# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## S.1 Project Synopsis

### S.1.1 Project Location

The proposed 608-acre Lilac Hills Ranch project site is located in the westernmost portion of the Valley Center Community Plan (VCCP) area and Bonsall Community Plan (BCP) area, less than one-half mile from the I-15 corridor ~~approximately 2.0 miles from Interstate 15 (I-15)~~ and Old Highway 395. From the northwest corner of the site, West Lilac Road serves as the northern boundary, while Rodriguez Road serves generally as the boundary to the south and east. From the southwest corner, the western boundary runs along Shirey Road and extends to Standell Lane. From there, the project site extends back to Shirey Road, which serves as the northwestern boundary.

The project site is generally characterized by agricultural lands and gently rolling knolls, with steeper hillsides and ridges running north and south along the western edge. Existing land uses in the surrounding area include residential dwellings that range from suburban to semi-rural densities, along with agricultural uses and vacant lands.

### S.1.2 Project Description

The project would consist of a mix of residential, commercial, and institutional uses, along with parks and open space. Specifically, the project would include: 90,000 square feet of commercial, office, and retail, including a 50-room country inn; 903 traditional single-family detached homes; 164 single-family attached homes; 211 residential units within the commercial mixed-use areas; and 468 single-family detached age-restricted residential units within a senior citizens neighborhood; necessary facilities and amenities to serve the senior population (including a senior community center, a ~~group residential and~~ group care facility, and a memory care facility); and a 2.0-acre Community Purpose Facilities (CPF) area that could be comprised of a private recreational facility and civic fire station, with the total area of both not to exceed 40,000 square feet. The project also proposes a school site to accommodate K-8 students, public and private parks, and other recreational amenities. Also planned within the project site are a Recycling Facility (RF), a Water Reclamation Facility (WRF), and other supporting infrastructure. The mixed-use, commercial, and civic uses, with parks, would form a Town Center and two Neighborhood Centers, to which residents can walk for various social and commercial needs. Open space would retain some of the existing citrus and avocado groves, sensitive biological/wetland habitat, and cultural resources totaling 104.1 acres.

Structural and wildland fire protection for the project would be provided by the DSFPD and/or CAL FIRE. As discussed in subchapter 2.7, fire services would meet the minimum travel times identified in Table S-1 (Policy S-6.4 of the General Plan) at project build-out with ~~response times from the designated "primary" DSFPD station, Station 11, would meet the response time standards identified by the County's General Plan at project build-out upon selection of~~ any one of the four Fire Options identified in Chapter 1.0.

Primary access to the project site would be provided via West Lilac Road, which connects to Old Highway 395 to the west of the project site. From Old Highway 395, freeway access to I-15 exists. Additional access to the County-maintained road system

would be provided by West Lilac Road via Covey Lane (the on-site portion would be a private road and the off-site portion would be a public road) and gated access would provide secondary emergency access south of the project site to Circle R Drive via Mountain Ridge Road. The Institutional site (proposed church) would have direct access to Mountain Ridge Road and secondary emergency access to Rodriguez Road. The gate would be north of the Institutional site.

The project includes a comprehensive circulation plan that provides access to the project site and improves vehicular circulation throughout the project site in accordance with County standards. To minimize impediments to secondary emergency access, all streets within the project site would be designed in accordance with the County private road standards and in compliance with the County Consolidated Fire Code. The needs of truck traffic, fire apparatus, and loading activities related to commercial structures would also be incorporated in the design of the roadways.

Initial development of the project would be accessed through two connections along West Lilac Road with unrestricted internal roads throughout Phases 1, 2, and 3. Additional gated access points are proposed throughout Phases 4 and 5, for use by residents and/or emergency vehicles. The specific location of gated access points are detailed in subchapter 2.7. All gates proposed for the project would be in compliance with DSFPD guidelines and County Consolidated Fire Code, Section 503.6. The gates on roads that will be used by residents to go in and out of the project would have automatic openers (for exiting) that are triggered by either a buried sensor or an optical sensor. After being triggered, the gates would remain open to accommodate a stream of traffic. These gates would also be equipped with an approved emergency traffic control activating strobe light sensor or other device approved by the fire code official, which would activate the gate on the approach of emergency apparatus. During an emergency requiring evacuation of residents, the gates would be put in an open position allowing surrounding residents to use project roads. This would be done by the HOA using a special code that can be entered remotely.

Development of the project would be phased over approximately 10 years. Phasing would occur in accordance with a logical and orderly expansion of roadways, public utilities, and infrastructure. Grading would take place throughout all of the project's five phases. Phasing would be implemented through the recording of the Final Maps. Each recorded map would be required to comply with the provisions and guidelines within the Lilac Hills Ranch Specific Plan, which includes a Community Design section containing policies to address visual quality aspects of the project including streetscape, entry treatments, parks, pedestrian circulation, lighting, signs, and landscaping.

The project site is located entirely within the Valley Center Municipal Water District (VCMWD), which would provide potable water service to the project. As part of the initial development phase, the project includes construction of improvements needed to provide sufficient redundant reservoir capacity within the zone to serve the project. The project is served primarily from the VCMWD's Country Club Zone. The VCMWD requires the project to provide redundancy (both for potable and recycled water) in the zone. To this end, the VCMWD is currently replacing the Country Club Reservoir with two reservoirs. The VCMWD filed a Notice of Exemption with the County Clerk on December 12, 2013 for the reservoir replacement project. Each reservoir would be approximately 4.8 million gallons. The cost for the split will be added to capacity fees. The Country Club Reservoir would then be available for potable water storage.

Thereafter, the Old Country Club Reservoir and existing 12~~-foot~~ inch water line in Circle R Lane could be converted to recycled water use. The piping required to be connected to the reservoir would be located in ~~utilize the existing~~ the utility easements within the ~~trenches located within paved roadways following~~ existing rights-of-way. As detailed in subchapter 3.1.7, there is adequate spacing available within the existing ~~trench~~ right-of-way to fit all required water and sewer service lines, and no ~~new trenching~~disturbance outside the existing right-of-way would be required.

The applicant would construct an on-site wastewater collection system such that water could either be transferred to the Lower Moosa Canyon WRF or treated, to some level, at an on-site water reclamation facility. The specific wastewater treatment options are as follows:

(1) On-site WRF with Solids Treatment;

(2) On-Site Scalping WRF without Solids Treatment;

(3) Lower Moosa Canyon WRF ~~Alternative~~Option; and

(4) On-site WRF without Solids Treatment for a Portion of the Project.

These options are discussed in detail in Chapter 3.0.

The project would require the following discretionary actions from the County:

- General Plan Amendment
- Specific Plan
- Master and Implementing Tentative Maps
- Rezone
- Open Space Easement Vacations
- Blasting Permits
- "B" Designator Site Plan(s) (Design Review)
- Major Use Permit(s)
- Grading Plan (L-Grading Permit)
- Habitat Loss Permit

The project would also require discretionary approval from other agencies for the following:

- Streambed Alteration Agreement (California Department of Fish and Wildlife);
- Clean Water Act – Section 404 Permit (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers)
- Clean Water Act – Section 401 Certification (Regional Water Quality Control Board [RWQCB])
- Statewide National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit (RWQCB)
- Waste Discharge Permit or Master Reclamation Permit (Water Reclamation Plant) (RWQCB)
- Major Encroachment Permit (SDCWA)
- Encroachment Permit (VCMWD).

### S.1.3 Environmental Setting

The environmental setting of the project site is viewed from both a local and regional perspective. The project site is within the unincorporated area of northern San Diego County, within the Valley Center and Bonsall Community Plan areas. Communities in proximity to the project site include: Fallbrook, Bonsall and Hidden Meadows to the west; the Pala-Pauma Community Plan area to both the north and east; and the North County Metro Community Plan Area and the city of Escondido to the south.

The topography is characterized by the east-west San Luis Rey river valley along the SR-76 corridor and the north-south I-15 corridor. Both the San Luis Rey River floodplain and the I-15 corridor are flanked by rolling hills which have historically been used for citrus and avocado groves, estate residences, and open space, with cattle grazing also occurring in the more rugged terrain.

The localized surrounding land uses include agricultural, residential, open space, and commercial uses. Varying types of homes exist in the project area ranging from small lot townhomes to farm homes on large parcels with mostly citrus and avocado groves. Single-family residential homes are located on parcels ranging from less than 5,000 square feet to 40 acres. Agriculture uses in the vicinity include primarily orchards and nurseries, but also row crops. Other uses in the vicinity include commercial and office buildings; a trailer park and storage; and an industrial rock manufacturing and concrete batch plant. To the southwest of the project site is an area containing the Castle Creek Inn and Resort as well as a golf course.

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

Table S-1 summarizes the results of the environmental analysis completed for the project. Table S-1 also includes mitigation measures proposed to reduce or avoid the environmental effects, with a conclusion as to whether the impact has been mitigated to below a level of significance. Detailed analyses of significant environmental effects are discussed in Chapter 2.0, and effects found not to be significant during preparation of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or the Initial Study process, are found in Chapter 3.0.

Environmental design considerations that have been incorporated into the project include measures to reduce environmental impacts. All of these environmental design measures are detailed in Table 1-3.

## S.3 Areas of Controversy

The Notice of Preparation (NOP) was distributed in May 2012 for a 30-day public review and comment period. In addition, a public scoping meeting was held on July 17, 2012 at the Valley Center Community Library. The NOP and all of the comment letters received are included in this EIR as Appendices A and B, respectively. The issues that were raised in the comments and forms by the public agencies, local groups, and individuals are evaluated throughout Chapters 2.0 and 3.0 of the EIR, addressing both direct and cumulative impacts.

Issues of concern associated with the project include the change in aesthetics and community character; land use intensity relative to the County General Plan, and the Valley Center and Bonsall Community Plans; health and safety due to blasting and silica minerals released during grading; wildfire risk; Native American cultural resources; transportation/traffic impacts to roadways, schools and private roads; indirect agricultural resource impacts from lighting; geology and soils liquefaction; cumulative impacts associated with multiple issue areas; and the provision of school, water, and sewer service to the project site.

Due to the number of issues raised by commenters, the EIR was revised and recirculated for public review from June 12, 2014 through July 28, 2014 (a 45-day review period). Major areas of controversy raised were issues related to General Plan consistency including compliance with Land Use Element policy LU-1.2, the flexibility of the proposed phasing plan, the easement rights of the project to construct required improvements, the adequacy of fire services and evacuation, and significant and unavoidable impacts to I-15 segments. Several commenters raised issues with the analysis, feasibility, and impacts associated with the Mountain Ridge Road Fire Station Alternative. Other areas of concern include the approach to analyzing the project's GHG emissions. the adequacy of the road network, trip generation estimates, and traffic safety.

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

Issues to be resolved include whether or how to mitigate the significant impacts that would be created by the implementation of the project. The County of San Diego Board of Supervisors will decide if the significant and unavoidable effects associated with aesthetics, air quality, transportation/traffic, and noise can be reduced, whether feasible mitigation is available, and whether overriding considerations should be adopted. Additionally, the Board of Supervisors will determine whether the significant impacts associated with the environmental issues of agricultural resources, biological resources, cultural resources, and hazards have been fully mitigated to below a level of significance. The Board of Supervisors will also decide whether the project conforms with the criteria set out in land use regulations and policies, including the Valley Center and Bonsall Community Plans, and take into consideration the premise for the General Plan Amendment. Lastly, the Board of Supervisors will decide whether any of the project alternatives substantially reduces significant impacts while still meeting the key project objectives and whether one of the alternatives could be approved.

## S.5 Project Alternatives

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires an EIR to consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making. A number of alternatives to the project were considered during preparation of this EIR. The alternatives, include:

- No Project/No Development Alternative
- Legal Lot Alternative
- General Plan Consistent Alternative
- Reduced Footprint Alternative
- Reduced Intensity Alternative
- 2.2C Alternative

- Road Design Alternative
- Mountain Ridge Road Fire Station Alternative

In addition to the fully analyzed alternatives to the project, an Off-Site Location Alternative was considered and rejected as infeasible.

A summary of each fully analyzed alternative and the conclusions reached regarding each alternative's impacts and ability to meet project objectives compared to the project is provided below. The full alternatives' analysis is found in Chapter 4.0 of the EIR.

*Analysis of the No Project/No Development Alternative*

The No Project/No Development Alternative, detailed in subchapter 4.2, considers the continuation of existing uses on the site. The current 16 single-family homes would remain and no new construction would occur. This alternative was selected as the No Project Alternative is required by CEQA and would avoid both construction-period and long-term impacts associated with development of the proposed project.

Implementation of the No Project/No Development Alternative would result in less potentially significant and significant impacts than the project. This alternative would avoid significant unavoidable impacts related to: visual (dominance, scale, diversity, and continuity, construction, and cumulative viewshed impacts); air quality (compatibility with the RAQS and operational emissions); noise (traffic-generated), and traffic impacts. This alternative would also avoid significant and mitigated impacts associated with: direct and cumulative roadway segments and intersections; air quality (construction emissions); agricultural resources, biological resources, cultural resources, noise (construction, stationary and vibration), and hazards/fire safety. The No Project/No Development Alternative would avoid potential agricultural conflicts completely and the loss of farmland of Prime or Statewide Importance. This alternative would not develop housing nor meet any of the project's objectives.

*Analysis of the Legal Lot Alternative*

The Legal Lot Alternative, detailed in subchapter 4.3, is included as another form of the No Project Alternative under CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e) and illustrates how the project site would develop subject to existing land use regulations. This alternative would allow development consistent with existing legal lots. Under this alternative there would be a total of 49 single-family homes constructed on 2-acre minimum lots within the 608 acres.

This alternative would avoid significant unavoidable impacts related to visual (dominance, scale, diversity, and continuity, construction, and cumulative viewshed impacts); air quality (compatibility with RAQS and operational emissions); noise (traffic-generated), and traffic impacts. This alternative would also avoid significant and mitigated impacts associated with direct and cumulative roadways and intersections, air quality (construction emissions), noise (construction, stationary and vibration), and agricultural and cultural resources. Similar impacts associated with fire hazards would occur. This alternative could, however, result in greater impacts to biological resources because preservation of on-site biological resources would not be required and the dedication of 104.1 acres of open space would not occur. Development could occur

without discretionary permits and there would be no mechanism to mitigate biological resource impacts. This alternative would not meet any of the project's objectives.

*Analysis of the General Plan ~~Consistency~~ Consistent Alternative*

The General Plan Consistent Alternative would allow development in accordance with the General Plan Land Use designation, Semi-Rural. This alternative also would be subject to the County's Conservation Subdivision Ordinance (CSO), which requires the preservation of 75 percent of the project site within the SR-10 as open space. The CSO applies to the 131 acres within the SR-10 designation within Valley Center and the 78 acres within the SR-10 designation with Bonsall. Compliance with the CSO would thus require the preservation of 156.75 acres of open space on-site within the SR-10. Overall, this alternative would yield approximately 110 single-family dwelling units. The single-family homes would be clustered as to preserve sensitive biological resources. A total of 98 acres of open space would be preserved within the SR-4 land use designation, and 159 acres would be preserved within the SR-10, thus conforming to the requirements of the CSO. The General Plan Consistent Alternative also would construct half-width improvements of the existing West Lilac Road on the project site, consistent with General Plan Mobility Element roadway network standard Road 2.2C. All other internal roadways would be constructed to the same standard as proposed by the project. No gates would be included in this alternative.

Compared to the project, the General Plan Consistent Alternative would result in reduced visual impacts due to the reduced density/intensity of development that would occur within the site. This alternative also would reduce significant and unavoidable air quality impacts because it would conform to the existing air quality plans and result in fewer operational emissions due to fewer average daily traffic (ADT). Likewise, significant and unavoidable traffic impacts would be reduced to less than significant. Significant mitigable air quality impacts associated with short-term construction would remain, but be reduced from those of the project. Significant and mitigated impacts associated with direct and cumulative roadways and intersections, agricultural, biological and cultural resources, noise, and hazards/hazardous materials and would be less than the project. No impacts would be greater. This alternative would not meet most of the basic project objectives as it would only meet three of the seven project objectives (3, 4, and 5). This alternative would not meet project objectives 1, 6, or 7 as it would not create a walkable mixed-use village; would not provide a range of housing and lifestyle opportunities in a manner that encourages non-automotive mobility; nor would it provide for a variety of housing, including housing for seniors. Also, this alternative would not provide educational and neighborhood retail opportunities in close proximity to residential uses. While this project alternative would not meet the majority of the project objectives, this alternative was included for planning purposes to demonstrate what development could occur under the existing General Plan.

*Analysis of the Reduced Footprint Alternative*

The Reduced Footprint Alternative, detailed in subchapter 4.5, is designed to reduce the development footprint in order to increase preservation of sensitive biological resources on-site. The Reduced Footprint Alternative would entail clustering development on approximately 441.3 acres and the preservation of 166.7 acres of on-site biological open space. Residential development would be removed from the upland habitat in Phases 1, 2, and 3 of the project, and wetland buffers would be increased from 50 to 100 feet

throughout the site. Development of this alternative would include 1,251 residential dwelling units, including 783 single-family detached homes and 468 senior housing units. No single-family attached or mixed-use would be provided under this alternative due to the reduced amount of developable area. The alternative would include 25,000 square feet of specialty commercial located on 6 acres within Phase 2 only. No recycling facility, trailhead, private recreation facility or group care would be provided under this alternative. This alternative would include the WRF, a school site, 18 acres of institutional uses in Phase 5, and 16 acres of parkland, approximately 8 acres less than provided by the project due to fewer number of on-site residents. Under this alternative 166.7 acres of biological open space would be provided on-site, along with 20.2 acres of common area and agriculture. All roadways would be private for this alternative, similar to the project. Also, under this alternative an on-site fire station or renovation to a nearby station would be required as for the project. Like the project, the Reduced Footprint Alternative would require both a General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan and would include the preparation of a Site Plan for any type of development permit.

The Reduced Footprint Alternative would reduce the significant and unavoidable visual quality impacts associated with the project. Because this alternative would place fewer lots adjacent to the northern project perimeter, visual impacts to views along the existing West Lilac Road would be less under this alternative than for the project. Significant and unavoidable traffic impacts would also be reduced under this alternative. Due to the fewer number of units and fewer ADT, operational air quality, traffic, and noise impacts would be less under this alternative as compared to the project. Due to the smaller development footprint and reduced quantity of grading required, impacts related to biological and cultural resources would be less under this alternative as compared to the project. Agricultural resource impacts also would be reduced under this alternative, as there would be fewer areas for potential agricultural adjacency conflicts. Finally, both the Reduced Footprint Alternative and the project would result in similar impacts relative to hazards, and each would be required to prepare a Fire Protection Plan and provide for additional fire services to serve the project site. This alternative would meet six of the seven project objectives.

*Analysis of the Reduced Intensity Alternative*

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would create less dense community with a smaller commercial area compared to the project. Development of this alternative would include two single-family neighborhoods totaling 881 detached homes. This alternative would include a 5.6-acre commercial area adjacent to a village square with 75,000 square feet of commercial uses. No attached single-family, senior housing, mixed-use or group care facilities would occur. This alternative would also include 103.6 acres of biological open space, 2 parks, and 65 acres of common areas/agriculture. A WRF would be constructed to serve the on-site residents, similar to the project. Also, under this alternative, an on-site fire station or renovation to a nearby station would be required as for the project. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would construct the alignment of West Lilac Road through the project site; however, it would be constructed consistent with the General Plan Mobility Element road standard 2.2C. All other internal roadways would be private and would be constructed to the same standard as proposed by the project. No gates would be included. Like the project, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would require a General Plan Amendment, Rezone, and approval of a Specific Plan.

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would not reduce the significant and unavoidable visual quality impacts associated with the project. Because this alternative would place smaller lots adjacent to the northern project perimeter, visual impacts to views along the existing West Lilac Road would be greater under this alternative than for the project. Significant and unavoidable traffic impacts would be reduced under this alternative. Due to the reduced intensity of development and fewer ADT, operational air quality, traffic, and noise impacts would be less under this alternative as compared to the project. Because of the similar development footprint and grading required, impacts related to agricultural, biological, and cultural resources would be similar for both this alternative and the project. Impacts relative to hazards also would be similar for this alternative and the project. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would meet three of seven project objectives; however, it would not meet objectives 1, 2, 6, or 7. The project would not provide a pedestrian-oriented mixed-use community, would not provide a range of housing and lifestyle opportunities in a manner that encourages non-automotive mobility, would not provide diverse housing types including mixed-use and senior housing, and would not provide educational opportunities in close proximity to residential uses. As a result, this alternative does not meet the most basic project objectives.

*Analysis of the 2.2C Alternative*

The 2.2C Alternative combines both Phases 1 and 2 of the Reduced Intensity Alternative with Phases 3, 4, and 5 of the project. The intent of this alternative is to show how West Lilac Road could be constructed to Road 2.2C standard through the project site with the majority of project features remaining in place, to the extent feasible. Overall, development of this alternative would include 792 single-family detached homes, 468 senior housing units, 105 single-family attached units, and a total of 85,000 square feet of commercial uses on 15.3 acres. This alternative would also include: a WRF, RF/trailhead, 5.5 acres of detention basins, a 12.0-acre school site; 2 acres of private recreation; 6.5 acres for a group care facility; 10.7 acres of institutional uses; 103.6 acres of biological open space; 2 parks, and 45 acres of common areas/agriculture. The 2.2C Alternative would reflect the alignment of West Lilac Road through the project site as consistent with General Plan Mobility Element road standard 2.2C. All other internal roadways would be constructed to the same standard as proposed by the project. Development of this alternative also would require a new fire station either co-located on the CAL FIRE Miller Station site or within the project site. Like the project, the 2.2C Alternative would require a General Plan Amendment, Rezone, and approval of a Specific Plan.

The 2.2C Alternative would not reduce the significant and unavoidable visual quality impacts associated with the project. Because this alternative would place smaller lots adjacent to the northern project perimeter, visual impacts to views along the existing West Lilac Road would be greater under this alternative than for the project. Significant and unavoidable traffic impacts would be reduced. Due to the slightly reduced intensity of development and fewer ADT, operational air quality, traffic, and noise impacts would be less under this alternative as compared to the project. Impacts related to agricultural, biological and cultural resources, and hazards would be similar for both this alternative and the project. The 2.2C Alternative would meet all the objectives of the project. However, it would not do so to the same degree. While this alternative does not result in a lessening of impacts as compared to the project, the 2.2C Alternative was included to disclose the impacts that would occur if West Lilac Road were constructed to a County Road 2.2C standard.

*Analysis of the Road Design Alternative*

The Road Design Alternative provides an analysis of alternative road designs that would be required should any of proposed design exceptions not be approved by the County. The different road designs analyzed in this alternative include the project's construction of roadways: (1) according to County standards, without exception; (2) construction of roads to existing Mobility Element Classifications; and (3) construction of roads within existing and alternative alignments. Except for changes to the individual road designs, all other aspects of the alternative would be the same as the project.

The Road Design Alternative would not reduce the significant and unavoidable visual quality impacts associated with the project. Because this alternative would increase grading along West Lilac Road, visual impacts to views along the existing West Lilac Road would be slightly greater under this alternative than for the project. Likewise, because a greater amount of grading would be required for this alternative, construction-related air quality and noise impacts would be slightly greater for this alternative than under the project. Significant and unavoidable traffic impacts would remain the same under this alternative. A number of the design scenarios would result in increased impacts to agricultural and biological resources, and the West Lilac Road bridge. Alternative designs would result in additional visual (scenic), traffic (construction), and emergency response (construction) impacts. Impacts to cultural resources and hazards would be similar for all the road designs analyzed under this alternative and the project. All project objectives would be met under this alternative. While this alternative does not result in a lessening of impacts as compared to the project, the Road Design Alternative was included to disclose the impacts that would occur if the project road modifications were not approved. Table 4-3 of the EIR provides a detailed comparison on the impacts associated with each road design.

*Analysis of the Mountain Ridge Road Fire Station Alternative*

The Mountain Ridge Road Fire Station Alternative would relocate the potential fire station from Phase 3 to Phase 5. To accommodate the fire station, this alternative includes improving Mountain Ridge Road to a County Public Rural Residential Collector and eliminating the gates from Phases 4 and 5. All other aspects of this alternative would be the same as the project, including the number or residential units.

This alternative would also avoid the potential project impacts to unknown subsurface cultural resources at the Miller Station site, as this alternative would not include improvements to the Miller Station. However, the overall cultural resource impact of this alternative would be similar to the project considering the additional grading required to widen Mountain Ridge Road. Also due to the additional Mountain Ridge Road grading, additional impacts to air quality and biological resources would occur under this alternative as compared to the project. Impacts related to transportation/traffic, noise, agricultural resources, hazards, geology and soils, greenhouse gases, hydrology and water quality, land use planning, public services, recreation, utilities and service systems, and growth inducement would be similar for both this alternative and the project. This alternative would meet all the objectives of the project.

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.1 Aesthetics | **Impact V-1**: The project would change the composition of the visual environment in terms of dominance, scale, diversity, and continuity, as viewed from West Lilac Road resulting in a significant impact. | **M-V-1:** Street trees shall be planted at close intervals to assure the overlapping foliage would provide adequate screening of the project site from view along West Lilac Road.<br>However, this mitigation measure is infeasible to implement due to Fire Code and impacts associated with the change to the visual environment would remain significant and unavoidable. | Significant and Unavoidable |
| | **Impact V-2**: The project would change the composition of the visual environment in terms of dominance, scale, diversity, and continuity, as viewed from surrounding residential areas resulting in a significant impact. | See **M-V-1.**<br>However, this mitigation measure is infeasible to implement due to Fire Code and impacts associated with the change to the visual environment would remain significant and unavoidable. | Significant and Unavoidable |
| | **Impact V-3**: During project construction, the site would conflict with the surrounding visual characteristics. While this impact is temporary, short-term visual impacts would be significant. | **M-V-2**: The commencement of construction of each subsequent phase will be delayed to allow the landscaping for the previous phase to mature.<br>However, this mitigation is infeasible due to the interdependency of each phase and impacts associated with temporary construction related visual would remain significant and unavoidable. | Significant and Unavoidable |
| | **Impact V-4**: The composition of the project viewshed would be adversely affected by physical changes introduced by the project along with projects within the cumulative project area. These changes would not be compatible with the existing visual character of the area resulting in significant cumulative visual impacts. | See **M-V-1.**<br>However, this mitigation is infeasible due to the interdependency of each phase and impacts associated with the cumulative change to the visual environment would remain significant and unavoidable. | Significant and Unavoidable |
| 2.2 Air Quality | **Impact AQ-1**: Implementation of the project would conflict with and exceed the assumptions used to develop the current RAQS. | **M-AQ-1:** The County shall provide a revised housing forecast to SANDAG to ensure that any revisions to the population and employment projections used by SDAPCD in updating the RAQS and the SIP will accurately reflect anticipated growth due to the proposed project.<br>However, impacts associated with conflicts with the RAQS would remain significant and unavoidable until the anticipated growth is included in the emission estimates of the RAQS and the SIP. | Significant and Unavoidable |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.2 Air Quality (cont.) | **Impact AQ-2a**: Construction emissions are projected to exceed the applicable SLTs for $PM_{2.5}$ during all construction phases.<br>**Impact AQ-2b:** Construction emissions are projected to exceed the applicable SLT for $PM_{10}$ (all phases). | **M-AQ-2**: The following dust control measures will be implemented by the project applicant or its designee:<br>• A "trackout" gravel bed shall be installed at every access point used during construction including every location off-road equipment transitions to paved surfaces. The gravel bed shall be 25 feet long and the width of the access point/roadway.<br>• Chemical stabilizers shall be applied annually to all unpaved storage/maintenance yards, parking areas, and unpaved roads.<br>• Vehicle speeds will be limited to 15 miles an hour or less and shall be randomly verified by radar enforcement. | Less than Significant |
| | | **M-AQ-4:** The following measure shall be implemented to reduce $PM_{10}$ and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions levels during rock crushing days by the project applicant or its designee:<br>Any permit conditions for crushing equipment shall be followed. Material shall be pre-watered prior to loading into the crusher as required to comply with permit and opacity emission limits. The crusher's emissions opacity shall be monitored once every 30 days of operation and an opacity limit of 20 percent as averaged over a six-minute period shall be maintained. Water shall be applied to crushed material to prevent dust plumes. | |
| | | **M-AQ-5**: The following measure shall be implemented to reduce $PM_{10}$ and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions levels during blasting by the project applicant or its designee:<br>Blasting activities shall adhere to permitting requirements by the California Division of Industrial Safety and the best management practices for control of fugitive dust from construction and demolition for blasting, such as wet drilling and wetting the surface area prior to blasting. | |
| | | **M-AQ-5a:** The following measure shall be implemented to reduce $PM_{10}$ and $PM_{2.5}$ emission levels associated with vehicle emissions by the project applicant or its designee:<br>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit and building permit, the applicant shall submit verification to Planning & Development Services that a ridesharing program for the construction crew has been encouraged by the contractor. Evidence shall include copies of rideshare materials provided to employees and any incentives offered. | |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.2 Air Quality (cont.) | **Impact AQ-2c:** Construction emissions are projected to exceed the applicable SLTs for $NO_X$ (Phase 1/ Phase 4 only). | **M-AQ-3**: The following measure shall be implemented to reduce $NO_X$ emission levels during blasting days by the project applicant or its designee:<br>All construction activity shall be halted for the entire day any blasting operation occurs and only equipment required as part of the blasting operations, e.g., drill rig or equipment used to excavate and remove material, shall operate on the same day as blasting occurs during the construction of Phase 4. | Less than Significant |
| | **Impact AQ-3:** Operational emissions are projected to exceed the applicable SLTs for ROG, CO, and $PM_{10}$ during Scenarios C through E | **M-AQ-6:** The project applicant/phase developer shall develop a Green Cleaning Product education program to be made available at rental offices, leasing spaces, and/or on websites. The education program is intended for households and institutional consumers and consists of:<br>1) Provision of educational materials on low ROG/VOC consumer products;<br>2) Educational materials addressing the use of detergents; cleaning compounds; polishes; floor finishes; cosmetics; personal care products; home, lawn and garden products; disinfectants; sanitizers; aerosol paints; automotive specialty products; low ROG/VOC paints and architectural coatings; and low emission landscape equipment.<br>3) Educational materials on the importance of recycling and purchasing recycled material.<br>**M-AQ-7:** The project applicant or its designee shall pPromote and encourage ride share and alternate forms of transportation. | ~~Less than Significant~~ Significant and Unavoidable |
| | | **M-AQ-7a:** To minimize idling time and combustion of vehicle fuels, the project applicant or its designee shall ensure that any nonresidential building that utilizes large-scale refrigerated storage (e.g., restaurant; grocery store) equips each loading dock with an electrical hookup to power refrigerated trucks.<br>**M-AQ-7b:** To minimize fuel combustion, the project's HOA shall require that all open space areas under its control be landscaped and maintained with electrical equipment, to the extent feasible. | |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.2 Air Quality (cont.) | **Impact AQ-4:** The phasing of project construction would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants as a result of operational and construction impacts occurring simultaneously. | See **M-AQ-2** through **M-AQ-5b**. | ~~Less than Significant~~ Significant and Unavoidable |
| | **Impact AQ-5:** Implementation of the project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in emissions of criteria pollutants for which the SDAB is listed as nonattainment under an applicable CAAQS, and also ~~conflicting~~ conflicts with the current RAQS. | See **M-AQ-1**.<br>However, impacts associated with cumulative conflict with the RAQS would remain significant and unavoidable until the anticipated growth is included in the emission estimates of the RAQS and the SIP. | Significant and Unavoidable |
| | **Impact AQ-6:** Operational and construction impacts associated with the project's phasing of construction, in combination with the emissions from other proposed projects or reasonably foreseeable future projects, would be cumulatively significant. | See **M-AQ-2 through M-AQ-7b**. | ~~Less than Significant~~ Significant and Unavoidable |
| 2.3 Transportation/ Traffic | ***Existing Plus Project (Traffic Scenario A)***<br>**Impact TR-1:** Gopher Canyon Road, between E. Vista Way and I-15 SB Ramps<br>**Impact TR-2:** E. Vista Way / Gopher Canyon Road | **M-TR-1:** Prior to recordation of the Final Map associated with the 238th equivalent dwelling unit (EDU) of the Lilac Hills Ranch Specific Plan, the applicant or its designee shall install a dedicated right-turn lane at the westbound Gopher Canyon Road approach of the East Vista Way/Gopher Canyon Road intersection. | Less than Significant |
| | ***Existing Plus Project (Traffic Scenario B)***<br>**Impacts TR-1 and TR-2** (see above) | See **M-TR-1.** | |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.3 Transportation/ Traffic (cont.) | **Impact TR-3***:* I-15 SB Ramps/Gopher Canyon Road (Caltrans) | **M-TR-2:** Prior to the recordation of Final Map associated with the 363rd EDU of the Lilac Hills Ranch Specific Plan, the applicant or its designee shall, ~~contingent upon~~coordinate with Caltrans to ~~approval~~, ~~either: (1)~~ install a traffic signal at the I-15 SB Ramps/Gopher Canyon Road intersection~~, or (2) enter into an agreement with Caltrans whereby the applicant or its designee would provide funding equivalent to the cost to install a traffic signal at the I-15 SB Ramps/Gopher Canyon Road intersection and Caltrans would agree to install such signal prior to recordation of the Final Map associated with the 363rd EDU of the Lilac Hills Ranch Specific Plan~~.<br><br>While signalization of this intersection would mitigate the project impact, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable because these improvements are under Caltrans jurisdiction. | Significant and Unavoidable |
| | **Impact TR-4**: I-15 NB Ramps/Gopher Canyon Road (Caltrans) | **M-TR-3:** Prior to the recordation of Final Map associated with the 363rd EDU of the Lilac Hills Ranch Specific Plan, the applicant or its designee shall~~, contingent upon~~coordinate with Caltrans to ~~approval, either: (1)~~ install a traffic signal~~s~~ at the I-15 NB Ramps/Gopher Canyon Road intersection~~, or (2) enter into an agreement with Caltrans whereby the applicant or its designee would provide funding equivalent to the cost to install a traffic signal at the I-15 NB Ramps/Gopher Canyon Road intersection and Caltrans would agree to install such signal prior to recordation of the Final Map associated with the 363rd EDU of the Lilac Hills Ranch Specific Plan~~.<br><br>While signalization of this intersection would mitigate the project impact, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable because these improvements are under Caltrans jurisdiction. | Significant and Unavoidable |
| | ***Existing Plus Project (Traffic Scenario C)*** **Impacts TR-1 and TR-2** (see above) | See **M-TR-1.** | Less than Significant |
| | **Impacts TR-3 and TR-4** (see above) | See **M-TR-2** and **M-TR-3**, above. | Significant and Unavoidable |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.3 Transportation/ Traffic (cont.) | **Impact TR-5:** West Lilac Road from Old Highway 395 to Main Street | **M-TR-4:** Prior to recordation of the Final Map associated with the 929th EDU of the Lilac Hills Ranch Specific Plan, the applicant, or its designee, shall improve West Lilac Road between Old Highway 395 and Main Street to meet the General Plan Mobility Element classification of 2.2C, subject to exceptions as approved by the County. | Less than Significant |
| | **Impact TR-6:** E. Vista Way from Gopher Canyon Road to Osborne Street | **M-TR-5:** Prior to recordation of the Final Map associated with the 476th EDU of the Lilac Hills Ranch Specific Plan, the applicant, or its designee, shall install a dedicated right-turn lane at the northbound E. Vista Way approach of the East Vista Way/Gopher Canyon Road intersection. | Less than Significant |
| | **Impact TR-7:** Old Highway 395/West Lilac Road | **M-TR-6**: Prior to recordation of the Final Map associated with the 585th EDU of the Lilac Hills Ranch Specific Plan, the applicant, or its designee shall signalize the Old Highway 395/West Lilac Road intersection and construct a left-turn lane at the westbound West Lilac Road approach to the Old Highway 395/West Lilac Road intersection~~.~~. | Less than Significant |
| | ***Existing Plus Project (Traffic Scenario D)*** **Impact TR-1, TR-2, TR-5, TR-6, and TR-7** (see above) | See **M-TR-1, M-TR-4, M-TR-5** and **M-TR-6.** | Less than Significant |
| | **Impacts TR-3** and **TR-4** (see above) | See **M-TR-2** and **M-TR-3**. | Significant and Unavoidable |
| | **Impact TR-8**: Old Highway 395/Circle R Drive | **M-TR-7**: Prior to recordation of the Final Map associated with the 1,220 total EDU of the Lilac Hills Ranch Specific Plan, the applicant, or its designee, shall install a traffic signal at the Old Highway 395/Circle R Drive intersection. | Less than Significant |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.3 Transportation/ Traffic (cont.) | ***Existing Plus Project (Traffic Scenario E, Build-out)*** **Impact TR-1, TR-2, TR-5**, **TR-6, TR-7,** and **TR-8** (see above) | See **M-TR-1**, **M-TR-4**, **M-TR-5, M-TR-6,** and **M-TR-7.** | Less than Significant |
| | **Impacts TR-3** and **TR-4** (see above) | See **M-TR-2**, **M-TR-3.** | Significant and Unavoidable |
| | **Impact TR-9**: E. Vista Way, between SR-76 and Gopher Canyon Road | See **M-TR-1** and **M-TR-5.** | Less than Significant |
| | ***Existing Plus Cumulative Projects Plus Project*** **Impact TR-10:** W. Lilac Road, Old Highway 395 and Main Street | See **M-TR-4** and **M-TR-6.** | Less than Significant |
| | **Impact TR-11**: Camino Del Rey between Old River Road and West Lilac Road **Impact TR-13**: Gopher Canyon Road between Little Gopher Canyon Road and I-15 SB Ramps **Impact TR-14**: E. Vista Way, between SR-76 and Gopher Canyon Road **Impact TR-15**: E. Vista Way, between Gopher Canyon Road and Osborne Street **Impact TR-18**: Cole Grade Road, between Fruitvale Road and Valley Center Road | **M-TR-8**: Prior to issuance of any building permit for new structures within the Lilac Hills Ranch Specific Plan, the applicant or its designee, shall pay all applicable fees to the County TIF Program, which should be updated to include the changes to the Land Use and Mobility Elements proposed by the project. | Less than Significant |
| | **Impact TR-12:** Gopher Canyon Road, E. Vista Way to Little Gopher Canyon Road | While improvement of this segment to a 4.1B classification would mitigate the project impact, such mitigation is infeasible. | Significant and Unavoidable |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.3 Transportation/ Traffic (cont.) | **Impact TR-16**: Pankey Road, between Pala Mesa Drive and SR-76 | While the improvement of this segment to a 4.2B classification would mitigate the project impact, such mitigation is infeasible.<br>**M-TR-7:** The following mitigation measures would mitigate the significant cumulative traffic impacts to Impacts TR-12 and TR-13:<br>If the TIF is not updated to include Pankey Road from Pala Mesa Drive to SR-76, an alternative mitigation measure for Impact TR-13 would be to construct Pankey Road from Pala Mesa Drive to SR-76 to a 4.2B classification. However, the Pankey Road segment is already required to be improved by the Campus Park and Meadowood projects, which have been conditioned to construct the roadway to its current classification of 2.1A Community Collector. Furthermore, the proposed project contributes approximately 5 percent of the total trips to the cumulative traffic condition. This small amount is not roughly proportional to the mitigation of improving the roadway to a 4.B classification over the length of Pankey Road. Mitigation measures must be roughly proportional to the environmental impacts caused by the project. Therefore, because the project's contribution to the cumulative traffic condition is not roughly proportional to the improvements required to mitigate the impact, conditioning this project to construct the road improvements is not feasible, and the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. | Significant and Unavoidable |
| | **Impact TR-17:** Lilac Road, between Old Castle Road and Anthony Road | **M-TR-9**: Prior to issuance of any building permit for new structures within the Lilac Hills Ranch Specific Plan, the applicant or its designee shall construct intermittent turn lanes at major access locations along Lilac Road from Old Castle Road to Anthony Road, including the segment between Robles Lane and Cumbres Road, and the intersection of Sierra Rojo Road and Lilac Road. | Less Than Significant |
| | **Impact TR-19:** E. Vista Way/Gopher Canyon Road<br>**Impact TR-23:** Old Highway 395/West Lilac Road<br>**Impact TR-24**: I-15 SB Ramps/Old Highway 395<br>**Impact TR-25:** I-15 NB Ramps/Old Highway 395<br>**Impact TR-27:** I-15 SB Ramps/Gopher Canyon Road<br>**Impact TR-28:** I-15 NB Ramps/Gopher Canyon Road | See **M-TR-8.** | Less than Significant |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.3 Transportation/ Traffic (cont.) | **Impact TR-20:** SR-76/Old Highway 395 (Caltrans)<br><br>**Impact TR-21:** SR-76/Pankey Road (Caltrans) | While intersection improvements would reduce these project impacts to below a level of significance, such mitigation is infeasible because these intersections are under Caltrans jurisdiction. County staff coordinated with Caltrans, and Caltrans confirmed that it has no project, fund, or program to make the necessary improvements to which the applicant can make a fair-share contribution. Therefore, because improvements necessary to reduce significant cumulative impacts are the responsibility of another jurisdiction, and no program is available to which the applicant could contribute, mitigation is infeasible. No other feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce the significant cumulative impacts at these three intersections. The impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. | Significant and Unavoidable |
| | **Impact TR-22:** Old Highway 395/E. Dulin Road | **M-TR-10:** Prior to issuance of any building permit for new structures within the Lilac Hills Ranch Specific Plan, the applicant or its designee shall construct a traffic signal at the Old Highway 395/East Dulin Road intersection. | Less than Significant |
| | **Impact TR-26:** Old Highway 395/Circle R Drive | See **M-TR-7.** | Less than Significant |
| | **Impact TR-29**: Miller Road/Valley Center Road | **M-TR-11:** Prior to issuance of any building permit for new structures within the Lilac Hills Ranch Specific Plan, the applicant or its designee shall construct a traffic signal at the Miller Road/Valley Center Road intersection. | Less than Significant |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.3 Transportation/ Traffic (cont.) | **Impact TR-30**: I-15, between Riverside County Boundary and Old Highway 395<br>**Impact TR-31:** I-15, between Old Highway 395 and SR-76<br>**Impact TR-32:** I-15, between SR-76 and Old Highway 395<br>**Impact TR-33:** I-15, between Old Highway 395 and Gopher Canyon Road<br>**Impact TR-34:** I-15, between Gopher Canyon Road and Deer Springs Road<br>**Impact TR-35:** I-15, between Deer Springs Road and Centre City Parkway<br>**Impact TR-36:** I-15, between Centre City Parkway and El Norte Parkway<br>**Impact TR-37:** I-15, between El Norte Parkway and SR-78 | While there are plans to widen I-15 between Riverside County and SR-78 that would mitigate cumulative I-15 impacts, there is no secured funding for the improvement and there is no mechanism in place to provide contributions to the improvement. Ultimately, mitigation is infeasible because the I-15 is under Caltrans jurisdiction. | Significant and Unavoidable |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.4 Agricultural Resources | **Impact AG-1:** The project was analyzed pursuant to the County's LARA Model and was found to be a significant agricultural resource. Thus, the direct impact to 43.8 acres of Prime and Statewide Importance soils was determined to be significant. | **M-AG-1**: Pursuant to the County Guidelines (page 45) for direct impacts, a 1:1 mitigation ratio shall be required for impacts to Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance and which are "available for agriculture. Therefore, the project shall implement the following option(s) to mitigate the project impact to 43.8 acres:<br>A. The applicant shall purchase mitigation credits through the County's PACE program. The County's PACE program is an approved mitigation banking method which uses in-lieu fees to purchase PACE credits to offset agricultural impacts. Each acre of land permanently protected with an agricultural conservation easement under the PACE program would equate to one mitigation credit. Therefore, the applicant shall mitigate for the 43.8 acres of Prime and Statewide important soils impacted, at a 1:1 ratio, through the purchase of 43.8 mitigation credits. The credits shall be purchased prior to the issuance of a grading permit.<br>B. In the event that PACE credits are unavailable or the applicant elects not to participate; the applicant may choose to independently secure conservation easements. The conservation easement shall prohibit non-agricultural uses and must include Prime and Statewide important soils equal or greater to the soils being converted and at a 1:1 ratio (43.8 acres). ~~The conservation easements shall occur within the County of San Diego and within 100 miles of the project site.~~ The conservation easements shall be located within the cumulative project area, or, at a location approved by the Director of P&DS. The applicant shall grant the easement in perpetuity to the County prior to the issuance of a grading permit.<br>~~C. To the extent feasible, the applicant may choose to mitigate for 43.8 acres of impacts to Prime and Statewide important soils by preserving soils of equal value (prime or statewide importance) within a conservation easement on the project site.~~<br>~~D.~~C. The applicant may choose to mitigate for 43.8 acres of Prime and Statewide important soils through a combination of options A or B ~~1, 2, or 3~~ so long as the total acreage of mitigation is equal to a 1:1 ratio (43.8 acres) and occurs on soils of equal value to those being converted. The applicant shall provide proof to the County that the mitigation has been implemented prior to the issuance of a grading permit. | Less Than Significant |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.4 Agricultural Resources (cont.) | **Impact AG-2:** The project would result in a significant adjacency issue associated with the on-site park (P-10) also identified as AA 6.<br>**Impact AG-3:** The project would result in a significant adjacency issue associated with the Institutional site (AA 13).<br>**Impact AG-4:** The project would result in a significant adjacency issue associated with the age restricted area within Phase 4 also identified as AA 8.<br>**Impact AG-5:** The project would result in a significant adjacency issue associated with AA 3.<br>**Impact AG-6:** The project would result in a significant adjacency issue associated with AA 4.<br>**Impact AG-8:** The project would result in a significant adjacency issue associated with AA 7.<br>**Impact AG-9:** The project would result in a significant adjacency issue associated with AA 9.<br>**Impact AG-10:** The project would result in a significant adjacency issue associated with AA 10.<br>**Impact AG-11:** The project would result in a significant adjacency issue associated with AA 13.<br>**Impact AG-13:** The project would result in a significant on and off-site adjacency issue associated with storage of hazardous materials.<br>**Impact AG-14:** The project would result in a significant adjacency issue associated with non-native pests or domestic pets.<br>**Impact AG-15:** The project would result in a significant adjacency issue associated with the spread of pathogens and disease. | **M-AG-2:** A 50-foot-wide agricultural buffer planted with two rows of the appropriate tree crop (e.g., citrus, avocado) shall be provided. This buffer shall be located where residential uses in the project will abut existing, adjacent orchards and other agricultural operations in order to create a transition between the two uses. This buffer shall be required at impact locations AG-2 through AG-11~~ and AG-13 through AG-15.~~, with the exception that AG-6 (AA 4), AG-9 (AA 9) and AG-3 (AA 13) would provide less than two rows of trees due to site constraints as detailed in Figures 2.4-7b, 2.4-7g, and 2.4-7i of subchapter 2.4. This measure is also implemented to reduce impacts to AG-13, AG-14, and AG-15.<br><br>Specific to the agricultural buffer provided in AA 6 (Impact AG-2), Canary Island Pines shall be planted among the tree crops to further reduce any potential pesticide drift that may occur between the existing adjacent agricultural use and the proposed project's park and school sites. The Canary Island Pine is a fast-growing pine that grows 60–80 feet tall, has needles (which are more efficient at removing small drifting droplets from the air than smooth leaves), and has low water needs. The pines shall be 36- to 48-inch boxed trees placed consistent with accepted practice that optimizes porosity and maximizes pesticide drift interception, with buffer density at approximately 30 to 50 percent and tree spacing at approximately 15–20 feet. All plantings shall be spaced in accordance with the County Fire Code.<br><br>**M-AG-3:** A 6-foot-high fence shall be maintained along the southern edge of the park (AG-2), the institutional site (AG-3), the age-restricted area (AG-4), and at the other project boundaries discussed above where compatibility impacts would require mitigation (AG-~~5~~6 through AG-11). The fencing would also be required in order to prevent intrusion by people and domesticated pets and to reduce the chances of spreading pathogens or diseases (AG-14 and AG-15, respectively). The fence shall be restricted to one of two types (refer to Exhibit 137 of the Specific Plan): (1) the solid masonry type with a foundation that extends below ground level and with no gaps; or (2) the type that is a combination of masonry and metal fencing. | Less than Significant |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.4 Agricultural Resources (cont.) | | **M-AG-4:** A Limited Building Zone shall prohibit habitable structures as well as any structure (e.g., covered patios and picnic shade structures, a community building, etc. ) which could accommodate congregating residents, visitors, or children within close proximity to the AA areas (and the proximate agricultural operations). The prohibition shall extend to (but is not limited to) ball fields, swimming pools, horseshoe pits, picnic areas, or any other uses that would attract or keep people near the project boundary or AA. This mitigation shall be implemented at the park site (AG-2), the institutional and age-restricted areas (AG-3 and AG-4) and along the project boundaries where it is necessary to discourage new residents from being within close proximity to off-site agricultural uses (AG-5, AG-6; and AG-8 through AG-11). This prohibition against habitable or attractant structures near the AAs would apply to impact locations AG-13, AG-14, and AG-15. | |
| | **Impact AG-7:** The project would result in a significant adjacency issue associated with AA 5. | See **M-AG-2,** and **M-AG-3** | Less than Significant |
| | **Impact AG-12:** The project would result in a significant adjacency issue associated with interim on-site agricultural activities. | **M-AG-5:** ~~Pursuant to the Specific Plan Figure 142, the project shall include a~~An interim 100-foot ~~fuel modification zone/~~limited building zone shall be required between ongoing agricultural uses and residential development, for each phase of development. In addition to the restriction of aerial pesticide application, which is stated in the Specific Plan, the limited building zone shall also limit pesticide use to only organic materials.~~The fuel modification zone/limited building zone shall comply with all State Law and County Agricultural, Weights and Measures Regulations.~~ | Less than Significant |
| | **Impact AG-16**: The project would result in a considerable contribution to the cumulatively significant loss of Important Farmland. | See **M-AG-1** | Less than Significant |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.5 Biological Resources | **Impact BIO-1**: The project would impact more than 5 percent of the raptor foraging habitat on-site, and therefore the project raptor foraging impact would be significant. | **M-BIO-1a:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit for Phase 1, the following shall be provided either on-site within the open space easement; off-site within a draft PAMA of the draft North County MSCP in Valley Center or <u>suitable lands with native habitat adjacent to the project boundary;</u> ~~adjacent communities;~~ or through a mitigation bank, subject to the approval of the County and appropriate wildlife agencies:<br>1. Impacts to 9.8 acres of coastal sage scrub (including disturbed) shall be mitigated at a 2:1 ratio with 19.6 acres.<br>2. Impacts to 0.1 acre of disturbed coastal/valley freshwater marsh shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 0.3 acre.<br>3. Impacts to 0.5 acre of southern coast live oak riparian woodland shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 1.5 acres.<br>4. Impacts to 0.5 acre of southern mixed chaparral shall be mitigated at a 0.5 to 1 ratio with 0.3 acre.<br>5. Impacts to 0.5 acre of southern willow riparian woodland shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 1.5 acres. | Less than Significant |
| | | **M-BIO-1b:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit for Phase 2, the following shall be provided either on-site within the open space easement; off-site within a draft PAMA of the draft North County MSCP in Valley Center or <u>suitable lands with native habitat adjacent to the project boundary</u>~~adjacent communities~~; or through a mitigation bank, subject to the approval of the County and appropriate wildlife agencies:<br>1. Impacts to 6.8 acres of coastal sage scrub (including disturbed) shall be mitigated at a 2:1 ratio with 13.36 acres.<br>2. Impacts to 0.2 acre of southern coast live oak riparian woodland shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 0.6 acre.<br>3. Impacts to 0.3 acre of open water shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 0.9 acre. | |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.5 Biological Resources (cont.) | | **M-BIO-1c:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit for Phase 3, the following shall be provided either on-site within the open space easement; off-site within a draft PAMA of the draft North County MSCP in Valley Center or <u>suitable lands with native habitat adjacent to the project boundary</u>~~adjacent communities~~; or through a mitigation bank, subject to the approval of the County and appropriate wildlife agencies:<br>1. Impacts to 0.3 acre of coast live oak woodland shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 0.9 acre.<br>2. Impacts to 3.0 acres of coastal sage scrub (including disturbed) shall be mitigated at a 2:1 ratio with 6.0 acres.<br>3. Impacts to 0.8 acre of southern coast live oak riparian woodland (including disturbed) shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 2.4 acres.<br>4. Impacts to 53.8 acres of southern mixed chaparral (including disturbed) shall be mitigated at a 0.5 to 1 ratio with 26.9 acres.<br>5. Impacts to 0.3 acre of southern willow scrub (including disturbed) shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 0.9 acre.<br>6. Impacts to 0.1 acre of mule fat scrub (including disturbed) shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 0.3 acre. | |
| | | **M-BIO-1d:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit for Phase 4, the following shall be provided either on-site within the open space easement; off-site within a draft PAMA of the draft North County MSCP in Valley Center or <u>suitable lands with native habitat adjacent to the project boundary</u> ~~adjacent communities~~; or through a mitigation bank, subject to the approval of the County and appropriate wildlife agencies:<br>1. Impacts to 0.1 acre of southern coast live oak riparian woodland shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 0.3 acre.<br>2. Impacts to 0.1 acre of disturbed southern willow scrub shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 0.3 acre.<br>3. Impacts to 0.1 acre of disturbed wetland shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 0.3 acre. | |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.5 Biological Resources (cont.) | | **M-BIO-1e**: Prior to issuance of a grading permit for Phase 5, the following shall be provided either on-site within the open space easement; off-site within a draft PAMA of the draft North County MSCP in Valley Center or suitable lands with native habitat adjacent to the project boundary~~adjacent communities~~; or through a mitigation bank, subject to the approval of the County and appropriate wildlife agencies:<br>1. Impacts to 0.2 acre of southern willow scrub shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 0.6 acre.<br>2. Impacts to 0.2 acre of open water shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 0.6 acre.<br>**M-BIO-1f**: Prior to issuance of a grading permit for off-site improvements, the following shall be provided either on-site within the open space easement; off-site within a draft PAMA of the draft North County MSCP in Valley Center or suitable lands with native habitat adjacent to the project boundary~~adjacent communities~~; or through a mitigation bank, subject to the approval of the County and appropriate wildlife agencies:<br>1. Impacts to 0.1 acre of coastal sage scrub (including disturbed) shall be mitigated at a 2:1 ratio with 0.2 acre. | |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.5 Biological Resources (cont.) | | **M-BIO-1g:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit for the addition of intermittent turn lanes along Lilac Road from Old Castle Road to Anthony Road (M-TR-7), a biological survey (including vegetation mapping) shall be completed by a qualified biologist to determine the specific biological impacts of the improvements. Impacts to sensitive resources shall be mitigated in accordance with the County's Biology Guidelines or relevant regulations. Should these improvements require additional grading outside the currently disturbed areas, potential impacts could result to sensitive habitat as follows:<br><br>• The additional widening of Lilac Road necessary to add the turn lanes at the Robles Lane and Cumbres Road intersection could impact approximately 0.17 acre of chaparral. Chaparral would require mitigation at a 0.5:1 ratio.<br><br>• Impacts at Sierra Rojo and Lilac Road would affect approximately 0.14 acre of woodlands. Woodlands would require mitigation at a 3:1 ratio.<br><br>Mitigation land shall be provided ~~either on-site within the open space easement;~~ off-site within a draft PAMA of the draft North County MSCP in Valley Center or suitable lands with native habitat adjacent to the project boundary~~adjacent communities~~; or through a mitigation bank, subject to the approval of the County and appropriate wildlife agencies, as directed in the biological survey identified above.. (Refer to the Traffic subchapter 2.3.6.1, "Potential Impacts of Traffic Mitigation Measures" for a discussion of the potential impacts associated with this traffic mitigation measure.) | |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | **M-BIO-1h:** If the project proceeds prior to the SUKUP project (TM5184), prior to the grading of Rodriguez Road the following shall be provided either on-site within the open space easement; off-site within a draft PAMA of the draft North County MSCP in Valley Center or suitable lands with native habitat adjacent to the project boundary~~adjacent communities~~; or through a mitigation bank, subject to the approval of the County and appropriate wildlife agencies:<br>1. Impacts to 0.02 acre of coast live oak woodland shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 0.06 acre.<br>2. Impacts to 0.04 acre of coastal sage scrub shall be mitigated at a 2:1 ratio with 0.08 acre.<br>3. Impacts to 0.03 acre of southern coast live oak riparian woodland shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 0.09 acre.<br>4. Impacts to 0.08 acre of non-native grassland shall be mitigated at a 0.5:1 ratio with 0.04 acre. | |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.5 Biological Resources (cont.) | **Impact BIO-2**: The project would have direct impacts to riparian habitat and sensitive natural communities, consisting of the following: coast live oak woodland (0.3 acre), coastal sage scrub (17.0 acres), disturbed coastal sage scrub (2.6 acres), disturbed coastal/valley freshwater marsh (0.1 acre), southern coast live oak riparian woodland (1.1 acres), disturbed southern coast live oak riparian woodland (0.5 acre), southern mixed chaparral (49.4 acres), disturbed southern mixed chaparral (4.9 acres), southern willow riparian woodland (0.5 acre), southern willow scrub (0.3 acre), disturbed southern willow scrub (0.3 acre), open water (0.5 acre), and disturbed wetland (0.01 acre). Off-site impacts include coastal sage scrub (0.1 acre). As the project construction would occur in five phases, the impacts would occur in phases (see Table 2.7-4 of the EIR). These impacts to riparian habitat and sensitive natural communities would be considered significant. | **M-BIO-2:** A Resource Management Plan (RMP) shall be prepared by a qualified biologist prior to the issuance of the first grading permit and each subsequent grading permits to address any restoration, enhancement, and maintenance of open space, which shall be dedicated as a condition of project approval (see Table 1-3) . The report shall address the location of the mitigation sites that meet the specific mitigation requirement for the type of habitat (e.g., in-kind habitat preservation, no net loss, presence of special status species, etc.) within the project site and off-site, site preparation, irrigation system requirements, on-site culvert maintenance to allow for wildlife passage, plant palettes, installation procedure, and describe the maintenance and monitoring program for both the establishment mitigation areas and the enhancement mitigation areas per the project conceptual wetland revegetation plan (EIR Appendix G, Attachment 16) or requirements for habitat selection contained in the conceptual resource management plans (EIR Appendix G, Attachments 17 and 18). The proposed open space easement (M-BIO-1) shall be owned by a conservancy, the County or other similar, experienced entity subject to approval by the County. Maintenance responsibilities shall be provided by an entity approved by the County and funding shall be provided through an endowment, Community Facility District or other finance mechanism approved by the County. | Less than Significant |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.5 Biological Resources (cont.) | | Should a regional entity to manage biological open space be formed, the natural habitat areas within the project site could be dedicated to that entity, subject to County approval, ~~-~~and managed as part of an overall preserve system for northern San Diego County. In addition to the success criteria for the creation, restoration, and/or enhancement of native habitats contained in the conceptual wetland revegetation plan and the conceptual resource management plan, the management goals for the on-site biological open space shall also include the following:<br>1. Preserve and manage the open space lands to the benefit of the flora, fauna, and native ecosystem functions reflected in the natural communities occurring within the RMP land.<br>2. Manage the land for the benefit of sensitive plant and wildlife species and existing natural communities, without ~~substantive efforts to~~ altering or restricting the natural course of habitat development and dynamics.<br>3. Reduce, control, and where feasible, eradicate non-native, invasive flora and/or fauna known to be detrimental to native species and/or the local ecosystem.<br>Maintain the character and function of certain agricultural areas within the wetland buffer and open space area.<br>The Resource Manager shall be responsible for interpreting the results of site monitoring to determine the ongoing success of the RMP and achievement of the success criteria and performance standards contained in the conceptual wetland revegetation plan (EIR Appendix G, Attachment 16) and conceptual resource management plans (R Appendix G, Attachments 17 and 18. ~~). If it is necessary to modify the plan between regularly scheduled updates, plan changes shall be submitted to the County and agencies for approval as required.~~Both the On-Site RMP and Off-Site RMP (see Attachments 17 and 18, respectively, of Appendix G) would be implemented in phases to allow for project mitigation to be implemented consistent with the project phasing. | |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.5 Biological Resources (cont.) | **Impact BIO-3:** The project would impact jurisdictional waters, including 4.22 acres (2.92 acres of non-wetland waters and 1.30 acres of wetlands) of ACOE jurisdictional area, 6.55 acres (3.1 acres of streambed and 3.45 acres of wetlands) of CDFW/RWQCB jurisdictional area, and 2.23 acres of County RPO wetlands located on-site. These direct impacts to riparian habitat would be significant. | **M-BIO-3a:** Prior to the issuance of grading permits, wetland impacts shall be mitigated at a ratio of 3:1, consisting of on-site preservation, enhancement, and/or creation of wetlands. Mitigation of wetlands shall include a 1:1 creation component (of the 3:1) to ensure no net loss of wetlands. Non-wetland waters and streambed shall be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio consisting of preservation/enhancement. Mitigation measures for impacts to ACOE, CDFW/RWQCB, and County RPO wetlands are listed as follows:<br>1. ACOE jurisdiction: On-site permanent impacts to 2.9 acres of non-wetland waters of the US shall be mitigated with the preservation/enhancement of 2.9 acres of wetlands. Permanent impacts to 1.30 acres of wetlands on-site shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 3.9 acres of ACOE jurisdictional wetlands enhancement/preservation/creation (1:1 creation component).<br>2. CDFW/RWQCB jurisdiction: On-site permanent impacts to 3.1 acres of streambed shall be mitigated with the preservation/enhancement of 3.1 acres of streambed. Permanent impacts to 3.45 acres of state wetlands on-site shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 10.35 acres of CDFW/RWQCB jurisdictional state wetlands enhancement/ preservation/ creation (1:1 creation component).<br>3. County RPO jurisdiction: Permanent impacts to 2.23 acres of RPO wetlands on-site shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 6.69 acres of RPO wetlands enhancement/ preservation/ creation (1:1 creation component).<br>Mitigation for impacts to CDFW/RWQCB jurisdictional area fulfills the mitigation requirements for impacts to ACOE jurisdictional and County RPO wetlands. Ultimately, the jurisdictional waters/wetland mitigation shall proceed in accordance with the permit and certification requirements of the ACOE, CDFW/RWQCB, and County. | Less than Significant |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.5 Biological Resources (cont.) | | **M-BIO-3b**: If the project proceeds prior to the SUKUP project (TM5184), prior to the grading of Rodriguez Road wetland impacts shall be mitigated at a ratio of 3:1, consisting of on-site preservation, enhancement, and/or creation of wetlands. Mitigation of wetlands shall include a 1:1 creation component (of the 3:1), to ensure no net loss of wetlands. Non-wetland waters and streambed shall be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio consisting of preservation/enhancement. Mitigation measures for impacts to ACOE, CDFWG/RWQCB, and County RPO wetlands are listed as follows:<br>1. USACE/CDFW/RWQCB/RPO: Permanent impacts to 0.03 acre of wetlands shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 0.09 acre of jurisdictional wetlands enhancement/ preservation/creation (1:1 creation component).<br>**M-BIO-4:** A Revegetation Plan shall be prepared by a qualified biologist to address the mitigation identified in M-BIO-3 and the wildlife agency permits. The ACOE, CDFW/RWQCB, and County shall review and approve the Revegetation Plan prior to the issuance of wetland permits and grading permits. Success criteria shall be the following, at a minimum:<br>1. 80 percent transplant/container plant survival in year 1;<br>2. 100 percent transplant/container plant survival in year 2 with 50 percent native cover, 50 percent diversity and 50 percent density;<br>3. 100 percent transplant/container plant survival in year 3 with 60 percent native cover, 60 percent diversity and 60 percent density;<br>4. 100 percent transplant/container plant survival in year 4; with 75 percent native cover, 70 percent diversity and 70 percent density;<br>5. 100 percent transplant/container plant survival in year 5 with 80 percent native cover, 70 percent diversity and 70 percent density;<br>6. The wetland revegetation areas must sustain themselves for a minimum of one year (meeting the fifth-year performance standards) in the absence of significant maintenance measures; and | |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.5 Biological Resources (cont.) | | 7. The cover of non-native annuals and herbs, as identified by the project biologist, will be no more than 10 percent by the end of the five-year monitoring period. No invasive exotic perennials on the Cal-IPC lists A and B will be permitted on the revegetation sites by the end of the five-year monitoring period.<br>8. If the success criteria/performance standards are not achieved at the end of each year of monitoring or by the end of the fifth year, the owner/project proponent will consult with the County of San Diego to develop appropriate remedial measures. Remedial measures may involve actions such as replanting areas, continued weed control, or finding alternative revegetation sites. | |
| 2.6 Cultural Resources | **Impact CR-1**: Although, site CA-SDI-20436 does not meet the threshold of significance under RPO, it is a significant resource under CEQA. Because the site may be impacted by ongoing agricultural uses, there is a potential for significant direct and indirect impacts. | **M-CR-1:** Prior to approval of the first Final Map, an open space easement shall be dedicated over CA-SDI-20436. The open space easement shall allow for the continued agricultural use of the western portion of site CA-SDI-20436. The open space easement shall include a requirement for a Phase 2 archaeological testing program for the western portion of CA-SDI-20436 prior to any proposed planting to determine whether there is a subsurface deposit present and to assess CEQA significance. The Phase 2 archaeological testing plan shall be designed and completed by an approved County archaeologist in coordination with the Lilac Hills Ranch grove manager and Luiseño Native American monitor, subject to the approval of the County. The archaeological testing program shall be implemented at the time of planting. The significance of any resources encountered during the Phase 2 testing shall be determined by the County-approved archaeologist in consultation with the County archaeologist and the Luiseño Native American Monitor. If the Phase 2 testing determines that the western portion of the site does not meet the CEQA significance criteria, then the ongoing agricultural use (i.e., citrus grove with a drip irrigation system) shall be allowed under the open space easement. The open space easement shall also specify | Less than Significant |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.6 Cultural Resources (cont.) | | that (1) ongoing orchard uses shall limit ground disturbance to tree plantings and orchard maintenance; (2) the interval between tree plantings will have a radius of 30 feet from one another, (3) no additional subsurface irrigation shall be installed and/or implemented throughout the entire archaeological site in perpetuity, and (4) no trails shall be permitted within the site. The eastern portion of site CA-SDI-20436 shall remain undisturbed and will be preserved through avoidance and surrounded by natural barriers, as addressed in the RMP (Appendix G, Attachment 17).<br>If the western portion of site CA-SDI-20436 is determined to contain a CEQA significant deposit, (1) existing agricultural operations shall not expand, and (2) existing agricultural operations shall be limited in a manner to avoid impacts to the resources (e.g., no additional planting, no tree removal, no ground disturbance), as determined appropriate by the County-approved archaeologist in consultation with the County archaeologist and the Luiseño Native American Monitor. There shall be no public access to this site. Access shall be granted only to the site property owner, agents and/or employees, County of San Diego, Easement Manager, and the Bands of the Luiseño Nation upon request.<br>Because CA-SDI-20,436 is very important to the Luiseño people, all artifacts and or evidence of Native American habitation discovered and/or collected pursuant to archaeological testing for CA-SDI-20,436 shall be repatriated in accordance with the beliefs of the Luiseño people and shall not, under any circumstances, be subject to curation. Repatriation shall occur on-site in an appropriate location as determined by the Bands of the Luiseño Nation. | |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.6 Cultural Resources (cont.) | **Impact CR-2**: Unknown CEQA and/or RPO-significant archaeological resources could be buried within the project site. Such previously undiscovered cultural sites could be disturbed during on-site grading activities. Impacts to any unknown cultural resources are potentially significant. | **M-CR-2:** Prior to approval of grading or improvement plans for any phase of the project (on- or off-site) or associated with improvements to the Miller Station site, the 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 Planning & Development Services. This program shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following actions:<br>a. Provide evidence to the Department of Planning & Development Services that a County-approved archaeologist has been contracted to implement a grading monitoring and data recovery program to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning & Development Services.<br>The letter shall include the following guidelines:<br>(1) The project archaeologist shall contract with a Luiseño Native American monitor to be involved with the grading monitoring program as outlined in the County of San Diego Report Format and Content Guidelines (2007d).<br>(2) The County-approved archaeologist and Luiseño Native American monitor shall attend the pre-grading meeting with the contractors to explain and coordinate the requirements of the monitoring program as outlined in the County of San Diego Report Format and Content Guidelines (2007d).<br>(3) The project archaeologist and the Luiseño Native American Monitor shall monitor all areas identified for development including off-site improvements.<br>(4) During the original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits, the project archaeological monitor(s) and Luiseño Native American monitor(s) shall be on-site as determined by the project archaeologist ~~of~~ monitoring the excavations. Inspections will vary based on the rate of excavation, the materials excavated, and the presence and abundance of artifacts and features. The frequency and location of inspections | Less than Significant |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.6 Cultural Resources (cont.) | | will be determined by the project archaeologist in consultation with the Luiseño Native American monitor. Monitoring of cutting of previously disturbed deposits will be determined by the project archaeologist.<br>(5) Isolates and clearly non-significant deposits will be minimally documented in the field and the monitored grading can proceed.<br>(6) In the event that previously unidentified potentially significant cultural resources are discovered, the project archaeological monitor(s) and/or the Luiseño Native American Monitor shall have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area of the discovery to allow evaluation of potentially significant cultural resources. The project archaeologist shall contact the County<br>Archaeologist at the time of the discovery. The project archaeologist, in consultation with the County archaeologist and the Luiseño Native American Monitor, shall determine the significance of the discovered resources. The County Archaeologist must concur with the evaluation before construction activities will be allowed to resume in the affected area. For significant cultural resources, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program or other agreed upon mitigation shall be prepared by the consulting archaeologist and approved by the County Archaeologist, then carried out using professional archaeological methods. If the cultural resources is determined to be Native American in origin, the Research Design and Data Recovery Program or other agreed upon mitigation shall be prepared by the consulting archaeologist in coordination with the Luiseño Native American Monitor and approved by the County Archaeologist, then carried out using professional archaeological methods that take into account traditional Luiseño beliefs and practices. | |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.6 Cultural Resources (cont.) | | (7) If any human remains are discovered, Health & Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 shall be followed. If any human remains are discovered, the project archaeologist shall halt activities that could potentially disturb the remains and contact the County Coroner. 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, shall be contacted by the project archaeologist in order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains.<br>(8) Before construction activities are allowed to resume in the affected area, the artifacts shall be recovered and features recorded using professional archaeological methods or, if artifacts are determined to be of Native American origin, alternative mitigation may be applied as agreed upon through consultation with the project archaeologist, the County Archaeologist, and the Luiseño Native American monitor. The project archaeologist shall determine the amount of material to be recovered for an adequate artifact sample for analysis.<br>(9) In the event that previously unidentified cultural resources are discovered, all cultural material collected during the grading monitoring program shall be processed and curated at a San Diego facility or a culturally affiliated Tribal curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79, and therefore would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within San Diego County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the curation facility identifying that archaeological materials have been received and that all fees have been paid. | |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.6 Cultural Resources (cont.) | | Or<br>Alternatively, cultural material collected may be repatriated to the appropriate Luiseño tribe. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the tribe that archaeological materials have been received.<br>(10) Monthly status reports shall be submitted to the Director of Planning & Development Services starting from the date of the notice to proceed to termination of implementation of the grading monitoring program. The reports shall briefly summarize all activities during the period and the status of progress on overall plan implementation. Upon completion of the implementation phase, a final report shall be submitted describing the plan compliance procedures and site conditions before and after construction.<br>(11) In the event that previously unidentified cultural resources are discovered, a report documenting the field and analysis results and interpreting the artifacts and research data within the research context shall be completed and submitted to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning & Development Services. The report shall include Department of Parks and Recreation Primary and Archaeological Site forms.<br>(12) In the event that no cultural resources are discovered, a brief letter to that effect shall be sent to the Director of Planning & Development Services by the consulting archaeologist that the grading monitoring activities have been completed.<br>b. Provide evidence to the Director of Public Works that the following notes have been placed on the Grading Plan:<br>(1) The County-approved archaeologist and Luiseño Native American monitor shall attend the pre-construction meeting with the contractors to explain and coordinate the requirements of the monitoring program. | |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.6 Cultural Resources (cont.) | | (2) The project archaeologist and the Luiseño Native American Monitor shall monitor all areas identified for development including off-site improvements.<br>(3) During the original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits, the project archaeological monitor(s) and Luiseño Native American monitor(s) shall be on-site as determined by the project archaeologist of the excavations. Inspections will vary based on the rate of excavation, the materials excavated, and the presence and abundance of artifacts and features. The frequency and location of inspections will be determined by the project archaeologist in consultation with the Luiseño Native American monitor. Monitoring of cutting of previously disturbed deposits will be determined by the project archaeologist, in consultation with the Luiseño Native American monitor.<br>(4) In the event that previously unidentified potentially significant cultural resources are discovered, the project archaeological monitor(s) and/or the Luiseño Native American Monitor shall have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area of the discovery to allow evaluation of potentially significant cultural resources. The project archaeologist shall contact the County Archaeologist at the time of the discovery. The project archaeologist, in consultation with the County archaeologist and the Luiseño Native American Monitor, shall determine the significance of the discovered resources. The County Archaeologist must concur with the evaluation before construction activities will be allowed to resume in the affected area. For significant cultural resources, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program or other agreed upon mitigation shall be prepared by the consulting archaeologist in coordination with the Luiseño Native American Monitor and approved by the County Archaeologist, then carried out using professional archaeological methods that will take into account traditional Luiseño beliefs and practices. | |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.6 Cultural Resources (cont.) | | (5) The project archaeological monitor(s) and Luiseño Native American monitor shall monitor all areas identified for development.<br>(6) If any human remains are discovered, Health & Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 shall be followed. If any human remains are discovered, the project archaeologist shall halt activities that could potentially disturb the remains and contact the County Coroner. 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, shall be contacted by the project archaeologist order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains.<br>(7) The project archaeologist shall submit monthly status reports to the Director of Planning & Development Services starting from the date of the notice to proceed to termination of implementation of the grading monitoring program. The reports shall briefly summarize all activities during the period and the status of progress on overall plan implementation. Upon completion of the implementation phase, a final report shall be submitted describing the plan compliance procedures and site conditions before and after construction.<br>(8) Prior to rough grading inspection sign-off, provide evidence that the field grading monitoring activities have been completed to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning & Development Services. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the Project Investigator.<br>(9) Prior to Final Grading Release, submit to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Development Services, a final report that documents the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the Archaeological Monitoring Program. The report shall also include the following:<br>(a) Department of Parks and Recreation Primary and Archaeological Site forms. | |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.6 Cultural Resources (cont.) | | (b) Evidence that all cultural material collected during the grading monitoring program has been curated at a San Diego facility or a culturally affiliated Tribal curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79, and therefore would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/ researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within San Diego County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the curation facility identifying that archaeological materials have been received and that all fees have been paid. Alternatively, cultural material collected may be repatriated to the appropriate Luiseño band(s).<br>Or<br>In the event that no cultural resources are discovered, a brief letter to that effect shall be sent to the Director of Planning &Development Services by the project archaeologist that the grading monitoring activities have been completed. | |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.6 Cultural Resources (cont.) | **Impact CR-3:** The improvements proposed within and adjacent to CA-SDI-5072 could result in significant impacts if any trenching required for off-site improvements in this area would affect native soils. | **M-CR-3:** Prior to approval of off-site improvement plans, if it is determined that trenching for signalization cannot be accommodated within the existing fill layer above native soils within CA-SDI-5072, a capping plan shall be developed and implemented to preserve site deposits beneath the roadway improvements. The capping plan shall be similar to that implemented for construction of I-15 and associated facilities in the area of this site and consist of the following:<br>a. Any brushing and grubbing required shall be completed by hand;<br>b. The soil cap shall be at least 12 inches thick and shall consist of documented fill soil that is free of any cultural material;<br>c. Fill material shall be placed by end-dumping using rubber-tired vehicles prior to any other grading operations;<br>d. All work in the vicinity of CA-SDI-5072 shall be monitored by an archaeologist and a Native American (Luiseño) monitor;<br>e. There shall be no storage or staging of equipment or vehicles within the boundaries of the archaeological site, except in areas that are already paved;<br>f. There shall be no encroachment into the archaeological site by workers or vehicles except in areas that are already paved or capped. | Less than Significant |
| | **Impact CR-4:** Ground-disturbing activity associated with potential improvements to the Miller Fire Station site could result in disturbance of previously undiscovered cultural sites. Impacts to any unknown cultural resources are potentially significant. | See **M-CR-2.** | Less than Significant |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.7 Hazards/ Hazardous Materials | **Impact HZ-1:** The project would result in a potentially significant adverse impact associated with wildland fires, due to the fact that within several areas of the project site, fuel modification zones would be less than 100-feet in width, as required by County Fire Code. | **M-HZ-1:** For areas within the project site where buildings or structures do not meet the standard 100-foot setback for fuel management, one of the following measures shall be met:<br>A. Prior to approval of the first Final Map, a recorded easement on adjacent property shall be obtained in order to meet FMZ standards off-site.<br>B. If an easement on adjacent property cannot be obtained, the applicant shall select alternative mitigation measures from those described in the FPP that achieve the same level of protection. the specific measures shall be subject to approval by DSFPD and once approved, shall be incorporated into the site plan and/or use permit plot plan for the area. The alternative mitigation measures that could be selected include:<br>1. Additional ignition-resistant construction methods and other non-combustible features, such as parking lots, sidewalks, concrete patios, decorative rock, natural boulders on-site, and similar landscape features; and/or<br>2. Fire-barrier walls.<br>Either measure A or B above shall be met before the first Final Map is approved. | Less than Significant |
| 2.8 Noise | **Traffic-generated Noise (Direct)**<br>**Impact N-1:** Traffic generated noise at identified exterior receivers would be significant.<br>**Impact N-2:** Interior noise levels of second floor receivers adjacent to the roadways could exceed allowable interior noise levels and would result in a significant impact. | **M-N-1:** Prior to approval of the Master Tentative Map, or subsequent Implementing Tentative Map, as appropriate, the project applicant shall dedicate “noise protection easements” on the master tentative map and each subsequent implementing tentative map for all lots located within the 60 CNEL contour, as shown on Figures 2.8-2a and 2.8-2b.<br>The noise protection easements shall contain a restriction requiring compliance with the standards for the subject land use as stated in Tables N-1 and N-2 of the County General Plan Noise Element (see Appendix M, Tables 7 and 8). Potential feasible measures to achieve | Less than Significant |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.8 Noise (cont.) | | compliance include, but are not limited to, altering lot configurations and building locations, varying grading contours, and construction of solid barriers (i.e., sound walls). The noise easement shall contain the following language.<br>• For single-family residential uses: The noise level at exterior use areas associated with single-family detached dwelling units, shall be measured at an outdoor living area that adjoins and is on the same lot as the dwelling and that contains at least the following minimum net lot area:<br>▪ For lots less than 4,000 square feet in area, the exterior area shall include 400 square feet;<br>▪ For lots between 4,000 square feet to 10 acres in area, the exterior area shall include 10 percent of the lot area; and<br>▪ For lots over 10 acres in area, the exterior area shall include 1 acre.<br>• Noise levels within the single-family residential exterior use areas shall not exceed 60 CNEL.<br>▪ For single-family lots along West Lilac Road, west of Main Street and single-family properties fronting Main Street, located between West Lilac Road and C Street, a site specific design for building placement and inclusion of wing walls would be required to reduce noise levels at exterior NSLU areas.<br>▪ For residential lots other than single-family lots: The noise level at exterior use area is defined as areas which are provided for private or group usable open space purposes (as defined in Table N-2 of the County General Plan Noise Element).<br>Noise levels in the exterior use areas for all other residential uses shall not exceed 65 CNEL. These areas include areas which are provided for private or group usable open space purposes (as defined in Table N-2 of the County General Plan Noise Element). | |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.8 Noise (cont.) | | • For non-residential noise sensitive land uses: The exterior use areas are subject to the noise level as specified in the County Noise Element, Tables N-1 and N-2.<br>• For all other land uses the exterior noise level standard shall not exceed the limit defined as "Acceptable" in Table N-1 of the County General Plan Noise Element or the equivalent one-hour noise standard.<br>• The lots with the noise protection easements shall be identified on all Final Maps.<br>**M-N-2:** Prior to issuance of any building permit for properties located in noise restriction easements, the building permit applicant shall demonstrate that interior noise levels due to exterior noise sources would not exceed the applicable standards detailed below for the subject land use (see Figures 2.9-2a and 2.9-2b). In these cases, it is anticipated that the typical method of compliance would be to provide the homes with air conditioning or equivalent forced air circulation, dual pane windows and weather stripping for doors, to allow occupancy with closed windows, which, for most residential construction, would provide sufficient exterior-to-interior noise reduction.<br>An acoustical study shall be prepared to demonstrate and verify that interior noise levels are below 45 CNEL in all residential structures, and below 50 CNEL within schools, churches, medical/dental facilities (i.e., hospitals, laboratories, nursing homes) child care facilities, government facilities, and commercial uses (office and retail). | |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.8 Noise (cont.) | **Impact N-3:** Traffic generated noise at off-site receivers adjacent to Covey Lane and future Lilac Hills Ranch Road would increase significantly over existing conditions and would result in a significant impact. | See **M-N-1**.<br>However, impacts associated with traffic related noise increase would remain significant and unavoidable. | Significant and Unavoidable |
| | **Stationary and Construction Noise (Direct)**<br>*Operational Impacts*<br>**Impact N-4:** Noise at exterior receivers due to the location of HVACS would result in a significant impact.<br>**Impact N-5:** Noise at exterior receivers due to the location of non-emergency generators would result in a significant impact.<br>**Impact N-6:** Noise at exterior receivers due to the location of parking lots would result in a significant impact<br>**Impact N-7:** Noise at exterior receivers due to the location of loading docks would result in a significant impact..<br>**Impact N-8:** Noise levels due to dog park activities would be a significant noise impact.<br>**Impact N-9:** The project includes the construction and operation of a WRF the location of which would result in a significant impact at exterior noise receiver locations.<br>**Impact N-10:** The project includes the construction and operation of a RF the location of which would result in a significant impact at exterior noise receiver locations. | **M-N-3:** Best engineering practices shall be used ~~and considered~~ in the placement of noise generating equipment and shielding when installing stationary noise sources associated with HVAC systems and standby generators. Prior to the issuance of any building permit for stationary noise generating equipment such as HVAC systems or standby generators, the applicant, or its designee, shall prepare an acoustical study(s) of the proposed stationary noise sources associated with HVAC systems and standby generators for submittal to the County for review and approval. The acoustical study shall identify all noise-generating equipment and ~~predict~~ identify noise levels at the applicable property lines from all identified equipment. Where predicted noise levels would exceed those levels established by County Noise Ordinance Section 36.40, the acoustical study shall identify mitigation measures shown to be effective in reducing noise levels (e.g., structural components such as enclosures, barriers, and building ~~site~~ orientation on-site), to be implemented as necessary, to comply with the County Noise Ordinance Section 36.404, and such mitigation measures shall be implemented by the applicant or its designee prior to issuance of any building permit.<br>**M-N-4**: Best engineering practices shall be used in the placement of noise generating equipment when developing site plans for commercial land uses containing loading docks, delivery areas, and parking lots such that noise levels at the property line comply with County standards. Development plans shall be accompanied by an acoustical analysis demonstrating compliance with County standards for approval prior to issuance of building permits. Prior to the issuance of any building permit for commercial land uses containing loading | |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.8 Noise (cont.) | | docks, delivery areas, and/or parking lots, the applicant, or its designee, shall prepare an acoustical study(s) of the proposed commercial land use site plans for submittal to the County for review and approval. The acoustical study shall identify all noise-generating areas and associated equipment and shall calculate ~~predicted~~ noise levels at the applicable property lines from all identified sources. Where predicted noise levels would exceed those established by County Noise Ordinance Section 36.404, the acoustical study shall identify mitigation measures (e.g., enclosures, barriers, site orientation, reduction of parking stalls), to be implemented as necessary, to comply with the property line noise level limits established by County Noise Ordinance Section 36.404, and such measures shall be implemented by the applicant or its designee prior to the issuance of a building permit. Implementation of this measure shall also require best engineering practices to be used, including consideration of the noise rating of selected equipment, equipment orientation and placement within a site, and site design, such as building placement enclosures and the use of terrain to shield adjacent properties from on-site noise generator. | Less than Significant |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | **M-N-5:** Best engineering practices shall be used ~~and considered~~ in the placement and design of dog parks, such that noise levels at surrounding property lines comply with County standards for the applicable zone. The building plans shall be accompanied by an acoustical analysis demonstrating compliance with County standards for approval prior to issuance of building permits. Prior to the issuance of any building permit associated with the dog park, the applicant, or its designee, shall prepare an acoustical study(s) of the proposed dog parks for submittal to the County for review and approval. The acoustical study shall calculate ~~predicted~~ noise levels at potentially affected property lines from all potential sources. Where predicted noise levels would exceed those established by County Noise Ordinance Section 36.404, the acoustical study shall identify mitigation measures shown to be effective in reducing noise levels (e.g., barriers, site location, etc.) to be implemented as necessary to comply with the property line noise levels established by County Noise Ordinance Section 36.404, and such measures shall be implemented by the applicant or its designee prior to the issuance of any building permit. Implementation of this measure shall also require best engineering practices to be used, including consideration of the noise rating of selected equipment, equipment orientation and placement within a site, and site design, such as building placement enclosures and the use of terrain to shield adjacent properties from on-site noise generator. | |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.8 Noise (cont.) | | **M-N-6:** Best engineering practices shall be used ~~and considered~~ in the placement of noise generating equipment when developing site plans for the WRF such that noise levels at the property line comply with County standards. Development plans shall be accompanied by an acoustical analysis demonstrating compliance with County standards for approval prior to issuance of building permits. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for the WRF, the applicant, or its designee, shall prepare an acoustical study(s) of the proposed WRF for submittal to the County for review and approval. The acoustical study shall identify all noise-generating sources and associated equipment and calculate ~~predicted~~ noise levels at potentially affected property lines from all identified sources. Where predicted noise levels would exceed those established by County Noise Ordinance Section 36.404, the acoustical study shall identify mitigation measures shown to be effective in reducing noise levels (e.g., enclosures, barriers, site orientation, etc.) to be implemented, as necessary, to comply with the property line noise levels limits established by County Noise Ordinance Section 36.404, and such measures shall be implemented by the applicant or its designee prior to issuance of a building permit. Implementation of this measure shall also require best engineering practices to be used, including consideration of the noise rating of selected equipment, equipment orientation and placement within a site, and site design, such as building placement enclosures and the use of terrain to shield adjacent properties from on-site noise generator. | |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | **M-N-7:** Best engineering practices shall be used ~~and considered~~ in the placement of noise generating equipment when developing site plans for the recycling and green waste collection facility such that noise levels at the property line comply with County standards. Development plans shall be accompanied by an acoustical analysis demonstrating compliance with County standards for approval prior to issuance of building permits. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for the Recycling Facility, the applicant, or its designee, shall prepare an acoustical study(s) of the proposed recycling/green waste collection facility for submittal to the County for review and approval. The acoustical study shall identify all noise-generating sources and associated equipment and calculate ~~predicted~~ noise levels at potentially affected property lines from all identified sources. Where predicted noise levels would exceed those established by the County Noise Ordinance Section 36.40, the acoustical study shall identify mitigation measures shown to be effective in reducing noise levels (e.g., enclosures, barriers, site orientation, etc.) to be implemented to comply with the property line noise level limits of County Noise Ordinance Section 36.404, and such measures shall be implemented by the applicant or its designee prior to issuance of a building permit. Implementation of this measure shall also require best engineering practices to be used, including consideration of the noise rating of selected equipment, equipment orientation and placement within a site, and site design, such as building placement enclosures and the use of terrain to shield adjacent properties from on-site noise generator. | |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.8 Noise (cont.) | *Construction Impacts*<br>**Impact N-11:** As explained in the noise technical report and discussed on page 2.8-16, construction noise if allowed along more than one property line of any existing on-site property identified as NAP would be significant.<br>**Impact N-12:** Construction noise associated with the off-site Cal Fire Miller Station (if selected as the fire option, see subchapter 2.7) property would exceed noise thresholds at adjacent residential properties resulting in a significant impact.<br>**Impact N-13:** Rock crushing noise levels at surrounding and on-site property lines could exceed County standards representing a significant impact.<br>**Impact N-14:** Blasting associated with construction may result in a significant impact due to impulsive noise. | **M-N-8:** During all phases of project-related construction activities, the project applicant or designated contractor shall ensure that construction does not occur along more than one property line of any single existing on-site property that is identified as NAP on the implementing map.<br>**M-N-9:** Prior to and during project-related construction activities for the expansion of the CAL FIRE Miller Station, the project applicant(s) and primary contractor(s) shall erect a temporary 12-foot-high noise barrier sufficient to block the line of sight from the adjacent properties to the construction activities along the eastern and western property lines of CAL FIRE Miller Station. The noise barrier shall be constructed of material with a minimum weight of two pounds per square foot with no gaps or perforations. Noise barriers may be constructed of, but are not limited to, 5/8-inch plywood, 5/8-inch oriented strand board, or hay bales.<br>**M-N-10:** Prior to and during all project-related rock crushing activities, the project applicant(s) and primary contractor(s) of all project phases involving rock crushing shall ensure that all rock crushing activities are located a minimum distance of 350 feet from the nearest property line where an occupied structure is located and shall comply with County noise standards pursuant to County Noise Ordinance, Section 36.409. The 350-foot setback distance may be reduced if a noise study is conducted for rock processing activities and such activities noise levels are within acceptable County limits (Noise Ordinance section 36.409) at modified distances determined by the noise study. | Less than Significant |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.8 Noise (cont.) | | **M-N-11:** Prior to approval of the grading permit for any implementing tentative map, the project applicant or the designated contractor shall have a blast and monitoring plan prepared with an estimate of noise and vibration levels of each blast at NSLU within 1,000 feet of each blast. Where potential exceedance of the County Noise Ordinance are identified, the blast-drilling and monitoring plan shall identify mitigation measures shown to be effective in reducing noise and vibration levels (e.g., altering orientation of blast progression, increased delay between charge detonations, presplitting), to be implemented to comply with the noise level limits of County Noise Ordinance Sections 36.409 and 36.410 and the vibration level limits of 1.0 in/sec PPV, and such measures shall be implemented by the applicant or its designee prior to the issuance of the grading permit. Additionally, all project phases involving blasting shall conform to the following requirements:<br>• All blasting shall be performed by a blast contractor and blasting personnel licensed to operate in the County.<br>• Each blast shall be monitored and recorded with an air blast over-pressure monitor and groundborne vibration accelerometer approved by the County that is located outside the closest residence to the blast.<br>• A blasting plan, including estimates of the air blast over-pressure level and groundborne vibration at the residence closest to the blast, shall be submitted to the County for review prior to the first blast. Blasting shall not commence until the County has approved the blast plan.<br>• Blasting shall not exceed 1 in/sec PPV at the nearest occupied residence in accordance with County of San Diego Noise Guidelines Section 4.3.<br>Blasting shall not be conducted within 1,000 feet of on- or off-site sensitive receptors unless the Blasting Study concludes that a distance less than 1,000 feet would not exceed County construction and impulsive noise standards. | |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.8 Noise (cont.) | **Vibration (Direct)**<br>**Impact N-15:** During project grading, there would be impacts associated with the exposure of a NSLU to groundborne vibration levels associated with heavy equipment. This would result in a significant impact.<br>**Impact N-16:** During project grading and blasting operations, there would be impacts associated with the exposure of a NSLU to groundborne vibration levels associated with blasting. This would result in a significant impact. | **M-N-12:** Prior to beginning construction of any project component within 150 feet of an existing or future occupied residence or medical facility, a vibration monitoring plan shall be submitted to the County Noise Control Officer for review and approval. At a minimum, the vibration monitoring plan shall require data be sent to the County Noise Control Officer or designee on a weekly basis or more frequently as determined by the Noise Control Officer. The data shall include vibration level measurements taken during the previous work period. In the event that the County Noise Control Officer determines there is reasonable probability that future measured vibration levels would exceed allowable limits (vibration levels from blasting or pile driving in excess of 1 in/sec PPV or vibration levels from general construction in excess of 0.004 in/sec RMS), the County Noise Control Officer or designee shall take those steps necessary to ensure that future vibration levels do not exceed such limits and would be below the allowable limits, including, but not limited to suspending those further construction activities that would result in excessive vibration levels until either alternative equipment or alternative construction procedures can be used that generate vibration levels that do not exceed 0.004 RMS at the nearest residential structure. Construction activities not associated with vibration generation could continue.<br>The vibration monitoring plan shall be prepared and administered by a County-approved noise consultant. In addition to the data described above, the vibration monitoring plan shall at a minimum also include the location of vibration monitors, the vibration instrumentation utilized, a data acquisition and retention plan, and exceedance notification and reporting procedures. A description of these plan components is provided below. | Less than Significant |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.8 Noise (cont.) | | Location of Vibration Monitors: The vibration monitoring plan shall include a scaled plan indicating monitoring locations, including the location of measurements to be taken at construction site boundaries and at nearby residential properties.<br>Vibration Instrumentation: Vibration monitors shall be capable of measuring maximum unweighted RMS and PPV levels triaxially (in three directions) over a frequency range of 1 to 100 hertz. The vibration monitor will be set to automatically record daily events during working hours and to record peak triaxial PPV values in 5-minute interval histogram plots. The method of coupling the geophones to the ground will be described and included in the report. The vibration monitors shall be calibrated within one year of the measurement and the certified laboratory conformance report will be included in the report.<br>Data Acquisition: The information to be provided in the data repots shall include at a minimum daily histogram plots of PPV vs. time of day for three triaxial directions and maximum peak vector sum PPV and maximum frequency for each direction. The reports will also identify the construction equipment operating during the monitoring period and their locations and distances to all vibration measurement locations.<br>Exceedance Notification and Reporting Procedures: A description of the notification of exceedance and reporting procedures will be included and the follow-up procedures taken to reduce vibration levels to below the allowable limits. | |
| | **Cumulative Impacts**<br>**Impact N-17:** The project would place NSLUs in areas where the projected cumulative noise levels from road traffic could exceed the County's exterior noise limits. This is a significant cumulative impact. | See **M-N-1, 2, 11, and 12.**<br>However, impacts associated with cumulative traffic related noise increase would remain significant and unavoidable. | Significant and Unavoidable |

**TABLE S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS**
**(continued)**

| Subchapter/Issue | Potential Effects | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.8 Noise (cont.) | **Impact N-18:** Traffic generated noise at off-site receivers adjacent to Covey Land and future Lilac Hills Ranch Road would increase significantly over existing conditions and would result in a significant cumulative impact.<br>**Impact N-19:** If construction operations occurred on-site and off-site simultaneously, a significant cumulative impact could result.<br>**Impact N-20:** Construction noise would result in impulsive noise events from blasting. If multiple blasting operations occurred simultaneously, a significant cumulative impact could result. | See **M-N-1, 2, 11,** and **12.** | Less than Significant |

***THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.***