

## CHAPTER S.0 PROJECT SUMMARY

### S.1 Project Synopsis

The Project site consists of approximately 176.58 acres in the Spring Valley community of unincorporated San Diego County, California. The Highlands Ranch Project consists of a proposed Specific Plan Amendment (SPA 02-002), a Tentative Map (TM 5299RPL6), a Major Use Permit (P02-023) and other related implementing actions as more fully described in Section 1.0, *Project Description*. The Project is a proposed residential development involving the construction of 211 detached single-family homes on 5,000 square foot minimum lot sizes, two private parks, supporting roadways and infrastructure, and the preservation of open space. Private streets would provide access into and throughout the proposed development area, with primary site access from a continuation of Pointe Parkway at the eastern Project boundary. A second point of access is proposed from Montemar Drive at the northwest Project boundary.

The Highlands Ranch SPA would amend and supersede a previously approved Specific Plan for the site, known as the Panorama Ridge Specific Plan Amendment (SPA 83-01). When SPA 83-01 was approved in 1983, it amended and superseded the previously approved 1977 Dictionary Hill Specific Plan (SP 77-02). Please refer to EIR *Section 1.1.3, Technical, Economic, and Environmental Characteristics*, for a detailed description of the Project's entitlement history. The proposed SPA would increase open space preservation and reduce the number of residential lots from a maximum of 355 lots to a maximum of 211 lots; overall plan density would be reduced from 1.95 dwelling units per acre (du/ac) to 1.20 du/ac. Approximately 75.93 acres, or approximately 43% of the site, would be graded or otherwise disturbed to accommodate development proposed by the SPA. The remaining 100.65 acres, or 57% of the site, would be preserved as natural open space. Approximately 1,066,689 cubic yards of earthwork is proposed during site grading. Development would occur roughly in the center of the property, with natural hillsides preserved around the property perimeter. The peak of Dictionary Hill would be lowered approximately 35 feet.

Because a previous Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared for the Panorama Ridge SPA, this document is a Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) as defined in Section 15162 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. The major issues to be addressed in this SEIR as identified by the County of San Diego (*EIR Request Letter, dated August 12, 2004*) include aesthetics/visual quality, air quality, biological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, public services, recreation, transportation and traffic, and utilities and service systems.

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

Based on the analysis that follows in this SEIR, three levels of environmental impacts could occur regarding the issues that have been analyzed:

(1) **Unavoidable significant effects** are impacts that could result from the Project that are not able to be fully mitigated, and for which findings would need to be made, and a statement of overriding considerations would need to be adopted by the decision-makers for the Project to be approved. These effects are also known as significant and not mitigable environmental impacts. Impacts to aesthetics and visual quality are identified in this section.

(2) **Significant environmental effects** are impacts that could result from the Project that can be alleviated through adoption of Project-specific mitigation measures. Through the detailed analysis prepared as part of this SEIR, the following issues would result in significant environmental effects: air quality, biological resources, hydrology/water quality, noise, and transportation and traffic. Mitigation measures for these significant environmental effects are presented in the relevant sections of this SEIR and address how these Project-specific significant impacts would be fully mitigated under the requirements of CEQA. Mitigation measures would become conditions of approval. These effects are also known as significant and mitigable environmental impacts.

(3) **Effects found not to be significant** are impacts that, based upon detailed analysis in this SEIR, have been found not to result in significant impacts on the environment and for which no mitigation measures are required. Through the analysis prepared in this SEIR, the following issues are determined to be effects found not to be significant: hazards and hazardous materials, land use and planning, public services, recreation, and utilities and service systems. No mitigation measures are required related to these issues. These effects are also known as not significant impacts. Based on analysis conducted as part of the Initial Study preparation process, implementation of the proposed Project was found to have no significant impacts in the issue areas of: agriculture, cultural resources, geology and soils, minerals, and population and housing.

Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code requires that public agencies adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes made to the project or conditions of project approval, adopted in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. The reporting or monitoring program shall be designed to ensure compliance during project implementation. A list of proposed mitigation measures and environmental design considerations is provided in Chapter 8.0 of this SEIR.

*Table S-1, Summary of Environmental Effects*, located at the end of this section, includes a summary of all Project related impacts, including direct, indirect, and cumulative. Each environmental effect of the proposed Project is summarized, a determination is made as to level of significance, and a conclusion is reached as to whether the effect is reduced to a level below significant after application of the recommended mitigation measures.

### **S.3 Areas of Controversy**

At the time this SEIR was prepared, no areas of controversy have been made known to the Lead Agency related to this Project, with the exception of general community opposition to any development of the site. No issues have been presented by the applicant, the public, and/or by public agencies that raise areas of controversy related to this Project other than the Issues to be Resolved by the Decision-Making Body, as addressed below. Several environmental issues were raised by the public and public agencies in response to the Draft SEIR's Notice of Preparation. Those issues were reviewed by the County, are addressed in this SEIR, and are not viewed as controversial.

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

The issues to be resolved by the decision-making body, the San Diego County Board of Supervisors, relate to whether and how to mitigate the significant effects of the Project, whether to select the

Project as proposed or one of the Project alternatives, and whether or not the Project conforms with relevant County of San Diego codes, ordinances, and plans. These issues are discussed in detail in this SEIR. Issues that will need to be resolved by the decision-making body include the following:

- Visual Quality. The proposed Project is situated atop Dictionary Hill, a visually prominent landform within the communities of La Presa and Spring Valley. Although mitigation is provided in SEIR Section 2.1 to reduce visual quality impacts to the greatest possible extent, implementation of the proposed Project would result in a significant and unmitigable impact to visual quality. The decision-making body will need to make a determination about whether mitigation proposed by the Project would reduce impacts to the maximum practical extent.

## **S.5 Project Alternatives**

### **S.5.1 No Development Alternative**

The No Development Alternative assumes that the 176.58-acre site would not be developed, and would remain in its present condition for the foreseeable future. The Project site is undeveloped except for an existing water reservoir, electric transmission lines, and unimproved access roads. The specific impacts of the No Development Alternative compared to the proposed Project are addressed in Section 5.2, *No Development Alternative*. This Alternative would avoid impacts under every issue evaluated by this SEIR. However, this Alternative would not establish restrictions over unauthorized activities in the natural open space. Also, in the long-term, biological diversity could be reduced due to the relatively isolated nature of the site.

### **S.5.2 No Project Alternative**

The CEQA mandated No Project Alternative assumes that the site would be developed per the standards and provisions outlined in the Panorama Ridge SPA which allows for the development of 355 residential homes. CEQA §15126.6(e) requires that the SEIR include an alternative describing what would reasonably be expected to occur on the property if the Project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services. The specific impacts of the No Project Alternative compared to the proposed Project are addressed in Section 5.3, *No Project Alternative*.

### **S.5.3 Reduced Grading Alternative**

The Reduced Grading Alternative contemplates development of the site with 39 lots (10,000 s.f. minimum lot sizes), with through access provided at Pointe Parkway and an emergency access connection to Ivy Street. The specific impacts of the Reduced Grading Alternative compared to the proposed Project are addressed in Section 5.4, *Reduced Grading Alternative*. Due to the reduced number of dwelling units and reduced footprint of ground disturbance, environmental impacts would be proportionately less as compared to the proposed Project. This alternative is identified as the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

#### **S.5.4 Reduced Footprint/Maximum Density Alternative**

The Reduced Footprint/Maximum Density Alternative would increase development intensity on the site to 332 clustered single-family attached residential homes to be consistent with the land use designation of 2 du/ac applied to the site by the County's pending General Plan Update. The Alternative would divide the development into two development envelopes to reduce grading and biology impacts in the center of the site. Access to the site would be provided from the east via Pointe Parkway and from the west via Montemar Drive. The specific impacts of the Reduced Footprint/Maximum Density Alternative compared to the proposed Project are addressed in Section 5.5, *Reduced Footprint/Maximum Density Alternative*. This Alternative would slightly reduce biological resource and landform alteration impacts of the Project. Due to an increase in the number of units, however, an increase in vehicular traffic would occur on Pointe Parkway, as well as other roadways including but not limited to Jamacha Blvd. and Sweetwater Springs. A direct impact would occur on Jamacha Boulevard south of Campo Road where it would meet the significance threshold of 400 ADT. Although impacts to traffic would be fully mitigable under this Alternative, impacts to traffic would be increased as compared to the proposed Project. Likewise, impacts to air quality and noise would increase under this alternative, but mitigation is available to reduce these impacts to a level below significant. This alternative would not eliminate any of the Project's significant impacts

#### **S.5.5 Reduced Project Alternative**

The Reduced Project Alternative would reduce the number of residential lots from 211 to 150. Street layout and access would be similar to the proposed Project, as would areas proposed for grading and disturbance. Under this alternative, 150 single-family homes would be constructed on minimum 6,500 s.f. lot sizes. The specific impacts of the Reduced Project Alternative compared to the proposed Project are addressed in Section 5.6, *Reduced Project Alternative*. This Alternative would reduce impacts to aesthetics and visual quality, biological resources, air quality, noise, traffic, and hydrology and water quality.

#### **S.5.6 Reduced Visibility Alternative**

This Alternative would reconfigure residential lots and incorporate retaining walls between some lots to eliminate significant unmitigable effects to aesthetics and visual quality from the South Barcelona viewshed. The western 0.35-acre private park site would be removed under this Alternative, and the eastern private park site would be reduced in acreage from 1.03 acres to approximately 0.51-acre. The specific impacts of the Reduced Visibility Alternative compared to the proposed Project are addressed in Section 5.7, *Reduced Visibility Alternative*. As noted, this alternative would reduce impacts to visual quality from a portion of the Spring Valley community, although impacts to visual quality would remain significant and unavoidable. In addition, due to a reduction in the number of residential units from 211 to 209, environmental impacts due to traffic, air quality, noise, and public services would be essentially the same. The development footprint also would be slightly smaller, reducing impacts to biological resources.

**TABLE S SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
<b>Aesthetics/Visual Quality (See Section 2.1)</b>			
2.1-A	The proposed Project has the potential to significantly impact views from two scenic highways, Jamacha Boulevard and SR-125	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As a component of the review of future applications for building permits, the County DPLU shall review proposed architecture plans for consistency with the Project’s MUP plot plan, which includes architectural elevations and site design details found to be consistent with the Spring Valley Design Guidelines.</li> <li>2. A landscaping program shall be implemented as approved by the County of San Diego as part of P02-023. As a component of the review of future landscaping plans, the County DPLU shall review proposed landscaping plans for compliance with the Spring Valley Design Guidelines relating to landscape character. The planting program shall, at a minimum, provide for the following:                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A visual transition from natural slopes to developed areas.</li> <li>b) Screening of structures.</li> <li>c) Screening of off-street parking lots.</li> <li>d) Erosion prevention.</li> <li>e) View enhancement and slope beautification by blending landscaping in with the existing vegetation that will remain undisturbed (blending includes consideration of color, texture and placement).</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Less than Significant
2.1-B	Retaining walls proposed by the Project have the potential to conflict with the visual character of existing retaining walls within the eastern portion of the Spring Valley community.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As a component of the review of future applications for grading permits, the County DPLU shall ensure that proposed grading plans incorporate retaining walls that are composed of plantable keystone materials. In addition, a planting scheme for the retaining walls shall be provided as a component of future landscaping plans. The planting scheme shall incorporate trees and/or shrubs within the 8-foot gap between Retaining Walls 4 and 5 in order to screen these walls from off-site locations.</li> </ol>	Less than Significant

**TABLE S SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
2.1-C	<p>The Project proposes to construct manufactured slopes ranging from approximately 25 feet to 100 feet in vertical height, disturb steep natural slopes, and alter a portion of the site’s topographic landform (i.e., lower the peak of Dictionary Hill by 35 feet). These proposed changes to the landform would be visible from the east and northeast within the Spring Valley community and could result in a physical change to the visual environment that is in conflict with the visual character of the area.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mitigation Measure 2.1-A(2) shall apply.</li> <li>2. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the County DPLU shall review drainage plans to ensure that practical, drainage devices on graded slopes will be located so as to minimize visibility. Concrete drains shall be color tinted to blend with the natural soil color, and landscaping shall be used to further screen drainage devices, as appropriate.</li> <li>3. As a component of the review of future grading and landscape plans, the County DPLU shall ensure that manufactured slopes adjacent to natural open space areas have been revegetated with native plant species. Areas of cut face shall be serrated to create a “pocket” in which trees and shrubs can take hold. Serration requirements shall be noted on Project grading plans.</li> </ol>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
2.1-D	<p>Project implementation, when considered in the context of other existing developments, would result in a direct and cumulatively significant visual quality impact to the Spring Valley viewshed due to the visual prominence of proposed grading activities. In addition, changes to the appearance of the Project site due to the addition of homes that would be visible from portions of the La Presa and Spring Valley viewsheds would result in significant impact to a scenic resource (i.e., Dictionary Hill) if measures are not incorporated into the Project’s design that would minimize the visual prominence of the proposed development.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mitigation Measures 2.1-A(1), 2.1-A(2), 2.1-C(2), and 2.1-C(3) shall apply.</li> </ol>	<p>Significant</p>

**TABLE S SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
2.1-E	Project lighting has the potential to result in light and glare impacts that have the potential to affect daytime and nighttime views in the area.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As a component of the review of building permits, the County DPLU shall review proposed lighting plans to ensure compliance with the Light Pollution Code (San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Division 9, Sections 59.101-59.115). In addition, the review of proposed lighting plans also should ensure that proposed lighting elements are consistent with the Project’s MUP plot plan.</li> <li>2. Prior to the approval of building permits, the County DPLU shall review proposed construction materials to verify that windows proposed for residential homes are consistent with the requirements of the MUP plot plans and architectural design guidelines pertaining to window treatments.</li> </ol>	
<b>Air Quality (See Section 3.1)</b>			
3.1-A	Should the rock crushing plant be required during project grading activities, project implementation would exceed the SDAPCD construction-related air quality standards for oxides of nitrogen (NO <sub>x</sub> ), which would be regarded as a significant direct and cumulative impact.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. During operation of the on-site rock crusher, the following Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be implemented during construction activities in order to reduce NO<sub>x</sub> emissions:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use electricity from power poles rather than temporary diesel power generators for all stationary construction equipment (estimated 50% reduction in emissions).</li> <li>• The construction supervisor shall instruct all diesel-fueled construction vehicle operators to restrict idling times to five minutes and to turn off engines when vehicles are not in use. Idling restrictions shall be noted on all grading plans and construction drawings.</li> <li>• Construction equipment operating onsite shall be equipped with two to four degree engine timing retard or pre-combustion chamber engines (estimated 20% reduction in emissions).</li> <li>• Daily NO<sub>x</sub> monitoring on the project site shall be performed by an Air Quality engineer approved by the County during operation of the rock crusher. Should</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	Less than Significant

**TABLE S SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>NOx levels over the 1-hr CAAQS for NO<sub>2</sub> or 0.25 ppm be identified, use of the rock crusher shall be temporarily suspended until applicable control measures are implemented as required by the Air Quality engineer.</p>	
3.1-B	<p>Without incorporation of design control measures during grading, a significant short-term impact due to PM<sub>10</sub> emissions from fugitive dust would result.</p>	<p>1. In conformance with Section 87.101 (et seq.) of the County’s Grading Ordinance, the following design control measures shall be implemented into the construction plan in order to reduce the potential for dust generation (i.e., PM<sub>10</sub>) during construction activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In disturbed areas, ground cover shall be replaced as quickly as possible, in conformance with Section 87.417(a) of the County’s Grading Ordinance (estimated 10% reduction in PM<sub>10</sub> emissions);</li> <li>• Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply non-toxic soil binders according to manufacturers’ specification to exposed piles (i.e., gravel, sand, and dirt) with 5% silt content, in conformance with Section 87.428 of the County’s Grading Ordinance (estimated 30% reduction in PM<sub>10</sub> emissions);</li> <li>• In conformance with Section 87.428 of the County’s Grading Ordinance, during construction, use water trucks or sprinkler systems to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. At a minimum, this should include wetting down such areas in the late morning and after work is completed for the day. Increased watering frequency should be required whenever the wind speed exceeds 15 mph. Reclaimed water should be used whenever possible (estimated 50% reduction in PM<sub>10</sub> emissions);</li> <li>• Suspend all excavating and grading operations when wind speeds exceed 25 mph (estimated 30% reduction in PM<sub>10</sub> emissions);</li> <li>• All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least</li> </ul>	Less than Significant

**TABLE S SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>two feet of freeboard (i.e., minimum vertical distance between the top of the load and the top of the trailer) in accordance with the requirements of California Vehicle Code (CVC) Section 23114 (estimated 15% reduction in PM<sub>10</sub> emissions);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restrict onsite vehicle speeds on unpaved surfaces to 15 miles per hour or less, in conformance with Section 87.428 of the County’s Grading Ordinance (estimated 30% reduction in PM<sub>10</sub> emissions). Submit to the Director, Department of Planning and Land Use evidence that temporary 15 MPH signs have been placed along unpaved roads and/or haulways before construction occurs. Evidence shall include photographs of the signs placed on the project site and a stamped, signed statement from a California Registered Engineer, or licensed surveyor that 15 MPH speed signs have been placed along these routes;</li> <li>• Gravel pads must be installed at all access points to prevent tracking of mud on to public roads, in conformance with Section 87.428 of the County’s Grading Ordinance (estimated 5% reduction in PM<sub>10</sub> emissions);</li> <li>• In conformance with Section 87.422(a) of the County’s Grading Ordinance, the contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons as a “Permit Compliance Engineer” to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering, as necessary, to prevent transport of dust offsite. Their duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the Air Pollution Control District prior to land use clearance for map recordation and land use clearance for finish grading for the structure;</li> <li>• In conformance with Section 87.208(b)(7) of the</li> </ul>	

**TABLE S SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>County’s Grading Ordinance, prior to land use clearance, the applicant shall include, as a note on a separate informational sheet, these dust control requirements. All requirements shall be shown on grading and building plans;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In conformance with Section 87.428 of the County’s Grading Ordinance, sweep streets at the end of the day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public paved roads (recommended water sweepers with reclaimed water; estimated 10% reduction in PM<sub>10</sub> emissions);</li> <li>• In conformance with Section 87.428 of the County’s Grading Ordinance, apply water three times daily (or as needed) to all unpaved roads and parking or staging areas (estimated 30% reduction in PM<sub>10</sub> emissions);</li> <li>• Periodic (once weekly) PM<sub>10</sub> monitoring shall be performed by a County-approved Air Quality engineer to ensure compliance with the County’s Grading Ordinance. Should PM<sub>10</sub> emissions be found to exceed an ambient air quality concentration increase of 5 parts per billion, grading activities shall be temporarily reduced until control measures are implemented as required by the Air Quality engineer.</li> </ul>	
<b>Biological Resources (See Section 3.2)</b>			
3.2-A	The Project would directly impact a total of 69.91 acres of coastal sage scrub.	<p>The impacts to 69.91 acres of coastal sage scrub will be mitigated at a ratio of 1.5:1 providing for the preservation of a total of 104.9 acres of Tier II (coastal sage scrub) habitat within the MSCP Subregion, in compliance with the Biological Mitigation Ordinance.</p> <p>The conditions of approval will require that prior to issuance of grading permits or improvement plans and prior to approval of the Final Map, the applicant shall (a) grant an open space easement to the County of San Diego preserving 96.3 acres of coastal sage scrub as shown on the Open</p>	Less than Significant

**TABLE S SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		Space Exhibit or Tentative Map, and (b) provide for the approval of the County DPLU Director evidence that 8.6 acres of Tier II habitat credit has been secured in a County approved mitigation bank within the MSCP Subregion.	
3.2-B	The Project would directly impact a total of 0.36-acre of non-native grassland on-site.	Mitigation for on-site impacts to 0.36 acres of non-native grassland will be preservation of comparable habitat at a ratio of 0.5:1 providing for the preservation of a minimum of 0.18 acres of Tier III (non-native grassland) habitat, in compliance with the Biological Mitigation Ordinance.  The conditions of approval will require that prior to issuance of grading permits or improvement plans and prior to approval of the Final Map, the applicant shall grant an open space easement to the County of San Diego which preserves approximately 1.6 acres of non-native grassland as shown on the Open Space Exhibit or Tentative Map.	Less than Significant
3.2-C	The Project would directly impact 1.68 acres of non-native grassland off-site.	Mitigation for impacts to 1.68 acres of non-native grassland will be preservation of comparable habitat at a ratio of 0.5:1 providing for the preservation of a minimum of 0.84 acres of Tier III (non-native) grassland habitat, in compliance with the Biological Mitigation Ordinance.  The conditions of approval will require that prior to issuance of grading permits or improvement plans and prior to approval of the Final Map, the applicant shall grant an open space easement to the County of San Diego which preserves approximately 1.6 acres of non-native grassland as shown on the Open Space Exhibit or Tentative Map.	Less than Significant
3.2-D	Short-term direct and indirect impacts to sensitive habitats, plants and wildlife species have the potential to occur during project construction.	Mitigation for inadvertent damage to the preserve area during construction will be (1) maintaining conspicuous temporary fencing to mark the limits of grading, and (2) employing a project biologist to monitor clearing and grading activities and to provide education to the construction superintendent regarding the sensitivity of the	

**TABLE S SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>onsite biological resources and the need to prevent any direct construction impacts.</p> <p>Project Design Elements which reduce the potential for impacts include maintaining compliance with the Stormwater Management Plan and Grading Ordinance, monitoring contractor conduct for site cleanliness (to avoid attracting predators), keeping construction maintenance and storage activities away from the preserve, minimizing night lighting near the preserve, and reporting to the County weekly.</p>	
3.2-E	<p>Indirect impacts to sensitive habitats, plants and wildlife species may occur due to edge effects, human intrusion and domestic animals.</p>	<p>Mitigation for indirect impacts to sensitive habitats, plants and wildlife species will be (1) permanent fencing between the development and the preserve boundary to reduce the potential for unauthorized human and domestic animal access, (2) dedicating a limited building zone easement to reduce the risk of fire fuel modification requirements in the preserve, and (3) funding and implementation of a Habitat Management Plan (HMP) that will provide stewardship for the preserve, monitoring and remediation of Project-related indirect impacts in the preserve, and reporting on the status of the preserve, and naming the County as a third party beneficiary to the HMP fund.</p>	Less than Significant
3.2-F	<p>The Project would directly impact approximately 12.8% (2,425 plants) of the onsite variegated Dudleya population.</p>	<p>Mitigation for direct impacts to variegated dudleya will be (1) avoidance of 80% of the population onsite, and (2) additional mitigation at a 2:1 mitigation ratio, in accordance with the Biological Mitigation Ordinance. In addition, the MSCP species management directives to conduct species-specific monitoring and protect the species from edge effects have been incorporated into the Project’s HMP [Measure 3.2-E(3)].</p> <p>The conditions of approval will require (1) avoiding 80% of the onsite population; (2) preservation of an additional</p>	Less than Significant

**TABLE S SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		7.2 percent (1,360 plants) of the onsite population; and (3) off-site mitigation of 3,490 variegated Dudleya plants, or other acreage deemed acceptable by the Director of the County Department of Planning and Land Use (which can be included in the total coastal sage scrub mitigation acreage as required by Mitigation Measure No. 3.2-A), to be purchased in a pre-approved mitigation bank within the MSCP Subregion..	
3.2-G	The Project would directly impact approximately 6.0% (849 plants) of the onsite San Diego goldenstar population.	Mitigation for direct impacts to San Diego goldenstar will be (1) avoidance of 80% of the population onsite, and (2) additional mitigation at a 2:1 mitigation ratio, in accordance with the Biological Mitigation Ordinance. In addition, the MSCP species management directive to protect the species from edge effects has been incorporated into the Project’s HMP [Measure 3.2-E(3)].  The conditions of approval will require (1) avoiding 80% of the onsite population, and (2) preservation of an additional 14 percent (1,981 plants) of the on-site population.	Less than Significant
3.2-H	The Project would directly impact 17.9% (170 plants) of the onsite coast barrel cactus population (950 plants).	Mitigation for direct impacts to coast barrel cactus will be (1) avoidance of 80% of the population onsite, and (2) additional mitigation at a 1:1 mitigation ratio, in accordance with the Biological Mitigation Ordinance. In addition, the MSCP species management directives to protect the species from edge effects, unauthorized collection, and to require fire management to avoid a too frequent fire cycle have been incorporated into the Project’s HMP [Measure 3.2-E(3)].  The conditions of approval will include (1) avoiding 80% of the onsite population; (2) preservation of an additional 2.1 percent (20 plants) of the on-site population; and (3) off-site mitigation of 150 coast barrel cactus plants, or other acreage deemed acceptable by the Director of the County	Less than Significant

**TABLE S SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		Department of Planning and Land Use (which can be included in the total coastal sage scrub mitigation acreage as required by Mitigation Measure No. 3.2-A), to be purchased in a pre-approved offsite mitigation bank within the MSCP Subregion.	
3.2-I	The Project would impact approximately 3.3 acres, or 16.7%; of the onsite population of Munz’s sage (20 acres).	Mitigation for direct impacts to Munz’s sage will be (1) avoidance of 80% of the population onsite, and (2) additional mitigation at a 1:1 mitigation ratio in accordance with the Biological Mitigation Ordinance.  The conditions of approval will include (1) avoiding 80% of the onsite population; (2) preservation of an additional 3.3 percent (0.7 acres) of the on-site population; and (3) off-site mitigation of 2.7 acres of habitat dominated by Munz’s sage, or other acreage deemed acceptable by the Director of the County Department of Planning and Land Use (which can be included in the total coastal sage scrub mitigation acreage as required by Mitigation Measure No. 3.2-A), to be purchased in a pre-approved offsite mitigation bank within the MSCP Subregion.	Less than Significant
3.2-J	The Project would impact approximately 85.6% of the onsite western Dichondra population.	Mitigation for direct impacts to western Dichondra is mitigated on a habitat basis in compliance with Mitigation Measure No. 3.2-A. This is because Dichondra is fairly common in the region, but of limited distribution. Because habitat-based mitigation will occur in the MSCP subarea, it will also benefit this species and will mitigate this impact.	Less than Significant
3.2-K	The Project would impact the observed location of one coastal rosy boa and habitat for the species.	Mitigation for direct impacts to coastal rosy boa is mitigated on a habitat basis in compliance with Mitigation Measure No. 3.2-A. This is because rosy boa, while not common, is widespread where adequate blocks of habitat are present in the region. Because habitat-based mitigation will occur according to MSCP preserve design criteria, it will benefit this species and will mitigate this impact.	Less than Significant

**TABLE S SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
3.2-L	The Project would impact the observed location of one orange-throated whiptail and habitat for the species.	Mitigation for direct impacts to orange-throated whiptail is mitigated on a habitat basis in compliance with Mitigation Measure 3.2-A. This is because this whiptail is fairly common where adequate blocks of habitat are present in the region. Because habitat-based mitigation will occur according to MSCP preserve design criteria, it will benefit this species and will mitigate this impact. In addition, the MSCP species management directive to protect the species from edge effects has been incorporated into the project’s HMP [Measure 3.2-E(3)].	Less than Significant
3.2-M	The Project would impact the observed locations of nine coastal California gnatcatchers: three pairs, two juveniles, and one individual adult, and territory and habitat for the species.	Mitigation for direct impacts to California gnatcatcher will be (1) purchase of offsite habitat containing 9 California gnatcatcher individuals, to be secured in a County approved mitigation bank within the MSCP Subregion and (2) implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.2-A(1) which includes preservation of 93.3 acres of coastal sage scrub onsite, currently providing habitat for 19 California gnatcatchers. Mitigation for indirect construction impacts will be (3) the MSCP-required restriction of brushing and clearing of occupied habitat between March 1 and August 15 and (4) providing for a monitoring biologist to be responsible for locating the birds in the clearing area and flushing them from the impact footprint. Long-term indirect impacts will occur with permanent fencing, dedication of a limited building zone, and the projects HMP [Mitigation Measure 3.2-E(3)]. MSCP species management directives apply that require measures to reduce edge effects and minimize disturbance during the nesting period, fire management to avoid a too frequent fire cycle and maintain habitat quality have been incorporated into the project’s HMP.	Less than Significant
3.2-N	The Project would directly impact habitat for the coast horned lizard.	Mitigation for direct impacts to coast horned lizard is mitigated on a habitat basis in compliance with Mitigation Measure 3.2-A. This is because coast horned lizard, while not common, is widespread where adequate blocks of	Less than Significant

**TABLE S SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>habitat are present in the region. Because habitat-based mitigation will occur according to MSCP preserve design criteria, it will benefit this species and will mitigate this impact. In addition, the MSCP species management directives to protect the species from edge effects, including the spread of Argentine ants, has been incorporated into the project’s HMP [Measure 3.2-E(3)].</p>	
3.2-O	<p>The Project would directly impact habitat for the Bell’s sage sparrow.</p>	<p>Mitigation for direct impacts to Bell’s sage sparrow is mitigated on a habitat basis in compliance with Mitigation Measure 3.2-A. This is because sage sparrow, while not common, is widespread where adequate blocks of habitat are present in the region. Because habitat-based mitigation will occur according to MSCP preserve design criteria, it will benefit this species and will mitigate this impact. Mitigation Measure 3.2-M will also benefit this species by reducing the potential for short-term direct impacts from construction.</p>	Less than Significant
3.2-P	<p>The Project would impact the observed locations of eight southern California rufous-crowned sparrows and habitat for this species.</p>	<p>Mitigation for direct impacts to southern California rufous-crowned sparrow is mitigated on a habitat basis in compliance with Mitigation Measure 3.2-A. This is because this sparrow is generally widespread where adequate blocks of habitat are present in the region. Because habitat-based mitigation will occur according to MSCP preserve design criteria, it will benefit this species and will mitigate this impact. In addition, the MSCP species management directive to encourage open phases of coastal sage scrub has been incorporated into the project’s HMP [Measure 3.2-E(3)]. Mitigation Measure 3.2-M will also benefit this species by reducing the potential for short-term direct impacts from construction.</p>	Less than Significant

**TABLE S SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
3.2-Q	The Project would impact the observed locations of five San Diego black-tailed jackrabbits and habitat for this species.	Mitigation for direct impacts to black-tailed jackrabbit is mitigated on a habitat basis in compliance with Mitigation Measure No. 3.2-A. This is because jackrabbit, while not common, is widespread where adequate blocks of habitat are present in the region. Because habitat-based mitigation will occur according to MSCP preserve design criteria, it will benefit this species and will mitigate this impact.	Less than Significant.
3.2-R	The Project has the potential to indirectly impact nesting raptors (red-shouldered hawks, red-tailed hawks, Cooper’s hawks, and sharp-shinned hawks) during construction in the eucalyptus woodland located in the northeastern corner of the site.	Mitigation for indirect impacts to nesting raptors will be a prohibition on grading or clearing allowed within 500 feet of the eucalyptus woodland habitat between February 15 and July 15. This measure can be waived by the Director of Planning and Land Use if pre-grading surveys show that no active raptor nests are present.	Less than Significant.
3.2-S	The Project would directly impact foraging habitat for the northern harrier.	Mitigation for direct impacts to northern harrier and other raptors is mitigated on a habitat basis in compliance with Mitigation Measure 3.2-A. This is because raptor foraging habitat is widespread where adequate blocks of habitat is present in the region. Because habitat-based mitigation will occur according to MSCP preserve design criteria, it will provide raptor foraging habitat and will mitigate this impact. Mitigation Measure 3.2-M will reduce the potential for short-term direct impacts from construction.	Less than Significant.
<b>Hydrology and Water Quality (See Section 3.3)</b>			
3.3-A	Project implementation would result in the increase of peak discharge from the site as follows: Basin N1: 5.33 cfs; Basin N2: 7.84 cfs; Basin W1: 1.38 cfs; Basin W2: 1.34 cfs; Basin W3: 1.55 cfs; Basin S1: 14.66 cfs; Basin S2: 12.58 cfs; Basin S3: 13.09 cfs; Basin E1: 11.29 cfs; and Basin E2: 12.54 cfs. These increases have the potential to increase flood hazards and/or	Prior to the recordation of the first Final Map for the Project, a Final Drainage Study shall be submitted to the Department of Public Works for review and approval. The Final Drainage Study shall depict the locations of proposed on-lot vegetated swales and ponding trenches and shall demonstrate that these features will attenuate anticipated increase of runoff within drainage basins N1, N2, W1, W2, W3, S1, S2, E1 and E2 to pre-development levels. In addition, the Final Drainage Study shall provide for a detention basin within the eastern park site, and shall	Less than Significant

**TABLE S SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
	overwhelm the capacity of planned or existing drainage facilities.	further demonstrate that the combination of vegetated swales, ponding trenches, and a detention basin will reduce post-development peak runoff volumes within Basin S3 to below pre-development levels. The final design, configuration, and location of the detention basin within drainage basin S3 shall be depicted on the Final Map.	
<b>Noise (See Section 3.4)</b>			
3.4-A	During project construction, nesting raptors and breeding California Gnatcatchers in the vicinity may be exposed to noise levels from blasting operations ranging up to 95.6 decibels at 50 feet and from normal construction activities including drilling ranging up to 87.2 decibels at 50 feet. The following mitigation measures shall be required to avoid or to reduce potential indirect noise impacts to less than significant levels for the eucalyptus woodland habitat of nesting raptors between February 15 and July 15 and for the coastal sage scrub habitat of California gnatcatchers between March 1 and August 15	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Implementation of Mitigation Measure No. 3.2-R which includes a prohibition on grading or clearing within 500 feet of the eucalyptus habitat between February 15 and July 15 (unless waived by the Planning Director if pre-grading surveys are negative), would mitigate potential indirect impacts to nesting raptors to below a level of significance.</li> <li>2. The following requirements shall be imposed if construction is planned to occur between March 1 and August 15, the breeding season of the coastal California gnatcatcher: Prior to initiating construction activity, a qualified biological monitor shall survey and map all California gnatcatchers onsite. The biological monitor shall meet with the construction foreman and a County approved acoustical consultant to determine appropriate noise avoidance measures, if any. This may include avoidance or implementation of suitable noise reduction features such as temporary attenuation barriers constructed from hay bales or 3/4-inch thick exterior plywood. If gnatcatchers are identified, start up noise monitoring shall be conducted at appropriate boundary locations and weekly noise monitoring shall be conducted at the edge of occupied habitat by a County approved acoustical consultant and documentation for the monitoring shall be submitted to the County to verify that noise levels within occupied habitat do not exceed 60 dBA hourly average. The effective 60 decibel noise contour from construction activities in a worst case scenario for indirect impacts to sensitive avian habitat</li> </ol>	Less than Significant

**TABLE S SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>is approximately 1100 feet in radius. If noise levels exceed 60 decibels Leq hourly, the monitor shall notify the contractor, and construction activities in the area shall cease until adequate attenuation can be achieved as directed by the qualified acoustician or until the end of the breeding season (August 16).</p>	
3.4-B	<p>In the event that on-site rock crushing is necessary during project grading operations, a significant noise impact to off-site areas, including sensitive habitat occupied by raptors and/or the California gnatcatcher, could occur as a result of exposing these areas to noise levels up to 86.5 dBA at 50 feet.</p>	<p>1. Pursuant to the Major Use Permit 02-023, the applicant shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Be prohibited from operating portable hoe rams and jackhammers on the project site during mass grading and blasting operations.</li> <li>2. Be prohibited from operating rock drills within 200 feet of any occupied residential property.</li> <li>3. For any on-site rock-crushing and related materials handling operations, provide evidence to the satisfaction of the Director of the Department of Planning Land Use that:                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Specifies one Kobelco 309 brake-horse power unit or an equivalently sized rock crusher producing no more than 87 decibels (A) at a reference distance of 50 feet.</li> <li>b. Specifies the location of any rock-crushing equipment and related materials handling activities shall be conducted on Lot 870 of the project site.</li> <li>c. Prior to the onset of mass grading and blasting activities, construct a temporary open enclosure for noise reduction purposes on Lot 870 for both rock crushing and materials handling equipment on the project site. The minimum height of this earthen berm enclosure shall be 16 feet tall with respect to the level of the crusher pad. The</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Less than Significant

**TABLE S SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>configuration of the enclosure for this crusher pad is shown on Figure 9 of the Acoustical and Vibration Site Assessment (#03-068) by Investigative Science and Engineering, Inc. dated February 28, 2007.</p> <p>d. Specify that the above applicable conditions be implemented prior to the onset of mass grading and blasting activities and will remain in place until they are completed subject to final inspected by the County of San Diego.</p> <p>2. Pursuant to the Major Use Permit 02-023, the applicant shall not be issued any Certificates of Occupancy for any phase of this development prior to the completion of all mass grading activities and their final inspection by the County of San Diego.</p>	
3.4-C	<p>As shown on EIR Figure 3-7, Proposed 60 dBA CNEL Ground Trace Contours, the 60 dBA CNEL contour is projected to be 84 feet from the centerline of Pointe Parkway. Accordingly, future interior noise levels could exceed the County Noise Element Policy 4b noise abatement threshold of 45 dBA. In addition, more than 10% of the net lot area for lots fronting on Pointe Parkway could be exposed to exterior noise levels in excess of 60 dBA, which also would exceed the County Noise Element Policy 4b noise abatement requirements.</p>	<p>Prior to recordation of any Final Map, a Noise Protection Easement shall be granted to the County of San Diego over the entire area of Lots 29-54, 71-92, 99-101, 116-118, 125-128, 136-149, and 190-211 of Tentative Map 5299RPL6. This easement is for the mitigation of present and anticipated future excess noise levels including traffic flow on Pointe Parkway for residential use of these affected Lots. The easement shall require the following:</p> <p>Prior to the issuance of any building permit for any residential use within the Noise Protection Easement, the applicant shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Complete to the satisfaction of the Director of the Department of Planning and Land Use, an acoustical analysis performed by a County approved acoustical engineer, demonstrating that the present and anticipated future noise levels for exterior and interior noise sensitive land uses will not exceed the</li> </ol>	Less than Significant

**TABLE S SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>allowable sound level limit of the Noise Element of the San Diego County General Plan [exterior (60 dBA CNEL) and interior (45 dBA CNEL)].</p> <p>2. Incorporate to the satisfaction of the Director of the Department of Planning and Land Use all of the recommendations or mitigation measures of the acoustical analysis into the project design and building plans.</p>	
<b>Transportation/Circulation (See Section 3.5)</b>			
3.5-A	<p>Under Existing Plus Project Conditions and Near Term Cumulative Conditions, the proposed Project would contribute traffic to three Jamacha Blvd. roadway segments that are operating at unacceptable levels of service: 1) Omega to Jamacha Road (Maya); 2) Jamacha Road (Maya) to Whitestone; and 3) Whitestone to Pointe Parkway. These are regarded as direct and cumulative impacts of the proposed Project.</p>	<p>1. Improvements to Jamacha Blvd. from Omega to Pointe Parkway are under construction to widen the roadway to a four-lane roadway segment within a Prime Arterial roadbed(County Project #CG-4476/Log 89-19-105E. Prior to issuance of occupancy permits, planned improvements to Jamacha Boulevard (County Project #CG-4476/Log 89-19-105E) shall be completed.</p> <p>2. At the time of building permit issuance, the required Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) for Spring Valley as set forth in County Ordinance, Section 77.208 shall be paid. Payment of the TIF adequately mitigates the Project’s cumulative impacts to the following segments of Jamacha Blvd.: 1) from Jamacha Road (Maya) to Whitestone; and 2) from Whitestone to Pointe Parkway.</p>	Less than Significant
3.5-B	<p>Under Near Term Cumulative Conditions, the proposed Project would contribute traffic to three roadway segments that are operating or are projected to operate at unacceptable levels of service: 1) Jamacha Blvd. from Pointe Parkway to Sweetwater Springs; 2) Jamacha Blvd. from Campo Road to Calavo Drive; and 3) Sweetwater Springs from Del Rio to</p>	<p>At the time of building permit issuance, the required Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) for Spring Valley as set forth in County Ordinance, Section 77.208 shall be paid. Payment of the TIF adequately mitigates the Project’s cumulative impacts to these roadway segments.</p>	Less than Significant

**TABLE S SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
	Austin. These are regarded as cumulative impacts of the proposed Project.		
3.5-C	Under Near Term Cumulative Conditions, the proposed Project's traffic would result in a cumulatively significant impact to the following three intersections which are projected to operate at unacceptable levels of service: 1) Jamacha Blvd./Pointe Parkway; 2) Jamacha Blvd./Sweetwater Springs; and 3) Sweetwater Springs/State Route 94-Westbound.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At the time of building permit issuance, the required Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) for Spring Valley as set forth in County Ordinance, Section 77.208 shall be paid. Payment of the TIF adequately mitigates the Project's cumulative impacts to the intersection of Jamacha Blvd/Sweetwater Springs.</li> <li>2. For the intersection of Jamacha Blvd./Pointe Parkway, prior to issuance of the first building permit, the Project shall ensure that the following improvements are included as part of The Pointe Development ultimate configuration, or the Project will be required to pay a fair share of additional improvements not included in the current design plan. These improvements listed below shall be constructed prior to issuance of the Project's first occupancy permit. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Eastbound: (2) lefts, (2) through, (1) right;</li> <li>•Westbound: (1) left, (2) through, (1) right;</li> <li>•Northbound: (1) left, (1) through, (1) right;</li> <li>•Southbound: (2) left, (1) through, (1) right.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. The Project shall contribute to the County's traffic signal fee program for modification of the traffic signal at Jamacha Blvd./Pointe Parkway.</li> <li>4. In the event that prior to issuance of building permits improvements to the intersection of Sweetwater Springs/State Route 94-Westbound are not identified and fully funded by the TIF program, then the applicant shall assure the construction of an additional dedicated left turn lane. The Project's obligation may be met through a fair-share contribution toward the</li> </ol>	Less than Significant

**TABLE S SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>improvement (if constructed by others), or through direct construction of this improvement with reimbursement by others.</p> <p>5. In the event that prior of the issuance of building permits the TIF program has been updated to include funding for a dedicated left turn lane at the intersection of Sweetwater Springs/State Route 94-Westbound, the required Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) for Spring Valley as set forth in County Ordinance, Section 77.208 shall be paid. Payment of the TIF adequately mitigates the Project's cumulative impacts to this intersection.</p>	