

SUMMARY

SUMMARY

S.1 Project Synopsis

Relevant Prior Documents

This document is an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Campus Park Project (hereafter referred to as “Proposed Project” or “Project”). This EIR is prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and ensures that information required by the public as well as County of San Diego (County) decision makers is both adequate and available. Prepared prior to County Board of Supervisors consideration of the Proposed Project for approval or denial, the purpose of this EIR is to identify the potential occurrence of impacts, and the anticipated significance of those impacts, that could occur if the proposed Campus Park Project is implemented.

This EIR is a “subsequent” EIR, as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. A subsequent EIR is prepared when a prior EIR has been certified as complete and adequate under CEQA by the CEQA lead agency; here the County of San Diego. (Details as to regulatory guidelines relating to determination of subsequent EIR applicability are provided in Chapter 1.0 of this EIR.)

In this instance, two previous certified EIRs from 1981 and 1983 evaluated the Project site. The 1981 Sycamore Springs Specific Plan EIR (EAD Log No. 79-2-197) addressed a 442-acre site adjacent to and east of Interstate 15 (I-15) and both north and south of State Route (SR 76) in the Fallbrook Community Planning area. The project proposed a total of 1,160 mobile homes as well as an 18-hole golf course and 7.5 acres of commercial and professional uses. The 1983 Campus Park Specific Plan EIR (EAD Log No. 82-2-95) addressed the same geographic location, but changed proposed uses to the Specific Plan site to accommodate a Hewlett-Packard research and development facility (including manufacturing uses). That plan included uses considered more intensive than the Proposed Project.

The current Campus Park Project addresses a 416.1-acre site. Detail as to the current Proposed Project is presented in Section 1.2.3 of this EIR. In brief, the refined Project proposes ~~1,076~~751 single- and multi-family homes, a Town Center with village commercial and support facilities, neighborhood parks, an active sports park, office professional uses, an equestrian/trail staging area, infrastructure adequate to support all of these uses, and biological preservation.

In addition to the changes in Project design, substantial portions of the earlier Specific Plan area have been severed to accommodate development proposals by others (the Palomar College District and Campus Park West). In addition, a parcel north of the original Sycamore Springs/Campus Park Specific Plan boundaries has been added to the current Campus Park area.

In the time since the 1981 and 1983 EIRs were certified, there has been virtually no change at all to the state of the property parcels. There have, however, been changes in: (1) required analyses due to changes in regulations; and/or (2) changes to surrounding conditions that would potentially affect the previously identified impacts.

For these reasons, the current Proposed Project cannot simply rely on the earlier certified EIRs for accurate and complete disclosure with regard to potential impact type, impact magnitude (i.e., significance) and appropriate mitigation. Although the document incorporates and relies upon the certified 1981/1983 EIRs to the extent appropriate/reasonable/feasible, new information is provided where warranted. Introductions to each topical discussion within Chapters 2.0, 3.0, and 4.0 of this EIR

provide information regarding how the earlier certified EIRs apply to the current subsequent document and environmental analyses within it.

Project Location/Boundary

The Project site is located in the unincorporated portion of San Diego County in the community of Fallbrook, approximately 6 miles southeast of downtown Fallbrook and 46 miles north of downtown San Diego. The Project site consists of two contiguous properties totaling 416.1 acres. SR 76 (also called Pala Road), borders the southern boundary of the 416.1-acre Project site, and I-15, an eight-lane regional transportation corridor, borders the property along a portion of the northwestern edge.

Project's Component Parts

Since circulation of the Project Draft EIR, refinements in Project description have been implemented in response to comments received. The Campus Park Project circulated for public review contained 1,076 residential units and residential components were located throughout the Project property, along with related supporting infrastructure. Following completion of public review and receipt of comments, the Project was refined to consist of substantially fewer units (751), and several portions of the Project property that were initially proposed for development are now proposed for open space. Overall, primary design changes result in 325 fewer multi-family homes, or a reduction of 41 percent, and an increase in biological open space preserve by 20.7 acres, or 11 percent.

The majority of Project developed uses and their construction footprints (residential, office professional, recreational, and commercial) remain the same as previously described and analyzed in the circulated EIR. Project refinements largely occur west of future Horse Ranch Creek Road and all of them would be south of proposed Harvest Glen Lane, where the Proposed Project has been refined to: (1) eliminate some development areas, (2) modify specifics of development detail in some areas, and (3) eliminate the potential for connection to an off-site future wastewater treatment plant (WTP) to be constructed by others. Specifics of road design improvements also vary. Each of these changes is addressed below.

The Draft EIR included two multi-family residential areas (MF-1 and MF-4) west of future Horse Ranch Creek Road and north of SR 76. These areas were proposed to contain a total of 300 residential units sited on a total of 21.1 acres. Both have been eliminated and now would largely be in open space. Within the MF area east of future Horse Ranch Creek Road and north of future Harvest Glen Lane, Draft EIR MF-3 has been renamed MF-1. MF-2 has been reconfigured to include a different product and a lower number of homes overall.

In the Draft EIR, two wastewater treatment options were proposed. Under Wastewater Management Option 1, all Project sewage would have flowed to infrastructure owned and operated by Rainbow Municipal Water District (RMWD), and then to the San Luis Rey Wastewater Treatment Plant (WTP) in Oceanside. Under Wastewater Management Option 2, sewage from 850 equivalent dwelling units (EDUs) would have been sent to RMWD (the Oceanside WTP) for treatment, with the remainder to be treated at a new WTP proposed by the adjacent Meadowood Project. Under Option 2, a storage pond was required within the Project site. At this point, refinements to the proposed development have resulted in elimination of need for sewage treatment of approximately 328 EDUs. This has resulted in the following changes: (1) any reference to Wastewater Management Option 1 is now simply a reference to the Project wastewater management, and no additional service commitment is required beyond that already obtained by the Applicant from RMWD; (2) all references to Wastewater Management 2 have been deleted, and (3) the need for the wet weather storage pond has been deleted.

A 2.4-acre detention basin was previously located south of MF-1 west of future Horse Ranch Creek Road. With the elimination of MF-1, this basin has been relocated to the north, and the basin size and shape have been modified to encompass a surface area of approximately 5.2 acres (although the detention capacity has not changed as the current basin is shallower). As noted, a 2.6-acre potential wet weather storage pond associated with old Wastewater Management Option 2 would be eliminated (along with any associated impacts) as would any utility lines required to tie into the proposed Meadowood WTP.

With regard to Project road improvements, changes have been made to specific design of an off-site portion of future Pala Mesa Drive, Pankey Road, and on-site Pankey Place. With regard to Pala Mesa Drive/Pankey Road, modifications resulted from a request by the abutting Campus Park West Project to shift a portion of the alignment, and this shift has been worked out in coordination with the Department of Public Works. For on-site Pankey Place, modifications are related to deletion of MF-4 multi-family residential area on the south side of the road, and the retention of open space.

A sewer lift or pump station and trail staging area would be moved from an isolated small Project parcel west of future Pankey Road and north of SR 76 to east of future Pankey Road, in the old area of MF-4. The trail staging area is now located immediately north of the lift station, and would be 0.2 acre larger than originally planned (for a total of 0.8 acre in size).

This lower impact development scenario is evaluated throughout the environmental analysis chapters (2.0, 3.0, and 4.0) of this EIR.

On-site Improvements

The Proposed Project is a mixed-use community including 521 single-family and ~~555-230~~ multi-family homes, as well as a public active sports park, six neighborhood parks, homeowner's association (HOA) recreational facilities, office professional use, Town Center, common area open space, and biological open space preserves. The infrastructure necessary to support the development would include on- and off-site roadways, sewer and water facilities, storm drains, and support for non-vehicular modes of transportation via bikeways and pedestrian paths. Discretionary Project approvals being sought from the County include a General Plan Amendment (GPA), Specific Plan Amendment (SPA), zone reclassification, Vesting Tentative Map, "V" Setback Site Plan, and "B" Special Area Designator Site Plan. Project development would occur over a five- to six-year period to ensure a logical and orderly expansion of roadways, public utilities, and infrastructure.

Single-family residences on lots ranging from 4,000 to 5,000 square feet (s.f.) are proposed in the central and northern portions of the site within five planning areas (PAs R-1 to R-5), while multi-family residences are proposed in the central ~~and southeastern~~ portions of the site within ~~four~~ two planning areas (PAs MF-1 ~~to and~~ MF-42). Single-family residential development densities within each planning area would range between 3.8 and 5.8 dwelling units per gross acre (DU/gross ac). Development densities for the multi-family residential areas would range between ~~9.97.7~~ and ~~47.89.9~~ DU/gross ac. A maximum building height of 35 feet would be allowed in the single-family detached portions of the Project site. Sound barriers to attenuate I-15 and Project-generated traffic noise comprise important elements of Project design and are addressed in Project streetscape specifications (see detailed discussion in Chapter 1.0 and Sections 2.1.3 through 2.1.6 of this subsequent EIR).

A 61,200-s.f. Town Center would be constructed on 8.1 gross acres within PA TC-1 in the central portion of the Project site. The Town Center is proposed to consist of single-story 35-foot high (or lower) structures, with architectural projections to approximately 40 feet.

Two office professional planning areas (PAs PO-1 and PO-2) are proposed for the development, 2.7 and 8.8 gross acres in size. The office professional uses would be located in the northwestern portion of the Project site near I-15. Total office professional building area on these lots would be 157,000 s.f. Office professional structures would be up to 35 feet in height.

Architectural guidelines prepared for the development outlined in the Specific Plan and General Plan Amendment Report (Development Design Services and GraphicAccess [DDS/GA] ~~2009~~2010) for this Project promote levels of both visual compatibility and variety in a community setting. To encourage individual identity and neighborhood interest, residential building façades would be designed with pedestrian-oriented treatments to facilitate connections between the proposed homes and the public streets, sidewalks, and community trails. Homes and public spaces within each neighborhood would express individual character while maintaining a consistent California Heritage theme. Façades visible from public view areas (trails, streets, parks, etc.) would be articulated to avoid visual monotony using façade treatments such as undulating building mass and roof planes, and vertical and horizontal stepped massing. Specifics of the façades, together with the walls and fences discussed below, would set the overall “tone” of the development.

Campus Park is designed to be a “walkable” community served by a network of pedestrian and equestrian community and nature trails. Primary streetscapes have been designed to be pedestrian oriented, with tree-shaded walkways, pedestrian-scaled lighting, and shortened or enhanced crosswalks. Village multi-purpose trails would extend along the west side of Horse Ranch Creek Road from SR 76 to Baltimore Oriole Road, the east side of Horse Ranch Creek Road from Baltimore Oriole Road to the nature trail within Open Space 3 (OS-3), the north side of Baltimore Oriole Road, ~~the west side of Pala Mesa Drive from SR 76 to Pankey Place, the north side of Pankey Place to access the trail staging area,~~ and the south side of Harvest Glen Road. Multi-purpose trails would be meandering eight-foot-wide, decomposed granite, stabilized walkways with rail fencing provided for safety and directional needs. These trails would allow pedestrian, equestrian, and bicycle travel. An eight-foot trail would extend along the east side of Pankey Road from SR 76 to the bridge crossing for Horse Ranch Creek and along the north side of Pankey Place. North of the bridge, a six-foot trail would be located on the east side of Pankey Road and north side of Pala Mesa Drive. A village “promenade” would be located along the east and south sides of Longspur Road. This village ~~promenade~~ would provide connection between residential neighborhoods, the Town Center, and the active sports park. The (non-equestrian) promenade also would have an eight-foot-wide decomposed granite meandering walkway. Village pathways (five feet in width) are proposed along: ~~the east side of Pala Mesa Drive between SR 76 and Pankey Place, the south side of Pankey Place,~~ the east side of Horse Ranch Creek Road from SR 76 to Baltimore Oriole Road, the south side of Baltimore Oriole Road, the west and north sides of Longspur Road, and the north side of Harvest Glen Road. Finally, open space (“nature”) trails generally would be eight feet wide and would be located ~~along the western, northern and southern boundaries of PA MF 1, within the fuel management area, and within open space and fuel management area~~ surrounding the northern development area, connecting to the off-site Monserate Mountain trail to the north and east.

Related to some of these facilities, a trail staging area (PA P-4) is proposed to be located immediately ~~west east of Pala Mesa Drive~~Pankey Road, immediately north of the pump station and south of Pankey Place north of SR 76. This staging area would provide parking for recreational users intending to use the region’s existing and proposed trail network. It would include an asphalt parking area; parking lot trees and landscaping; and perimeter landscaping, including a landscaped berm to screen asphalt portions of the parking area from view.

In addition to six private neighborhood parks (PAs P-1, P-2, and P-5 through P-8, ranging between 0.2 and ~~0.6~~0.5 acre) within single-family residential areas, the Project would provide an 8.5-gross-acre (with 5.8 net usable acres) public active sports complex in the central portion of the Project site. The sports

complex would include two baseball fields, a multi-purpose sports field, restrooms/maintenance facility, and a parking lot. An additional 1.2 acres of private development use including a swimming pool, community meeting room, restrooms, outdoor seating areas, and a parking area would be provided within an HOA recreational facility (PA P-3).

~~Depending upon wastewater management option chosen, a~~ total of ~~173.2 to 175.8~~ 197 gross acres (approximately ~~42-47~~ percent of the Project site) of biological open space preserves would be provided by the Project (refer to Figure 3.3-8, Proposed Open Space, in the EIR). In addition to the biological open space preserves provided by the Project, ~~22.727~~ acres of HOA-maintained open space would be designated, for a total of ~~195.9 to 198.5~~ 224 gross acres (~~47 to 48~~ 54 percent, ~~respectively~~) of the Project site proposed for open space. HOA-maintained open space would encompass fuel modification zones, as well as manufactured slopes.

A 0.2-acre sewer lift station would be constructed in PA I-1, north of SR 76 and south of ~~between~~ the trail staging area ~~and existing Pankey Road~~. The sewer lift station, with a minimum firm pumping capacity of ~~948-685~~ gallons per minute (gpm), would pump all wastewater generated by the Project to an existing ~~42-inch diameter~~ force main in SR 76.

~~In addition to the sewer lift station, two wastewater treatment options are available to the Project (as described below). Under Wastewater Management Option 1, all Project sewage would flow from the gravity line to infrastructure owned and operated by Rainbow Municipal Water District (RMWD), and then flow to the San Luis Rey Wastewater Treatment Plant (WTP) in Oceanside. Under Option 2, approximately 70 percent of sewage generated on site would be treated at the San Luis Rey WTP and approximately 30 percent would be treated at an off site WTP within the adjacent Meadowood Project. A 2.6-acre storage pond with an access road would be located on the Project site to accommodate wet weather flow under Option 2. This pond (PA OS-8) would be located in the southern portion of the site, west of Horse Ranch Creek Road and north of Pankey Place.~~

Landscape/Hardscape

The natural setting of Campus Park includes broad pastures, riparian corridors, oak woodlands, and rock outcroppings on hillsides. Groves are visible on surrounding hillsides. This setting provides the inspiration for a Mediterranean landscape theme. Grove plantings and pastures are planned along major streetscapes and adjoining slopes. Trees that complement the native landscape and traditionally are associated with San Diego County rural settings such as oak, sycamore, and Brisbane box, would be used either in small grove settings or in linear streetscape settings (30 feet on center). Traditional materials that complement the natural landscaping, such as stone/stone product and wood, would be used in hardscape elements.

Landscaping of lots would be in accordance with the requirements set forth in the Landscape Concept and Design Guidelines section of the Specific Plan and General Plan Amendment Report and the Conceptual Fire Protection Plan/Fuel Modification Plan (FPP/FMP) for the Proposed Project (Hunt Research Corporation 2009, as amended). The master Campus Park HOA and individual HOAs would be responsible for private roads, signage, common area landscaping and irrigation, streetscape maintenance and irrigation, community entries and gates, the neighborhood parks, fire protection zones, and other responsibilities, as deemed necessary.

Major landscape zones (e.g., Nature/Naturalizing, Riparian Transition, Community Entry, etc.) have been identified, each of which contains specific and detailed landscape palettes described in Chapter 1.0 and Tables 1-3 through 1-11 of this EIR. These tables list the proposed trees, shrubs, groundcover,

succulents, and hydroseed mix appropriate for each zone. California pepper trees are expressly excluded, as are other non-native invasives or plants listed as unacceptable in the Project Conceptual FPP/FMP.

Off-site Project Elements

Project Development Improvements

Proposed off-site improvements include access roads, water lines, and sewer lines that would be connected to existing facilities. Access would be provided northwest (connection from existing Pankey Road to proposed Horse Ranch Creek Road), southwest (Pala Mesa Drive, Pankey Road and Pankey Place), and southeast (Pankey Place, and southern segment of Horse Ranch Creek Road) of the Project site. Pankey Road/Pala Mesa Drive would extend from the Project site ~~through~~ onto the adjacent Campus Park West property, where it would connect to Pala Mesa Drive and then an existing bridge over I-15. The southern portion of Horse Ranch Creek Road would extend through the adjacent Meadowood property to SR 76. Pankey Place (Street R of the adjacent Meadowood proposal) would provide a connection from Pankey Road/Pala Mesa Drive to Horse Ranch Creek Road. The ~~existing~~ Pankey Road (~~future Pala Mesa Drive~~)/SR 76 intersection would be improved. The new Horse Ranch Creek Road/SR 76 and Old Highway 395/Pala Mesa Drive intersections also would be constructed.

A proposed off-site water line would be located within Pala Mesa Drive, Pankey Road, Pankey Place, and Horse Ranch Creek Road. Two proposed pressure-reducing stations would be constructed at the connections to the existing water mains that would serve the Project; one within Horse Ranch Creek Road, north of Baltimore Oriole Road at Stewart Canyon Road and the other within Pala Mesa Drive, just east of I-15. The stations would be installed in above-grade vaults.

Proposed off-site sewer improvements would include a gravity sewer main generally within a segment of Horse Ranch Creek Road from the eastern property boundary to Pankey Place. At that point the main would extend southwesterly through the Meadowood property and Campus Park to the proposed sewer lift station located just ~~east~~ south of the proposed trail staging area. Wastewater then would be pumped from the lift station in a force main line to SR 76, and then to the west for a brief distance to connect to an existing line.

Approximately 25.6 acres would be impacted by the above-described proposed off-site improvements as well as relatively minor grading associated with construction of Pala Mesa Drive, as well as Song Sparrow Drive along the eastern property boundary, single-family residential lots to the south of PA R-2, multi-family residential lot adjacent to Harvest Glen Road, and Horse Ranch Creek Road adjacent to the Palomar College site and through the proposed Meadowood project.

Potential Mitigation-related Improvements

Cumulative traffic impacts are routinely addressed through Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) payment required by the County to address cumulative impacts. Although not part of Project design, after coordination with the Fallbrook Planning Group, a potential alternative scenario ~~the Project Applicant is proposing~~ is possible to provide specific improvements to several additional off-site intersections to mitigate for regional cumulative projected traffic impacts. The mitigation would consist of adding lanes and/or installing traffic signals (refer to Subchapter 2.2, Transportation/Traffic, and Figures 1-35 ~~and 1-37a through 1-37e in Chapter 1.0~~), and would take place in conjunction with Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) payment, required by the County to address cumulative impacts. Actual construction of these improvements would provide immediate benefit to area residents at these specified locations. Potential secondary impacts associated with these off-site mitigation areas are discussed throughout the environmental analyses in this subsequent EIR, as appropriate.

Potential Improvements by Others

Active proposals for development in the immediate vicinity include a Palomar College campus immediately abutting the west side of proposed Horse Ranch Creek Road; Campus Park West on either side of Pankey Road/Pala Mesa Drive in the south; and Meadowood, north of SR 76 on either side of future Horse Ranch Creek Road and then generally east of the Proposed Project boundary to the vicinity of Pala Mesa Heights Road. ~~In addition, Granite Construction (mining Rosemary's Mountain just east of the Project) is currently expanding SR 76 to four lanes between I-15 and their driveway (east of future Horse Ranch Creek Road). This project began in the second quarter of 2008 and is nearing completion.~~

Project Objectives

The overall objective of the Project is to provide a mixed-use planned community with a strong sense of presence and identity. Specific objectives of the Project include:

- Create a walkable and public transportation-friendly mixed-use community with on-site work, live, shop, and play opportunities.
- Design and develop common areas to establish a Project theme.
- Provide a variety of lot sizes and high-quality housing types, including single-family and multi-family homes, to accommodate forecasted population increase.
- Provide convenient, community-serving commercial uses within a Town Center.
- Provide public services, roadways, and utilities infrastructure to support the Proposed Project in a timely and efficient manner that is concurrent with need.
- Provide for a variety of recreational uses, including parks and a comprehensive network of regional and local trails to link the office professional area, Town Center, residential areas, and nature trails.

Environmental Setting

Surrounding Conditions

The Project site is located in a valley generally referred to as the I-15 corridor (see Figures 1-1 and 1-2 in Chapter 1.0 of this EIR). The area surrounding the site is topographically varied. Monserate Mountain and its foothills border the Project site on the north and northeast. Some of this area, including the area immediately adjacent to the northern and northeastern property boundary, is located within a Resource Conservation Area owned and managed by the Fallbrook Land Conservancy. Rosemary's Mountain, a rocky peak, is east of the southern boundary of the Project site (just north of the San Luis Rey River and SR 76). Citrus and avocado groves, non-irrigated agriculture, and large-lot residential are the main land uses east of the Project site.

Lancaster Mountain and an open space corridor exist south of the Project site, associated with the San Luis Rey River. The San Luis Rey River trends from the east toward the west within one-quarter mile of the southern boundary of the Project site. The river also is identified as a Resource Conservation Area in the County General Plan and includes large patches of riparian woodland vegetation. South of the river is the Lake Rancho Viejo residential subdivision, a master-planned development of approximately 450 single-family homes and associated community amenities. A new phase of the Lake Rancho Viejo development, including approximately 100 residences, is being constructed between the existing houses

and I-15. Farther to the south the hills rise to 1,485 feet above mean sea level (amsl), creating the southeastern boundary of the valley through which I-15 extends.

Another north/south trending series of peaks creates the valley's western boundary (west of the Project site). The highest among these peaks rises to approximately 929 feet amsl. Pala Mesa Resort, a private resort with a public golf course, numerous guest rooms, and a restaurant, is located at the bottom of the hills to the west of Old Highway 395, directly across I-15 from the Project site. This area also includes small housing developments, a hotel/restaurant, and commercial uses near Old Highway 395, and single-family residences located among the hills, as well as small-scale agricultural facilities (e.g., nurseries, and citrus or avocado groves). Some native vegetation and undeveloped areas are scattered among these hills. The Beck Reservoir, owned by RMWD, and the Engel Family Preserve, owned by Fallbrook Land Conservancy, are also in this area.

A number of proposed projects (described on Tables 1-14 and 1-15 of Chapter 1.0 of this EIR) abut the Project site and are expected to become important aspects of the Project setting. The Meadowood Specific Plan Area, currently containing cultivated citrus and avocado groves, is located to the east. Campus Park West abuts the Project on the southwest, and the proposed Palomar College site is located immediately west of the central portion of the Project site.

On-site Conditions

The central and southern area of the Project site is relatively flat, with pasture covering most of the central area, and southern riparian forest covering much of the southern portion of the site. Other on-site habitats south of the existing Pala Mesa Heights Drive include southern willow scrub, freshwater marsh, coast live oak woodland, Diegan coastal sage scrub (including disturbed habitat), non-native grassland, and pasture. In the northern area of the site, the land slopes up, with drainages trending to the northeast. The northern area is covered primarily with coastal sage scrub (including disturbed) habitat, but also has areas of non-native grassland, oak woodland, and rock outcroppings. On-site elevations range from approximately 260 feet amsl in the southernmost area of the site to 850 feet amsl in the northeastern corner of the property.

The majority of the Project site is currently being used for non-commercial grazing. Historically, the flatter portion of the site was used for farming. Containment and drainage channels were constructed to allow for irrigation and cultivation of crops. When I-15 and SR 76 were constructed, drainage from the property into the San Luis Rey River was restricted. Horse Ranch Creek, which is currently located along the Proposed Project's western boundary adjacent the southern biological open space preserve, was originally altered during the construction of Old Highway 395 and SR 76. More recently, the creek was realigned during construction of I-15.

The southern extension of existing Pankey Road, which intersects with SR 76, divides the southwesternmost portion of the Campus Park property. Several dirt roads also trend through the site, including Pala Mesa Heights Road, which bisects the northern and southern portions of the Project site. The private road provides access to properties east of the Project site and Rice Canyon.

S.2 Summary of Significant Effects and Mitigation Measures that Reduce or Avoid the Significant Effects

Table S-1, Summary of Significant Effects, located at the end of this chapter, provides a summary of significant environmental impacts resulting from Project implementation. A subchapter reference is provided in the table, referring to the detailed EIR analysis for each significant impact. Table S-1 also includes mitigation measures to reduce and/or avoid the environmental effects, with a conclusion as to whether the impact would be mitigated to below a level of significance. Detailed analyses of significant

environmental effects are provided in Chapters 2.0 and 3.0 of this EIR. Chapter 2.0 provides analyses of significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided. Chapter 3.0 discusses significant impacts that can be mitigated if the Project is implemented. Explanations of those effects found not to be significant during preparation of the Initial Study and this EIR are provided in Chapter 4.0, with the full Initial Study provided in Appendix A.

In addition to mitigation measures (post-design and enhanced Project elements), standard environmental measures have been incorporated into grading and construction design to reduce adverse environmental effects related to the issues of transportation/traffic, air quality, noise, erosion, hazards and water quality. Additional measures are proposed as a matter of specific Project design to minimize potential long-term adverse effects associated with the issues of aesthetics and landform alteration, transportation/traffic, air quality, noise, geology/paleontology, biological resources, hydrology and water quality, hazards, fire protection, and land use and planning. These environmental design considerations are proposed as part of the Project description and are delineated in Subchapter 1.1 (Table 1-13) of this EIR, as well as in each of the relevant topical areas.

The mitigation measures listed in Table S-1 also are discussed within each of the relevant topical areas. Both design considerations and mitigation measures are included as Chapter 8.0 of the EIR, List of Mitigation Measures and Environmental Design Considerations.

S.3 Areas of Controversy

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) was distributed on January 20, 2005 for a 30-day public review and comment period. Public comments were received on the NOP for this EIR and reflect concern or controversy over a number of environmental issues. (Refer to Appendix A for the NOP and NOP comment letters.) Environmental issues were raised in nine letters commenting on the NOP, as listed below:

- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Game
- California Department of Transportation
- California Department of Health Services
- California Native American Heritage Commission
- San Diego Association of Governments
- San Diego Local Agency Formation Commission
- North County Fire Protection District
- Fallbrook Union Elementary School District
- Endangered Habitats League

Issues raised in the NOP comment letters include concerns regarding the following issue areas:

- Biological Resources (e.g., the design/size and maintenance of open space, impacts to sensitive species, use of a biological monitor, no creation of new trails, Project landscaping and lighting, appropriate mitigation for impacts)
- Traffic (e.g., preparation of a comprehensive Traffic Impact Study that identifies impacts and required mitigation)
- Water Availability (e.g., completion of a water study to determine if water would be available to the Project)
- Cultural Resources (e.g., probability of cultural resources to occur on site, inclusion of mitigation for impacts to unknown resources, consideration of avoidance of archaeological resources)

- Fire Service (e.g., negotiation of tax exchange rates for the Project, provision/upgrading of fire suppression facilities/equipment, provision of adequate access to Project property, installation of sufficient fire hydrants and sprinklers, proper clearance of vegetation from structures)
- School Facilities (e.g., overcrowding of schools)
- Land Use (e.g., consistency with the General Plan Update and the North County Multiple Species Conservation Program Subarea Plan)

Issues raised within these letters are evaluated in this EIR in Chapters 2.0 through 4.0.

S.4 Issues to be Resolved by the Decision-making Body

An EIR is an informational document intended to inform the public agency decision makers and the public of the significant effects of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project. The lead agency (in this case the County) must respond to each significant effect identified in this EIR by making “Findings” for each significant effect. The issues to be resolved include whether or how to mitigate the associated significant effects, including whether to implement a project alternative, the determination of which is to be made by the decision makers. Preparation of a Statement of Overriding Considerations (explaining the overriding value of the Project despite adverse effects) would be required for any remaining significant and unmitigated impacts (i.e., those likely to be associated with aesthetics, traffic, and air quality).

Issues to be resolved that are directly related to the Proposed Project include the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate the significant effects. In particular, the County must decide if the significant and unmitigated effects identified for the issues of aesthetics, traffic, and air quality can be reduced further, and determine if the significant impacts associated with noise, geology/paleontology, biological resources, cultural resources, and public services/utilities have been fully mitigated to below a level of significance. In addition, the County must determine whether any of the Project alternatives would substantially reduce significant aesthetics, traffic, air quality, noise, and biological resources effects while still meeting key Project objectives.

S.5 Project Alternatives

Six project alternatives ~~have been identified~~ have been identified for further analysis in this Subsequent EIR, the: No Project/No Development Alternative, No Project/Existing Plan Alternative, Single-family Alternative, Biological Reduced Footprint Alternative, General Plan Update Draft Land Use Map Alternative, and General Plan Update Board Referral Map Alternative. These additional alternatives are evaluated in Chapter 5.0 of this EIR, where environmental effects are compared to those of the Draft EIR Proposed Project and are assessed relative to their ability to meet the basic objectives of the Project (also refer to Table 5-1). Impact-reducing elements of the Biological Reduced Footprint Alternative and the Single-family Alternative have been incorporated into the refined Project currently proposed for approval.

Biological Reduced Footprint Alternative

This alternative (refer to Subchapter 5.5 of the EIR) would preserve a greater amount of biological resources by decreasing the development footprint, as shown in Figure 5-3a, Biological Reduced Footprint Alternative, and Figure 5-3b, Biological Resources Impacts of the Reduced Footprint Alternative, which depicts biological resources affected by this alternative. Development would be greatly reduced in the northern portion of the site, and no development would occur in the southern portion of the site except infrastructure such as the detention basin and sewer lift station. This alternative would include 390 single family units on lot sizes ranging from 40 by 100 feet to 50 by 100 feet, 255 multi-family units, 61,200 s.f. of Town Center, and 157,000 s.f. of office professional use.

Approximately 64 percent of the site (267 acres) would be open space or parks as opposed to ~~52-57~~ percent (~~214-236~~ acres) for the Proposed Project. This alternative would generate 16,384 ADT.

The Biological Reduced Footprint Alternative would be preferred over the Proposed Project for the issues of aesthetics, biological resources, ~~visual quality~~, traffic, air quality, and noise. It would be equivalent to the Proposed Project for the issues of geology/paleontology and cultural resources. This alternative would be environmentally superior to the Proposed Project.

No Project/No Development Alternative

The No Project/No Development Alternative (refer to Subchapter 5.2 of the EIR) assumes that the Project site would continue in its current state over the long term; the Project site would retain its current mix of native and non-native habitats (including pasture), together with disturbed/developed areas. The approximately 409 acres of native and naturalized habitat throughout the site would remain, as would the existing dirt roads and one single-family residence. The non-commercial grazing of 40 to 80 head of cattle would continue.

The proposed mixed-use Project with single- and multi-family residential, office professional uses, a Town Center, and supporting infrastructure (i.e., roadways and utilities connections), would not be constructed, nor would the multi-use community and hiking trails be created. The active sports complex, neighborhood parks, and HOA recreation facilities would not be provided. There would be no off-site improvements.

Aesthetic, transportation/traffic, short-term air quality, biological resources, and noise adverse impacts identified for the Proposed Project, as well as potential (currently unknown) paleontological and cultural resources impacts related to disturbance of resources during grading, would not occur under this alternative. A land use plan conformity issue would remain. This alternative would be environmentally superior to the Proposed Project.

Single-family Alternative

This alternative (refer to Subchapter 5.4 of the EIR) would have the same development footprint as the Proposed Project in the northern half of the Project and east of future Horse Ranch Creek Road. It also would be similar to the Proposed Project in that it would have the same uses and number of residential lots except it would not include multi-family residential units (see Figure 5-2, Single-family Alternative). Single-family lots would replace the multi-family lots of the Proposed Project and additionally would be located west of Horse Ranch Creek Road in areas proposed for detention basins, trail staging area, pump station, and open space under the refined Project. This alternative would include 751 single-family homes (~~325 residential units fewer than under the Proposed Project~~) on lots ranging from 40 by 100 feet to 50 by 100 feet, and similar to the Proposed Project would include 61,200 s.f. of Town Center, and 157,000 s.f. of professional office use. This alternative would have 214.4 acres of park and open space. Traffic generated by this alternative would total 17,973 ADT.

Although balanced by development in areas preserved as open space by the refined Project, the Single-family Alternative would result in incrementally better (lower) slightly reduced effects associated with traffic, air quality, noise, and aesthetics due to the lack of multi-family homes and the replacement of those fewer homes with single-family dwellings on individual lots, resulting in a development format more consistent with surrounding uses, with fewer residents and fewer school age children. The incremental reduction in adverse effects would not lower the CEQA impact to a less than significant level—impacts would remain significant and unmitigable with regard to aesthetics (temporary and cumulative effects), transportation/traffic (project direct effects) and air quality (temporary effects). In

addition, the construction of homes in areas anticipated to be largely open space under the refined Project, as well as associated sound walls, could result in this alternative being considered more impactful than the refined Project for aesthetics. The sound walls would be addressed, however, through alternative-mandated screening similar to sound walls proposed for the refined Project. Similarly, the fewer residential units would not lower impacts identified as significant but mitigable (an impact level equal to that of the Proposed Project) for the issue of noise. Environmental impacts would be similar for the issues of geology/paleontology, ~~biology~~ and cultural resources and would be incrementally worse for biology and noise (and potentially aesthetics) due to increased development area. This alternative would be environmentally superior to the Proposed Project.

No Project/Existing Plan Alternative

The No Project/Existing Plan Alternative (refer to Subchapter 5.3 of the EIR) addresses the land uses and densities that would be permitted under the current County General Plan (northern approximately 175 acres of the site) and the approved Campus Park Specific Plan (southern approximately 241 acres of the site).

In the northern area, the existing General Plan designation is EDA, which would allow low-density residential and agricultural uses with lot sizes of 2 to 20 acres, depending on the slope gradient, or a maximum of 90 dwelling units. In consideration of the steep slopes near the western, northern, and eastern sides of the property and the consequential increase in lot sizes, however, this alternative would yield 63 dwelling units.

In the southern area of the current Project site, the existing (1983) Campus Park Specific Plan would allow development of 2.5 million s.f. of industrial research park in buildings up to 50 feet in height, parking for 5,500 cars, a pond, community trails, and a variety of recreational amenities for use by employees. Palomar College purchased a portion of the specific planning area, thus reducing the parcel considered under the current Campus Park plan. This alternative would include 1,975,000 s.f. of light industrial and professional office uses. Some riparian habitat in the southern portion of the site would be preserved; however, portions of the southern riparian forest would be impacted by the development of recreational facilities. Primary internal access would be along Horse Ranch Creek Road. Overall average daily traffic (ADT) generated by this alternative would total 23,858. Although some residential uses were proposed for the adjacent Campus Park West property under the 1983 Hewlett-Packard Specific Plan, this alternative would not involve the construction of multi-family residential, commercial, and park uses associated with the Proposed Project. Given the approximately ~~16-27~~ percent increase in ADT over the Proposed Project, off-site road improvements assumed as part of the Project (and perhaps even additional improvements) would be required for this alternative.

The No Project/Existing Plan Alternative would avoid land use impacts and could potentially incrementally reduce adverse noise impacts due to siting residential and other uses in more separated locales than would occur under the Proposed Project, where such uses are intermixed. Off-site traffic and noise effects related to an increased number of peak hour trips, as well as the associated air quality effects would be increased compared to the Proposed Project. Although schools impacts would be somewhat lesser, aesthetics, geology/paleontology, and cultural resources impacts would be similar to those identified for the Proposed Project. Biological resources impacts also generally would be the same, but as would open space set aside would be less than is proposed under the refined Project. This alternative would not be environmentally superior to the Proposed Project.

It should also be noted that the 1983 Specific Plan proposed a company-specific (Hewlett-Packard) research and technology campus. Such a use may not be feasible, as Hewlett-Packard is no longer

interested in developing such a facility at this site, and an alternate large company would have to be found to own/occupy the entire development.

General Plan Update Draft Land Use Map Alternative

This alternative (refer to Subchapter 5.6 of the EIR) would result in development in accordance with the proposed General Plan Update draft land use map (Figure 5-4, General Plan Update Draft Land Use Map Alternative). This alternative generally would have the same development footprint as the Proposed Project in the northern half of the property, except it would have a small amount of open space ~~immediately north of SR 76 and~~ on the eastern edge of the central portion of the project site. Single-family dwelling units would be located only in the northernmost portion of the site. This alternative would replace refined Project open space, pump station and trail staging area south of Pankey Place, while multi-family dwelling units would be located in the central and southern portion of the site (the southernmost multi-family area would replace with highway commercial uses, which are not included in the Proposed Project). Implementation of this alternative would result in 248 single-family dwelling units ranging from 45 by 100 feet to 50 by 100 feet, 1,059 multi-family dwelling units, 188,000 square feet of Town Center and highway commercial (120,000 s.f. of Town Center and 68,000 s.f. of highway commercial), 40,000 s.f. of office professional, and 234.4 acres of open space and parks. The General Plan Update Draft Land Use Map Alternative would generate 34,748 ADT.

This alternative is not considered a standard CEQA alternative in terms of identification of lower or fewer significant impacts. It is, however, a viable planning alternative based on County goals for increased densification/intensity of development next to existing service nodes and primary transportation routes. It has therefore been included in this EIR for the information and consideration of the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during hearings on Project approval.

This alternative would result in roughly equivalent impacts to ~~aesthetics,~~ geology/paleontology, and biological and cultural resources. The additional development areas west of future Horse Ranch Creek Road would result in increased development over areas that would retain open space in the refined Proposed Project. It would result in substantial increases in impacts to off-site traffic congestion and associated adverse noise and air quality effects. In addition, the larger amount of traffic associated with this alternative may require a larger study area for analysis, with additional identified impacts. This alternative would not be environmentally superior to the Proposed Project.

General Plan Update Board Referral Map Alternative

This alternative (refer to Subchapter 5.7 of the EIR) would result in development in accordance with a draft General Plan update land use map proposed by the Board of Supervisors (Figure 5-5, General Plan Update Board Referral Map Alternative). This alternative would generally have the same development footprint as the Proposed Project, except it would have a small amount of open space ~~immediately north of SR 76 and~~ on the eastern edge of the central portion of the project site. There would be ~~only~~ two multi-family areas with this alternative, one in the central portion and one in the southern portion of the site. Implementation of this design would replace the southernmost multi-family area with highway commercial, which is not included in the Proposed Project. The alternative would result in 404 single-family dwelling units ranging from 45 by 100 feet to 80 by 100 feet, 258 multi-family dwelling units, 188,000 s.f. of commercial (120,000 s.f. of Town Center and 68,000 s.f. highway commercial), 40,000 s.f. of office professional, and 234.9 acres of open space and parks. The General Plan Update Board Referral Map Alternative would generate 29,902 ADT.

This alternative is not considered a standard CEQA alternative in terms of identification of lower or fewer significant impacts. It is, however, a viable planning alternative based on County goals for increased

densification/intensity of development next to existing service nodes and primary transportation routes. It has therefore been included in this EIR for the information and consideration of the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during hearings on Project approval.

This alternative would meet Proposed Project objectives and would provide additional commercial services to area residents. It would result in roughly equivalent impacts to ~~aesthetics~~, geology/paleontology, and biological and cultural resources. It would have roughly similar, but incrementally greater, impacts to aesthetics. It would result in substantial increases in impacts to off-site traffic congestion and associated adverse noise and air quality effects. In addition, the larger amount of traffic associated with this alternative may require a larger study area for analysis, with additional identified impacts. This alternative would not be environmentally superior to the Proposed Project.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

The No Project alternatives (Subchapters 5.2 and 5.3 of this EIR) would result in minimal to substantially reduced environmental impacts. Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines, however, requires identification of an alternative other than the No Project as the environmentally superior alternative.

The Environmentally Superior Alternative for the Campus Park Project is the Reduced Biological Footprint Alternative, which had reduced impacts for the issues of biology based on a smaller impact footprint (approximately 29 percent smaller), a decrease in alternative-related ADT of approximately 18 percent from the circulated EIR Proposed Project (with an associated decrease in noise and air quality impacts), as well as incrementally lower impacts to visual resources.

**Table S-1
 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Significant and Unmitigable Impacts			
Aesthetics (Subchapter 2.1)			
Project Direct Impacts			
AE-1	The proposed construction would cause the site character to temporarily conflict with the surrounding characteristics. While this impact is temporary, short-term adverse visual impacts would be significant.	No mitigation beyond Project design features already incorporated is available.	Unmitigable
Cumulative Impacts			
AE-2	The visual environment of the I-15 corridor viewshed in the Project area would be adversely affected by the major change in composition introduced by the cumulative projects that would be incompatible with the existing-prior visual character of the area.	No mitigation beyond Project design features already incorporated is available.	Unmitigable
AE-3	The cumulative conversion of the viewshed from a rural area with abundant open space to a developed area with sparse open space is considered significant.	No mitigation beyond Project design features already incorporated is available.	Unmitigable

**Table S-1 (cont.)
 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Significant and Unmitigable Impacts			
Transportation/Traffic (Subchapter 2.2)			
Project Direct Impacts			
TR-1	Under Existing Plus Project conditions, direct impacts would occur at the following segments of SR 76: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Mission Road to Gird Road • Sage Road to Old Highway 395 • Horse Ranch Creek Road to Couser Canyon Road 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SR 76 from South Mission Road to Gird Road and Sage Road to Old Highway 395: Under TransNet SR 76 Widening, SR 76 shall be widened to four lanes. Due to timing considerations, the Project Applicant would require a Statement of Overriding Considerations if the Proposed Project is occupied before TransNet improvements. • SR 76 from Horse Ranch Creek Road to Couser Canyon Road: Under Caltrans, SR 76 shall be widened to four lanes. Due to timing considerations, the Project Applicant would require a Statement of Overriding Considerations if the Proposed Project is occupied before Caltrans improvements. 	Unmitigated

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Significant and Unmitigable Impacts			
Air Quality (Subchapter 2.3)			
Project Direct Impacts			
AQ-1	Based on the estimates of the emissions associated with Project operations, volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions would exceed the significance criteria established for Year 2015.	No feasible mitigation measures beyond Project design features already incorporated into the Project are currently available to address traffic-related emissions.	Unmitigable
AQ-2	Nitrogen oxide (NO _x), fine particulate matter (PM _{2.5}), and respirable particulate matter (PM ₁₀) criteria pollutants emissions during construction would constitute a temporary but significant impact on the ambient air quality.	No feasible mitigation measures beyond Project design features already incorporated into the Project are currently available to address construction-related emissions.	Unmitigable
Cumulative Impacts			
AQ-3	Project construction would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in NO _x , PM _{2.5} , and PM ₁₀ ; impacts would be cumulatively significant.	No feasible mitigation measures beyond Project design features already incorporated into the Project are currently available to address construction-related emissions.	Unmitigable

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance			
Transportation/Traffic (Subchapter 2.2)			
Project Direct Impacts			
TR-1	Under Existing Plus Project conditions, direct impacts would occur at the following segment of SR 76: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I-15 southbound (SB) ramps to I-15 northbound (NB) ramps 	Construction of a loop on-ramp at the intersection of SR 76/I-15 SB ramps and restripe bridge to four lanes.	Less than Significant
TR-2	Under Existing Plus Project conditions, direct impacts (both County and CMP impacts) would occur at the following signalized intersection: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SR 76/I-15 NB ramps (PM peak hour) 	Construction of an eastbound (EB) to NB loop on-ramp, and addition of a NB to EB off-ramp right-turn lane and a westbound (WB) to NB on-ramp right-turn lane to SR 76 and I-15.	Less than Significant
TR-3	Under Existing Plus Project conditions, direct impacts (both County and CMP impacts) would occur at the following unsignalized intersection: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Old Highway 395/Reche Road (AM and PM peak hours) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installation of a traffic signal at the intersection of Old Highway 395/Reche Road. 	Less than Significant
Cumulative Impacts			
TR-4	Under Existing Plus Cumulative Plus Project conditions, the Proposed Project would contribute to significant cumulative impacts to the following local roadway segments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Old Highway 395 from East Mission Road to West Lilac Road • Reche Road from Green Canyon Norte to Gird Road • Pankey Road from SR 76 to Shearer Crossing • Pala Mesa Drive from Wilt Road/Sage Road to Old Highway 395 	Participation in the Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) Program.	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance			
Transportation/Traffic (Subchapter 2.2) (cont.)			
Cumulative Impacts (cont.)			
TR-5	Under Existing Plus Cumulative Plus Project conditions, the Proposed Project would contribute to significant cumulative impacts to the following segments of SR 76: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Melrose Drive to Old Highway 395 • I-15 SB ramps to I-15 NB ramps • Horse Ranch Creek Road to Pala Mission Road 	Participation in the TIF Program for the following intersections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Melrose Drive to Old Highway 395 • Horse Ranch Creek Road to Pala Mission Road Significant impacts to SR 76 between I-15 SB ramps to I-15 NB ramps shall be mitigated through implementation of M-TR-1, above.	Less than Significant
TR-6	Under Existing Plus Cumulative Plus Project conditions, the Proposed Project would contribute to significant cumulative impacts to the following signalized intersections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SR 76/Gird Road (PM peak hour) • SR 76/Old Highway 395 (AM and PM peak hours) • SR 76/I-15 SB ramps (AM and PM peak hours) • SR 76/I-15 NB ramps (AM and PM peak hours) • Mission Road/Old Highway 395 (PM peak hour) • Mission Road/I-15 SB ramps (AM and PM peak hours) • Mission Road/I-15 NB ramp (PM peak hour) • SR 76/Melrose Drive (AM and PM peak hours) • SR 76/East Vista Way (AM and PM peak hours) • SR 76/North River Road (AM and PM peak hours) • SR 76/Olive Hill Road (AM and PM peak hours) • SR 76/South Mission Road (PM peak hour) 	Participation in the TIF Program.	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (cont.)			
Transportation/Traffic (Subchapter 2.2) (cont.)			
Cumulative Impacts (cont.)			
TR-7	Under Existing Plus Cumulative Plus Project conditions, the Proposed Project would contribute to significant cumulative impacts to the following unsignalized intersections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SR 76/Via Monserate (AM and PM peak hours) • SR 76/Sage Road (AM and PM peak hours) • SR 76/Pankey Road (AM and PM peak hours) • SR 76/Rice Canyon Road (AM and PM peak hours) • SR 76/Couser Canyon Road (AM and PM peak hours) • Old Highway 395/Pala Mesa Drive (AM and PM peak hours) • Old Highway 395/Stewart Canyon Road (AM and PM peak hours) • Old Highway 395/Reche Road (AM and PM peak hours) • Old Highway 395/Dulin Road (PM peak hour) • Reche Road/Live Oak Park Road (AM peak hour) 	Participation in the TIF Program.	Less than Significant
TR-8	Under Year 2030 plus Project conditions, the Proposed Project would significantly contribute to cumulative impacts at the following roadway segment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pankey Road from SR 76 to Shearer Crossing 	Participation in the TIF Program.	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (cont.)			
Transportation/Traffic (Subchapter 2.2) (cont.)			
Cumulative Impacts (cont.)			
TR-6a to 8a		<p>The following improvements may be constructed by the Project Applicant and credited toward TIF payments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SR 76/Old Highway 395: Project Applicant shall construct NB to WB and SB to EB left turn lanes, and complete signal modifications. • Old Highway 395/Pala Mesa Drive: Project Applicant shall install a traffic signal, and construct additional NB and SB through lanes and EB to NB and WB to SB left-turn lanes. • Old Highway 395/Stewart Canyon Road: Project Applicant shall install a traffic signal and add a WB to SB left-turn lane. • SR 76/Pala Mesa DrivePankey Road: Project Applicant shall <u>revamp Pankey Road to tie into existing SR 76</u>install a traffic signal and add NB to WB and SB to EB left turn lanes. 	Less than Significant

**Table S-1 (cont.)
 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Noise (Subchapter 3.1)			
Project Direct Impacts			
N-1	Exterior ground-level receptors within PA R-4 would experience noise levels greater than the County standard of 60 dBA CNEL.	Nine-foot high noise attenuation barriers shall be constructed along the property boundaries of lots 285 through 301 within PA R-4 and the HOA recreational facility (PA P-3) (Figure 3.1-108).	Less than Significant
N-2	Exterior ground-level receptors within PA R-1 would experience noise levels greater than the County standard of 60 dBA CNEL.	Ten-foot high noise attenuation barriers shall be constructed along the property boundaries of lots 412 through 445 within PA R-1 (Figure 3.1-108).	Less than Significant
N-3	Exterior second floor receptors within PA MF-1 would experience noise levels greater than the County standard of 60 dBA CNEL.	Outdoor balconies of the residences adjacent to Horse Ranch Creek Road and the two southernmost units within PA MF-1 shall require six foot high noise attenuation barriers (Figure 3.1-10).	Less than Significant
N-4 3	Exterior ground-level receptors within PA MF-2 1 would experience noise levels greater than the County standard of 60 dBA CNEL.	Ten-foot high noise attenuation barriers shall be constructed along portions of MF-2 1 that front <u>the Town Center</u> and a portion of Longspur Road Horse Ranch Creek Road and Harvest Glen Lane (Figure 3.1-108).	Less than Significant
N-5 4	Exterior ground-level receptors within PA MF-3 2 would experience noise levels greater than the County standard of 60 dBA CNEL.	Ten-foot high noise attenuation barriers shall be constructed along portions of MF-3 2 that front <u>Horse Ranch Creek Road and Harvest Glen Lane</u> the Town Center and a portion of Longspur Road (Figure 3.1-108).	Less than Significant
N-6	Exterior ground level receptors within PA MF-4 would experience noise levels greater than the County standard of 60 dBA CNEL.	Eight foot high noise attenuation barriers shall be constructed along portions of MF-4 that front Pala Mesa Drive and Pankey Place and 10 foot high noise attenuation barriers shall be constructed along portions of MF-4 that front SR-76 (Figure 3.1-10).	Less than Significant

**Table S-1 (cont.)
 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Noise (Subchapter 3.1) (cont.)			
Project Direct Impacts (cont.)			
N-75	At receptors where the exterior noise would be significant, interior noise levels also would exceed the County standard of 45 dBA CNEL.	<p>A final noise study for the second floors of all single- and multi-family homes on the Project site shall be prepared prior to obtaining building permits for the Project. The report shall finalize the noise requirements based on actual building design specifications. Noise requirements could include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A “windows closed” condition shall be provided that requires a means of mechanical ventilation for the second floors of all single- and multi-family houses. • The second floors of all single- and multi-family houses shall be provided with weather-stripped solid-core exterior doors. • Exterior wall/roof assemblies shall be free of cutouts and openings. • Upgraded windows shall be provided for the second floors of single- and multi-family houses. <p><u>Preliminary exterior and interior noise requirements for tentative tract map approval shall be presented in the final noise report prior to obtaining building permits.</u></p>	Less than Significant
N-86	Noise levels at PA P-3 would exceed the County standard of 60 dBA CNEL.	Nine-foot high noise attenuation barriers shall be constructed along the western side of the northern half of PA P-3 (Figure 3.1-108).	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Noise (Subchapter 3.1) (cont.)			
Project Direct Impacts (cont.)			
N-97	Pending post-construction testing. Noise levels associated with emergency generators for the proposed sewer lift station in PA I-1 may exceed the County standard of 60 dBA CNEL at the nearest property line.	The generators shall be <u>equipped with the manufacturer's sound enclosure to decrease noise levels to 70 dBA at 23 feet to comply with</u> located in a cinder block building that utilizes acoustical louvers to decrease the noise level to the adjacent property lines standards. <u>Additionally, the proposed generator must be sited within the parcel a minimum of 35 feet from the trail staging area and 100 feet from biological open space. The louvers shall be placed on the southern side of the building. The sides of the building facing east, north, and west shall be completely free of any openings or ventilation.</u> Sound level measurements shall be conducted at the nearest property line once the pump stations are fully operational to ensure compliance with the County's Noise Ordinance.	Less than Significant
N-40a-8a and b	A temporary significant impact associated with construction operations (grading and blasting) may occur to off-site residences or to potential on-site residences of Campus Park.	A specific mitigation plan based upon the location of the construction equipment and/or blasting activities shall be identified by a County-approved acoustical engineer. If construction noise impacts are anticipated, the Project Applicant shall install a temporary noise attenuation barrier along any property line, or at an appropriate location. The mitigation plan shall determine the height and location of any necessary temporary barriers. The barrier shall be constructed of solid non-gapping wood and shall comply with the County's 75 dBA standard and Noise Ordinance criteria for construction operations.	Less than Significant
Cumulative Impacts			
N-449	Because occupied residences may be within 375 feet of construction activities, significant cumulative impacts related to construction noise could occur.	Cumulative impacts associated with construction to future on-site residences would be mitigated by the implementation of Mitigation Measure M-N-40a-8a and b.	<u>Less than Significant</u>

**Table S-1 (cont.)
 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Geology/Paleontology (Subchapter 3.2)			
Project Direct Impacts			
GE-1	Potentially significant landslide hazards may be identified during preparation of grading plans or subsequent detailed geotechnical investigation.	If potentially unstable landslide deposits or outcrops are encountered during geotechnical investigation or Project construction, they shall be remediated per direction by the Project Geotechnical Engineer.	Less than Significant
GE-2	Areas subject to significant liquefaction impacts may be identified during preparation of grading plans or subsequent detailed geotechnical investigation.	Potential measures to address impacts from liquefaction and related hazards include the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Deposits subject to potential liquefaction hazards shall be overexcavated and recompacted, per direction by the Project Geotechnical Engineer. b. In-place ground modifications of applicable deposits shall be conducted via methods such as “cement deep soil mixing,” placement of vibra-stone columns within wick drains, compaction grouting, or dynamic compaction, per direction by the Project Geotechnical Engineer. c. Surcharge procedures shall be implemented under the raised embankment areas for the proposed Pala Mesa Drive roadway to address potential settlement that otherwise might adversely impact the pavement and infrastructure located within the roadway. d. Subdrains shall be placed in appropriate locations to reduce surficial saturation, per direction by the Project Geotechnical Engineer. 	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Geology/Paleontology (Subchapter 3.2) (cont.)			
Project Direct Impacts (cont.)			
GE-3	Areas subject to significant settlement/collapse impacts may be identified during preparation of grading plans or subsequent detailed geotechnical investigation.	Potential measures to address impacts from settlement/collapse of surficial materials include the following: a. Implementation of densification measures as described above for potential liquefaction hazards. b. Surcharging of fill and allowance of appropriate time delays shall be implemented in applicable areas, per direction by the Project Geotechnical Engineer. c. Wick and blanket drains shall be installed in applicable locations, per direction by the Project Geotechnical Engineer.	Less than Significant
P-1	Project grading, including shallow excavations and minor grading activities, would have the potential to significantly impact paleontological resources preserved within the described terrace deposits.	Evidence shall be provided to the Director of County of San Diego Department of Planning and Land Use (DPLU) that the following notes have been placed on the grading plan: a. A qualified paleontologist shall be at the pre-construction meeting to consult with the grading and excavation contractors concerning excavation schedules, paleontological field techniques, and safety issues.	Less than Significant

**Table S-1 (cont.)
 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Geology/Paleontology (Subchapter 3.2) (cont.)			
Project Direct Impacts (cont.)			
P-1 (cont.)		b. The qualified paleontologist shall conduct or supervise mitigation tasks associated with full-time monitoring during original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits of moderate paleontological resource sensitivity (i.e., Quaternary river terrace deposits). Refer to M-P-1 in Subchapter 2.3 for the complete mitigation measure.	

**Table S-1 (cont.)
 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Biological Resources (Subchapter 3.3)			
Project Direct Impacts			
BI-1a	<p>Wastewater Management Option 1: The Project would result in significant impacts to 9.22.1 acres of southern riparian forest (including 8.21.4 acres on site and 1.00.7 acre off site).</p> <p>Wastewater Management Option 2: The Project would result in significant impacts to 10.5 acres of southern riparian forest (including 9.5 acres on site and 1.0 acre off site).</p>	<p>Wastewater Management Option 1: Mitigate at a 3:1 ratio, including 1:1 creation and 2:1 enhancement. A total of 9.22.1 acres of riparian forest shall be created off on site. Mitigation shall either occur at an approved mitigation bank, or any other land determined acceptable by the Director of DPLU. A final mitigation plan for wetland creation shall be approved by DPLU. In addition, 18.44.2 acres of the on-site southern riparian forest shall be enhanced.</p> <p>Wastewater Management Option 2: Mitigate at a 3:1 ratio, including 1:1 creation and 2:1 enhancement. A total of 10.5 acres of riparian forest shall be created off site. Mitigation shall either occur at an approved mitigation bank, or any other land determined acceptable by the Director of DPLU. A final mitigation plan for wetland creation shall be approved by DPLU. In addition, 21.0 acres of the on-site southern riparian forest shall be enhanced.</p>	Less than Significant

**Table S-1 (cont.)
 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Biological Resources (Subchapter 3.3) (cont.)			
Project Direct Impacts (cont.)			
BI-1b	The Project would result in significant impacts to 1.662.4 acres of southern willow scrub (including 1.6 acres on site and 0.060.8 acre off site).	Mitigate at a 3:1 ratio, including 1:1 creation and 2:1 enhancement. This mitigation <u>requires creation of shall consist of creating 1.662.4</u> acres of southern willow scrub habitat <u>off on</u> site. Mitigation shall either occur at an approved mitigation bank, or any other land determined acceptable by the Director of DPLU. A final mitigation plan for wetland creation shall be approved by DPLU. An additional 3.324.8 acres of the southern riparian forest on site shall be enhanced. On-site enhancement shall include cowbird trapping, <u>and</u> removal of exotics, and potential removal of existing berms.	Less than Significant
BI-1c	<p>Wastewater Management Option 1: The Project would result in significant impacts to 6.60.11 acres of freshwater marsh (including 6.50.01 acres on site and 0.1 acre off site).</p> <p>Wastewater Management Option 2: The Project would result in significant impacts to 7.9 acres of freshwater marsh (including 7.8 acres on site and 0.1 acre off site).</p>	<p>Wastewater Management Option 1: Mitigate at a 3:1 ratio, including 1:1 creation and 2:1 enhancement. This mitigation <u>requires creation of shall consist of creating 6.60.11</u> acres of freshwater marsh habitat <u>off on</u> site. Mitigation shall either occur at an approved mitigation bank, or any other land determined acceptable by the Director of DPLU. A final mitigation plan for wetland creation shall be approved by DPLU. In addition, 13.20.22 acres of the southern riparian forest on site shall be enhanced.</p> <p>Wastewater Management Option 2: Mitigate at a 3:1 ratio, including 1:1 creation and 2:1 enhancement. This mitigation shall consist of creating 7.9 acres of freshwater marsh habitat off site. Mitigation shall either occur at an approved mitigation bank, or any other land determined acceptable by the Director of DPLU. A final mitigation plan for wetland creation shall be</p>	Less than Significant

**Table S-1 (cont.)
 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Biological Resources (Subchapter 3.3) (cont.)			
Project Direct Impacts (cont.)			
		approved by DPLU. In addition, 15.8 acres of the Project site's riparian forest shall be enhanced.	
BI-1d	The Project would result in significant impacts to 1.3 acres of coast live oak woodland (all on site).	Mitigate at 2:1 as it is in the fuel modification zone and 0.3 acre shall be mitigated at 3:1 as it would be impacted due to grading. Therefore, a total of 2.9 acres is required to mitigate this habitat type. This mitigation shall consist of preserving 1.5 acres on site and purchasing 1.4 acres of oak woodland in an off-site mitigation bank or on other land as approved by the Director of DPLU.	Less than Significant
BI-1e	The Project would result in significant impacts to 46.25 <u>46.07</u> acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub (including 42.3 acres on site and 3.95 <u>3.77</u> acres off site).	Mitigate at a 2:1 ratio for a total mitigation requirement of 92.50 <u>92.1</u> acres. This impact shall be mitigated through the preservation of the remaining Diegan coastal sage scrub on site (87.3 acres) and by purchasing 5.20 <u>4.8</u> acres off site in a mitigation bank or other land as approved by the Director of DPLU.	Less than Significant
BI-1f	The Project would result in significant impacts to 47.57 <u>44.77</u> acres of non-native grassland (including 41.23 <u>8.5</u> acres on site and 6.37 <u>6.27</u> acres off site).	Mitigate at a ratio of 0.5:1 for a total mitigation requirement of 23.79 <u>22.4</u> acres. Mitigation shall consist of preserving the remaining non-native grassland on site (2.95 <u>6</u> acres) and purchasing 20.89 <u>16.8</u> acres off site in a mitigation bank or other land as approved by the Director of DPLU.	Less than Significant
BI-1g	The Project would result in significant impacts to 141.56 <u>144.46</u> acres of pasture (including 133.8 <u>135.4</u> acres on site and 7.76 <u>9.06</u> acres off site).	Significant impacts to 141.56 acres of pasture (including 133.8 acres on site and 7.76 acres off site) shall be mitigated at a ratio of 0.5:1 for a total mitigation requirement of 70.78 <u>72.2</u> acres. Mitigation shall consist of preserving the remaining pasture on site (1.6 acres) and purchasing 69.18 <u>72.2</u> acres off site of mitigation credit at an approved mitigation bank or on land approved by the Director of DPLU.	Less than Significant

**Table S-1 (cont.)
 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Biological Resources (Subchapter 3.3) (cont.)			
Project Direct Impacts (cont.)			
BI-1d(1) through g(1)	The Proposed Project may include the improvements of some additional off-site intersections as part of cumulative traffic mitigation in conjunction with payment of TIF: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0.01 acre of coast live oak woodland • 0.45<u>0.23</u> acre of Diegan coastal sage scrub • 0.03 acre of non-native grassland • 0.14 acre of pasture 	<p><u>Coast live oak woodland</u>: Mitigation shall consist of purchasing 0.02 acre (2:1 ratio) of oak woodland in an off-site mitigation bank or on other land as approved by the Director of DPLU.</p> <p><u>Diegan coastal sage scrub</u>: Mitigation shall consist of purchasing 0.90<u>0.46</u> acre (2:1 ratio) off site in a mitigation bank or other land as approved by the Director of DPLU.</p> <p><u>Non-native grassland</u>: Mitigation shall consist of purchasing 0.015 acre (0.5:1 ratio) off site in a mitigation bank or other land as approved by the Director of DPLU.</p> <p><u>Pasture</u>: Mitigation shall consist of purchasing 0.07 acre (0.5:1 ratio) off site of mitigation credit at an approved mitigation bank or on land approved by the Director of DPLU that is equal to or “like functioning” to the impacted pasture.</p>	Less than Significant

**Table S-1 (cont.)
 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Biological Resources (Subchapter 3.3) (cont.)			
Project Direct Impacts (cont.)			
BI-2	<p>Wastewater Management Option 1: The Project would significantly impact 13.94<u>4.41</u> acres of wetlands, as well as 1.6 acres of non-wetland Waters of the U.S., under U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) jurisdiction on site. Impacts to California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) jurisdictional areas on site would include 7.5<u>1.41</u> acres of wetlands and 1.4<u>1.6</u> acres of non-wetland Waters of U.S. Off-site Project improvements would impact 1.16<u>0.8</u> acres of Corps wetlands and <u>0.8</u> acre of Corps non-wetland Waters of the U.S., as well as 1.16<u>1.6</u> acres of CDFG wetlands.</p> <p>Wastewater Management Option 2: The Project would significantly impact 16.5 acres of wetlands, as well as 1.6 acres of non-wetlands Waters of the U.S., under Corps jurisdiction on site. Impacts to CDFG jurisdictional areas on site would include 8.8 acres of wetlands and 1.4 acres of non-wetland Waters of U.S. Off-site Project improvements would impact 1.16 acres of Corps wetlands, as well as 1.16 acres of CDFG wetlands.</p>	<p>Wastewater Management Options 1 and 2: Significant impacts to Corps and CDFG jurisdictional wetlands shall be mitigated through habitat-based mitigation, as described in M-BI-1a through 1c, above. Impacts to Waters of the U.S. shall be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio (1.6 acres) through enhancement of on-site southern riparian forest. The Project Applicant shall obtain applicable regulatory permits from other agencies.</p>	Less than Significant
BI-3	<p>The Proposed Project would significantly impact the smaller population of approximately 248 individuals of Parry's tetracoccus (<i>Tetracoccus dioicus</i>) on site.</p>	<p>Mitigate through the preservation of the remaining population of this species on site. Minor encroachment into the larger northern population shall be avoided during brushing and clearing. The limits of the population shall be flagged or fenced to demarcate the limits of brush clearing. To mitigate for the loss of the 248 plants in the north central portion of the site, habitat supporting this plant species at a 2:1 ratio shall be</p>	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Biological Resources (Subchapter 3.3) (cont.)			
Project Direct Impacts (cont.)			
		purchased or created off site. This may co-occur with other mitigation/habitat needs of the Project. Off-site lands must be within an approved mitigation bank or lands deemed acceptable by the Director of DPLU.	
BI-4	The location of one least Bell's vireo (<i>Vireo bellii pusillus</i>) observed on site would be directly impacted by implementation of the Proposed Project. This would result in a significant impact.	Mitigate through habitat-based mitigation addressed in M-BI-1a, above. Creation and enhancement shall be conducted in accordance with habitat requirements of the least Bell's vireo.	Less than Significant
BI-54	Implementation of the Proposed Project would directly impact one observed location of one pair of coastal California gnatcatchers (<i>Polioptila californica californica</i>) on site, as well as habitat for the gnatcatcher (46.2546.07 acres on and off site). This would result in a significant impact.	Mitigate through the habitat preservation on site and habitat purchase off site per M-BI-1e, above.	Less than Significant
BI-65	The Proposed Project would directly impact the location of the yellow warbler (<i>Dendroica petechia</i>) observed on site. This would result in a significant impact.	Mitigate through the habitat-based mitigation addressed in M-BI-1a, above. Creation and enhancement shall be conducted in accordance with habitat requirements of the yellow warbler.	Less than Significant
BI-76	The Proposed Project would directly impact two of the four locations of the yellow-breasted chats (<i>Icteria virens</i>) observed on site. This would result in a significant impact.	Mitigate through the habitat-based mitigation addressed in M-BI-1a, above. Creation and enhancement shall be conducted in accordance with habitat requirements of the yellow-breasted chat.	Less than Significant
BI-87	The loss of non-native grassland and pasture on site would result in diminished carrying capacity for raptors on site and in the immediate Project vicinity. This would result in a significant impact.	Mitigate through the habitat-based mitigation addressed in M-BI-1f and M-BI-1g, above.	Less than Significant

**Table S-1 (cont.)
 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Biological Resources (Subchapter 3.3) (cont.)			
Project Direct Impacts (cont.)			
BI-98	Grading, clearing, or construction activities within 300 feet of an active coastal California gnatcatcher, southern California rufous crowned sparrow (<i>Aimophila ruficeps canescens</i>), least Bell's vireo, yellow warbler, or yellow-breasted chat nest during these species' breeding seasons would have the potential to disrupt nesting behavior. Similarly, any grading, clearing, or construction within 500 feet of an active tree-nesting raptor nest or 800 feet of an active ground-nesting raptor during breeding season would have the potential to disrupt nesting behavior. Impacts to these bird species during the breeding season would be significant.	<p>No grading, clearing, or construction activity shall be initiated within 300 feet of occupied habitat during coastal California gnatcatcher and southern California rufous-crowned sparrow breeding season (February 15 through August 31), 300 feet of occupied habitat during least Bell's vireo, yellow warbler, and yellow breasted-chat breeding season (March 15 through September 15), 500 feet of occupied tree-nesting raptor habitat during breeding season (January 15 through July 15), or within 800 feet of ground nesting raptor habitat during breeding season (February 1 through July 15). All grading permits, grading plans, and improvement plans shall state the same. If grading, clearing, or construction would occur during gnatcatcher and/or raptor nesting seasons, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey to determine if these species occur within impacted areas. If there are no gnatcatchers or raptors nesting (including nest building or other breeding/nesting behavior) within this area, development shall be allowed to proceed.</p> <p>If blasting and associated drilling in the development area are scheduled to occur during sensitive bird breeding seasons in the northern portion of the Project site, the areas shall be surveyed by a qualified biologist to determine if nests occupied by these species are present. Where drilling is required, maximum feasible sound attenuation measures shall be incorporated.</p>	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Biological Resources (Subchapter 3.3) (cont.)			
Project Direct Impacts (cont.)			
BI-9-8 (cont.)		Outside of the nesting season or during the nesting season if pre-construction surveys are negative, no restriction shall be placed on grading, including blasting/drilling activities, clearing, or construction. A report shall be submitted to the Director of DPLU describing the survey results and dates of clearing, grading, and construction activities. This design measure may be modified as necessary with written approval of the Director of DPLU.	
BI-10-9	The introduction of nuisance or domesticated animals species into open space would be potentially significant.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement a final Resource Management Plan (RMP) for the Proposed Project. The conceptual RMP (within Appendix G of EIR Appendix G) is a draft document that set guidelines. The final RMP will, include, but not be limited to, the following measures: • Participate in a Landscape Maintenance District as the funding mechanism for the long-term management of open space. • Exotic plant species shall be removed. • Sensitive plant population boundaries shall be mapped. • Trash shall be removed from open space. • All habitats and sensitive plant and animal species shall be monitored. Biological surveys shall be conducted. • Fencing and signs within open space shall be maintained. • The presence of the Limited Building Zones between development and the remaining habitat shall provide a buffer to minimize edge effects. 	Less than Significant
BI-11-4	Colonization of non-native plant species in open space areas due to potential use of non-native plant species by residents and the resulting degradation of native habitat would be considered significant should it occur.		Less than Significant
BI-11-2	Impacts to wetland buffers would be considered significant.		Less than Significant

**Table S-1 (cont.)
 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Biological Resources (Subchapter 3.3) (cont.)			
Project Direct Impacts (cont.)			
B- 10-9 through B- 12-11 (cont.)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The final landscape plans will be approved to ensure that no invasives (as identified by the California Invasive Plant Council) are used adjacent to any biological open space areas. • The limits of grading shall be flagged or marked with silt fencing prior to grading to prevent inadvertent impacts to adjacent sensitive habitat. • A qualified biologist shall monitor the limits of grading during clearing, grubbing, and grading. <p>Refer to M-B-10-9 through 12-11 in Subchapter 3.3 for the complete mitigation measures.</p>	
B- 13 <u>12</u>	Impacts associated with road kill along Pankey Place have the potential to be significant.	A barrier shall be erected on the north side of the road, adjacent to OS-2.	Less than Significant

**Table S-1 (cont.)
 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Cultural Resources (Subchapter 3.4)			
Project Direct Impacts			
CR-1a	On-site brushing and initial grading activities associated with construction of the Proposed Project could result in the discovery of previously unrecorded, potentially significant, archaeological resources. Such impacts to uncovered cultural resources on site could be significant.	Direct impacts to buried, previously unrecorded cultural resources would be mitigated through the implementation of a grading monitoring program for both on-site development and off-site improvements. Prior to approval of grading or improvement plans, the Project Applicant shall implement a grading monitoring and data recovery program to mitigate potential impacts to undiscovered buried archaeological resources to the satisfaction of the Director of DPLU. Refer to M-CR-1a, 1b, and 1d in Subchapter 3.4 for the complete mitigation measure.	Less than Significant
CR-1b	Off-site brushing and initial grading activities associated with construction of the Proposed Project could result in the discovery of previously unrecorded, potentially significant, archaeological resources. Such impacts to uncovered cultural resources off site could be significant.		Less than Significant
CR-1c	Off-site brushing and initial grading activities occurring within 100 feet of CA-SDI-682/ Monserate adobe associated with construction of off-site improvements could impact the site. Such impacts could be significant.	Prior to the start of grading or improvements, the Project applicant shall implement a temporary fencing plan to mitigate potential impacts to site CA-SDI-682/ Monserate adobe to the satisfaction of the Director of DPW. Refer to M-CR-1c in Subchapter 3.4 for the complete mitigation measure.	Less than Significant
CR-1d	A significant impact would occur if human remains are unearthed during grading activities.	Same as mitigation for Impacts CR-1a and CR-1b.	Less than Significant

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK