

**CITY OF POWAY
ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY
AND CHECKLIST**

A. INTRODUCTION

This Environmental Initial Study and Checklist, along with information contained in the public record, comprise the environmental documentation for the proposed project as described below pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Based upon the information contained herein and in the public record, the City of Poway has prepared Mitigated Negative Declaration for the proposed project.

B. PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Project Title: St Bartholomew's Episcopal Church Parrish Community Center and Preschool Expansion, Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 18-019, Development Review (DR) 18-008, and Variance (VAR) 19-001
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Poway, Development Services
13325 Civic Center Drive, Poway, CA 92064
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Oda Audish, Associate Planner, (858)668-4661
4. Project Location: 16275 Pomerado Road, Poway CA 92064
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Mark Davis, 16275 Pomerado Road, Poway, CA 92064
6. General Plan Designation: Rural Residential-C
7. Zoning: Rural Residential-C (RR-C)
8. Description of Project: This is a request for a phased modification and expansion of the St. Bartholomew's Episcopal Church campus located at 16275 Pomerado Road consisting of the demolition of an existing 8,435 square-foot, two-story parish hall, establishment of a new parking lot area, expansion of the existing pre-school playground area, construction of a new 13,422 square-foot, two-story parish community center, conversion of six Sunday school classrooms to six preschool classrooms, and increasing the maximum number of preschool students from 82 to 154 students. A Variance is also requested to allow the proposed parish community center to observe a 29-foot front yard setback along Pomerado Road where 40 feet is required in the RR-C zone. The proposed project will also require grading, installation of a new wall along the parking lot, construction of a new walkway, removal of trees, installation of stormwater treatment facilities, and relocation of a fire hydrant.

The proposed project will be constructed in phases over approximately eight years as funding becomes available. The first phase would include the demolition of the existing parish hall and replacing it with a new parking lot. A new pedestrian ramp will be created from the new parking lot to the existing columbarium and the area of the existing ramp will be developed with a separate playground for two-year old children.

The two next phases would include the construction the new parish community center. The first floor with an interim roof terrace covered with red fabric would be constructed first.

EIS and Checklist

Subsequently, the roof terrace would be converted to the second floor of the community center and a permanent roof would be constructed.

The final phase would involve changing six existing Sunday School classrooms to preschool classrooms to allow the preschool student count to increase from 82 to 154 students at any one time.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: The 5.16-acre project site is located in an urban setting and surrounded by single-family residential uses on all sides, except for a religious facility that is located to the north. Pomerado Road borders the site along the west property line.

The site slopes approximately 80 feet downward from the southwest corner to the northeast corner. The project site is developed with a religious facility consisting of five buildings (a sanctuary, an administration building, an education (preschool) building, and a parish hall) totaling 34,384 square feet. In addition, the site is developed with a columbarium, playground, parking lot, and landscaping. The approximately one-acre southeasterly portion of the site consists of disturbed native vegetation.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g.: permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): None
11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

In accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1(b), the Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians and Barona Band of Mission Indians tribes, which are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area within the City of Poway's jurisdiction, requested formal notice of and information on proposed projects within the City of Poway. On January 12, 2020, in compliance with California Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1, the City of Poway, as Lead Agency, sent a letter to the Tribal Representatives for those tribes notifying the tribes of the proposed project. Responses to the AB 52 consultation notices were received as discussed in this document.

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

EIS and Checklist

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

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

Determination (To be completed by the Lead Agency):

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	<input type="checkbox"/>
I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case as revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent and/or mitigation has been agreed to. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.	<input type="checkbox"/>
I find that the proposed MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.	<input type="checkbox"/>
I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.	<input type="checkbox"/>



 City of Poway

2-20-20

 Date

C. EIS and Checklist

ISSUE	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
I. AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
c. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?				X
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	
II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES.				
In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land,				X

EIS and Checklist

ISSUE	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:				
a. Convert prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance (farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				X
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest land?				X
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
III. AIR QUALITY.				
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X

EIS and Checklist

ISSUE	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
b. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?				X
c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people?				X
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
e. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X

EIS and Checklist

ISSUE	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?				X
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?				X
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?		X		
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?		X		
VI. ENERGY. Would the project:				
a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			X	
b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?				X
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:				
l) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based				X

EIS and Checklist

ISSUE	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				X
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv) Landslides?				X
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				X
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risk to life or property?				X
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				X
f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X

EIS and Checklist

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.				
Would the project:				
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X	
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.				
Would the project:				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working within the project area				X
f. Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
g. Expose people or structures either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving				X

EIS and Checklist

wildland fires?				
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?				X
b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?				X
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
(i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite?				X
(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a matter which would result in flooding on- or offsite;				X
(iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or				X
(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				X
e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?				X

EIS and Checklist

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING.				
Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?				X
b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X	
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES.				
Would the project:				
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State?				X
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X
XIII. NOISE.				
Would the project result in:				
a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient, noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
b. Generation of, excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?			X	
c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING.				
Would the project:				
a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other				X

EIS and Checklist

infrastructure)?				
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES.				
a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services.				
i. Fire protection?			X	
ii. Police protection?			X	
iii. Schools?				X
iv. Parks?				X
v. Other public facilities?			X	
XVI. RECREATION.				
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X	
XVII. TRANSPORTATION Would the project:				
a. Conflict with program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?				X
b. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?			X	
c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g.: sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses				X

EIS and Checklist

(e.g.: farm equipment)?				
d. Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES				
a. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or				X
ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.		X		
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.				
Would the project:				
a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future				X

EIS and Checklist

development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?				
c. Result in the determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project, that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?				X
e. Comply with federal, state and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
XX. WILDFIRE If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?				X
c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				X
d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?				X

EIS and Checklist

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
<p>a. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples or the major periods of California history or prehistory?</p>				X
<p>b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulative considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</p>				X
<p>c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly?</p>				X

D. DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

Please refer to the Environmental Initial Study Checklist Form above when reading the following evaluation.

I. AESTHETICS:

- a. **No Impact.** The project site is not located in the City's designated Hillside Ridgeline areas or along a street that is designated a scenic corridor. The project site is currently developed with a church that is mainly visible from Pomerado Road due to site topography. The proposed new parish hall and parking lot will be located in an area of the site that has been previously developed. Full and partial visibility of the project will be limited to the neighborhoods in the immediate vicinity of the project site and to Pomerado Road. The architecture of the proposed parish hall building will be similar to the architecture of existing building on the site. Thirty-eight trees are proposed to be removed due to the health of the trees or to make room for the new development. The project calls for landscaping, including, but not limited to, trees will be planted to soften the appearance of the proposed parking lot and parish hall. No impact would occur.
- b. **No Impact.** The project site is not located in the vicinity of any State scenic highway, the proposed project would not damage any scenic resources within a State scenic highway. No impact would occur.
- c. **No Impact.** See response I.a.
- d. **Less Than Significant Impact.** The site is currently developed with a religious facility with sources of light and glare consisting of headlights on cars in the parking lot, exterior light fixtures in the parking lot and court yards, and interior light spilling through windows. The proposed project would include the installation of five additional parking lot and seven courtyard lights. The new parish hall would also have interior light that would be visible from the surrounding area. Compliance with City lighting standards, including, but not limited to directing exterior lights downward would help to ensure that the light and glare created by the proposed project would be consistent with the levels of light and glare currently emitted in the surrounding developed environment. Therefore, a less-than significant impact would occur.

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY_RESOURCES:

- a. **No Impact.** The project site is a previously developed property and not identified as important farmland. Thus, the project would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farm-land of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural uses. No impact would occur.
- b. **No Impact.** The project site is not being used for agricultural production and does not contain Williamson Act contract land. No impact would occur.

EIS and Checklist

- c. **No Impact.** The project site does not contain, and is not zoned for, forest land, timberland or timberland zoned Timberland Production. No impact would occur.
- d. **No Impact.** As stated in response II.c, the project site is not located in an area containing forest land. Accordingly, the project would not convert any forest land to non-forest use, and no impact would occur.
- e. **No Impact.** The project would not directly impact agriculture or forest lands, nor introduce new elements into the landscape that would contribute to future conversion of agricultural use to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use. No impact would occur.

III. AIR QUALITY:

- a. **No Impact.** The City of Poway is part of the San Diego Air Basin and air quality in the area is administered by the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (APCD). An air quality management plan (AQMP) describes air pollution control strategies to be taken by a City, County or region classified as a non-attainment area to meet the Clean Air Act (CAA) requirements. The main purpose of an AQMP is to bring the area into compliance with the requirements of federal and state air quality standards, and to coordinate regional and local governmental agencies to achieve air quality improvement goals. A San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategies Plan – 1994 (jointly developed by the Air Pollution Control District and the San Diego Association of Governments-SANDAG) exists for the San Diego area and provides strategies for pollution control to improve air quality in the region. Land use plans and build out projections of the General Plans of jurisdictions within the San Diego area were considered in establishing the strategies of the Regional Air Quality Strategies Plan. The Poway General Plan includes strategies that are directed toward reducing air emissions through land use patterns, transportation planning, regional agency cooperation, energy conservation, and construction. The project is consistent with the Poway General Plan strategies, in that the General Plan envisioned this type of development on the project site, therefore it is also consistent with the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategies Plan. No impact would occur.
- b. **No Impact.** See response II.a above.
- c. **Less Than Significant.** Grading of the project will likely result in the creation of dust and can affect the surrounding residential area. Standard City best management practice requirements include implementation of dust control measures and the operations are subject to San Diego Air Pollution Control District standards. Impacts will be less than significant.
- d. **No Impact.** The project will not result in the creation of objectionable odor. No impact would occur.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:

- a. **No Impact.** Almost the entire property subject to this proposal has been developed or previously disturbed. Since the proposed development is contained within areas that have been previously disturbed or developed, no impacts to habitat would occur. Approximately 36 ornamental trees are proposed for removal on the site to make room for the proposed development or because the trees are diseased and pose a danger of falling over. None of the trees are native. The trees proposed for removal are required to be replaced in accordance with the City of Poway's Urban Forestry Ordinance, Chapter 12.32 of the Poway Municipal Code (PMC). No impact would occur.
- b. **No Impact.** There is no riparian habitat or other sensitive habitat that would be directly impacted by the proposed development. The property to the south is occupied by coastal sage scrub habitat which is a sensitive natural community identified in the Poway Habitat Subarea Conservation Plan (HCP) and a type of habitat that is known as nesting habitat for the California Gnatcatcher. In accordance with the HCP, its companion Implementing Agreement, and associated Mitigated Negative Declaration for the HCP, a condition of approval of the church expansion project will prohibit grading within 500 feet of Coastal Sage Scrub during February 15 to July 1 which is the gnatcatcher nesting season adopted by the HCP unless a California gnatcatcher nesting survey has been completed and demonstrates that there are no California gnatcatcher nesting within 500 feet of the proposed area to be graded. No impact would occur.
- c. **No Impact.** The site and adjoining areas do not contain any wetlands. No impact would occur.
- d. **No Impact.** The project site is not located within any reported local or regional corridors for native or migratory wildlife. See IV.b.
- e. **No Impact.** See IV.a.
- f. **No Impact.** See IV.b.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES:

- a. **No Impact.** The subject site does not contain any historical resources. The existing parish hall to be demolished is not on the City's list of historical structures. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- b. **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** The project site was developed with a church in 1967 and has been subject to several expansion projects. Grading and excavation required for the project will be located in areas of previous disturbance. However, since the subject property is mapped in the Poway General Plan as being in an area where there is high potential for cultural resources to exist, there is a potential during construction of the discovery of cultural resources. Grading and trenching in greater depths than have previously occurred on the site, as well as other ground-disturbing

actions, have the potential to damage or destroy previously unidentified and potentially significant cultural resources within the Project area. Disturbance of any deposits that have the potential to provide significant cultural data would be considered a significant impact under CEQA. As discussed in XVIII.a.ii, the Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians asked that native cultural monitoring be conducted during ground disturbance considering that the church is located about half a mile from a known sensitive cultural resource to the north of the church site. The potential impacts of the Project on any unknown cultural resource would be reduced to less than significant with the implementation a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program listed below.

Mitigation Measures:

1. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall provide written verification that a qualified archaeologist and recognized Native American monitor has been retained to implement the monitoring program. This verification shall be presented in a letter from the project archaeologist to the lead agency.
2. The certified archaeologist and recognized Native American monitor shall attend the pre-grading meeting with the contractors to explain and coordinate the requirements of the monitoring program.
3. The consulting archaeologist and recognized Native American monitor shall direct the field monitor during the initial brushing of the parcel and any grading of the upper levels of soils disturbance of all areas identified for development.
4. During the original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits, the archaeological and recognized Native American monitor shall be on-site, as determined by the consulting archaeologist, to perform inspections of the excavations. The frequency of inspections may vary from full time to part time depending upon the rate of excavation, the materials excavated, exposure of formational soils and bedrock, and the presence and abundance of artifacts and features.
5. Isolates and clearly non-significant deposits will be minimally documented in the field, so the monitored grading can proceed.
6. In the event that unidentified historic resources are discovered, the archaeologist and recognized Native American monitor shall have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground-disturbance operation in the area of discovery to allow for the evaluation of potentially significant cultural resources. The archaeologist shall contact the lead agency at the time of discovery. The archaeologist and recognized Native American monitor, in consultation with the lead agency, shall determine the significance of the discovered resources. The lead agency must concur with the evaluation before construction activities will be allowed to resume in the affected area. For significant cultural resources that are discovered, and which will be destroyed by grading, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program to mitigate impacts shall be

prepared by the consulting archaeologist and approved by the lead agency before being carried out using professional archaeological methods. If any human bones are discovered, all grading at that location must stop and the county coroner and City of Poway shall be contacted. In the event that the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Most Likely Descendant, as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), shall be contacted in order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains.

7. Before construction activities are allowed to resume in the location of any discovered significant cultural deposits, the artifacts shall be recovered, and features recorded using professional archaeological methods. The archaeological monitor and recognized Native American monitor shall determine the amount of material to be recovered for an adequate artifact sample for analysis.
8. All cultural material collected during the grading monitoring program shall be processed and curated according to the current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.
9. A report documenting the field and analysis results and interpreting the artifact and research data within the research context shall be completed and submitted to the satisfaction of the lead agency prior to the issuance of any building permits. The report will include Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Primary and Archaeological Site Forms.

c. **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** See V.b.

VI. ENERGY

- a. **Less than Significant Impact.** Construction of the project would create temporary increased demands for electricity and vehicle fuels compared to existing conditions. Construction of the project would require electricity use to power construction equipment. Electricity use during construction would vary during different phases of construction. The majority of construction equipment would be gas powered. Since the project site is already served by onsite electrical infrastructure, adequate electrical infrastructure capacity is available to accommodate the electricity demand during construction. Operation of the larger parish hall and the increase in the number of preschool students would result in an increase in electricity demands. However, there is sufficient electricity infrastructure in the region for the increase in electricity demand and the project would not require expanded electricity supplies. Therefore, impacts from energy use during short-term construction activities and operation would be less than significant.
- b. **No Impact.** The project would not obstruct any state or local plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency. No impact would occur.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS:

- a.i) **No Impact.** No active known faults traverse the project site or are near the site. The nearest known fault is an unnamed fault located approximately three miles west of the project site. Murphy Canyon Fault is the nearest main southern California fault, located approximately ten miles southwest of the project site. Three major fault systems within the project vicinity include the Elsinore, San Jacinto and Rose Canyon faults. The active Elsinore fault trends northwest and is about 22 miles northeast of Poway. The San Jacinto fault is also an active northwest-trending fault about 45 miles northeast of Poway. The Rose Canyon fault is located about 16 to 20 miles west of Poway in the Pacific Ocean and is considered potentially active. There is potential for some local damage in the event of a major earthquake along one of these fault systems which could result in significant impacts to project facilities. While the potential for onsite rupture cannot be completely discounted (e.g. unmapped faults could conceivably underlie the site), the likelihood for such an occurrence is considered low due to the absence of known faulting within or adjacent to the site. No impact would occur.
- a.ii) **No Impact.** The project site is located in seismically active southern California and is likely to be subjected to moderate to strong seismic ground shaking. Seismic shaking at the site could be generated by events on any number of known active and potentially active faults in the region, including several unnamed faults, larger faults such as Murphy Canyon Fault, and major fault systems such as Elsinore, San Jacinto and Rose Canyon. An earthquake along any of these known active fault zones could result in severe ground shaking and consequently cause injury and/or property damage in the project vicinity. This could potentially result in significant impacts to project facilities. The buildings will be designed and constructed to incorporate measures to accommodate projected seismic loading in compliance with current construction codes. These codes are produced through joint efforts by industry groups to provide standard specifications for engineering and construction activities. They are widely accepted by regulatory authorities and are regularly included in related standards such as municipal building and grading codes, and they include measures to accommodate seismic loading parameters. The buildings will be designed and constructed to accommodate projected seismic loading, pursuant to these existing guidelines. No impact would occur.
- a.iii) **No Impact.** No impacts resulting from seismically related ground failure would occur.
- a.iv) **No Impact.** The project site is not underlain by formations identified as susceptible to seismically induced landslides. No impact would occur.
- b. **Less Than Significant Impact.** Grading activities will comply with City requirements, including implementation of standard erosion control measures, and will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Impacts are less than significant.

EIS and Checklist

- c. **No Impact.** The project site is not located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project. The parking lot and pad for the proposed parish hall will be graded according to City requirements and fill material which will be compacted in compliance with City standards and inspected for adequacy before the issuance of any building permits. No impact would occur.
- d. **No Impact.** Expansive soils change in volume (shrink or swell) due to changes in moisture content of the soil. The buildings will be constructed in accordance with geotechnical recommendations that incorporate California Building Code (CBC) standards, as required by the City of Poway. No impact would occur.
- e. **No Impact.** The project site will be served by the public sewer system. No septic tanks or other alternative waste water disposal systems are proposed. No impact would occur.
- f. **No Impact.** The project does not propose any significant ground excavation activities that could affect potentially present and unknown paleontological resources or unique geologic features. The project site is located on a site developed with a church in 1967 and has been subject to several expansion projects. Grading and excavation required for the project will be located in areas of previous disturbance. Therefore, the project would result in less than significant impact to paleontological resources.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS:

- a & b. **Less Than Significant Impact.** Greenhouse gases (GHG), allow solar radiation (sunlight) into the Earth's atmosphere, but prevent radiative heat from escaping, thus warming the Earth's atmosphere. GHGs are emitted by both natural processes and human activities; and the accumulation of GHGs in the atmosphere regulates the Earth's temperature. Emissions of GHGs in excess of natural ambient concentrations are thought to be responsible for the enhancement of the greenhouse effect and contributing to what is termed "global warming." GHG impacts that attributable to this proposed project are emissions associated with construction activities and operations related to traffic and energy use.

A Greenhouse Gas Analysis report was prepared for the project by Dr. Valorie L. Thompson (on behalf of Eilar Associates, Inc.) and dated October 29, 2018. The report explains that many lead agencies have adopted the threshold as recommended by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA), *CEQA and Climate Change – Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Projects Subject to the California Environmental Quality Act* as a guidance on screening when a project would generate greenhouse gas emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment and would warrant further analysis. In that document, CAPCOA proposed a quantitative threshold of 900 metric tons of CO₂ equivalent emissions as a threshold below which no significant impacts on the environment would be anticipated. The project GHG analysis concluded that the net increase of GHG emissions of 250 metric tons of CO₂ is well below the

EIS and Checklist

CAPCOA threshold of 900 metric tons. Furthermore, the emissions associated with the project will be further reduced to a level that is consistent with the goals of AB 32 to reduce statewide GHG emissions through the implementation mobile source emission regulations, Title 24 energy efficiency requirements, and renewable portfolio standards adopted by the State of California. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable global climate change impact.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:

- a - c. **No Impact.** The project involves the construction of a new parish community center, addition of parking spaces, and an increase in preschool student count at a site with an existing church. No transport, storage or use of hazardous materials beyond that which typically occurs with a religious facility will occur. No impact would occur.
- d. **No Impact.** The site is not on the established lists of hazardous wastes site. No impact would occur.
- e. **No Impact.** The closest airports to the project site are Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, located approximately 10 miles southwest of the project site, and Gillespie Field, located approximately 9 miles east of the project site. The project site is not located within the Airport Influence Area of either of these airports. Thus, operation of the project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area and no impact would occur.
- f. **No Impact.** The project would not impair or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Operation of the project would not interfere with people's ability to utilize roadways for evacuation purposes. No impact would occur.
- g. **No Impact.** According to the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (VHFHSZ) map for Poway (CAL FIRE 2009), the project site is not located within the VHFHSZ. Accordingly, the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. No impact would occur.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:

- a. **No Impact.** The project will comply with all storm water quality regulations or waste discharge requirements surface water quality as governed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), the County of San Diego, and the City of Poway. The project will require a grading permit and a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which will be ensured as part of the project improvements plan review and building permit process. The project will incorporate pervious paving in new parking lot areas and implement other Low Impact Development (LID) features. The project incorporates stormwater basins and will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. No impact would occur.

EIS and Checklist

- b. **No Impact.** The project does not propose any construction activities that would directly affect groundwater, contribute to the depletion of groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge through the use of pervious paving and implementation of LIDs. No impact would occur.
- c.i-iii) **No Impact.** The project has been designed such that there is no increase in the amount of storm water runoff beyond which currently occurs. The project will incorporate pervious paving in new parking lot areas and implement other Low Impact Development (LID) features and will include the construction of storm water treatment facilities. The stormwater management facilities are required to be maintained throughout the life of the project as outlined in section 16.104 of the Poway Municipal Cod. No impact would occur.
- c.iv) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project has been designed such that there is no increase in the amount of storm water runoff beyond which currently occurs. The project will incorporate pervious paving in new parking lot areas and implement other Low Impact Development (LID) features and will include the construction of storm water treatment facilities. The stormwater management facilities are required to be maintained throughout the life of the project as outlined in section 16.104 of the Poway Municipal Cod. Impacts will be less than significant
- d. **No Impact.** The project is not located in a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zone that would pose the risk of pollutants being released due to project inundation. No impact would occur.
- e. **No Impact.** See X.a and X.b above. No impact would occur.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING:

- a. **No Impact.** The project involves the construction of a new parish community center, addition of a parking lot, and an increase in preschool student count at a site with an existing church. The project will not divide an established neighborhood. Therefore, no impact would occur.
- b. **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project would modify an existing religious facility which is an allowed land use with the approval of a Conditional Use Permit. The proposed project will comply with all development standards for the RR-C zone and a semi-public facility such as a church, except for a requested variance to allow the Parish Community Center building to maintain a 29-foot front yard setback along Pomerado Road when 40 feet is required for the RR-C zone. The requested reduced front yard setback will not result in an aesthetic impact or other environmental effect considering that the setback is identical to an existing building on the site and the visual effect of the structure as seen from Pomerado Road will be softened by the grade difference between the proposed structure and the adjacent road and sidewalk and incorporation of trees and landscaping. Furthermore, the nearest home to the building with the reduced setback is located more than 125 feet away, across Pomerado Road behind a wall. The nearest development to the south and east will not be able to see the portion of the building with the reduced setback. The nearest

property to the north that would be able to see the building is more than 300 feet away and is also developed with a religious facility. Therefore, allowing a reduced front yard setback will have less than significant impact.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES:

- a & b. **No Impact.** Pursuant to the City of Poway Master Environmental Assessment prepared in conjunction with the update to the Poway General Plan in 1991, there are no known mineral resources on the site. Additionally, the site has been previously developed and the proposed church expansion is located in an area that has been previously developed or disturbed. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

XIII. NOISE:

- a. **Less Than Significant Impact.** The applicant submitted a noise analyses titled St. Bartholomew's Episcopal Church Improvements, dated June 13, 2019 and prepared by dBF Associates, Inc. The noise analysis evaluates potential noise that would affect or be produced by the church's project. The primary noise source in the project vicinity is vehicular traffic, particularly from Pomerado Road which borders the Project site on the west side.

The noise analysis evaluated the effect traffic noise has on the proposed preschool playground expansion. The study found that the future Exterior Noise Levels (CNEL) would be 54 dBA which is within the "Normally Acceptable" noise levels for playground areas (up to 67.5 dBA) as established in the Public Safety Element of Poway General Plan. The noise analysis also evaluated the interim condition for the Parish Community Center building when the building would be one-story with a roof top terrace. A project feature of the rooftop terrace includes a solid five-foot high noise barrier along its full west edge and western half of its north edge. With this project feature, the future exterior noise level on the outdoor usable area would be 63 dba which is within the "Conditionally acceptable" noise levels for auditoriums, concert halls and amphitheaters as established in the Public Safety Element of Poway General Plan. Although the general plan states that the outdoor environment will seem noisy, such space and associated use could be approved. The outdoor terrace area will only be used for special function and for short durations.

The noise analysis evaluated the existing and future noise sources generated by the proposed Project consisting of HVAC units, children in the playground, people having conversations in outdoor gathering areas, and vehicle movement. The noise study also considered occasional use of amplified sound on the proposed terrace for specific events subject to City approval of a Temporary Use Permit. The analysis found that at the property line, the noise levels generated by the project would be 50 dBA Leq or less during daytime hours, 45 dBA Leq or less during the evening, and 40 dBA Leq or less during the night. These noise levels comply with the Poway Municipal Code noise limits for residential areas along the north, east, and south property lines and with the City of San Diego Municipal Code noise limits along the west property line.

EIS and Checklist

- b. **Less Than Significant Impact.** The noise study described above in XIII.a. analyzed construction vibration generated by the proposed Project. The report lists typical vibration levels associated with potential construction equipment. Considering that earth moving equipment would be at least 150 feet away from the nearest residence, the study found that the vibration level generated by the equipment would be “barely perceptible” to humans within neighboring residence and would not cause damage to nearby residential structures. The temporary vibration impacts associated with the Project construction would be less than significant.
- c. **No Impact.** The closest airports to the project site are Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, located approximately 10 miles southwest of the project site, and Gillespie Field, located approximately 9 miles east of the project site. The project site is not located within the Airport Influence Area of either of these airports. Thus, operation of the project would not result in a noise hazard for people working in the project area and no impact would occur.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING:

- a & b. **No Impact.** The proposed project is located on a lot that is currently developed with a religious facility along a major arterial. A religious facility is a semi-public use that is allowed in the RR-C zone with the approval of a CUP. The project will not induce growth indirectly as it will be serviced by existing infrastructure within the project vicinity. Additionally, no people or housing will be displaced as project as the site does not contain of any residential uses. Therefore, no impact would occur.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES:

- a.i. **Fire Protection – Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is served by the City of Poway Fire Department. The project could result in an incremental increase in the demand for fire protection and emergency services with the larger parish hall and increased preschool student count. The site is already included within the Fire Department service area and the incremental increase in potential for an unexpected emergency call to this project can be accounted for. Aside from relocating an existing fire hydrant to make room for the proposed parish community center, no new or upgraded fire protection facilities would be required as a result of this project and no physical impacts resulting from construction of new facilities are identified. A less than significant impact would occur.
- a.ii. **Police Protection – Less Than Significant Impact.** The City of Poway contracts with the San Diego County Sheriff’s Department for law enforcement services. The project site is currently served by the Poway Station, which is located at 13100 Bowron Road. The site is included within the Sheriff’s service area. Any specific service provided that should be an (unexpected) emergency call to the site is accounted for. No new or upgraded police protection facilities would be required as a result of establishment of this project and no physical impacts resulting from construction of new facilities and increase in preschool student count are identified. A less than significant impact would occur.

EIS and Checklist

- a.iii. **Schools – No Impact.** The proposed church expansion and increase in preschool student count will not generate the need for additional school facilities as no new residents would be associated with the project. No impact would occur.
- a.iv. **Parks – No Impact.** The proposed church expansion and increase in preschool student count will not generate the need for additional park space as no new residents would be associated with the project. The proposed project includes an expansion of the playground area to accommodate the additional children. No impact would occur.
- a.v. **Other Public Facilities – Less Than Significant Impact.** The project would result in an incremental increase in the need for use of public facilities such as storm drain usage, solid-waste disposal, water usage, and wastewater disposal or service, but would not require new or physically altered public facilities. A less than significant impact would occur.

XVI. RECREATION:

- a. **No Impact.** The recreational needs of proposed additional in preschool students would be met with the proposed playground expansion. The remainder of the project involves the construction of a new parish community center and creation of additional parking spaces at a site with an existing church. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in an increase in the use of existing neighborhood and regional park or other recreational facilities. No impact will occur.
- b. **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed new parish community center and creation of additional parking spaces at a site with an existing church will not require the need for development of recreational facilities. The recreational needs of proposed additional in preschool students would be met with the proposed expansion of the playground. The new playground would be developed in an area that is currently developed with an existing walkway/ramp leading to an existing columbarium garden through grading and construction of a retaining wall. The walkway/ramp will be reestablished a more northerly location similar to the existing walkway/ramp. Therefore, the proposed playground expansion will have less than significant adverse physical effect on the environment.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION:

- a. **No Impact.** The proposed project is a minor expansion in the capacity of an existing religious facility and would not be in conflict with program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. No impact will occur.
- b. **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project will not be in conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b) in that the proposed project is a land use project involving an expansion of an existing religious facility and existing preschool that is located approximately 200 feet

EIS and Checklist

from a bus stop along Pomerado Road which is a major arterial with connections to major transit stops. Therefore, the proposed project would cause less than a significant transportation impact.

- c. **No Impact.** The proposed project would not affect the design of streets. The existing driveway will be used as access to the site. No impact will occur.
- d. **No Impact.** The project will not result in inadequate emergency access as the site will be accessed via the existing driveway from the public street. The parking lot will be reconfigured to provide closer and more direct emergency vehicle access to existing and proposed buildings. No impact will occur.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES:

- a.i) **No Impact.** The project site is not on a “Local register of historical resources” and is not officially designated or recognized as historically significant by Poway. No impact would occur.
- a.ii) **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** See V.b and V.c.

In accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1(b), the Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians and Barona Band of Mission Indians tribes, which are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area within the City of Poway’s jurisdiction, requested formal notice of and information on proposed projects within the City of Poway. On January 12, 2020 in compliance with California Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1, the City of Poway, as Lead Agency, sent a letter to the Tribal Representatives for those tribes requesting notification of the proposed project. The Barona Band responded that it did not have any further requests. The Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians requested that native monitoring be conducted during ground disturbance considering that the church is located about half a mile from a known sensitive cultural resource to the north of the church site. The incorporation of mitigation measures for cultural resources as listed in V.a.1 through V.a.8 would also reduce the potential impacts on tribal cultural resources to less than significant.

Mitigation:

See mitigation measures V.a.1 through V.a.8

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS:

- a. **No Impact.** The proposed Project is an expansion of an existing church facility with a preschool. As such, the proposed project would only result in an incremental need for increased use of water, wastewater treatment, electric power, natural gas, and telecommunication systems. Further, the proposed project would result in a minor increase of impervious areas (9.5 percent increase). The project includes adding stormwater treatment basins and other facilities on-site designed to address the incremental increase. Therefore, no impact would occur.

EIS and Checklist

- b. **No Impact.** As discussed above, the proposed project would result in a minor increase in the intensity of existing uses on the project site. The resulting increased water use would be considered insignificant. The project is served by the City of Poway which has a sufficient water supply available to serve this project. No impact would occur.
- c. **No Impact.** As discussed above, the proposed project would result in an insignificant increase in wastewater generation. The City of San Diego treatment plant has adequate capacity to treat the incremental wastewater generated by the project. No impact would occur.
- d. **No Impact.** Demolition of the existing building and construction of the proposed project would result in the generation of solid waste such as scrap lumber, concrete, residual wastes, packing materials, and plastics. The project would be required to dispose of such materials according to a Construction Waste Management Plan. Operation of the larger parish hall and increase in the number of students on the project site would likely be associated with an increased generation of solid waste. Solid waste collection and disposal is currently provided in EDCO Waste Management. Solid waste is collected and sorted for recyclables and the solid waste that is not recycled is hauled to a permitted landfill. The solid waste generated by the project is not anticipated to significantly impact the life expectancy of the landfill that serves the city. The solid waste generated by the project will increase, it will not significantly impact its life expectancy of the landfill. Therefore, no impact would occur.
- e. **No Impact.** This project will be required to comply with and meet all applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations regarding solid waste collection and disposal. The facility will appropriately separate its waste so that recyclables and controlled (and food) wastes are separated from landfill trash in accordance with the City's waste reduction and recycling program. Therefore, no impact would occur.

XX. WILDFIRE:

- a. **No Impact.** See Section XV.a.i. (Public Services – Fire Protection).
- b. **No Impact.** According to the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (VHFHSZ) map for Poway (CAL FIRE 2009), the project site is not located within the VHFHSZ. Accordingly, the project would not expose any project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. No impact will occur.
- c. **No Impact.** The proposed parish community center, parking lot expansion and increase in preschool student count would not require the installation or maintenance of infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. Therefore, no impact will occur.
- d. **No Impact.** As discussed in Section X, the project site is not located in a dam inundation area, at the base of a mountainous landform, or in an area prone to

flooding. Additionally, the project will not be altering drainage patterns on the site. Therefore, the proposed project will not expose people or structures to downslope or downstream flooding or landslides. No impact would occur.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDING OF SIGNIFICANCE:

- a. **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation.** See responses V and XVIII above.
- b. **No Impact.** The project, considered cumulatively with past and future projects, will not result in significant impacts. The project, as well as past projects and future projects have or will comply with the land use and density limitations of the City's General Plan. Infrastructure and services per the General Plan, are in place or are planned and will be provided to accommodate future growth.
- c. **Less Than Significant Impact.** See responses I, III, VII, and XIII above.