impacts during construction. The provisions of the Caltrans’ Standard Specifications, Section 7-1.0F “Air Pollution Control” and Section 10 “Dust Control” require the contractor to comply with the SDAPCD rules, ordinances, and regulations (Entech 2010). Thus, project construction emissions would result in less than significant air quality impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase and Duration</th>
<th>Equipment Type and Number of Equipment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition and Clearing (1 week)</td>
<td>(3) Concrete Saw&lt;br&gt;(1) Dozer&lt;br&gt;(2) Air Compressor&lt;br&gt;(2) Tractor/Loader/Backhoe&lt;br&gt;(1) Dump Truck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct Temporary Parking (3 weeks)</td>
<td>(2) Dump Truck&lt;br&gt;(1) Bulldozer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading (1 week)</td>
<td>(1) Grader&lt;br&gt;(2) Dozer&lt;br&gt;(2) Tractor/Loader/Backhoe&lt;br&gt;(1) Water Truck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct Parking Garage (7 months)</td>
<td>(2) Crane&lt;br&gt;Welders&lt;br&gt;(2) Forklifts&lt;br&gt;(1) Generator Set&lt;br&gt;(2) Cement Mixer&lt;br&gt;(2) Tractor/Loader/Backhoe&lt;br&gt;(1) Drilling Rig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo Temporary Parking (1 week)</td>
<td>(2) Tractor/Loader/Backhoe&lt;br&gt;(1) Dump Truck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct Surface Parking/Bus/Loop/Paving/Landscaping (2 months)</td>
<td>(1) Cement Mixer&lt;br&gt;(1) Paver&lt;br&gt;(1) Roller&lt;br&gt;(2) Tractor/Loader/Backhoe&lt;br&gt;(1) Dump Truck</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DEA 2010
Demolition and clearing anticipated to start in early to mid-spring 2011.
Approximately 3.5 acres will be disturbed during project construction.
Table 3
Estimated Construction Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Activities</th>
<th>Month and Year</th>
<th>Maximum Daily Emissions (pounds/day)</th>
<th>Above or Below Threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>June 2011</td>
<td>0.00 0.11 0.11 0.00 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coatings and Asphalt</td>
<td>June 2011</td>
<td>0.11 0.49 0.44 0.00 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>June 2011</td>
<td>0.11 0.49 0.38 0.00 0.11 0.05</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure Construction</td>
<td>July 2011 to January 2012</td>
<td>1.21 4.16 5.86 0.00 0.05 0.05</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>January 2012</td>
<td>0.44 0.16 0.16 0.00 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coatings and Asphalt</td>
<td>February to March 2012</td>
<td>0.33 1.32 1.32 0.00 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Entech 2010

Operational Emissions

Operational emissions generated by the project would include those from vehicular traffic, bus operations and routine maintenance of the transit facility. According to the project traffic report (Appendix E), the project would generate 4,970 daily vehicle trips. The number of daily vehicle trips takes into consideration park and ride trips, ride-sharing trips, and kiss and ride trips. Vehicle trips would account for nearly all of operational emissions; other activities such as bus operations and maintenance would be relatively minor and would not generate measurable contributions to operational air emissions. As shown in Table 4, Estimated Operational Emissions, operational emissions would be well below the applicable significance thresholds. Therefore, project operational emissions would result in less than significant air quality impacts.

Table 4
Estimated Operational Emissions (pounds per day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDAPCD Daily Emission Thresholds</th>
<th>250</th>
<th>250</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pollutant</td>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>SOx</td>
<td>PM10</td>
<td>PM2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Max Daily</td>
<td>0.0234</td>
<td>0.0410</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td>0.0026</td>
<td>0.0025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030 Without Project Max Daily</td>
<td>0.0132</td>
<td>0.0184</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>0.0029</td>
<td>0.0026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030 With Project Max Daily</td>
<td>0.0155</td>
<td>0.0207</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>0.0033</td>
<td>0.0031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Threshold?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Entech 2010
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)?

**c. Less Than Significant Impact.** The SDAB is currently classified as a non-attainment area for ozone (eight-hour) under Federal (NAAQS) and state standards (CAAQS), as well as particulate matter (PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$) under CAAQS. It is possible that construction of the project could coincide with construction of other projects in the project area. Even if construction activities were concurrent, the project’s contribution to short-term, construction related air emissions would not be cumulatively considerable. As discussed above, air emissions generated during project construction would be relatively minor and projects would be subject to the same air quality thresholds and would be required to implement BACMs during construction to ensure that short-term air emissions would not be significant. Project construction, therefore, would not result in a significant cumulative air quality impact.

With regard to long-term operational cumulative impacts associated with ozone precursors (NO$_x$ and ROC), significant cumulative impacts do not generally occur if project emissions have been accounted for in the ozone attainment assumptions contained within the RAQS. The project is listed in the RTP for the San Diego region; therefore, the project’s emissions have been considered in the cumulative analysis of impacts for non-attainment pollutants included in the attainment demonstration for the SDAB. Cumulatively considerable long-term impacts related to non-attainment pollutants would not occur with project implementation. Accordingly, the project would not result in cumulatively considerable long-term impacts related to nonattainment pollutants, create additional violations of Federal or state standards, or delay the Basin’s goal for meeting attainment standards.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

**d. Less Than Significant Impact.** A sensitive receptor is a person in the population who is particularly susceptible to health effects due to exposure to an air contaminant than is the population at large (City of San Diego). Sensitive receptors in proximity to localized CO sources, toxic air contaminants or odors are of particular concern. Sensitive receptors are typically defined as schools, hospitals, resident-care facilities, parks, child care centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality. The following sensitive receptors are located within 0.50-mile of the project site:

- Los Penasquitos Elementary School, 14125 Cuca Street
- Morning Creek Elementary School, 10925 Morning Creek Drive South
- Ashford University, 13500 Evening Creek Dr N # 600
- Carmel Mountain Ranch Community Park, 10192 Rancho Carmel Dr (approximate)
- San Diego Onnuri Church, 10954 Cool Lake Terrace

Localized CO impacts were analyzed by estimating maximum ambient CO concentrations near intersections having the greatest potential impact as a result of the project. Intersections analyzed included:

- Sabre Springs Parkway and Evening Creek Drive
- Sabre Springs Parkway and Carmel Mountain Express Drive
- Sabre Springs Parkway and Rancho Carmel Drive

Results from the CO hot-spot modeling analysis are shown in Table 5, Maximum Predicted CO Concentrations, and demonstrate that future predicted CO concentrations (2030 w/o project) are lower than existing levels due to the decrease in emissions factors resulting from improved vehicle technology and lower ambient levels. The comparison between 2030 w/o project and 2030 w/ project conditions indicate that the proposed project would cause CO concentrations to be higher due to the slight increase in
traffic using the transit center. Operation of the transit center will attract vehicles to the project area; however, throughout the region traffic will decrease due to the increase of ridership on passenger trains and buses that travel throughout the county. It is anticipated that the project would not contribute to a violation of CO standards and therefore local CO project-level transportation conformity requirements would be satisfied. As discussed in 3.b and 3.c, BACMs will be implemented during construction which will limit the exposure to toxic air contaminants impacting the project vicinity. The proposed project is not expected to create odors as discussed in 3.e below. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection Location</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>2030 w/o project</th>
<th>2030 w/ project</th>
<th>Above or Below Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1-Hour Concentrations (ppm)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard = 35 ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabre Springs Parkway and Evening Creek Drive</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabre Springs Parkway and Carmel Mountain Express Drive</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabre Springs Parkway and Rancho Carmel Drive</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8-Hour Concentrations (ppm)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard = 9 ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabre Springs Parkway and Evening Creek Drive</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabre Springs Parkway and Carmel Mountain Express Drive</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabre Springs Parkway and Rancho Carmel Drive</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Entech 2010

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

**e. Less Than Significant Impact.** Construction activities may generate temporary odors from diesel emissions, asphalt application, painting, or other construction tasks. During construction, there may be localized instances when the characteristic diesel exhaust is noticeable, but such transitory exposure is a brief nuisance. Construction odors would not occur in the intensity or duration to affect a substantial number of people. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

**a. Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would be located within an existing transit center comprised of paved surface parking, bus loading/unloading areas, security lighting, and construction trailers. A grove of approximately 20 eucalyptus trees and slope plantings are present along the eastern project perimeter. Slope plantings are also located along the northern perimeter of the project area. Construction of the proposed project would require removal of existing asphalt covering the transit center and driveways. Eucalyptus trees and other landscaping along the site perimeter are proposed to remain with project implementation (potential impacts to nesting birds species through possible removal of on-site trees is discussed in section 4.d below). Considering the developed nature of the transit center and lack of foraging area, habitat for candidate, sensitive, and special status species, is extremely limited. The limits of the transit center are not proposed to be broadened, thus direct impacts to species or their habitat as a result of the project would not be expected.

Much of the area surrounding the project has been extensively developed in recent years with the exception of Chicarita Creek, adjacent to the western boundary of the project site. Chicarita Creek is known to support riparian habitat suitable for least Bell's vireo (*Vireo bellis pusillus*; *vireo*), a state and federally listed endangered species, and for California gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica californica*; *gnatcatcher*), a federally listed threatened species and a California Species of Special Concern (California Department of Fish and Game Comment Letter, Comments on the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Sabre Springs Transit Project (SCH# 2002011064), February 20, 2002). The project would occur outside the limits of Chicarita Creek, therefore, potential direct impacts to state or federally listed species that may inhabit Chicarita Creek would not occur.

Potential indirect impacts to biological resources could result from short-term noise, fugitive dust, and lighting disturbances created during construction activities. The project site is located in a developed, mixed-use area where noise and lighting currently exist. As discussed in section 12.a, noise generated by the proposed project would not substantially increase existing noise levels. As discussed in section 1.d, all proposed lighting (including construction lighting, if necessary) would be directional and shielded to prevent spillover into the adjacent riparian habitat. Thus, the project’s contribution to the area’s ambient noise and lighting levels is not expected to be significant and is not expected to indirectly affect wildlife. Dust from heavy equipment that would result from construction activities could settle on nearby vegetation and interfere with photosynthetic processes (City of San Diego). However, as discussed in section 3.b, implementation of measures to control fugitive dust and equipment exhaust generation during construction would reduce indirect impacts from dust to a level of less than significant. Construction activities would occur within the limits of the transit center and outside the environmentally sensitive area of Chicarita Creek. For these reasons, potentially significant direct and indirect impacts to candidate, threatened, and endangered species, would be less than significant.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?
b. Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation. Due to the site’s adjacency to Chicarita Creek, indirect impacts to the off-site riparian habitat could potentially occur as a result of the proposed project. Potential impacts include indirect water quality impacts through erosion/sedimentation and the introduction of invasive exotic plant species, which could spread into Chicarita Creek and displace native vegetation. Conformance with existing regulatory requirements (i.e. acquisition of a NPDES General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)) would reduce indirect water quality impacts to levels of less than significant. To reduce the potential spread of invasive species into Chicarita Creek, implementation of the following mitigation is recommended:

BIOLOGY-1: A qualified biologist shall review the plant palette during preparation of the final landscape plans to confirm that invasive exotic species will not be planted in areas adjacent to Chicarita Creek.

With conformance with standard conditions and implementation of mitigation, impacts to off-site riparian habitat would be less than significant.

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

BIOLOGY-2: All tree removals shall be conducted during the non-breeding season (September through February) to avoid direct impacts to nesting birds. If tree removals are scheduled during the breeding season, a qualified ornithologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey of all trees to be removed to determine if any contain active nests. The preconstruction survey shall be conducted within 15 days prior to the start of work from March through May (since there is higher potential for birds to initiate nesting during this period), and within 30 days prior to the start of work from June through August. If active nests are found, the ornithologist shall determine an appropriately sized buffer around the nest in which no work...
shall be allowed until the young have successfully fledged. The size of the nest buffer shall be determined by the biologist in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game, and would be based to a large extent on the nesting species and its sensitivity to disturbance.

With implementation of mitigation, impacts would be less than significant. Chica Rita Creek is located immediately adjacent to and west of the project site; however no impact to wildlife movement in this corridor would occur with project implementation.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. Potential impacts to biological resources would be less than significant and mitigated to less than significant levels through mitigation measures discussed above. The project site is not located within the City of San Diego’s Multiple Habitat Planning Area (MHPA). The proposed project would not conflict with any local policy or ordinance protecting biological resources and no further analysis is required.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

f. No Impact. The project site is not located within or adjacent to the City of San Diego’s MHPA. The project site is previously developed and zoned for commercial development. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

a. No Impact. The site consists of a fully developed transit center with paved asphalt and construction trailers. According to the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared by for the Sabre Springs Transit Center (Appendix F), a cultural resources inventory that included an archaeological site record search and literature review indicated that no historic structures are present in the project vicinity. In addition, a review of early maps, including the 1930 USGS La Jolla Quadrangle and the 1952 USGS Poway Quadrangle reveal that no historic structures were present within the project area. Therefore, no impacts to historic resources would occur as a result of the proposed project.

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

b. Less Than Significant Impact. The record search previously conducted as part of the transit center’s development approval did not indicate the presence of on-site archaeological resources. The project site has been completely paved over and the potential to encounter cultural resources is minimal since the project will not go beyond the previous limits of disturbance. For these reasons, impacts to archaeological
resources are considered less than significant.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. No Impact. Potential impacts to scientifically significant paleontological resources typically occur in the form of destruction of buried fossil remains during earthmoving activities associated with construction. A Paleontological Identification Report was prepared by the San Diego Natural History Museum for the proposed project and is included as Appendix B to this Initial Study. The paleontology report identifies the specific geologic formations and fossils that may be encountered, assesses potential impacts to paleontologically sensitive geologic formations, and provides a recommended course of action related to paleontological resources within the limits of the project construction area. Based on the findings of the report, the surficial geologic deposits at the project site consist of Holocene alluvium and slope wash deposits, and adjacent to the project site are rocks mapped as the Santiago Peak Volcanics of late Jurassic to early Cretaceous age. The Holocene age of these deposits (alluvium and slope wash deposits) indicates they are too young to contain true fossil remains or traces. Consequently, they do not represent significant paleontological resources. Construction related excavations for the proposed project will be minor and have no potential to directly impact paleontological resources or a unique geological feature. Although the young sedimentary deposits would generally have a low potential to yield fossil resources, artificial fill materials overlying highly weathered metavolcanic bedrock were observed during site investigations (Kleinfelder 2009). These site conditions indicate that the proposed project has no potential to impact paleontological resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. No Impact. The project site has been disturbed by previous grading activities associated with the Sabre Springs/Peñasquitos I-15 Transit Center. The site has been previously excavated and no cultural resources were encountered within the previous limits of disturbance. Therefore, the potential to uncover human remains during construction is extremely low.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.(i) Less Than Significant Impact. A Preliminary Foundation Report was prepared by Kleinfelder for the proposed parking structure and provides geotechnical information for preliminary design and planning of the proposed project. The Preliminary Foundation Report has been appended to this document as Appendix C. According to the results of the foundation report, the project site does not lie within an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone and no active or potentially active faults are known to transect the project site. The closest known active fault is the Rose Canyon fault, located approximately 11 miles west of the project site. The project is outside an active fault zone; thus, the possibility of primary surface fault</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. No Impact. The project site has been disturbed by previous grading activities associated with the Sabre Springs/Peñasquitos I-15 Transit Center. The site has been previously excavated and no cultural resources were encountered within the previous limits of disturbance. Therefore, the potential to uncover human remains during construction is extremely low.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
rupture at the site is low and impacts would be less than significant.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

[a.(ii) Less Than Significant Impact. The site is located in a seismically active region of southern California that is subject to significant hazards from moderate to large earthquakes. Right lateral slip movement along the plate boundary of the San Andreas Fault is by far the most dominant factor controlling the seismicity in the region. Ground shaking due to nearby and distant earthquakes is anticipated during the life of the proposed project. The proposed project would be designed to accommodate seismic loading parameters in accordance with the 2007 California Building Code (CBC) (CBSC 2007) and ASCE/SEI 7-05 (2006) standard. Therefore, based on the incorporation of seismic design measures, potential impacts related to seismic ground shaking would be considered less than significant.

[a.(iii) Less Than Significant Impact. Earthquake-induced soil liquefaction can be described as a significant loss of soil strength and stiffness caused by an increase in pore water pressure resulting from cyclic loading during shaking. Liquefaction is most prevalent in loose to medium dense, silty, sandy and gravelly soils below the groundwater table. According to the Preliminary Foundation Report prepared for the project, the potential for soil liquefaction at the site is low due to the presence of dense to very dense soils and the lack of groundwater at the site (groundwater is expected at depths greater than 35 feet). Potential impacts associated with liquefaction and seismic-related ground failure is considered less than significant.

[iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

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

[b. Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is currently paved and is not susceptible to significant long-term soil erosion. During construction, grading and excavation could result in erosion or loss of topsoil, as areas of soil would be exposed for a short period of time. Conformance with a NPDES General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit would be required during construction of the project, including the preparation of a SWPPP, which incorporates Best Available Technology (BAT) and/or best conventional pollutant control technology (BCT) through the use of best management practices (BMPs). Implementation of a General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit (and associated SWPPP) would avoid or reduce potential short-term erosion and sedimentation impacts to a level of less than significant.

[c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

[c. Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in 6.a.iii and 6.a.iv above, potential impacts associated with liquefaction and landslides are negligible. The site is underlain by dense to very dense soils and a lack of groundwater. Therefore, potential impacts related to unstable geologic units of soils are considered less than significant.

[d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?
d. **No Impact.** Expansive soils with moderate or high expansive characteristics (soils that shrink upon drying and expand upon wetting) were not observed on-site or documented in reviewed reports. Based on the typically dense soils at the site and the underlying metavolcanic rock, the project will not create a substantial risk to life or property.

e) **No Impact.** The project does not propose use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems that depend upon appropriate soil regimes. No impact is expected and no further analysis is required.

### 7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☒ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a. Less Than Significant Impact.** “Greenhouse gases” (so called because of their role in trapping heat near the surface of the earth) emitted by human activity are implicated in global climate change, commonly referred to as “global warming.” These greenhouse gases contribute to an increase in the temperature of the earth’s atmosphere by transparency to short wavelength visible sunlight, but near opacity to outgoing terrestrial long wavelength heat radiation. The principal greenhouse gases (GHGs) are carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, ozone, and water vapor. Fossil fuel consumption in the transportation sector (on-road motor vehicles, off-highway mobile sources, and aircraft) is the single largest source of GHG emissions, accounting for approximately half of GHG emissions globally. Industrial and commercial sources are the second largest contributors of GHG emissions with about one-fourth of total emissions.

A Technical Air Quality Analysis was prepared by Entech Consulting Group (Appendix A), which evaluated project impacts from greenhouse gas emissions. The results and conclusions are summarized herein. To date, there are currently no adopted GHG significance thresholds for project CEQA clearance. The California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) has developed revisions to CEQA implementation guidelines to incorporate GHG. These were adopted by the California National Resources Agency in December, 2009, and went into effect in March 2010. They contain requirements to characterize the GHG setting, quantify the impacts resulting from the proposed project, determine impact significance, and mitigate as appropriate. They leave the determination of significance to the Lead Agency.

Based on guidance in the California Air Pollution Control Officer’s Association (CAPCOA) report CEQA and Climate Change, dated January 2008, an annual generation rate of 900 metric tons of GHG emissions was used as a screening threshold to determine if further GHG analysis is required of the project. The CAPCOA report references the 900 metric ton guideline as a conservative threshold for requiring further GHG analysis and mitigation. This emission level is based on the amount of vehicle trips, the typical energy and water use, and other factors associated with projects. If a project would exceed the annual 900 metric ton screening threshold, then a potentially significant GHG emissions impact would occur and preparation of a detailed quantitative GHG analysis would be required. GHG emissions associated with the project include those from construction and operations, as discussed below.
Construction Emissions

GHG emissions would be generated during the construction phase of the project through the use of heavy equipment. Equipment exhaust contains small amounts of methane and nitrous oxide which are also GHGs. Table 6, Construction GHG Emissions, depicts the calculated GHG emissions generated during project construction activities per year based upon the construction schedule and equipment fleet shown in 3.b above. When accounting for GHG, all types of GHG emissions are expressed in terms of CO$_2$ equivalents (CO$_2$(e)) and are quantified in metric tons (MT).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase/Year</th>
<th>CO$_2$(e) Emissions (MT per year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Entech 2010 (URBEMIS 2007 Summary Report)

GHG emissions generated during construction would be temporary and limited to the construction phases of the project. Reporting guidance from the County of San Diego also recommends amortizing short-term construction emissions over a 30-year period to account for their contribution to project lifetime GHG emissions. If emissions are amortized over a 30-year period, construction emissions would be estimated at approximately 8 MT CO$_2$(e)/year.

Operational Emissions

Implementation of the project would contribute to long term increases in GHGs as a result of traffic increases (mobile sources). As noted, fossil fuel consumption in the transportation sector is the primary source of GHG emissions globally. The project would also result in secondary operational increases in GHG emissions as a result of electricity generation to meet project-related increases in energy demand. Since electricity consumption at the site would be limited to powering security lighting, secondary sources would be extremely limited. If solar panels are installed onsite, secondary sources of GHGs could theoretically be eliminated if one-hundred percent of electricity demand is met by onsite power generation.

Annual GHG emissions, from both the construction and operational (mobile source) components are shown in Table 7, CO$_2$(e)/yr Project Emissions. Inputs used to estimate CO$_2$ emissions were peak and off peak total vehicle miles traveled (VMT), vehicle mix, and VMT distribution by speed. CO$_2$ emissions are expected to increase from existing conditions to build-out conditions due to increases in total VMT as a result of project generated trips. The proposed project’s annual operational CO$_2$(e) emissions would be 8.29 MT per year from combined primary and secondary sources. When operational and construction CO$_2$(e) emissions are combined, the suggested screening level threshold of 900 MT per year (at which point enhanced mitigation would be recommended) would not be exceeded. CO$_2$(e)/yr project emissions are substantially below the screening threshold. Therefore, GHG impacts resulting from project construction and operations would be less than significant and no further GHG analysis is required.
Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emission Source</th>
<th>Metric Tons/year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operational (2030)</td>
<td>8.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortized Construction</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Combined CO2(e)/yr</td>
<td>16.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold</td>
<td>900 MT/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Threshold?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Entech 2010 (Urbemis 2007)

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

b. No Impact. The applicable plan relative to GHG is AB 32 and a variety of GHG control legislation. A project that would inhibit AB 32 compliance would therefore have a potentially significant impact. AB 32 requires a 28 percent reduction in “business-as-usual” (BAU) practice to achieve the specified goal. A substantial percentage of that reduction will derive from national or state GHG reduction programs. The CARB has implemented programs and is developing regulatory actions such as the low-carbon fuel standard as well as passenger vehicle efficiency measures for on-road passenger/light truck transportation. Because the utilization of the proposed project would be subject to the requirements that would be developed due to AB 32, the proposed project would be consistent with the goals of AB 32. Thus, no GHG emissions impacts relative to conflicts with applicable plans or policies designed to reduce GHG emissions would occur.

8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☒ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☒ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in 8.a above, the potential for release of hazardous materials...
materials into the environment during construction would be of primary concern but would not likely occur since construction of the project would be performed in accordance with state and federal laws. Pursuant to the findings in the previous Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the transit center, the risk of hazardous materials release at the site has been evaluated and was determined to be improbable. A regulatory agency records review of properties in vicinity to the project site found that development at the transit center site would not be significantly impacted by past accidental releases of hazardous materials at off-site properties. Based on this review, associated impacts regarding the release of hazardous materials into the environment would be less than significant.

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

c. Less Than Significant Impact. The nearest public schools located in proximity to the site are Los Penasquitos Elementary School located at 14125 Cuca Street, and Morning Creek Elementary School, located at 10925 Morning Creek Drive South. Both of these schools are located greater than one-quarter mile from the proposed project site. Ashford University, a private provider of postsecondary education, is located at 13500 Evening Creek Dr N # 600, which is within one-quarter mile of the project site. Although this educational service is provided within one-quarter mile of the proposed project, compliance with state and federal laws during the construction period and implementation of BMPs, would ensure hazardous impacts do not occur.

d) 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, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

d. No Impact. A regulatory database review was conducted as part of the Initial Study for the existing transit center (Appendix F). The results of the database review concluded that no facilities located within the transit center site were included on a list of hazardous materials sites. As noted, operation of the proposed parking structure would not involve the use, transport and/or disposal of hazardous materials. Furthermore, the database review did not reveal mitigation of soil or groundwater contamination to the project site from accidental releases that have occurred off-site. Impacts associated with listed hazardous materials sites would not occur.

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

e. No Impact. The project site is approximately 15 miles southeast of McClellan-Palomar Airport, a county owned general aviation airport. The project site would be outside this airport’s area of influence as identified in the McClellan-Palomar Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (San Diego County Regional Airport Authority). No safety hazards associated with this airport facility would occur.

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

f. No Impact. The closest private airstrip to the project site is Marine Corp Air Station (MCAS) Miramar, located approximately six miles southwest of the project site. The project would be located outside MCAS Miramar’s Airport Influence Area. No impacts due to safety hazards would occur.
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**g. No Impact.** The proposed project would not impair or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Primary access to all major roads, including Sabre Springs Parkway, would be maintained during construction of the proposed project. No impacts would occur.

h) 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?

|   |   |   | X  |

**h. No Impact.** The proposed project is located in a developed and urban setting. No wildlands are located in vicinity to the project area. According to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, the project is not located in a very high fire hazard severity zone. No impacts related to wildland fires would occur.

---

**9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:** Would the project:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a. Less Than Significant Impact.** Potential water quality impacts associated with the proposed project would include short-term construction-related erosion/sedimentation and long-term operational storm water discharge. The short-term water quality impacts related to erosion/sedimentation would be less than significant based on conformance with existing regulatory requirements (i.e., acquisition of an NPDES General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit and implementation of a SWPPP).

Long-term water quality impacts associated with the project would include generation of minor quantities of urban contaminants, such as petroleum compounds, metals, and other types of contaminants that typically accumulate from parked vehicles and vehicle travel. The transport of pollutants from the project site could potentially affect water quality at receiving waters, namely Chicarita Creek. The proposed project would likely utilize the existing stormceptor (or similar water filtration system) located onsite, which is presently used to comply with NPDES guidelines for municipal storm water runoff. Long-term water quality impacts would be addressed through compliance with NPDES guidelines for municipal storm water runoff in accordance with the State Water Resources Control Board Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ, San Diego RWQCB Order No. R9-2007-0001 and/or related water quality guidelines adopted by local jurisdictions. These guidelines require that pollutant discharges and runoff from development is reduced to the maximum extent practicable and that receiving water quality objectives are not violated throughout the life of the project through implementation of source control and structural post-construction BMPs. Implementation of required BMPs would ensure that long-term water quality impacts associated with the proposed project would be less than significant.

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)?

**b. Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would not require the use of groundwater. Minimal amounts of landscape material are currently located on-site. With project implementation, this landscaping would be replaced with drought-tolerant vegetation or maintained where feasible. Thus, the proposed project would not substantially alter the amount of water consumption used for irrigation when compared to existing conditions. The site is currently developed with impervious surfaces; therefore, the proposed project would not significantly impact local groundwater recharge. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

**c. Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or vicinity and would not alter the course of a stream or river. The site is currently developed; thus, the proposed project would not significantly change stormwater flows or increase runoff volumes due to additional impervious surface. A drainage report has not yet been prepared for the project; however, on-site surface runoff would be collected in existing drainage facilities and/or proposed post-construction BMPs, which would be designed to accommodate anticipated runoff generated by the project. Therefore, potential impacts associated with on- or off-site erosion or siltation would be less than significant.

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

**d. Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or vicinity and would not alter the course of a stream or river. On-site surface runoff would be collected in existing drainage facilities and conveyed into the existing stormceptor or similar on-site water filtration system (as allowed by NPDES requirements), treated, and conveyed to Chicarita Creek. Where existing curb, gutter, and/or inlets would be removed to accommodate the new parking structure, similar facilities would be constructed at approximately the same location in areas that are currently impervious. Runoff quantities would not substantially change from present conditions since the site is already developed with hardscape/impervious surfaces. Impacts related to erosion/sedimentation, runoff rates and quantities, and/or flooding would be less than significant.

e) 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?

**e. Less Than Significant Impact.** Because there would be no substantial net increase of impervious surfaces upon project implementation, runoff volumes would not significantly increase. Runoff volumes would remain relatively unchanged and thus would not be expected to exceed the capacity of existing storm drain facilities. If it is determined that projected runoff would exceed the capacity of the existing drainage appurtenances, additional post-construction BMPs will be constructed. As discussed above, the project could contribute polluted runoff; however, the potential for water quality impacts would be addressed through compliance with the requirements of the State Water Board, San Diego RWQCB, and related water quality guidelines adopted by local jurisdictions. For these reasons, water quality impacts related to storm water capacity and/or polluted runoff would be less than significant.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

**f. Less than Significant Impact.** No additional water quality impacts other than those already described in
this section are anticipated.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**g. No Impact.** The project does not involve construction of residential units. Additionally, the project site is not within a mapped 100-year floodplain. No impact would occur.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**h. No Impact.** The proposed project is located within “Other Areas - Zone X,” or areas determined to be outside of the 500-year floodplain (FEMA). The proposed project does not include any substantial grading or fill that would impede or redirect water flow. No associated impacts related to flooding would occur.

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**i. No Impact.** As discussed above, the project site is not subject to flooding. The project site is not located within vicinity of any reservoir dam structures and thus, the potential for inundation due to dam failure is non-existent.

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**j. No Impact.** The project site is located approximately 10 miles inland and would not, therefore, be subject to inundation impacts related to tsunamis. The project site is not in close proximity to any large reservoirs or other surface waters that pose a seiche risk. The project is in a developed area and is therefore not subject to impacts related to inundation by mudflow based on the location and topography in the project area. No associated impacts would occur.

### 10. LAND USE AND PLANNING:

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a) Physically divide an established community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**a. No Impact.** The proposed parking structure and related improvements are located within the existing Sabre Springs/Peñasquitos I-15 Transit Center. The project is also located in the northern portion of the Sabre Springs community and does not propose construction of public roads, structures, or other improvements that would physically divide or separate neighborhoods within the established community. For these reasons, no physical division of the community would occur.

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**b. No Impact.** The proposed project would not conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations. The proposed project would be consistent with applicable goals and guidelines outlined in the San Diego General Plan, San Diego Strategic Framework, the Sabre Springs Community Plan, and the
2030 San Diego RTP. The recommendations contained in the Mobility Policy of the San Diego Strategic Framework are to “integrate land use and transportation planning to improve mobility” and to “support plans that make transit a viable option for peak and non-peak trips.” The proposed project would also be consistent with applicable goals and guidelines contained in the Mobility Element of the San Diego General Plan. The Mobility Element is a part of a larger body of plans and programs including the 2030 San Diego RTP that guides the development and management of the local and regional transportation system. One of the listed goals is to provide “a coordinated, multimodal transportation system capable of meeting increasing needs for personal mobility and goods movement at acceptable levels of service.” (City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan, Transportation Element, p. 87, 2006). Consistent with these goals, the proposed project supports the viability of a high-frequency express bus system along the I-15 corridor and the overall goals of the I-15 Managed Lanes Project, which is intended to increase mobility in the region. Additionally, the City General Plan provides a strategy to improve transportation options and reduce use of single-occupant vehicle trips by encouraging alternative modes of travel, such as carpooling, vanpooling, transit use, bicycling, and walking (City of San Diego General Plan, Mobility Element, Transportation Demand Management, p. ME-34, 2006). The proposed project would not result in impacts related to conflicts with adopted land use plans.

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. No Impact. The project site is located outside of the MHPA for the City’s MSCP Subarea Plan. The project site is developed and zoned for commercial development. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

11. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. No Impact. The project site is located within a developed transit center and no mineral resources occur on site. The project site is located within the designated MRZ-3 Mineral Resource Zone mapped by the California Division of Mines and Geology. Areas classified as MRZ-3 contain mineral deposits the significance of which cannot be evaluated from available information. However, no known previous mining of mineral resources has occurred at the project site. Therefore, no impacts to any current or future mining activities or regionally valuable mineral resources would occur.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. No Impact. The project site has not been used for mineral resource recovery and is not delineated as a mineral resource recovery site on any land use plans. Construction materials including sand and gravel that might be utilized for the proposed project are not expected to represent a significant amount of aggregate resources, when compared to available resources in the region. Thus, the project would not create a significant demand for mineral resources nor impact a mineral resource recovery site.
12. NOISE: Would the project result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

a. Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation. A project-focused noise assessment was prepared by Entech Consulting Group (Technical Noise Memo Sabre Springs/Peñasquitos Transit Center Project, July 2010), to evaluate noise impacts from the proposed project. The approach for assessing project noise impacts used both City of San Diego and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) criteria. A noise monitoring program was conducted to determine existing noise levels at sensitive land uses in the proposed project area. Sensitive land uses generally include residences, schools, hospitals, hotels/motels, nursing homes, resident-care facilities, parks, and child care centers. The project area west of Sabre Springs Parkway consists mainly of commercial land uses including office buildings, restaurants, and retail businesses. Single- and multi-family residences are located east of Sabre Springs Parkway. The Evening Creek Apartments are located approximately 250 feet east of the project site while single-family homes are located over 500 feet southeast from the project area, south of Evening Creek Drive. Carmel Mountain Ranch Community Park is located north of Ted Williams Parkway, approximately 400 feet from the project site. These sensitive receptors could potentially be impacted with noise generated by transit center operations and construction activities.

Transit Center Operations/Traffic Noise

Noise sources associated with operation of the transit center would primarily involve traffic noise from motor vehicles and buses that utilize the transit center. Sound measurements were conducted to measure existing noise levels from the existing transit center and surrounding area. The existing environment of the proposed project area is categorized as a “Very Noisy” Urban Residential Area. The dominant noise that contributes to this categorization results from vehicular traffic traveling on the nearby bordering roadways of I-15, Ted Williams Parkway, and Sabre Springs Parkway.

Noise impacts can be described as inaudible, potentially audible and audible. Inaudible impacts are less than 1.0 dB and are not detectable by the human ear. Potentially audible refers to changes in noise levels ranging between 1.0 and 3.0 dB. This range has only been found to be noticeable in laboratory environments. Lastly, the audible impacts generally refer to a change of 3.0 dB or greater which refers to increases in noise levels noticeable to humans. However a change in 3.0 dB or less has been found to be barely perceptible in exterior environments. Thus, a significant noise impact could occur if the proposed project would cause an increase in noise levels by greater than 3.0 dB.

Future noise impacts resulting from vehicular traffic on roadways were modeled using the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model (FHWA-RD-77-108) which includes the California specific vehicle noise curves (CALVENO). The noise computations use a series of regression formulas to calculate an energy average noise level for the different classes of vehicles (automobiles, medium truck, heavy trucks) average daily traffic volumes (ADT), vehicle speed, and the percentage of vehicles on the road during the three time periods of the day. Traffic inputs were obtained for roadway segments evaluated in the Traffic Impact Analysis Report (David Evans and Associates, Inc, 2010). Automobiles were assumed to be traveling at 45 miles per hour (mph) and medium and heavy trucks were assumed to be traveling at 40 mph and 35 mph, respectively, on Sabre Springs Parkway. On the I-15 HOV ramp, automobiles were assumed to be traveling at 65 mph and medium and heavy trucks were assumed to be traveling at 60 mph and 55 mph, respectively. Truck percentages of ADT were assumed to be at 5 percent for medium trucks and 3 percent for heavy trucks. The noise computations also calculated the CNEL value which applies an appropriate penalty for evening and nighttime hours. Traffic noise was
evaluated under existing conditions, near-term (2012) and long-term (2030) without project and with project conditions.

Table 8, Long-term Project Traffic Noise Impacts, identifies the calculated traffic noise levels without and with the proposed project under near-term (2012) and long-term (2030) conditions. As shown below, traffic noise would increase along two roadway segments in the project area, Sabre Springs Parkway, and the I-15 HOV (or DAR) ramp. During near-term conditions, Sabre Springs Parkway would experience an imperceptible change in noise with the proposed project. Although the HOV ramp would increase by 3 dB, the increase would not occur near any nearby sensitive receptors nor would the change be perceptible when combined with the existing noisy urban environment (existing noise environments along these roadways already exceed the City’s significance threshold of 65 dB CNEL for the most noise sensitive land uses without the project). Therefore, significant project-traffic noise impacts would not occur during near-term conditions. During long-term (2030) conditions, the project would cause a 0 dB CNEL increase along Sabre Springs Parkway and a 2 dB CNEL increase on the I-15 HOV ramp. Therefore, significant traffic noise impacts would not occur under long-term (2030) conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sabre Springs Pkwy</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15 HOV Ramp</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Entech 2010

Construction Noise

Temporary noise impacts are impacts associated with demolition, site preparation, grading and construction of the proposed project. Two types of short-term noise impacts are likely to occur during construction. First, the transport of workers and movement of materials to and from the site could incrementally increase noise levels along local roads. The second type of short-term noise impact is noise generated by construction equipment at the job site during demolition, site preparation, grading and/or building construction. The City of San Diego limits construction noise to between the hours of 7am and 7pm, as specified in Section 21.04 of the San Diego Municipal Code.

Earth-moving equipment (scrapers, heavy-trucks, etc.) are the noisiest sources of noise emissions during construction and can reach noise levels of 89 dBA Leq at 50 feet. It is assumed that this noise level would be representative of construction noise levels associated with the proposed project construction activities. This value takes into account the number of pieces and spacing of heavy equipment used in during construction. In later phases of construction, noise levels are typically reduced from these values and the physical structures that have been assembled further break up line-of-sight from the nearby receivers. Based on the 89 dBA value and assuming that construction were to occur for eight hours a day, the CNEL is calculated at 84 dBA at 50 feet. The location of construction for the proposed project would potentially expose noise sensitive receivers such as the single-family and multi-family residences to significant levels of short-term noise exposure from construction activities. Therefore, the following mitigation is required to ensure construction noise impacts are reduced to less than significant levels:
NOISE-1: Construction equipment and supplies shall be located in staging areas that shall create the greatest distance possible between construction-related noise sources and noise sensitive receivers nearest the project area. This information shall be specified on all grading, excavation and construction plans.

Implementation of NOISE-1 would ensure potentially significant short-term construction impacts are below a level of significance.

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

b. Less Than Significant Impact. The nearest sensitive receivers found within the proposed project area are single-family and multi-family residences located on the west side of Sabre Springs Parkway. These residences are labeled as Category 2 Land Uses, the nearest residences are located approximately 250 feet from the proposed project location. The maximum FTA screening distance for Category 2 Land Uses is 50 feet. Both the single-family and multi-family residences are located outside the FTA recommended screening distance, therefore, no vibration impacts are likely to occur. Construction activities, especially those associated with impact equipment such as pile driving, are a known source of groundborne noise and vibration. Construction of the proposed project would not require extensive use of impact equipment. For these reasons, a less than significant impact is expected.

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

c. Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in 12.a above, the proposed project would not lead to a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise in the project vicinity. Noise level increases during near-term (2010) and long-term (2030) conditions would be imperceptible. Therefore, a less than significant impact is expected with project implementation.

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

d. Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. See discussion in Item 12.a above.

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

e. No Impact. The project area is not within the airport land use plan of a public airport. Implementation of the project would not change the exposure of people to existing aircraft noise levels.

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

f. No Impact. The project area is not in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Implementation of the project would not change the exposure of people to existing aircraft noise levels.
13. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

**a. No Impact.** Implementation of the proposed project would not directly induce population growth due to the fact that no housing or new businesses are proposed. The proposed project would not provide substantial new employment that would foster in-migration. No major changes would be made to the existing circulation system, and the project would connect to existing utility lines. The project does not propose the extension of any new roads or infrastructure to previously undeveloped or inaccessible areas that would open up new areas for development. For these reasons, the project would not directly or indirectly induce population growth.

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

**b. No Impact.** The limits of construction are within the existing transit center. No housing units are located within the transit center and no housing would be removed as part of the project. No impacts would occur.

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

**c. No Impact.** The limits of construction are within the existing transit center whereby no housing or businesses are located. The project would not result in the removal of any existing houses, or the displacement of any residents or businesses. No impacts would occur.

14. PUBLIC SERVICES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

- Fire protection & Emergency Medical Services?

  **No Impact.**

- Police protection?

  **No Impact.**

- Schools?

  **No Impact.**
a. **No Impact.** The project site is located within an existing transit center and developed urban area that is currently served by public services, including fire and police protection, schools, and parks. The proposed project would not generate population growth, and, therefore, would not substantially increase demand for these public services.

The City of San Diego Fire Department currently provides and would continue to provide fire protection and emergency medical services at the transit center. Station 42 at 12110 World Trade Drive (approximately 2.5 miles northeast of the project site [driving distance]) serves the project site. Police protection is provided by the San Diego Police Department (Northeastern Division), with the closest station located at 13396 Salmon River Road, approximately 2.6 miles to the west. Police and fire protection for the proposed project would not result in the construction of any new residences or businesses which would generate a service need from police and fire protection agencies. Implementation of the proposed project in an existing developed area would not result in a demand for any new or altered police, fire protection or emergency medical services. The proposed project consists of parking structure and associated improvements which would not generate any residents who would require schools, parks, or other public facilities; therefore, no permanent impacts would occur to such facilities.

---

**15. RECREATION:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**b. No Impact.** Existing recreational facilities are located within the project vicinity, including the Carmel Mountain Ranch Recreation Center, located immediately north of SR-56, and Sabre Springs Park, located approximately one mile to the south. Construction of the proposed project does not include a residential component and therefore, would not substantially increase the use of these existing facilities, nor would it result in an increase in the demand for any new or altered park facilities. No impacts related to recreational facilities would occur.

**b. No Impact.** The proposed project does not include, nor does it require construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Impacts to recreational facilities would not occur.
16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including 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?

a. Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. A project-specific Traffic Impact Analysis was performed by David Evans and Associates, Inc. (Sabre Springs/ Peñasquitos I-15 Transit Center Traffic Impact Analysis, July 2010) to evaluate potential traffic impacts associated with the project under near-term (year 2012) and horizon year (2030) conditions. The traffic analysis analyzed existing and future conditions at seven intersections and two roadway segments in the project vicinity. The following intersections were analyzed:

- Sabre Springs and Ted Williams WB Ramps
- Sabre Springs and Ted Williams EB Ramps
- Sabre Springs Parkway and Carmel Mountain Express Drive
- Sabre Springs Parkway and Evening Creek Drive
- Evening Creek Drive and South Access Rd (SB)
- Internal Int/Main Structure Access (SB/NB)
- West Access (WB)

The following roadway segments were analyzed:

- Sabre Springs Parkway (between Ted Williams Parkway and Transit Center)
- Carmel Mountain Express Drive (between I-15 and Transit Center)

Assessment of project impacts on these intersections and roadway segments is based on City of San Diego significance thresholds, which establish measures of effectiveness for intersections and roadway segments. The City of San Diego Significance Thresholds are shown in Table 9, Intersections and Roadway Significance Thresholds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Measure of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Significance Threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Seconds of delay</td>
<td>&gt;2.0 seconds at LOS E or &gt;1.0 seconds at LOS F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Segment</td>
<td>v/c ratio</td>
<td>&gt;0.02 at LOS E or &gt;0.01 at LOS F, and adjacent intersections operate at unacceptable LOS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LOS = Level of Service; v/c = volume-to-capacity ratio; > = greater than

Source: DEA 2010

Project Traffic

Existing trips associated with the transit center consist of passenger cars and buses. Trip generation rates documented in the San Diego Trip Generation Manual (part of the San Diego Municipal Code, Land
Development Code, including May 2003 revisions) were used to estimate the traffic that would be generated by the proposed project. For future year trip generation, it was assumed that the provided parking spaces would be fully utilized during the peak hour periods. It was also assumed that additional transit services would be provided as necessary to meet the increased passenger demand and, therefore, the transit service characteristics were not considered to limit the trip generation of the lots.

Three types of trips were considered as part of the future trip generation analysis, including: park and ride trips; ride-sharing trips; and kiss and ride trips. Overall, the proposed project is estimated to generate 4,970 daily trips.

**Project Traffic Impacts**

Assessment of near-term and horizon year (2030) traffic conditions indicate that all analyzed intersections (signalized and unsignalized) would operate at LOS C or better during AM and PM peak periods. The projected performance of selected intersections in the existing year (2010), near-term, and horizon year, are indicated in Table 10, Summary of Average Delay and LOS: AM Peak Hour; and Table 11, Summary of Average Delay and LOS: PM Peak Hour. As shown in Tables 10 and 11, the proposed project would cause minor delays at intersections that were analyzed; however, the delay would not be substantial enough to reduce LOS at any off-site intersection under analysis or cause any intersection to fall below the acceptable standard (the acceptable LOS standard for intersections in San Diego is LOS D). All intersections would operate at LOS C or better under near-term and horizon year with project conditions.

The analyzed roadway segments of Sabre Springs Parkway (between I-15 and transit center) and Carmel Mountain Express Drive (between Ted Williams Parkway and the transit center access) would operate at LOS D or better, which exceeds the City of San Diego’s LOS standard for roadways. Sabre Springs Parkway is a four-lane major arterial that can carry up to 40,000 vehicles a day. With an existing traffic volume of 16,700 vehicles per day, the addition of 2,600 daily project trips would increase the volume to capacity (v/c) ratio from 0.56 (LOS C) without the project to 0.625 (LOS C) with the project. The increase in v/c ratio of 0.0625 is more than the 0.04 maximum allowable increase for roadways that operate at LOS C. However, this segment would operate at better than the acceptable LOS D standard for roadways. Along Carmel Mountain Express Drive, between I-15 and the transit center, the v/c ratio would increase from 0.17 (LOS A) without the project to 0.23 (LOS A) with the project. Carmel Mountain Express Drive is a two-lane collector roadway with no fronting property that can carry up to 10,000 vehicles a day. The addition of 600 vehicle trips from project traffic to an existing volume of 700 vehicle trips would not cause a significant degradation of service along Carmel Mountain Express Drive. Traffic impacts to intersections and roadway segments resulting from the proposed project would be less than significant under both near-term and horizon year conditions.
### Table 10
Summary of Average Delay and LOS: AM Peak Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>2010 Existing</th>
<th>2012 Without Project</th>
<th>2012 With Project</th>
<th>2030 Without Project</th>
<th>2030 With Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signalized (Delay/LOS for overall intersection)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabre Springs &amp; Ted Williams WB Ramps</td>
<td>C 23.6</td>
<td>C 23.7</td>
<td>C 25.1</td>
<td>C 25.8</td>
<td>C 27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabre Springs &amp; Ted Williams EB Ramps</td>
<td>B 17.1</td>
<td>B 17.3</td>
<td>B 17.6</td>
<td>B 19.9</td>
<td>C 24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabre Springs &amp; Carmel Mountain Express Drive</td>
<td>A 3.9</td>
<td>A 3.9</td>
<td>A 7.4</td>
<td>A 4.1</td>
<td>A 7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabre Springs &amp; Evening Creek Drive</td>
<td>C 24.8</td>
<td>C 24.9</td>
<td>C 25.3</td>
<td>C 26.7</td>
<td>C 27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unsignalized (Delay/LOS for critical movement)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening Creek Drive &amp; South Access Rd (SB)</td>
<td>B 11.2</td>
<td>B 11.2</td>
<td>B 12.7</td>
<td>B 12.1</td>
<td>B 14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Int/Main Structure Access (SB/NB) *</td>
<td>A 8.4</td>
<td>A 8.5</td>
<td>C 15.1</td>
<td>A 9.1</td>
<td>C 17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Access (WB)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>B 11.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (Without Project/With Project)

Source: DEA 2010

### Table 11
Summary of Average Delay and LOS: PM Peak Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>2010 Existing</th>
<th>2012 Without Project</th>
<th>2012 With Project</th>
<th>2030 Without Project</th>
<th>2030 With Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signalized (Delay/LOS for overall intersection)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabre Springs &amp; Ted Williams WB Ramps</td>
<td>B 16.9</td>
<td>B 17.1</td>
<td>B 17.9</td>
<td>B 19.0</td>
<td>C 21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabre Springs &amp; Ted Williams EB Ramps</td>
<td>B 16.1</td>
<td>B 16.1</td>
<td>B 16.9</td>
<td>B 16.6</td>
<td>B 17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabre Springs &amp; Carmel Mountain Express Drive</td>
<td>A 4.4</td>
<td>A 4.5</td>
<td>A 9.4</td>
<td>A 6.0</td>
<td>A 9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabre Springs &amp; Evening Creek Drive</td>
<td>C 25.5</td>
<td>C 25.6</td>
<td>C 26.0</td>
<td>C 29.7</td>
<td>C 30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unsignalized (Delay/LOS for critical movement)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening Creek Drive &amp; South Access Rd (SB)</td>
<td>A 8.8</td>
<td>A 8.8</td>
<td>B 10.2</td>
<td>A 9.7</td>
<td>B 10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Int/Main Structure Access (SB)</td>
<td>A 8.8</td>
<td>A 8.8</td>
<td>C 19.0</td>
<td>A 9.4</td>
<td>C 24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Access (WB)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>B 13.6</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (Without Project/With Project)

Source: DEA 2010
Temporary Construction Impacts

Project construction is anticipated to last approximately 12 months. During this time, the transit center is planned to be closed to accommodate staging and construction of the parking structure. The temporary closure of the transit center is expected to create some inconvenience for existing transit users. However, it is assumed that many of the existing users of the facility could utilize other park and ride lots in the area. In particular, the following two park and rides are close in proximity to the project and have an express bus route in common with the Springs/Peñasquitos I-15 Transit Center:

- **Park and Ride Lot No. 31**: Located at Rancho Carmel Drive and Provencal Place, north of Ted Williams Parkway, this is the closest park and ride lot to the transit center. The lot has 70 parking spaces and the 860 express bus route stops at this park and ride and connects to downtown San Diego.

- **Park and Ride Lot No. 16**: Located at Sabre Springs and Poway Road, this park and ride lot has 103 parking spaces. The 820 express bus route stops at this park and ride and connects to downtown San Diego.

Other park and rides located west of I-15 may also serve transit center users during the construction closure. Overall, it is believed that there are enough parking spaces and bus connections at the nearby park and ride lots to accommodate the temporary closure of the transit center; thus, the temporary closure of the transit center is not expected to create a significant delay for users. To ensure associated construction impacts are not created and remain less than significant, the following mitigation measure is recommended:

**TRAFFIC-1**: During construction, it is recommended that signage be posted to direct existing transit center users to the alternate park and ride facilities nearby. Sign verbiage shall remind drivers of alternative bus transit access locations, the location of alternate park and ride facilities, operable routes, and hours of operation. Signage shall also indicate that parking is prohibited at adjacent office/retail parking lots or on residential streets as posted.

Staging of construction equipment and materials storage for the proposed parking structure would be located entirely within the transit center site. An increase in construction-related truck traffic is expected during construction. However, overall traffic volumes are expected to decline due to the closure of the facility. The surrounding transportation network is expected to continue to function acceptably at all intersections and roadways within the study area while the transit center is under construction. With implementation of TRAFFIC-1, impacts would be less than significant.

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?

b. Less Than Significant Impact. The Congestion Management Program (CMP), established in 1990 as a part of SANDAG’s RTP, was established in order to monitor the performance of the region’s transportation system and develop programs to address congestion and integrate transportation and land use planning. Under the Land Use Program of the CMP, a Traffic Impact Study is required for all projects generating 2,400 or more average daily trips or 200 or more peak hour trips. The proposed expansion of the Sabre Springs/Peñasquitos I-15 Transit Center would generate approximately 5,000 vehicle trips per day. Therefore, the proposed project is subject to CMP guidelines and additional analysis.

The analysis must assess impacts to state highways and regionally significant arterials. Three roadway corridors listed in the CMP are potentially affected by the project including: the I-15 corridor from Riverside County Line to I-5; the SR-163 corridor from I-15 to I-5; and the SR-56 (Ted Williams Freeway) corridor.
from I-5 to I-15.

Construction of the proposed project would result in an estimated 600 daily vehicle trips originating from or destined for the transit center via the I-15 corridor. Specifically, these trips would be added to the I-15 Managed Lanes/HOV facility. Beyond the extents of this facility, the trips would utilize the I-15 mainline. These trips would be high-occupancy vehicle trips and transit trips replacing single-occupancy vehicle trips on the roadway system. Therefore, it is expected that the proposed transit center would actually reduce vehicles utilizing the mainline I-15 travel lanes.

The SR-163 corridor from I-15 to I-5 provides north-south access to downtown San Diego. Some of the vehicle trips to/from the proposed transit center would utilize SR-163 south of the I-15 Managed Lanes/HOV facility. These trips would generally be high-occupancy vehicle trips and transit trips replacing single-occupancy vehicle trips on the roadway system. It is expected that the proposed transit center will actually reduce vehicles utilizing SR-163.

The proposed project would attract an estimated 1,400 daily vehicle trips that would access the transit center via the SR-56 corridor. These vehicle trips would be trips shifting origins/destinations, rather than new trips along the corridor. Instead of directly accessing the I-15 mainline, the trips would originate from or be destined for the transit center. It is expected that the overall trips along the SR-56 corridor would remain the same with construction of the proposed transit center.

The proposed project would generally replace single-occupancy vehicle trips with high-occupancy vehicle trips and transit riders. For this reason, the proposed project would help to achieve the objectives of the CMP by reducing traffic volumes and no associated significant impacts to the applicable CMP would occur.

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

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

   f. No Impact. The proposed project consists of improvements to an existing transit center that supports a transit alternative to private vehicular travel. As discussed in item 10.b above, the proposed improvements are consistent with adopted policies, plans, and programs supporting alternative transportation. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:

   a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

      a. No Impact. The project is located within a transit center that is currently served by existing utilities and infrastructure. The proposed parking structure would not create additional facilities that would generate wastewater or increase water demand. The demand for wastewater and water services associated with the project would not require new or expanded facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

   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?

      b. No Impact. The proposed parking structure would not create additional facilities that would generate wastewater or increase water demand. Existing landscaping would be maintained or replaced to accommodate the project; however, no additional water usage would occur. The demand for wastewater and water services associated with the project would not require new or expanded facilities. No impact would occur.

   c. Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is comprised almost entirely of impervious surfaces and is currently served by water drainage facilities and water filtration infrastructure. Existing storm drain inlets are located in the southern portion of the site and along the west side of the access road. On-site storm water is collected by drainage inlets and conveyed to a stormceptor or similar water filtration system located along the existing DAR access road, prior to being discharged into Chicarita Creek. The proposed project would not result in an increase in impervious surface; therefore the amount of surface runoff and rate of runoff would not increase. Significant direct impacts associated with storm water drainage facilities would not occur because existing facilities are capable of handling storm water associated with the proposed project.

   d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

      d. No Impact. The project is located within a transit center that is currently served by existing utilities and infrastructure. The proposed parking structure would not create additional facilities that would generate wastewater or increase water demand. The demand for wastewater and water services associated with the project would not require new or expanded facilities. No impact would occur.
d. **No Impact.** The proposed project would not result in an increased demand for permanent water use and would not require expansion of existing water supply.

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

**e. No Impact.** The proposed project would not result in an increased demand for wastewater services. No impacts related to wastewater treatment would occur.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?

**f. Less Than Significant Impact.** Solid waste disposal needs would not permanently increase with project implementation. During construction, disposal of construction debris that cannot be reused or recycled would be served by remaining capacity at the West Miramar or Sycamore Sanitary Landfills. Landfill capacity is presently available at the West Miramar and Sycamore Sanitary Landfills to dispose of construction wastes from the project. Impact to regional landfill capacity would be short term during construction and would be less than significant.

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

**g. No Impact.** The proposed project would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, no associated impacts would occur.

---

18. **MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**a. Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** There is the potential for invasive species to spread into Chicarita Creek if project landscaping includes the use of invasive plants or trees. Implementation of BIOLOGY-1 would reduce this potential impact to below a level of significance. There is also the potential for tree removal, if any is necessary to accommodate project construction, to impact nesting birds. Implementation of BIOLOGY-2 would reduce this potential impact to below a level of significance. Due to the existing developed nature of the site, the proposed project would not substantially degrade the quality of the environment, nor would the proposed project cause a drop in fish or wildlife populations, threaten to eliminate a plant or wildlife habitat, or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. As discussed in Section 5, impacts to Cultural Resources would not occur.
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

b. Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project could contribute to cumulative effects associated with air quality, noise, and traffic.

Air Quality

As discussed under Section 3, Air Quality, pollutant emissions generated during construction and operation of the project would be substantially below established significance thresholds. It is possible that construction of the project could coincide with construction of the cumulative projects in the project area. However, even if construction activities were concurrent, the project’s contribution to short-term, construction related air emissions would not be cumulatively considerable. Cumulative projects would be subject to the same air quality thresholds and would be required to implement measures during construction, as required, to ensure that short-term air emissions would not be significant. Therefore, project implementation would not result in a significant cumulative air quality impact.

With regard to long-term operation cumulative impacts associated with ozone precursors (NOx and/or ROCs), significant cumulative impacts do not generally occur if a proposed project is consistent with the local transportation master plan and project emissions have been accounted for in the ozone attainment assumptions contained within the RAQS. The project would not promote growth or develop new roadways in areas where there are no existing roadways, and would be consistent with the City of San Diego General Plan (Mobility and Land Use Elements). Therefore, the project would not result in a cumulatively significant air quality impact.

Noise

Noise sources associated with operation of the transit center would primarily involve traffic noise from motor vehicles and buses that utilize the transit center. Cumulative traffic noise was evaluated in Section 12, Noise, as part of the long-term year (2030) traffic noise analysis. As identified in item 12.a, no significant traffic noise impacts would occur under long-term year conditions. Non-traffic noise generated by the project would be negligible and would not substantially increase existing ambient noise levels in the project area when combined with non-traffic noise of the cumulative projects. In addition, compliance with existing noise regulations of the City of San Diego for cumulative projects would minimize construction noise impacts. Therefore, the project would not contribute to cumulatively considerable noise impacts.

Traffic

Cumulative traffic impacts were evaluated in Section 16, Transportation/Traffic, as part of the horizon year (2030) conditions analysis. As identified in item 16.a, no significant traffic impacts would occur under horizon year conditions. Therefore, no cumulatively considerable significant traffic impact would occur.

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

c. Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in Section 8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, substantial adverse effects on human beings would not be created by project implementation. As discussed in Section 3, Air Quality, conformance with SDAPCD rules and regulations during construction would reduce air quality impacts associated with construction activities that could be harmful to humans. Therefore, adverse environmental effects on humans would be below a level of significance.
FISH AND GAME DETERMINATION

Based on the information above, there is no evidence that the project has a potential for a change that would adversely affect wildlife resources or the habitat upon which the wildlife depends.

☐ Yes (Certificate of Fee Exemption)

☒ No (Pay fee)
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