PROJECT NAME: Otay Ranch Planning Area 12

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Chula Vista

PROJECT APPLICANT: GGP-Otay Ranch L.P.

DATE: August 16, 2023

1 INTRODUCTION

The Final Environmental Impact Report for the Otay Ranch Freeway Commercial Sectional Planning Area Plan Planning Area 12 (FEIR) (identified by the City of Chula Vista as EIR 02-04, SCH 1989010154), which was certified by the Chula Vista City Council on April 1, 2003 (Resolution 2003-131) contains a comprehensive disclosure and analysis of potential environmental effects associated with implementation of the Sectional Planning Area (SPA) Plan and Freeway Commercial (FC-1 and FC-2) site in the City of Chula Vista (City) (City of Chula Vista 2003). The SPA Plan was developed to refine and implement the land use plans, goals, and objectives of the Otay Ranch General Development Plan (GDP) for the development of Planning Area (PA) 12.

In 2004, as part of the FEIR, the City approved the development of 1,215,000 square feet of commercial uses within the SPA Plan area, including administrative and professional office services, general commercial uses, and public and semipublic uses. The approved project also included a light rail alignment or transit way and a station site for the San Diego Trolley, accompanied by a park-and-ride facility. In May 2015, the City approved the General Plan and Otay Ranch GDP Amendments, as well as entitlements, for the proposed modifications to rezone the northerly FC-2 portion from Commercial to Mixed-Use Residential to add 600 residential units through approval of the First Addendum to the FEIR. In September 2016, a Second Addendum to the FEIR was prepared for the SPA Plan Amendments and a Tentative Map that implements the General Plan and Otay Ranch GDP. In May 2019, a Third Addendum to the FEIR was approved to add 300 residential units to Freeway Commercial North (FC-2). The FEIR, First Addendum, Second Addendum, and Third Addendum are collectively referred to herein as the "FEIR."

This Fourth Addendum addresses proposed modifications (involving the General Plan, GDP, and SPA Amendment) to the southerly FC-1 (project site) only (specifically, Assessor's Parcel Numbers 643-061-02, -04, -05, -08, and -11). See Figure 1, Project Location. This addendum proposes residential and mixed-use/residential in the northwest quadrant of the FC-1 site by introducing up to 840 residential units. The northwest portion of the FC-1 site would be rezoned

1

to Mixed-Use/Residential (MU/R). The SPA Amendment would also reduce existing commercial entitlements on the entirety of the FC-1 site from 960,000 square feet to 816,000 square feet. To date, 669,700 square feet of commercial area has been completed at the Otay Ranch Town Center.

The FC-1 site is 87.25 acres and is currently developed with commercial uses known as the Otay Ranch Town Center (Town Center). Existing land uses at the Town Center are primarily commercial, including retail, food and beverage, entertainment, and community-serving land uses.

2 CEQA REQUIREMENTS

Sections 15162 through 15164 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines discuss a lead agency's responsibilities in handling new information that was not included in a project's Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines provides the following:

- a. When an EIR has been certified...for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:
 - 1. Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
 - 2. Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
 - 3. New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the EIR was certified as complete, shows any of the following:
 - A. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the EIR;
 - B. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the EIR;
 - C. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or

D. Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

In the event that one of these conditions would require preparation of a subsequent EIR, but "only minor additions or changes would be necessary to make the EIR adequately apply to the project in the changed situation," the City could choose instead to issue a supplement to the FEIR (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15163[a]).

In the alternative, where the changes or new information would result in no new impacts, or no more severe impacts than any that were disclosed in the FEIR for the proposed project, the City "shall prepare an addendum" pursuant to CEQA Guideline Section 15164. That section states that an addendum should include a "brief explanation of the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162," and that the explanation needs to be supported by substantial evidence (CEQA Guidelines Section 15164[e]). The addendum need not be circulated for public review, but may simply be attached to the FEIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15164[c]).

Thus, in the following inquiry, the City considers under the standards articulated above whether each of these changed circumstances reveal or create previously undisclosed significant environmental impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously disclosed impacts (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15162, 15163, 15164[a]; 15088.5[a],[b]). As the following discussion demonstrates, it is appropriate for the City to prepare this Fourth Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Otay Ranch Freeway Commercial Sectional Planning Area Plan Planning Area 12, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 because none of the circumstances listed in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a) exist.

3 PROJECT LOCATION AND REGIONAL SETTING

Otay Ranch lies within the East Planning Area of the City. The East Planning Area is bordered by Interstate 805 to the west, San Miguel Mountain and State Route (SR) 54 to the north, the Otay Reservoir and the Jamul foothills to the east, and the Otay River Valley to the south. The SPA Plan area is in the northeastern portion of the Otay Valley Parcel of the 22,899-acre Otay Ranch GDP project area. The project site (16.59 acres), which comprises the northwestern portion of the FC-1 site, is immediately east of SR-125, west of Eastlake Parkway, and between Ring Road and Birch Road.

The existing Town Center is largely oriented in an east/west direction, abutting a private driveway that serves as the main connection between the shops. However, a theater building is near the northeast corner and is connected to the main axis via a pedestrian mall. Five commercial buildings are along Eastlake Parkway. Parking is spread across the property, primarily behind the buildings, and has mature and maintained landscaping. There are five signalized access points: two on Birch Road, two on Eastlake Parkway, and one on Town Center Drive entering the site from the north.

The Metropolitan Transit System operates a Bus Rapid Transit service that has a dedicated route on the northern boundary of the property, then southerly along the eastern boundary to Birch Road, then south. The Bus Rapid Transit stops on site north of the Main Street/Kestrel Falls Road entry to the property. In addition, there are temporary recreational uses generally located in the northwest corner of the project site.

The project site is surrounded by other Otay Ranch development areas, including Village 6 to the west, Village 11 to the east, a portion of the existing Eastlake community to the north and northeast, Village 7 to the southwest, and the Eastern Urban Center to the south of Birch Road. Eastlake High School and a commercial area are north of the project site, and the Arco Olympic Training Center is east of the project site, immediately adjacent to Otay Lake.

4 PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS

This Fourth Addendum addresses the proposed General Plan Amendment, Otay Ranch General Development Plan Amendment, SPA Plan Amendment, Tentative Map, and Planned Community Rezone. These amendments for FC-1 would allow development of 840 residential units (42 low-income and 42 moderate-income) while reducing the allowed commercial square footage from 960,000 square feet to 816,000 square feet. Development of the 840 residential units would be centered within the northwest portion of the FC-1 site and would have a density range of 18 to 56 units per acre. Three buildings are proposed: two residential buildings and one mixed-use/residential building (see Figure 2, Project Site Plan). Proposed residential uses would range in square footage from approximately 600 square feet to 1,400 square feet, ranging in height from two to six stories. The proposed residences would feature unique combinations of elevations and colors, focusing on creating a varied street scene.

Proposed amendments also include 2.73 acres of public plaza/park space. The existing Town Center would continue to operate, but demolition of 37,200 square feet of existing commercial space is proposed, to be replaced with a ground-floor commercial area within the Mixed-Use/Residential (MU/R) building. The commercial area to be demolished is located along the northwestern portion of Main Street/Kestrel Falls Road. This would allow for the construction of

one of the three proposed residential buildings. The other two buildings, which would be strictly residential, would be north of the Mixed-Use/Residential (MU/R) building on the portion of the site that is currently vacant/parking lot.

Based on the proposed reduction of commercial entitlements from 960,000 square feet to 816,000 square feet, and added to what is currently built in FC-1 (669,700 square feet), there would be approximately 146,300 square feet of remaining commercial entitlements that could be constructed in the future.

Various passive and active recreational open space areas would be distributed throughout the residential areas to provide recreational opportunities within walking distance of proposed residences. Active recreation areas may include children play areas, parkour routes, and walking trails, and passive recreational uses may include benches, tables, and paths. These areas would be a combination of landscaped and hardscaped areas surrounding the new structures and within the commercial core of the community. A significant portion of the existing private street that crosses the commercial core would be closed to vehicles to create a pedestrian core for shoppers and visitors. Additionally, each residential building would provide private open space areas, such as balconies, porches, patios, rooftop amenities, and recreation areas, for residents.

Site Access

The project site is bounded by Eastlake Parkway, a six-lane Major Arterial, to the east; Birch Road, a six-lane Prime Arterial to the south; SR-125 to the west; and the FC-2 site to the north. Olympic Parkway, an eight-lane Prime Arterial, forms the northerly boundary of the FC-2 site. The primary access into FC-2 is Town Center Drive, a Commercial Promenade that ties into Olympic Parkway and runs north/south, bisecting the FC-2 site.

To access the FC-1 site from the north, the southerly extension of Town Center Drive as a private collector road is proposed. There are three access drives (one signalized, full access at Main Street/Kestrel Falls Road, and two right-turn-only) into the site from Eastlake Parkway. Two signalized access drives off of Birch Road, at Otay Ranch Drive and Millenia Avenue, would remain.

Internal Circulation

Internal circulation for the project site would be provided by the extension of Town Center Drive, along with the proposed Private Street A, a private drive that would interconnect the residential and mixed-use/residential buildings in an east/west direction between Private First Street and Town Center Drive. Private First Street extends north/south from Private Street A to the existing Vista Miguel Avenue, adjacent to Macy's. Private Second Street extends southerly from Private

Street A and continues south beyond Macy's. The proposed Town Center Drive extension and the proposed private roads would interconnect to existing internal private circulation serving the commercial development at multiple locations, carrying traffic to the aforementioned access points at Eastlake Parkway and Birch Road.

Project Objectives

Following are the objectives of the proposed project:

- 1. Alleviate the growing housing needs of the City and region by providing for multi-family housing units, while also putting an underutilized property to productive economic use.
- 2. Develop a mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented community on an underutilized site with a range of residential and commercial uses, that will support commercial businesses to their highest and best performance.
- 3. Support ridership along the adjacent Bus Rapid Transit route and create a walkable district that will reduce residents' reliance on the automobile for daily trips, thereby reducing vehicle miles travelled.
- 4. Implement the goals, objectives, and policies of the Chula Vista General Plan; the Otay Ranch GDP; and the Freeway Commercial SPA Plan.
- 5. Implement practices and commitments to ensure that public and community facilities, such as transportation, water, flood control, sewage disposal, schools and parks, are provided in a timely manner and financed by the parties creating the demand for, and benefiting from, the improvements.
- 6. Provide for orderly planning and long-range development of the project to ensure community compatibility and orderly growth and prevent urban sprawl.
- 7. Ensure new uses are compatible with the existing community by establishing setbacks, design regulations and guidelines, best practices, and performance standards that enhance quality of life for neighboring properties.
- 8. Create a land use plan that can realistically be implemented within current and projected economic conditions.

5 IDENTIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

The environmental analysis provided in Section 6, Analysis, supports a determination that approval and implementation of the proposed modifications in the northwest portion of the FC-1 site would not result in any additional significant environmental effects beyond those previously analyzed under the FEIR.

The proposed modifications would not require an expansion of the project site from that studied in the FEIR. No additional significant impacts beyond those previously analyzed in the FEIR, or substantial increases in any identified significant impacts, are anticipated; however, the proposed modifications represent new information that was not available at the time that the FEIR was certified. Therefore, the City has prepared this addendum pursuant to CEQA Section 15162 to disclose minor changes in the proposed project, and minor changes in some of the environmental effects as a result of the proposed modifications.

6 ANALYSIS

Land Use, Planning, and Zoning

Impacts regarding land use, planning, and zoning were addressed in Section 5.1 of the FEIR. Impacts regarding land use compatibility and compliance with relevant plans, policies, and ordinances were determined to be less than significant and no mitigation would be required. Regarding impacts to a change in established community character, the FEIR determined that impacts would be significant and unavoidable due to development of site, which would change the character from rural open space to an urban use.

Since that determination in the FEIR was made, the site and surrounding area have been built out. New roads, commercial centers, and residential buildings have since been constructed in the immediate vicinity around the project site. Therefore, although the proposed modifications would increase development on the site, it would not further exacerbate the significant and unavoidable impact regarding community character that was determined in the FEIR. The proposed modifications would not result in new substantial or significant impacts beyond those previously analyzed in the FEIR.

Aesthetics/Landform Alterations

Impacts to aesthetics were addressed in Section 5.2 of the FEIR. Impacts regarding landform alteration were determined to be significant and unmitigable due to the change in topography and landscape, predominately from rural to urban/developed. Regarding light and glare, impacts were determined to be significant due to the increase in development on site and nighttime illumination impacts. With implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.2-1 through 5.2-9 from the FEIR, light and glare impacts were reduced to less than significant.

As analyzed in the FEIR, the SPA Plan would not result in obstruction of a scenic vista, and no scenic resources are visible from nearby roadways, including Olympic Parkway, which is not a designated scenic highway, but is considered a "scenic corridor" as designated by the City's

General Plan (City of Chula Vista 2021). The FEIR included an undulating landscaped buffer at the project frontage along Olympic Parkway as a project design feature; however, this feature was included to minimize impacts to visual quality resulting from the predominantly large-scale commercial development that was originally proposed. Those areas are now designated and proposed for residential and hotel uses. As such, the current proposal would offer urban scenes not commercial development, and an undulating landscaped buffer is no longer necessary.

Moreover, the adopted SPA Plan includes design development standards to minimize impacts to visual quality. The proposed modification would introduce residential and mixed-use/residential to the northwest quadrant of the FC-1 site by adding 840 residential units and reducing existing commercial entitlements from 960,000 square feet to 816,000 square feet. A Design Plan for the project has been prepared that guides the design of sites within the project to ensure that the quality of the adopted urban design and architectural concepts established for the overall Otay Ranch community are maintained. Retail, residential, office, service, restaurant, and entertainment uses would be integrated in a way that would provide an environment appropriate to each use. Because of the importance of unifying themes and designs over an extended development period, the Design Plan would be used to ensure overall consistency while allowing for flexibility at the site plan level of detail.

The project site is already built out, and the addition of residential units and reduction of commercial square footage would not result in any significant impacts to scenic vistas or resources beyond those analyzed in the FEIR. In addition, the FEIR includes a discussion of nine key views; however due to the amount of development that has occurred since preparation of the FEIR, the project site would not be visible from any of these locations.

The FEIR identified significant impacts resulting from additional light and glare to the area because the proposed project would introduce new land uses to a currently undeveloped site. The proposed modifications would introduce similar light and glare elements to the area; however, the project site boundaries would remain as analyzed previously, and no new light and glare impacts beyond those identified in the FEIR would occur. Any new lighting provided as part of the proposed modifications (e.g., street lighting, parking lot illumination, lighting of pedestrian walkways) would follow the requirements contained in Mitigation Measures 5.2-1 through 5.2-9 as identified in the FEIR. Therefore, no new mitigation would be required beyond Mitigation Measures 5.2-1 through 5.2-9 as identified in the FEIR.

Although the proposed modifications would result in additional residential units and a reduction in commercial square footage, the modification would maintain all previously analyzed design

standards and architectural considerations. Therefore, the proposed modifications would not result in new substantial or significant impacts beyond those previously analyzed in the FEIR.

Air Quality

Impacts to air quality are addressed in Section 5.4 of the FEIR. The FEIR found that impacts associated with air quality standard violations would be significant and unavoidable. The FEIR found that volatile organic compound (VOC) and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) emissions would exceed thresholds during construction, and that carbon monoxide (CO), VOC, NO_x, and particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀) emissions would exceed thresholds during operation. Given the project's air quality—related impacts identified in the FEIR, Mitigation Measures 5.4-1 through 5.4-4 were incorporated in project design to address emissions of VOCs, NO_x, CO, sulfur oxides (SO_x), PM₁₀, and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM_{2.5}) during construction and operation. The proposed modifications would comply with the mitigation measures to the extent they are applicable.

The following analysis was derived from the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Memorandum prepared for the proposed modifications by Dudek (Appendix A).

Thresholds of Significance

The State of California has developed guidelines to address the significance of air quality impacts based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.). In addition, Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines indicates that, where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air district may be relied on to determine whether a project would have a significant impact on air quality. This analysis focuses on addressing the potential for the project to violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, which is determined by comparing estimated project-generated construction and operational emissions to numeric thresholds established by the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD). The San Diego Air Basin is currently classified as a federal nonattainment area for ozone (O_3) and a state nonattainment area for PM_{10} , $PM_{2.5}$, and O_3 .

The City has opted to adopt thresholds from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) to address the significance of air quality impacts resulting from projects subject to CEQA environmental review. A project would result in a substantial contribution to an existing air quality violation of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) or California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) for O₃, which is a nonattainment pollutant, if the project's construction emissions would exceed SCAQMD's VOC or NO_x significance thresholds

(see Table 1). These emissions-based thresholds for O_3 precursors are intended to serve as a surrogate for an "ozone significance threshold" (i.e., the potential for adverse O_3 impacts to occur), because O_3 itself is not emitted directly, and the effects of an individual project's emissions of O_3 precursors (VOC and NO_x) on O_3 levels in ambient air cannot be determined through air quality models or other quantitative methods.

Table 1. SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds

	Criteria Pollutants Mass Daily Thresholds								
Pollutant	Construction (Pounds per Day)	Operation (Pounds per Day)							
VOCs	75	55							
NO _x	100	55							
СО	550	550							
SO _x	150	150							
PM ₁₀	150	150							
PM _{2.5}	55	55							
Leada	3	3							

Source: SCAQMD 2019.

Notes: SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District; VOCs = volatile organic compounds; NO_x = oxides of nitrogen; CO = carbon monoxide; SO_x = sulfur oxides; PM_{10} = coarse particulate matter; $PM_{2.5}$ = fine particulate matter.

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions thresholds for industrial proposed projects, as added in the March 2015 revision to the SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds, were not include included in the table because they will be addressed within the GHG emissions analysis and not the air quality analysis.

Construction Emissions

The proposed modifications are subject to SDAPCD Rule 55 – Fugitive Dust Control, which requires the project restrict visible emissions of fugitive dust beyond the property line. Compliance with Rule 55 would limit any fugitive dust (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) that may be generated during grading and construction activities. To account for dust control measures in the emissions modeling, it was assumed that the active sites would be watered at least two times daily, resulting in an approximately 55% reduction of particulate matter. Consistent with typical construction practices and SDAPCD Rule 67.0.1, it is anticipated that, for both residential and non-residential land uses, interior paint would not exceed flat coating limits (50 grams per liter [g/L] VOC), and exterior paint would not exceed non-flat coating limits (50 g/L VOC). It was conservatively assumed in the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) that all residential and non-residential (interior and exterior) architectural coating would be 100 g/L VOC. For parking lot land uses, 100 g/L VOC was assumed, consistent with SDAPCD Rule 67.0.1 limits for traffic marking coatings. SDAPCD Rule

The phaseout of leaded gasoline started in 1976. Because gasoline no longer contains lead, the project is not anticipated to result in impacts related to lead; therefore, it is not discussed in this analysis.

67.0.1 identifies VOC limits for various specialty coatings that exceed 150 g/L VOC, but preliminary project modification understanding indicates that specialty coatings are not anticipated.

As shown in Table 2, construction of the proposed modifications would not exceed SCAQMD's daily thresholds. Therefore, construction impacts associated with criteria air pollutant emissions would be less than significant. When compared to construction emissions from the original FEIR, emissions of CO and PM_{10} from the project modifications would slightly exceed original project emissions estimates. However, consistent with the findings of the original FEIR, neither CO nor PM_{10} would exceed the applicable daily significance thresholds.

Table 2. Estimated Maximum Daily Construction Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions

	VOC	NOx	СО	SOx	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Year			Pounds p	er Day		
2024	3.80	40.62	35.73	0.09	23.85	9.66
2025	2.09	15.58	22.20	0.06	3.01	1.18
2026	27.71	56.14	75.78	0.18	19.67	9.76
2027	19.59	17.21	26.04	0.07	4.22	1.55
2028	23.19	54.43	71.38	0.17	18.12	9.12
2029	2.17	16.23	23.05	0.06	3.91	1.43
2030	25.69	18.06	36.36	0.09	4.14	1.38
Maximum	27.71	56.14	75.78	0.18	23.85	9.76
SCAQMD Threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Threshold Exceeded?	No	No	No	No	No	No
FEIR Emissions ^a	142.47	247.67	54.79	N/A ^b	17.53	N/A ^b

Notes: VOC = volatile organic compound; NO_x = oxides of nitrogen; CO = carbon monoxide; SO_x = sulfur oxides; PM₁₀ = coarse particulate matter; PM_{2.5} = fine particulate matter; SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District; FEIR = 2003 Final Environmental Impact Report.

Operational Emissions

As shown in Table 3, the proposed modifications would not exceed SCAQMD's significance thresholds during operations, except for VOC. The FEIR previously found that all criteria pollutant emissions would exceed thresholds during operation, including CO, VOC, NO_x, and PM₁₀. The proposed modifications would result in reduced impacts compared to the FEIR; however, the VOC impact would continue to be significant, but reduced when compared to VOC emissions from the FEIR.

^a FEIR emissions were converted from tons per quarter to pounds per day assuming 91.25 days per quarter. Emissions include compliance with SDAPCD Rules 55 and 67.0.1.

b N/A = not applicable; FEIR did not analyze SO_x or PM_{2.5}.

Table 3. Estimated Maximum Daily Operation Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions

	VOC	NOx	CO	SOx	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Emissions Source	Pounds per Day					
Mixed-Use Residentia	al Building (1) and Horize	ontal: 2027			
Area	10.55	3.91	62.94	0.17	7.70	7.70
Energy	0.04	0.37	0.16	0.00	0.03	0.03
Mobile	3.09	3.22	28.38	0.06	7.26	1.96
Residen	tial Building	(2): 2029				
Area	17.83	6.26	100.68	0.27	12.32	12.32
Energy	0.07	0.59	0.25	0.00	0.05	0.05
Mobile	4.64	4.70	42.88	0.09	11.60	3.13
Residen	tial Building	(3): 2031				
Area	18.69	6.26	100.65	0.27	12.32	12.32
Energy	0.07	0.61	0.27	0.00	0.05	0.05
Mobile	7.26	6.86	64.54	0.14	17.50	4.72
Total	62.24	32.78	400.75	1	68.83	42.28
SCAQMD Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
Threshold Exceeded?	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
FEIR Emissions (operational year 2005) ^a	319	790	3,145	N/A ^b	389	N/A ^b

Notes: VOC = volatile organic compound; NO_x = oxides of nitrogen; CO = carbon monoxide; SO_x = sulfur oxides; PM_{10} = coarse particulate matter; $PM_{2.5}$ = fine particulate matter; SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District; FEIR = 2003 Final Environmental Impact Report.

The San Diego Air Basin has been designated as a federal nonattainment area for O₃ and a state nonattainment area for O₃, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions associated with construction generally result in near-field impacts. The nonattainment status is the result of cumulative emissions from all sources of these air pollutants and their precursors within the San Diego Air Basin. As indicated in Tables 2 and 3, project-generated construction and operational emissions would not exceed SCAQMD's emissions-based significance thresholds for NO_x, CO, SO₂, PM₁₀, or PM_{2.5}. The proposed modifications would generate operational emissions that would exceed SCAQMD's VOC thresholds, and the FEIR also found that VOC emissions during operation would exceed thresholds.

The FEIR estimated that operation of the project would exceed VOC thresholds by 264 pounds per day. The proposed modifications would exceed VOC thresholds by an estimated 7.24 pounds per day, a significant decrease. Therefore, VOC emissions would be significant, but not more severe than determined in the FEIR.

Thresholds in Table 5.4-5 in the FEIR erroneously labeled the threshold as tons per year, but the significance threshold itself is in terms of pounds per day. The First Addendum came to the same conclusions as in Table 1.

b N/A = not applicable; FEIR did not analyze SO_x or PM_{2.5}.

Consistency with Air Quality Plans

The most recent Regional Housing Needs Assessment from the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) stated that the City needs to build 11,105 housing units from 2021 through 2029 (SANDAG 2019). The project is expected to bring 840 units to market from 2026 to 2030 as each phase completes, which would be within SANDAG's growth projection for housing during the 6th Cycle planning horizon. Therefore, the project would not conflict with SANDAG's regional growth forecast for the City.

In addition, the project modifications proposed here would not result in a significant amount of new mobile trips above what was proposed in the FEIR. As indicated in the traffic analysis (see subheading "Traffic, Circulation, and Access," below), the proposed project modifications would generate fewer trips than the amount to which the Otay Ranch Town Center is entitled, and a vehicle miles traveled analysis was not required. Therefore, the project's VMT and associated mobile source emissions are within what was previously evaluated in the FEIR. The increase in the housing units and associated vehicle source emissions is not anticipated to result in air quality impacts that were not envisioned in the growth projections and Regional Air Quality Strategy, and the minor increase in residential units in the region would not obstruct or impede implementation of local air quality plans.

Health Risk Assessment

Due to the project's proximity to SR-125, a Health Risk Assessment was prepared for the proposed modifications by LDN Consulting Inc. (Appendix B). A Health Risk Assessment was not prepared as part of the FEIR.

New residential units have tighter building envelopes and better heating and ventilation systems that are compatible with energy-efficient designs. All proposed residential units would have mechanical heating and ventilation systems consistent with the latest building codes, such as Title 24. Typical indoor air filtration systems used within current heating and ventilation systems in California have a Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) of 13. The MERV rating is used to describe how well a particular filtration media removes particles from the air. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency found that MERV 13 filtration on a supply ventilation system reduced particulates of 1 to 3 microns by 85%, and particles less than 10 microns (PM₁₀) by 90% relative to outdoor ambient air (EPA 2022).

It was determined that, based on the worst-case scenario for outdoor receptors, cancer risks would not exceed the applicable significance threshold of 10 per 1 million exposed with the use of MERV

13 heating and ventilation systems. Based on Table 2 in Appendix B, the maximum risk exposure is 7.06 after 70 years of exposure.

Therefore, no new substantially significant sources of construction or operational air emissions beyond those identified in the FEIR would occur with implementation of the proposed modifications and Mitigation Measures 5.4-1 through 5.4-4 from the FEIR.

Biological Resources

Impacts to biological resources are addressed in Section 5.8 of the FEIR. As indicated in the FEIR, no sensitive habitat or wetlands occur on the project site, there is a low potential for sensitive plant species to occur on site, and no sensitive plant species were observed at the time of surveying. While the FEIR states that golden eagles (*Aquila chrysaetos*) and tri-colored blackbird (*Agelaius tricolor*) were observed during a 2001 survey, they were not observed on subsequent surveys. No suitable nesting habitat for either species been observed within this project site. The FEIR determined that impacts to burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*) and northern harrier (*Circus hudsonius*) would be potentially significant, and Mitigation Measures 5.8-1 through 5.8-3 would reduce impacts to less than significant. The FEIR also determined that impacts to 133 acres of agricultural fields that could be used as foraging areas for raptor species would be significant and unavoidable.

The Biological Resources Memorandum prepared for the proposed modifications by Dudek (Appendix C) indicated that the FC-1 site does not currently contain any natural vegetation communities or land cover types that are known to provide habitat to any special-status wildlife or plant species. The site has been mapped as urban/developed land cover. Further, there is no potentially jurisdictional aquatic features on site. Given the lack of sensitive wildlife and plant species habitat and lack of potentially jurisdictional aquatic features, no further focused studies or delineations are warranted. However, to comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, a preconstruction nesting bird survey would be required if demolition or construction occurs within the nesting season (January 15 through August 31). The proposed modifications would also be required to meet all goals and objectives of the City's General Plan and applicable Zoning Ordinance, including compliance with all CEQA regulations.

The proposed modifications would not exceed previously established boundaries for project development as approved in the SPA Plan, and the proposed modifications would be subject to mitigation measures as provided in Section 5.8 (5.8-1 through 5.8-3) of the FEIR, if applicable.

Therefore, no new or increased levels of impacts to biological resources would result from implementation of the proposed modifications beyond those previously analyzed in the FEIR.

Cultural and Paleontological Resources

Impacts to cultural resources are addressed in Section 5.6 of the FEIR. As analyzed in the FEIR, no significant impacts to cultural resources were determined to occur. No archaeological or historical resources were identified during the cultural resources survey or through research conducted on the property.

Impacts to paleontological resources were addressed in Section 5.7 of the FEIR. As analyzed therein, impacts from grading could result in significant impacts to buried paleontological resources in the Otay Formation. It was determined that impacts would be reduced with implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.7-1 through 5.7-4.

As identified in the Cultural Resources Inventory prepared for the proposed modifications by Dudek (Appendix D1), there are no cultural or historical resources on site as defined by CEQA. Dudek's cultural resources inventory of the FC-1 site indicates that there is low sensitivity for intact subsurface archaeological deposits to occur during implementation of the proposed modifications. The South Coastal Information Center records search did not identify any resources within the project site, and the review of historic aerial photographs showed extensive disturbance of the FC-1 site from development of the existing Town Center. A Sacred Lands File check was requested from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on July 14, 2022, and Dudek received a response on August 10, 2022. The NAHC results were positive, but did not indicate if the resources were within, adjacent, or within 0.5 miles of the FC-1 site. Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee representative Clint Linton stated that he did not know of any sacred lands within the project site. The NAHC results also included a list of tribal representatives who should be contacted. Dudek mailed outreach letters to the listed representatives on August 16, 2022, and is awaiting responses. One letter was received on September 19, 2022, from the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians, which stated that the project site is not within the boundaries of the recognized San Pasqual Indian Reservation, but it is within the boundaries of the territory that the tribe considers its Traditional Use Area. The San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians requested formal government-to-government consultation under Assembly Bill 52. However, Assembly Bill 52 consultation does not apply to the proposed modifications because the environmental document is an addendum. No further consultation will be conducted.

Due to the developed nature of the FC-1 site and the lack of surveyable ground surface, an intensive pedestrian survey of the site was not conducted. Due to the negative archival review and previous disturbance to the project site, Dudek recommends no further archaeological review. However, due to the positive NAHC results, Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee representative Clint

Linton recommends that a Native American monitor attend initial ground-disturbing work to determine cultural sensitivity.

In the event that archaeological resources (sites, features, or artifacts) are exposed during construction activities for the proposed modifications, all construction work occurring within 100 feet of the find shall immediately stop until a qualified archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards can evaluate the significance of the find. Construction activities may continue in other areas, but shall be redirected a safe distance from the find. If the new discovery is evaluated and found to be significant under CEQA and avoidance is not feasible, additional work, such as data recovery, may be warranted. In such an event, a data recovery plan shall be developed by the qualified archaeologist in consultation with the City and Native American representatives, if applicable. Ground-disturbing work can continue in the area of the find only after impacts to the resources have been mitigated and with City approval.

In accordance with Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, if human remains are found, the County Coroner shall be immediately notified of the discovery. No further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains shall occur until the appropriate treatment and disposition of the human remains. If the County Coroner determines that the remains are, or are believed to be, Native American, he or she shall notify the NAHC in Sacramento within 24 hours. In accordance with California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, the NAHC must immediately notify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descendant from the deceased Native American. The most likely descendant shall complete inspection within 48 hours of being granted access to the site, and make recommendations for the treatment and disposition, in consultation with the property owner, of the human remains.

As identified in the Paleontological Resources Inventory prepared for the proposed modifications (Appendix D2), a records search was sent to the San Diego Natural History Museum on July 20, 2022, to determine whether there are any known fossil localities in or near the FC-1 site, to identify sensitivity of geological units, and to aide in determining whether a mitigation program is warranted. Based on review of the records search, geological mapping, and literature, it was determined that the project site has high paleontological sensitivity. FEIR Mitigation Measures 5.7-1 through 5.7-4 would be required to prevent the inadvertent discovery and damage of a unique paleontological resources. In particular, Mitigation Measure 5.7-1 states that prior to issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall confirm to the City that a qualified paleontologist has been retained to carry out an appropriate mitigation program. An appropriate mitigation program is outlined in Appendix D2 and shall be implemented, in addition to FEIR Mitigation Measures 5.7-1 through 5.7-4.

No impacts beyond what was previously analyzed are anticipated to occur, and adherence to applicable laws, regulations, and mitigation measures would prevent an impact to any unidentified objects found during ground disturbance.

Drainage and Water Quality

Impacts to hydrology, drainage, and water quality were addressed in Section 5.10 of the FEIR. The FEIR determined that potentially significant impacts would occur as it relates to increase in runoff, water quality, and groundwater. As identified in the FIER, impacts associated with an increase in runoff due to the increase in impervious surfaces were determined to be potentially significant, and Mitigation Measure 5.10-1 was required to reduce the impact. Water quality impacts due to potential contamination of surface water was also determined to be potentially significant, and Mitigation Measure 5.10-2 was required to reduce the impact. In addition, impacts associated with groundwater hydrology and quality were determined to be potentially significant. Mitigation Measures 5.10-3 through 5.10-5 were required to reduce impacts to groundwater.

SPA-level drainage and water quality technical reports were completed for the previously approved project as analyzed in the FEIR. Similarly, a Drainage Study (Appendix I) and Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP; Appendix J), were prepared for the proposed modifications.

As described in Appendix I, an underground storage vault would be installed as part of the proposed modifications to mitigate the peak flows and address flow control (hydromodification) requirements for the areas to be redeveloped as part of the proposed modifications. Runoff from the site would drain south towards Private Street A. Inlets placed throughout the site would collect the runoff and the storm drain would convey flows to the proposed vault located south of Private Street A. Drainage facilities within the site would be designed in accordance with the requirements of the Chula Vista Subdivision Manual, the San Diego County Hydrology Manual, and the requirements of the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board.

The portion of the FC-1 site where proposed modifications would occur would need to meet updated criteria for site design (low-impact development), stormwater treatment, and hydromodification management, which is more stringent than the stormwater criteria in effect when the FEIR was prepared. Low-impact development would be accomplished in specific landscaped areas during final design. Stormwater treatment and hydromodification management would be addressed with a combination of biofiltration areas within landscaped areas and an underground vault (Appendix J).

The proposed modifications would continue to comply with all applicable rules and regulations, including compliance with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit requirements for urban runoff and stormwater discharge. Best management practices for design, treatment, and monitoring of stormwater quality would be implemented as delineated in the FEIR with respect to municipal and construction permits. Drainage (Appendix I) and stormwater quality reports (Appendix J), in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations, have been prepared to reflect changes in development of the project site as a result of the proposed modifications. Preparation of these reports and compliance with all applicable rules and regulations governing water quality constitutes implementation of all mitigation measures outlined in Section 5.10 of the FEIR (5.10-1 through 5.10-5). Therefore, no additional impacts to water quality beyond those previously analyzed would occur as a result of the proposed modifications.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The FEIR did not provide an evaluation of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, nor thresholds used to evaluate GHG emissions. At the time the FEIR was adopted, an evaluation of GHG emissions was not required under CEQA; however, since then, California laws have expanded to regulate GHG emissions with the passage of the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Assembly Bill 32) and Senate Bill 32. Although CEQA now requires evaluation of potential GHG emission impacts, based on the findings of Citizens for Responsible Equitable Environmental Development v. City of San Diego, GHG impacts is not a topic that constitutes "new information" triggering preparation of an EIR or a negative declaration if analysis from a prior EIR or negative declaration did not analyze GHG impacts. Accordingly, a GHG emissions analysis is not required for the proposed modifications. Nonetheless, for informational purposes, GHG emissions are presented herein to understand the potential magnitude of project-generated emissions. In addition, the project's potential to conflict with the City's Climate Action Plan (CAP), SANDAG's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and the California Air Resources Board's (CARB) Scoping Plan is presented herein for informational purposes. The FEIR also did not include mitigation measures pertaining to GHG emissions, but some of the air quality mitigation measures are relevant for GHG emissions, including developing a rideshare plan and using natural gas-powered vehicles for construction, and providing a bicycle-friendly facility, using solar water heaters, and installing energy-efficient lighting during operation.

The following informational analysis was derived from the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Technical Memorandum prepared by Dudek (Appendix A).

Construction Emissions

Construction of the project would result in GHG emissions, primarily associated with use of offroad construction equipment, on-road hauling and vendor (material delivery) trucks, and worker vehicles. GHG emissions associated with temporary construction activities were quantified using CalEEMod. Table 4 summarizes the estimated annual GHG construction emissions associated with the project, and the amortized construction emissions over a 30-year project life.

Table 4. Estimated Annual Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions

	CO ₂	CH₄	N₂O	CO₂e
Construction Year		Metric	c Tons	
2024	386.00	0.08	0.01	391.54
2025	651.02	0.08	0.03	661.30
2026	691.75	0.10	0.03	702.25
2027	720.14	0.08	0.03	731.24
2028	757.78	0.11	0.03	769.40
2029	725.04	0.08	0.03	736.85
2030	504.58	0.01	0.02	510.94
			Total Emissions	4,503.52
		30-Yea	r Amortized Emissions	150.12

Notes: CO_2 = carbon dioxide; CH_4 = methane; N_2O = nitrous oxide; CO_2 e = carbon dioxide equivalent.

Total construction-related GHG emissions for the proposed modifications are anticipated to be 4,503 metric tons (MT) of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e). Estimated 30-year amortized project-generated construction emissions would be approximately 150 MT CO₂e per year. However, because there is no separate GHG threshold for construction emissions alone, the evaluation of significance is discussed in the operational emissions analysis below.

Operational Emissions

Operation of the proposed modifications would generate GHG emissions from motor vehicle trips to and from the project site; landscape maintenance equipment operation; energy use (natural gas and generation of electricity consumed by the project); solid waste disposal; and generation of electricity associated with water supply, treatment, and distribution, and wastewater treatment. The estimated operational (year 2031) project-generated GHG emissions from these sources are shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Estimated Annual Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions

	CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O	CO ₂ e
Emission Source				
Area	775.47	0.82	0.01	799.10
Energy	1,278.27	0.06	0.01	1,283.78
Mobile	4,418.11	0.32	0.20	4,486.60
Solid waste	86.36	5.10	0.00	213.96
Water supply and wastewater	300.06	1.89	0.05	361.12
			Total	7,144.55
	150.12			
	7,294.67			

Notes: CO₂ = carbon dioxide; CH₄ = methane; N₂O = nitrous oxide; CO₂e = carbon dioxide equivalent.

As shown in Table 5, estimated annual project-generated GHG emissions in 2031 would be approximately 7,145 MT CO₂e per year as a result of project operations. Estimated annual project-generated emissions in 2031 from area, energy, mobile, solid waste, water/wastewater, and amortized project construction emissions would be approximately 7,295 MT CO₂e per year.

As discussed above, GHG emissions were not analyzed in the FEIR, and GHG emissions impacts do not constitute "new information" that would trigger preparation of an EIR or negative declaration. Therefore, a GHG emissions analysis is not required for the proposed modifications, but is provided here for disclosure.

City of Chula Vista Climate Action Plan

The City's CAP was adopted in 2017 and includes goals and policies to strengthen the City's climate action and GHG emission reduction efforts (City of Chula Vista 2017). Table 10 in Appendix A outlines the proposed modification's potential to conflict with the applicable policies and strategies of the City's CAP. As indicated in Table 10 in Appendix A, the project would involve planting additional trees and using solar-powered signs for construction and solar-powered water heaters during building operation. The project also provides for a higher population density and includes mixed-use development; includes implementation of bike-sharing, car-sharing, and other last-mile transportation options; and has been designed to comply with 2019 CalGreen requirements for provisions of electric-vehicle charging equipment. The proposed modifications are consistent with the applicable strategies from the City's CAP.

CARB Scoping Plan

The Climate Change Scoping Plan, approved by CARB in 2008 and updated in 2014, 2017, and 2022, provides a framework for actions to reduce California's GHG emissions and requires CARB and other state agencies to adopt regulations and other initiatives to reduce GHGs (CARB 2022). The Scoping Plan is not directly applicable to specific projects, and it is not intended to be used for project-level evaluations. Under the Scoping Plan, however, several state regulatory measures aim to identify and reduce GHG emissions. CARB and other state agencies have adopted many of the measures identified in the Scoping Plan. Most of these measures focus on area-source emissions (e.g., energy usage and GHGs with a high global warming potential in consumer products) and changes to the vehicle fleet (e.g., hybrid, electric, and more fuel-efficient vehicles) and associated fuels, among others. Nonetheless, the proposed modifications would comply with various GHG emission reduction regulations to the extent they apply to the project's emissions sources. The proposed project would support the state's carbon neutrality goals, as implementation includes addition of green space throughout the project site, which represent opportunities for potential carbon removal and sequestration over the project lifetime. Many of the measures and programs included in the Scoping Plan would result in the reduction of project-related GHG emissions with no action required at the project-level, including GHG emission reductions through increased energy efficiency and renewable energy production (SB 350), reduction in carbon intensity of transportation fuels (LCFS), and the accelerated efficiency and electrification of the statewide vehicle fleet (Mobile Source Strategy). Overall, the proposed project would comply with all regulations adopted in furtherance of the Scoping Plan to the extent applicable and required by law, and the proposed project's consistency with the applicable measures and programs would assist in meeting the City's contribution to GHG emission reduction targets in California.

SANDAG's San Diego Forward: The 2021 Regional Plan

The passage of Senate Bill 375 requires Metropolitan Planning Organizations to prepare a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) in their RTPs. SANDAG serves as the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the San Diego region, and is responsible for developing and adopting a SCS that integrates transportation, land use, and housing to meet GHG reduction targets set by CARB. The RTP/SCS is updated every 4 years in collaboration with the 18 cities and unincorporated County of San Diego, in addition to regional, state, and federal partners. The most recent RTP/SCS, San Diego Forward: The 2021 Regional Plan, was adopted in 2021 and provides guidance on meeting or exceed GHG targets through implementation of five key transportation strategies: complete corridors, high-speed-transit services, mobility hubs, flexible fleets, and a digital platform to tie the transportation system together. Through these strategies, the 2021 Regional Plan is

projected to reduce per-capita GHG emissions from cars and light-duty trucks to 20% below 2005 levels by 2035, exceeding the region's state-mandated target of 19% (SANDAG 2021).

The primary objective of the 2021 Regional Plan is to provide guidance for future regional growth (i.e., the location of new residential and non-residential land uses) and transportation patterns throughout the region, as stipulated under Senate Bill 375. The project is within defined mobility hubs present in the 2021 Regional Plan, which would provide rideshare and micro-transit options as part of the flexible fleets initiative. Furthermore, the project site is near current bus routes and the planned route for the Next Gen Rapid Bus Service. As discussed previously, the proposed modifications would generate fewer trips than the amount to which the Otay Valley Town Center is entitled and a vehicle miles traveled analysis was not required. Therefore, the project's VMT and associated mobile source emissions are within what was previously evaluated in the FEIR (see subheading "Traffic, Circulation, and Access," below). As such, the proposed modifications would not conflict with the goals and policies of the RTP/SCS.

As previously stated, the FEIR did not include an evaluation of GHG emissions, nor thresholds used to evaluate GHG emissions. At the time the FEIR was adopted, an evaluation of GHG emissions was not required under CEQA. Nonetheless, for informational purposes, the GHG emissions are presented herein to understand the potential magnitude of project-generated emissions. In addition, the project's potential to conflict with the City's CAP, SANDAG's RTP/SCS, and CARB's Scoping Plan is presented for informational purposes.

Noise

Impacts related to noise were addressed in Section 5.5 of the FEIR. Construction noise was determined to be less than significant, and operational noise as it relates to the potential for people to be exposed to noise in excess of 70 A-weighted decibels (dBA) Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) at commercial and outdoor uses, 65 dBA CNEL at residential exteriors, and 45 dBA CNEL in residential interiors was determined to be less than significant with mitigation. The operation of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning equipment; trash disposal activities; trucking; and loading were also determined to be less than significant with mitigation. Lastly, project-generated traffic was determined to be less than significant with implementation of mitigation adopted by the City for other projects. Mitigation Measures 5.5-1 and 5.5-2 were implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts to a less-than-significant level.

The following analysis was derived from the Acoustical Assessment prepared by Dudek for the proposed modifications (Appendix E).

Construction Noise

As identified in the Acoustical Assessment prepared for the proposed modifications (Appendix E), construction activities would be less than the threshold of 70 dBA CNEL for temporary construction noise, consistent with the FEIR, with most noise levels estimated to range from 60 to 65 dBA.

On-Site Non-Transportation Noise

Predicted aggregate hourly equivalent sound level (L_{eq}) noise exposure from the proposed modification's on-site stationary sound sources conservatively assumed that residential and retail uses would be operating air conditioning, ventilation, and refrigeration systems to keep buildings and occupants (and refrigerated/frozen foods of other items) cool during the summer. The predicted noise exposure is anticipated to be greater than 45 dBA but less than 50 dBA at the two-nearest representative multi-family residential noise-sensitive receivers (i.e., ST1 and ST2, on the western side of SR-125, as depicted in Figure 5 of Appendix E). The more stringent nighttime threshold of 50 dBA hourly L_{eq} is applied rather than the daytime threshold of 60 dBA hourly L_{eq} to assess impacts for continuous noise sources. With the predicted noise exposure levels at night being less than the City's standard of 50 dBA hourly L_{eq} for receiving multi-family residential land uses, project on-site noise emissions would be compliant and would not require implementation of noise reduction measures.

Off-Site Traffic Noise

The project would result in the creation of additional vehicle trips on local arterial roadways (i.e., Town Center Drive and Olympic Parkway), which could result in increased traffic noise levels at adjacent noise-sensitive land uses. The City's General Plan Noise Element establishes a policy for exterior sensitive areas to be protected from high noise levels. The Noise Element sets 65 dBA CNEL for the outdoor areas and 45 dBA CNEL for interior areas as the normally acceptable levels (City of Chula Vista 2021). For the purposes of this noise analysis, such impacts are considered significant when they cause an increase of 3 decibels (dB) from existing noise levels. An increase or decrease in noise level of at least 3 dB is required before any noticeable change in community response would be expected (Caltrans 2013). The noise model results are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6. Roadway Traffic Noise Modeling Results

Modeled Receiver Tag¹	Existing (2020) Noise Level (dBA CNEL)	Existing (2020) Plus Project Noise Level (dBA CNEL)	Maximum Project-Related Noise Level Increase (dB)
ST1	68.2	68.2	<0.1

Table 6. Roadway Traffic Noise Modeling Results

Modeled Receiver Tag ¹	Existing (2020) Noise Level (dBA CNEL)	Existing (2020) Plus Project Noise Level (dBA CNEL)	Maximum Project-Related Noise Level Increase (dB)
ST2	68.8	68.8	<0.1
ST3	60.9	60.9	<0.1

dBA = A-weighted decibel; CNEL = Community Noise Equivalent Level; dB = decibel.

Table 6 shows that at all three listed representative receivers, the addition of traffic generated by the proposed modifications to the roadway network would result in a CNEL increase of less than 3 dB, which is below the discernible level of change for the average healthy human ear. Thus, a less-than-significant impact is expected for proposed modification-related off-site traffic noise increases affecting existing residences in the vicinity.

Future Roadway Noise Exposures

Exterior representative receiver locations include building facades, balconies, patios, and open space areas. Each of the three residential building receptor locations includes four elevation positions that correspond with the building level or "floor," as identified in Table 7. Bold values in Table 7 are those that exceed 60 dBA CNEL, which would trigger the need for interior acoustical analysis as presented herein, and bold italicized values indicate predictions that exceed 65 dBA CNEL. Table 7 presents the predicted exterior noise levels at the representative receptor locations.

Table 7. Predicted Exterior Noise Levels Due to Nearby Future Roadway Traffic

Desilations	Floor	Modeled Rec	eiver Location (values i	n dBA CNEL)
Building	Floor	1	2	3
1	1st	54.3	59.8	N/A
1	2nd	58.4	64.3	N/A
1	3rd	60.0	65.0	N/A
1	4th	60.4	65.8	N/A
2	1st	51.3	N/A	N/A
2	2nd	55.6	N/A	N/A
2	3rd	57.7	N/A	N/A
2	4th	58.8	N/A	N/A
3	1st	40.4	51.6	51.9
3	2nd	44.2	55.5	54.9
3	3rd	46.1	59.5	56.9
3	4th	47.9	60.2	57.8

Modeled receiver tag locations are depicted in Figure 2 of Appendix E.

Table 7. Predicted Exterior Noise Levels Due to Nearby Future Roadway Traffic

Duilding	Floor	Modeled Rec	eiver Location (values i	n dBA CNEL)
Building	Floor	1	2	3
Open Space (OS) – 1 (Residential Courtyard)			35.8	

Notes: N/A = not available (position not modeled).

Bold values in Table 7 are those that exceed 60 dBA CNEL, which would trigger the need for interior acoustical analysis as presented herein, and bold italicized values indicate predictions that exceed 65 dBA CNEL.

Predicted exterior sound levels presented in Table 7 that exceed 65 dBA CNEL proximate to a patio, balcony, or other usable outdoor space (e.g., open space) would need localized sound abatement to yield an outdoor level compliant with the City's 65 dBA CNEL standard. The prediction of traffic noise levels, with dominant acoustical contribution from SR-125 at buildout, as presented by the values in Table 7, is generally consistent with what would be expected from a high-volume roadway at such distances, with exterior noise levels at the building facades increasing with floor height due to more direct traffic noise pathways to such receiver positions. The prediction of exterior noise levels at the western façade of Building MU/R-1 that exceed 65 dBA CNEL (due largely to exposure to SR-125 traffic volumes and vehicle speeds) is also consistent with the traffic noise analyses included in the FEIR and previous Addenda. Consistent with Otay Ranch GDP policies, balconies planned on these residential units that are counted toward any open space requirements would incorporate appropriate sound-attenuating features around the perimeter of the balconies.

Consistent with the recommended sound abatement approach on previous Otay Ranch multifamily residential projects, one technique to provide this identified noise reduction need on the order of 5 dB or less is the addition of a solid and sufficiently massive material layer to planned metal railings on the balcony usable-area perimeter. One option involves installation of a 6-millimeter (0.236 inch) sheet of plexiglass (acrylic) on the interior-facing side of the balcony railing structure, which would be expected to yield a sound transmission class (STC) rating of at least 15. Although the material itself has an STC rating of 29 (Appendix E), the approximate 1-inch-wide air gap between the bottom edge of the plexiglass panel and the balcony floor results in lower expected STC performance. In other words, the area of the gap as a fraction of the barrier material surface area causes the reduction in sound transmission loss performance.

Other barrier material options and designs are possible, subject to non-acoustical considerations, such as desired barrier opacity and balcony deck drainage, provided that the designed installation has barrier material having adequate mass and solidity that yield a minimum net STC rating of 15 and an approximate deck to top-edge height of 42 inches (3.5 feet). For instance, the outdoor-

exposed balconies requiring such sound abatement could incorporate solid, non-porous walls of comparable height (3.5 feet) as part of their design.

As a result of including acoustically upgraded balconies, these outdoor areas would not exceed the 65 dBA CNEL threshold.

Interior Noise

No special recommendations are needed with respect to providing an interior background sound level that is 45 dBA CNEL or less from the intrusion of future outdoor traffic noise. Residential units with facades exposed to exterior noise levels greater than 65 dBA CNEL would be expected to have closed windows and balcony/patio doors, to result in background sound levels that are compliant with the City's 45 dBA CNEL interior requirement (and to be consistent with the California Building Code). Customary closed dual-pane glazing on windows (and in the manufacture of balcony doors) as part of exterior building wall assemblies expected of modern building construction would provide anticipated and sufficient exterior-to-interior sound insulation to attain this City interior background noise threshold. Habitable spaces in such units would be equipped with mechanical means of ventilation and air conditioning for interior comfort when keeping such fenestration closed.

No additional impacts would occur or mitigation measures would be required beyond what was previously included in the FEIR. Mitigation Measure 5.5-1 from the FEIR would still be required to ensure impacts would be less than significant.

Traffic, Circulation, and Access

Impacts to traffic are addressed in Section 5.3 of the FEIR. Impacts were determined to be potentially significant, and Mitigation Measures 5.3-1 through 5.3-28 were required. All impacts were reduced to less than significant with mitigation, with the exception of impacts to freeways. A Local Mobility Analysis was conducted for the proposed modifications by LLG to evaluate the potential traffic impacts associated with the proposed modifications (Appendix F). When analyzing potential trip generation (see Table 8) and traffic impacts, the entire FC-1 site was accounted for, in addition to the proposed modifications.

Table 8. Average Daily Trips and Peak Traffic Volumes

	ADT AM Peak Hour				F	PM Peak Ho	ur						
					In:Out		Volume)	Rate	In:Out		Volume	
Land Use	Size	Trip Rate	Vol.	Rate perKSF	Split	In	Out	Total	per KSF	Split	In	Out	Total
					Entit	led Land L	<i>Ise</i>						
Regional Shopping Center	960	35/KSF	33,6001	4%	70:30	941	403	1,344	10%	50:50	1,680	1,680	3,360
		FEIR Total	33,600	_	_	941	403	1,344	_	_	1,680	1,680	3,360
				E	xisting Plus I	Proposed I	Modificatio	ns					
Regional Shopping Center (Existing)	669.7	35/KSF	23,440	4%	70:30	657	281	938	10%	50:50	1,172	1,172	2,344
Regional Shopping Center (Proposed)	146.3	35/KSF	5,120	4%	70:30	144	61	205	10%	50:50	256	256	512
Multi-Family Residential	840 DU	6/DU	5,040	8%	20:80	81	323	404	9%	70:30	318	136	454
Pr		cisting Plus odifications	33,600	_	ı	882	665	1,547	_	1	1,746	1,564	3,310
					F	Reductions							
Mixed-Use Reductio	n	10%	1,016	10%	_	23	38	61	10%	_	57	39	96
Transit Reduction		5%	457	5%	_	10	17	27	5%	_	26	18	44
Total with Mixed-Use Transit Reductions	e and	_	32,127	_	_	849	610	1,459	_	_	1,663	1,507	3,107
		Net [Difference (E	ntitled vs.	Proposed)	(59)	262	203	_	_	66	(116)	(50)

Source: Appendix F

Notes: ADT = average daily traffic; Vol. = volume; KSF = thousand square foot; DU = dwelling unit

ADT from the 2004 FEIR

Per SANDAG's (Not So) Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region (2002), unconstrained internal person trip capture rates for trip destinations within a mixed-use development, the average residential to restaurant and residential to cinema/entertainment trips are 18.5% in the AM (average of 17% and 20%) and 12% in the PM peak hour (average of 10% and 14%), respectively. Daily rates are not given and hence not shown. The mixed-use reduction shown in the table was not applied to the analysis.

Based on the analysis prepared by LLG (Appendix F), and as shown in Table 8, the density of the proposed modifications would generate fewer daily and PM peak-hour trips than those already approved under the FEIR, but the modifications would generate 203 more trips in the AM peak hour. Although there would be 203 more AM peak-hour trips associated with the proposed modifications, the overall average daily trips would be the same as the FEIR; therefore, impacts would not be substantially increased. The proposed modifications would provide signal optimization and an adaptive signal controller at Olympic Parkway and Town Center Drive, and right-of-way dedication on Olympic Parkway and Birch Road to accommodate a future Class IV Cycle Track per the City's Active Transportation Plan (City of Chula Vista 2020).

As established by SB 743, VMT has replaced LOS as a CEQA threshold of significance. They City's Transportation Study Guidelines (TSG) (adopted June 2020 and updated January 2022), provides screening criteria to determine whether or not a VMT analysis is required based on the type and location of a project. Included in Appendix F is the Project Information Form for Transportation Studies. As indicated therein, average daily trips for the proposed modifications would be the same as what was assumed in the FEIR. To substantiate the no net increase in average daily trips, it is assumed that proposed residential uses would replace existing and other planned retail uses within the Otay Ranch Town Center. Based on this, the proposed modifications are screened out from needing a detailed VMT analysis per the City of Chula Vista TSG, and is presumed to have a less than significant VMT impact.

Therefore, no new significant impacts would occur beyond what was analyzed in the FEIR. In addition, none of the traffic-related mitigation measures included in the FEIR are applicable to the proposed modifications.

Public Services and Utilities

Impacts to public services and utilities are addressed in Section 5.12 of the FEIR.

Water Demand and Water System

Potable water demand was analyzed in the FEIR, Section 5.12. As indicated in FEIR Table 5.12-1, potable water demand for the FC-1 site was estimated to be 192,175 gallons per day (gpd). Impacts to potable water demand were determined to be potentially significant, and Mitigation Measures 5.12-1 through 5.12-5 were required to reduce impacts to below a level of significance.

A review of water service availability was prepared for the proposed modifications (Appendix G1). As indicated therein, the proposed modifications would receive potable water service from the Otay Water District public water system. Potable water service to the project would be from

the 980 Pressure Zone. Potable water demands for the proposed modifications were estimated using water demand factors provided in the Otay Water District 2015 Water Facilities Master Plan (Otay Water District 2016). Table 9 summarizes the projected water demands as presented in the 2015 Water Facilities Master Plan, and projected demand based on the proposed modifications.

Table 9. Proposed Modifications Water Demand Summary

Land Use	Acres	Building Units	Unit Demand Factor	Total Demand (gpd)
	Potable Water Demand			
Commercial	87.25 ¹	_	1,785 gpd/ac ²	155,741
			Subtotal	155,741
	Proposed	Modification Potable Wa	ter Demand ³	
Existing Commercial Area	70.684	_	1,607 gpd/ac	113,551
Multi-Family Residential	_	840	170 gpd/unit	142,800
Proposed Commercial	0.85	_	1,607 gpd/ac	1,366
	257,717			
	101,976			

Source: Appendix G

Notes: gpd = gallons per day; gpd/ac = gallons per day per acre

The proposed modifications would receive water service by relocating a portion of the existing 12-inch-diameter 980 Pressure Zone potable water loop within the site. The pipeline relocation would be required to accommodate the proposed modifications.

Per the Otay Water District 2015 Water Facilities Master Plan, the fire flow requirements for single-family residential, multi-family residential, and commercial areas are 1,500 gallons per minute (gpm), 2,500 gpm, and 3,500 gpm, respectively (Otay Water District 2016). Thus, the fire flow requirement estimated for the proposed modifications is 3,500 gpm. The Maximum Day plus Fire Flow requirement is estimated to be 4,005 gpm (505 gpm + 3,500 gpm = 4,005 gpm), which is less than the 5,000 gpm fire flow requirement that was analyzed for the backbone potable water system in the previous Freeway Commercial SPA Plan Master Precise Plan for the existing site (Appendix G). Therefore, the backbone water system would not require any pipe size upgrades to support the proposed modifications.

Where proposed modifications would occur, private on-site water systems with connections to the public system would be installed. Domestic water service connections would include a master meter and a backflow preventer, and fire service connections would include a backflow preventer. Both domestic water service laterals and fire service laterals would be installed in accordance with Otay Water District standards.

Acreage reflects entire Otay Ranch Town Center site. The redevelopment will only affect 16.57 acres of Lots 1 and 4 which have a total area of 58.49 acres.

Based on water demand factor presented in the 2002 Subarea Master Plan.

³ Acreage excludes private street area (2.93) and park/plaza (2.73 acres) as no potable water demands are expected.

⁴ Acreage of existing Otay Ranch Town Center (87.25) reduced by 16.57 acres (redevelopment area).

As shown in Table 9, projected water demand with the proposed modifications would increase existing average potable water demand by 101,976 gpd, from 155,741 gpd to 257,717 gpd. However, as previously noted, potable water demand for the FC-1 site in the FEIR was estimated to be 192,175 gpd. Therefore, the proposed modifications would increase potable water demand by 65,542 gpd compared to what was assumed in the FIER. This would not be considered a substantial increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed.

In addition, per the Water Supply Assessment and Verification Report (WSAV; Appendix G2), the increase in demand is accounted for through the Accelerated Forecasted Growth demand increment of the Water Authority's 2020 UWMP. As documented in the Water Authority's 2020 UWMP, the Water Authority is planning to meet future and existing demands which include the demand increment associated with the accelerated forecasted growth. The Water Authority will assist its member agencies in tracking the environmental documents provided by the agencies that include water supply assessments and verifications reports that utilize the accelerated forecasted growth demand increment to demonstrate supplies for the development. In addition, the next update of the demand forecast for the Water Authority's 2025 UWMP will be based on SANDAG's most recently updated forecast, which will include the proposed modifications. Therefore, based on the findings from the Otay WD's 2020 UWMP and the Water Authority's 2020 UWMP, this project will result in no unanticipated demands.

Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and Mitigation Measures 5.12-1 through 5.12-5 from the FEIR would still be applicable. No new significant impacts would occur beyond what was analyzed in the FEIR.

Recycled Water Demand and Service

Recycled water demand was analyzed in Section 5.12 of the FEIR. As indicated in the FEIR, recycled water demand for the FC-1 site was estimated to be 0.026 mgd, or 31,225 gpd. Impacts to recycled water demand were determined to be potentially significant, and Mitigation Measures 5.12-6 through 5.12-10 were required to reduce impacts below a level of significance.

Recycled water supply is currently available to the Otay Ranch area from the 1.3-million-gallon-perday capacity Ralph W. Chapman Water Recycling Facility, located near the intersection of Singer Lane and Highway 94. Recycled water supply is also anticipated to be available from the City of San Diego's 15-million-gallon-per-day South Bay Water Reclamation Plant. The existing Town Center is provided recycled water from the Otay Water District 815 Pressure Zone. There are existing 12-inch recycled water lines in Birch Road and Eastlake Parkway and there are two existing 8-inch recycled water service laterals to the site: one lateral is connected to the existing 12-inch recycled

water line in Birch Road and the other is connected to the existing 12-inch recycled water line in Eastlake Parkway. Each 8-inch recycled water service lateral serves two existing 2-inch irrigation service laterals and meters (four total). It is anticipated that new public recycled water services will not be needed for the project.

To provide recycled water service to the redevelopment area the existing private irrigation system within the Otay Ranch Town Center site will be expanded. Proposed. Proposed elevations within the redevelopment area range from 614 feet to 626 feet, which results in a maximum static pressure range of 81 psi to 87 psi from the 815 Pressure Zone. Potential recycled water use areas for the proposed modifications include common landscaped areas and the public park/plaza.

Regarding recycled water use, the proposed modification would use recycled water for irrigation of the landscaped areas associated with the residential and mixed-use/residential land uses, as well as, the park/plaza area. Table 10 shows the average recycled water demand associated with the proposed modifications.

Table 10. Proposed Modifications Recycled Demand Summary

Land Use	Acres/Units	Percent Irrigated	Irrigated Area (acres)	Recycled Water Demand Factor	Total Demand (gpd)
	Existing Otay F	Ranch Town Center	Average Recycled \	Water Demand	
Existing Commercial	70.68 ¹	10%	7.07	1,900 gpd/ac1	13,433
	Propo	sed Modifications F	Recycled Water Dem	nand ²	
Multi-Family Residential/Mixed-Use	10.91	15%	1.59	1,900 gpd/ac1	3,116
Park/Plaza	2.73	100%	2.73	1,900 gpd/ac1	5,187
	21,736				

Source: Appendix G

Notes: gpd = gallons per day; gpd/ac = gallons per day per acre

As shown in Table 10, the estimated average recycled water demand for the proposed modifications is 21,736 gpd. The proposed modifications would comply with the City's guidelines for water conservation, including the use of recycled water for landscaping and implementation of additional water conservation measures, such as hot water pipe insulation, pressure reducing valves, and water efficient dishwashers. Furthermore, a Water Conservation Plan has been developed specifically for the proposed project and is included herein as Appendix G3.

Acreage of existing Otay Ranch Town Center site (87.25 acres) reduced by 16.57 acres (redevelopment area).

Acreage excludes private street area (2.93 acres) as no recycled water demand is expected.

As previously noted, recycled water demand for the FC-1 site was estimated to be 31,225 gpd per the FEIR. Therefore, the proposed modifications would decrease recycled water demand by 9,489 gpd compared to what was assumed in the FEIR. This would not be considered a substantial increase in impacts beyond what was previously determined. Mitigation Measures 5.12-6 through 5.12-10 from the FEIR would still be applicable, and no new significant impacts would occur beyond what is analyzed in the FEIR.

Wastewater Generation and Wastewater System

Wastewater generation was analyzed in the FEIR, Section 5.12. As indicated in FEIR Table 5.12-2, wastewater generation for the FC-1 site was estimated to be 215,250 gpd. Impacts to the sewer system were determined to be potentially significant, and Mitigation Measures 5.12-11 through 5.12-13 were required to reduce impacts below a level of significance.

A review of sewer system capacity was prepared for the proposed modifications (Appendix H). As indicated therein, the proposed modifications are within the City and would receive sewer service from the City's public sewer system. The planning criteria used to evaluate the sewer system requirements for the proposed modifications are in accordance with the City's 2014 Wastewater Collection System Master Plan (City of Chula Vista 2014). Table 11 shows a comparison between projected wastewater flows for the existing uses on site and wastewater flows based on the land uses of the proposed modifications.

Table 11. Proposed Modifications Wastewater Flow Summary

Land Use	Acres	Building Units	Unit Demand Factor	Total Demand (gpd)		
Commercial	87.25 ²	— 2,500 gpd/ac		218,125		
	218,125					
	307,556					
	403,531					
Proposed Modification Average Sewer Generation						
Existing Commercial ³	70.68		1,401 gpd/ac1	98,023		
Multi-Family Residential	ı	840	182 gpd/unit1	152,880		
Proposed Commercial	0.85	ı	1,401 gpd/ac1	1,191		
	253,094					
	34,969					
	356,863					
	468,224					

Source: Appendix H

Notes: gpd = gallons per day; gpd/ac = gallons per day per acre

Sewage generation factor derived from May 2001 Freeway Commercial Conceptual Sewer Study prepared by Powell/PBS&J

- ² Acreage reflects the entire Otay Ranch Town Center Site.
- Acreage of existing Otay Ranch Town Center (87.25 acres) reduced by 16.57 (redevelopment area).

Sewer service to the existing site is currently provided by 8-inch- and 10-inch-diameter sewer lines. The on-site sewer facilities convey sewage south to Birch Road by gravity to an existing 10-inch gravity sewer line. The 10-inch gravity sewer line in Birch Road conveys flow west across SR-125 and increases to a 12-inch line before reaching La Media Road. A 12-inch gravity sewer in La Media Road conveys flow north to the Poggi Canyon Interceptor in Olympic Parkway.

The proposed sewer system would require removal of the existing 8-inch-diameter gravity sewer line in the northwest corner of the FC-1 site. The two northernmost buildings proposed would receive sewer service by installing two new reaches of sewer to serve the two northernmost proposed buildings. These new reaches of sewer line would be required to have a minimum diameter of 8 inches. All other on-site lines meet City sewer criteria, and on-site sewer line upgrades are not required for the proposed modifications (Appendix H).

It was also determined based on the analysis that no public sewer improvements would be required to accommodate the proposed modifications because the existing public sewer system could accommodate the proposed modifications based on year 2050 flows (Appendix H).

In comparing the average sewerage generation estimates as shown in Table 11, the proposed modifications would increase existing average sewage generation by 34,969 gpd, from 218,125 gpd to 253,094 gpd. Wastewater generation for the FC-1 site in the FEIR was estimated to be 215,250 gpd. Therefore, the proposed modifications would increase wastewater generation by 37,844 gpd compared to what was assumed in the FIER. This would not be considered a substantial increase in impacts beyond what was previously determined. Mitigation Measures 5.12-11 through 5.12-13 from the FEIR would still be applicable, but no new significant impacts would occur beyond what was analyzed in the FEIR.

Poggi Canyon Basin

Consistent with FEIR Mitigation Measure 5.12-11, the applicant has demonstrated adequate capacity in the Poggi Canyon sewer line (Appendix H).

Wastewater generated within the Poggi Canyon Sewer Basin is conveyed to the Metro sewerage system via the Poggi Canyon Interceptor, which generally follows from Olympic Parkway to Brandywine Avenue, and then extends southerly to the Salt Creek Interceptor near the intersection of Palm Avenue and Main Street.

This evaluation of the Poggi Canyon Interceptor is based on the April 2009 Poggi Canyon Basin Gravity Sewer Development Impact Fee Update (DIF Report). A comparison was made of the current entitlements on the FC-1 site and the proposed modifications versus the assumptions in the DIF Report. Table 12 provides the sewer flow projections for the current land use plan for the proposed modifications compared to the 2009 DIF Report. As shown, the Poggi Basin projections in the 2009 DIF Report would be increased by approximately 131.9 equivalent dwelling units based on the current plan for the proposed modifications (Appendix H).

Table 12. Proposed Modifications Poggi Basin Equivalent Dwelling Unit Summary

Land Use	Acres	Unit Flow Factor	Average Flow (gpd)	EDUs ²				
2009 Development Impact Fee Study								
Commercial	87.25 ¹	2,500 gpd/ac	218,125	823.1				
			Subtotal	823.1				
Proposed Modification								
Existing Commercial	70.66	1,401 gpd/ac	98,995	373.6				
Multi-Family Residential	840	182 gpd/du	152,880	576.9				
Retail/Mixed Use	0.85	1,401 gpd/ac	1,191	1,191				
			Subtotal	955				
		_	Projected Change	131.9				

Source: Appendix H

Notes: gpd = gallons per day; gpd/ac = gallons per day per acre; EDUs = equivalent dwelling units.

It is anticipated that the proposed modifications would exceed the units foreseen in the 2009 DIF Report; however, the limits of the required DIF improvements remain the same. The cost related to the DIF improvements has been identified in the DIF Report, and the proposed modifications would require an update to the DIF Report as a condition of approval. The Poggi Basin Plan established a fee for funding capital improvements, and City Ordinance 2716 implements the fee to be paid by future development within the Poggi Canyon Basin. Therefore, in addition to updating the DIF Report, a fee is required for the proposed modifications, in accordance with the Public Facilities Financing Plan (PFFP) (City of Chula Vista 2019). No new significant impacts would occur beyond what is analyzed in the FEIR.

Solid Waste Management

Solid waste management was analyzed in Section 5.12 of the FEIR. Impacts to solid waste were determined to be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required. The FEIR determined

Acreage of the Otay Ranch Town Center site was presented as 81.92 acres in the 2009 DIF Study. Current numbers show the site has a total area of 87.25 acres. Therefore, the acreage was increased from 81.92 acres to 87.25 acres for this analysis.

Based on the sewer generation factor of 265 gpd per unit used in the 2009 Poggi DIF Report.

Acreage of existing Otay Ranch Town Center (87.25 acres) reduced by 16.59 (redevelopment area).

that solid waste would be taken to the Otay Landfill. Project modifications would also generate solid waste that would be taken to the Otay Landfill. The Otay Landfill has a remaining capacity of 21,194,008 tons and a potential closure date of 2030 (CalRecycle 2023). Therefore, there is enough remaining capacity to accommodate the proposed modifications, and impacts would be less than significant, consistent with the FEIR.

Police Protection, Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services, Schools, Libraries, and Parks

The Chula Vista Police Department currently provides police service to the FC-1 site from its existing police facility at 315 Fourth Avenue; however, the Chula Vista Police Department has a Storefront within the SPA Plan area (west end of Main Street) that is open 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. Monday through Friday. The Chula Vista Police Department has a threshold of responding to 81% of Priority 1 calls within 7 minutes and 30 seconds, and responding to all Priority 2 calls within 12 minutes or less. Currently, the Chula Vista Police Department maintains a staff of approximately 281 sworn officers and approximately 119 civilian support personnel (CVPD 2023).

The FC-1 site is within the City and is served by the Chula Vista Fire Department. The closest fire station to the site is Fire Station Number 10, at 1715 Millenia Avenue, Chula Vista, CA 91915, 0.3 miles south of the site. The Chula Vista Fire Department also provides emergency medical/ambulance services within the City. The Chula Vista Fire Department has a threshold of responding to 80% of calls by 7 minutes (CVFD 2023).

The SPA Plan area is within the Chula Vista Elementary School District (grades K–6) and the Sweetwater Union High School District (grades 7–12). Based on Chula Vista Elementary School District and Sweetwater Union High School district student generation factors (students per dwelling unit) used in the PFFP (City of Chula Vista 2019), there is a need to accommodate approximately 259 elementary students, 65 middle school students, and 139 high school students, for a total of 463 students.

Library services are provided by the City as described by the Chula Vista Public Library Strategic Facilities Plan (City of Chula Vista 2011). Using the threshold of 500 square feet of adequately equipped and staffed regional library facilities per 1,000 residents, the population of the SPA Plan area generates a demand for approximately 1,096 square feet of library facilities.

The City Municipal Code, Chapter 17.10, Parklands and Public Facilities, establishes the method by which actual required park acreage is to be calculated, based on the number and type of residential development determined at the Final Map level. The City's Municipal Code Chapter

17.10 also states that each single-family dwelling unit generates a need for 460 square feet of developed parkland, and each multi-family unit generates a need for 341 square feet of developed parkland. Based on 840 residential units, the parkland obligation for the proposed modifications is approximately 6.57 acres if the maximum density is built out. However, the proposed modifications would provide public plaza and park spaces of approximately 2.73 acres. The remaining park obligations would be satisfied through in-lieu fees determined as part of the Development Agreement.

The City Municipal Code Section 19.48.025 requires that new planned communities identify 1.39 acres of net usable land per 1,000 proposed residents for community purpose facilities (CPFs). The build-out population of the proposed modifications would require approximately 3.01 acres of CPF uses. The exact requirement of CPF acreage would be determined through the Development Agreement. These uses would be provided on site or in adjacent villages. CPF uses may include gathering areas, meeting rooms, and recreational facilities, which are consistent with the mix of uses provided in recreational spaces on site. If the final design of land uses that can accommodate CPF uses on site or in adjacent villages is insufficient to satisfy the requirements of City Municipal Code Section 19.48.025, then off-site facilities would be identified prior to approval of the final permit.

As described in Section 5.12 of the FEIR, police, fire and emergency medical, library, and school facilities would be financed as part of the required PFFP. A new PFFP is being prepared to reflect the changes in land uses within the site resulting from the proposed residential and mixeduse/residential development to provide adequate public facilities impact fees. City Municipal Code Section 19.80.030, Controlled Residential Development, is intended to ensure that new development does not degrade existing public services and facilities below acceptable standards for schools and other public services. The PFFP prepared in conjunction with preparation of a SPA Plan for a project is intended to ensure that development of that project is consistent with the overall goals and policies of the General Plan and would not degrade public services. City Municipal Code Section 19.09 requires a PFFP and the demonstration that public services meet the growth management ordinance quality of life threshold standards. The PFFP would ensure funding for any needed expansion of services, and ensure that public services would be provided commensurate with development and demand. Pursuant to Government Code Section 65996, the payment of these fees by a developer serves to fully mitigate all potential project impacts on school facilities to less than significant. Consistent with mitigation required by the FEIR, all required school fees would be paid prior to issuance of building permits. The PFFP would address any development impact fee requirements to ensure funding for any needed expansion of public services facilities, including police and fire facilities, parks, and libraries, commensurate with development and demand.

Any resulting increase in public facilities space, such as schools or libraries, would be minor, likely located within already developed or developing areas of the vicinity, and would not result in an adverse physical impact on the environment, consistent with the CEQA thresholds. The proposed modifications would include an increase of 840 residential units. The proposed modifications would also include 2.73 acres of parkland, and the remaining obligation would be satisfied through in-lieu fees determined as part of the Development Agreement. As such, the proposed modifications would not result in any new significant environmental effects beyond those previously analyzed under the FEIR for the proposed project.

Agriculture

Impacts to agriculture were addressed in Section 5.9 of the FEIR. The FIER relied upon the conclusions in the larger Otay Ranch GPA/GDP/SRP project (PEIR 90-01), which determined that the loss of agricultural grazing land and land suitable for the production of crops would result in a significant impact due to the incremental and irreversible loss of important or limited agricultural resources. Mitigation Measure 5.9-1 was proposed that would reduce short-term significant impacts between urban and agricultural operations; however, the loss of agricultural land was still considered significant and unavoidable.

Since that determination in the FEIR was made, the site and surrounding area have been built out. New roads, commercial centers, and residential buildings have since been constructed in the immediate vicinity around the project site. Therefore, although the proposed modifications would increase development on the site, it would not further exacerbate the significant and unavoidable impact regarding agricultural land that was determined in the FEIR. The proposed modifications would not result in new substantial or significant impacts beyond those previously analyzed in the FEIR.

Geology

Impacts related to geology were addressed in Section 5.11 of the FEIR. The FEIR determined that impacts associated with ground shaking, slope instability, expansive soils, and compressible soils would be significant. Mitigation Measures 5.11-1 and 5.11-2 were proposed, which reduced impacts to below a level of significance.

Since that determination in the FEIR was made, the site has been developed and the mitigation measures were complied with prior to construction. A Geotechnical Reconnaissance Report (Appendix K) for the proposed modifications has been prepared. As noted therein, the site would be required to adhere to site-specific seismic design criteria. The site has potentially expansive

soils, but it is not susceptible to liquefaction or landslides. Similar to FEIR Mitigation Measures 5.11-1 and 5.11-2, prior to issuance of a grading permit the applicant will also be required to incorporate the recommendations of the Geology Report into project design and construction documents to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista Engineer.

Therefore, although the proposed modifications would increase development on the site, it would not further exacerbate the significant impacts associated with geologic conditions that were determined in the FEIR. The proposed modifications would not result in new substantial or significant impacts beyond those previously analyzed in the FEIR.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials were addressed in Section 5.13 of the FEIR. The FEIR determined that impacts related to hazardous materials could result from implementation of the Planning Area 12 FC site, particularly because hazardous materials could be used or transported to the site as a part of the freeway commercial development. Impacts were determined to be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure 5.13-1.

Construction activities would entail routine transport of materials potentially hazardous to humans, wildlife, and sensitive environments. These materials include gasoline oil, solvents, cleaners, paint, and various other liquids and materials required for the operation of construction equipment. Operation of the proposed modifications include residential and commercial uses, which are not typically associated with the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Nonetheless, implementation of FEIR Mitigation Measure 5.13-1 would similarly reduce any potential impacts to less than significant.

Therefore, the proposed modifications would not further exacerbate significant impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials as determined in the FEIR. Mitigation Measure 5.13-1 from the FEIR would still be applicable, but no new significant impacts would occur beyond what was analyzed in the FEIR.

7 CONCLUSION

This document has identified all changed circumstances and new information, and memorializes in detail the City's reasoned conclusion that none of these changes would create the conditions requiring preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15163. The following mitigation measures included in the FEIR, and identified in Attachment 1, would be reviewed and complied with:

• Landform Alterations/Aesthetics: 5.2-1 through 5.2-9

• Air Quality: 5.4-1 through 5.4-4

• Noise: 5.5-1

Cultural and Paleontological Resources: 5.7-1 through 5.7-4

Biology: 5.8-1 through 5.8-3

Appendix J:

Appendix K:

Hydrology and Drainage: 5.10-1 through 5.10-5

Utilities

o Potable Water: 5.12-1 through 5.12-5

o Recycled Water: 5.12-6 through 5.12-10

o Wastewater: 5.12-11 through 5.11-13

• Hazards and Hazardous Materials: 5.13-1

Pursuant to Section 15164 of the State CEQA Guidelines and based upon the above discussion, I hereby find that approval and implementation of the proposed project would result in only minor technical changes or additions that are necessary to make the FEIR adequate under CEQA.

Name/Title Date Figure 1, Project Location Attachments: Figure 2, Project Site Plan Attachment 1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation - Otay Ranch Planning Area 12 FC SPA Plan Final EIR Appendix A: Air Quality and GHG Technical Memorandum (Dudek 2023) Appendix B: Health Risk Assessment (LDN 2022) Appendix C: Biological Resources Memorandum (Dudek 2023) Cultural Resources Inventory (Dudek 2023) *Appendix D1:* Appendix D2: Paleontological Inventory (Dudek 2022) Appendix E: Acoustical Assessment (Dudek 2023) Local Mobility Analysis (LLG 2023) Appendix F: Appendix G1: Overview of Water Service (Dexter Wilson 2023) Appendix G2: Water Supply Assessment and Verification Report (SDCWA 2023) Appendix G3: Water Conservation Plan (Dexter Wilson 2023) Appendix G3a: OWD Availability e-mail (Otay Water District 2023) Appendix H: Overview of Sewer Service (Dexter Wilson 2023) Appendix I: Drainage Report (Hunsaker & Associates 2022)

Geotechnical Reconnaissance Report (Geocon 2022)

Storm Water Quality Management Plan (Hunsaker & Associates 2022)

REFERENCES CITED

- CalRecycle (California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery). 2023. "SWIS Facility/Site Activity Details; Otay Landfill (37-AA-0010)." Accessed January 2023. https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/SiteActivity/Details/1790?siteID=2863.
- Caltrans (California Department of Transportation). 2013. *Technical Noise Supplement to the Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol*. September 2013.
- CARB (California Air Resources Board). 2022. 2022 Scoping Plan for Achieving Carbon Neutrality. November 16, 2022. https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2022-12/2022-sp.pdf.
- City of Chula Vista. 2003. Final Environmental Impact Report for the Otay Ranch Freeway

 Commercial Sectional Planning Area Plan Planning Area 12. City of Chula Vista EIR
 02-04; SCH #1989010154.
- City of Chula Vista. 2011. *Chula Vista Public Library Strategic Facilities Plan*. April 2011. https://www.chulavistaca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/4812/636070430788670000.
- City of Chula Vista. 2014. Wastewater Collection System Master Plan. May 2014.
- City of Chula Vista. 2017. *Chula Vista Climate Action Plan*. Adopted September 2017. https://www.chulavistaca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/15586/636428706054030000.
- City of Chula Vista. 2019. *Otay Ranch Freeway Commercial Spa Plan Supplemental Public Facilities Finance Plan*. First approved April 1, 2003; last updated May 16, 2019. https://www.chulavistaca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/14914/637181303440330000.
- City of Chula Vista. 2020. *Chula Vista Active Transportation Plan*. May 12, 2020. https://www.chulavistaca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/20838/637346375732130000.
- City of Chula Vista. 2021. *Chula Vista Vision 2020 General Plan*. Adopted December 13, 2005; amended July 13, 2021. https://www.chulavistaca.gov/departments/development-services/planning/planning-digital-library/general-plan.
- CVFD (Chula Vista Fire Department). 2023. "Chula Vista Fire Department." Accessed January 2023. https://www.chulavistaca.gov/departments/fire-department.
- CVPD (Chula Vista Police Department). 2023. "Chula Vista Police." Accessed January 2023. https://www.chulavistaca.gov/departments/police-department.

- EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency). 2022. "What is a MERV rating?" Last updated July 1, 2022. https://www.epa.gov/indoor-air-quality-iaq/what-merv-rating.
- Otay Water District. 2016. 2015 Water Facilities Master Plan Update. March 2016. https://lf.otaywater.gov/WebLink/0/edoc/782174/1.%202015%20WFMP%20Update%20 March%202016%20with%20Attachments.pdf.
- SANDAG (San Diego Association of Governments). 2019. 6th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment Methodology. November 22, 2019. https://www.sandag.org/-/media/SANDAG/Documents/PDF/projects-and-programs/regional-initiatives/housing-land-use/regional-housing-needs-assessment/6th-cycle-regional-housing-needs-assessment-methodology-2019-11-22.pdf.
- SANDAG. 2002. (Not So) Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region. April 2002.
- SANDAG. 2021. *San Diego Forward: 2021 Regional Plan*. December 2021. https://www.sandag.org/regional-plan/2021-regional-plan/-/media/8D0F181A086844E3A84C3D44576BED6B.ashx.

SCAQMD (South Coast Air Quality Management District). 2019. "South Coast AQMD Significance Thresholds." Revised April 2019. http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/scaqmd-air-quality-significance-thresholds.pdf.

