

# **ATTACHMENT C**

---

## **FINDINGS CONCERNING MITIGATION OF SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

**FINAL PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT  
AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION  
SCH # 2016021105**

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

## FINDINGS CONCERNING MITIGATION OF SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

### McClellan-Palomar Airport Master Plan Update Carlsbad, California SCH # 2016021105

The County of San Diego Board of Supervisors makes the following findings for each significant effect identified in the Final Program Environmental Impact Report (FPEIR) pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081(a)(1) (changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect) and mitigation measures are stated fully in the FPEIR. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081(a)(2), there are no changes that are the responsibility or jurisdiction of another public agency, and pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081(a)(3) no mitigation measures were identified as infeasible. These findings are explained below and are supported by substantial evidence in the record of proceedings.

Location of documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings:

#### 1. Aesthetics

**Significant Effect:** **Impact AE-1 – Introduction of a retaining wall along the southern slope at the Airport’s east end would contrast with the existing visual character and quality of the Proposed Project site along Palomar Airport Road, which would be considered a significant impact. (FPEIR p. 2-7).** A retaining wall along Palomar Airport Road would be constructed to support the extension of Taxiway A. It is anticipated that the retaining wall would be visible by motorists traveling along the roadway. This portion of the Airport currently consists of a natural slope, and the introduction of a retaining wall would potentially result in a significant adverse change to the visual character of the viewshed.

**Finding:** Pursuant to Public Resources Code, section 21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

#### **Mitigation Measures:**

**M-AE-1:** Detailed engineering design plans would be developed once funding is identified for the project-specific element regarding the extension of Taxiway A. The future retaining wall would be designed in consideration of the *City of Carlsbad Scenic Corridor Guidelines* to the degree feasible since any modification of the inactive landfill slopes would require coordination and oversight by applicable State and local agencies (i.e., County Landfills Management Unit, LEA, and RWQCB). Due to the rules and restrictions of these agencies, it is anticipated that future aesthetic treatments would be potentially limited to the façade of the future retaining wall. (FPEIR p. 2-11).

**Rationale:** Although there would be a alteration to the existing visual character with the landside improvements along this portion of Palomar Airport Road, the development would be consistent with the existing Airport character and the overall viewshed. The City of Carlsbad Scenic Corridor Guidelines classify Palomar Airport Road as a Community Theme Corridor. Therefore, when designing the future retaining wall, the design will incorporate aesthetic measures from the City of Carlsbad, including the Scenic Corridor Guidelines, which would reduce impacts related to the design and construction of the retaining wall to a level less than significant. All aesthetic components of the retaining wall will be subject to review and approval

by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) in accordance with their design engineering standards.

## 2. Biological Resources

**Significant Effect: Impact BI-1 – The Proposed Project would impact coastal California gnatcatcher occupied habitat resulting in the potential to impact California gnatcatcher nests. This would be considered a significant direct and indirect impact. (FPEIR p. 2-30).**

One nesting pair of coastal California gnatcatcher was observed in the Diegan coastal sage scrub within the northwestern portion of the Airport during 2016 protocol surveys, and a second pair was observed just off site to the north. Additionally, temporary construction noise would have the potential to displace coastal California gnatcatcher from nests within suitable habitat adjacent to construction activities.

**Finding:** Pursuant to Public Resources Code, section 21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

### Mitigation Measures:

**M-BI-1a:** If the NC MSCP is adopted at the time project impacts would occur, mitigation for impacts to coastal California gnatcatcher habitat (Diegan coastal sage scrub) shall occur at a 2:1 ratio in accordance with the adopted NC MSCP and mitigation strategy described in a joint letter from USFWS and CDFW (2011 Hardline letter). Mitigation will be provided through the preservation of southern maritime chaparral on County-owned lands on or contiguous with the eastern parcel (APN 209-050-25), or at another location deemed acceptable by the County and Wildlife Agencies. This would result in the preservation of 6.2 acres of southern maritime chaparral. The 2011 Hardline letter confirmed this mitigation strategy is adequate assuming adoption of the NC MSCP.

If the NC MSCP is not adopted at the time project impacts would occur, take authorization for impacts to coastal California gnatcatcher would require approval of either an HLP from the County or Section 7 (or 10) permit from USFWS.

If grubbing or clearing of occupied Diegan coastal sage scrub must occur during the breeding season of the coastal California gnatcatcher (February 15–August 31), a pre-construction survey shall be conducted to determine whether gnatcatchers occur within the impact area(s). The pre-construction survey shall consist of three site visits with each site visit occurring seven days apart. If there are no gnatcatchers nesting (includes nest building or other breeding/nesting behavior) within that area, grading and clearing shall be allowed to proceed. If, however, any gnatcatchers are observed, but no nesting or breeding behaviors are noted, additional surveys for breeding/nesting behaviors shall be conducted weekly. If any gnatcatchers are observed nesting or displaying breeding/nesting behavior during the pre-construction survey or additional weekly surveys within the area, construction within 300 feet of any location at which birds have been observed shall be postponed until all nesting (or breeding/nesting behavior) has ceased or until after August 31 (see M-BI-1b for mitigation for indirect noise effects). (FPEIR p. 2-36).

**M-BI-1b:** If operation of construction equipment occurs during the breeding season for the coastal California gnatcatcher (February 15–August 31), pre-construction survey(s) shall be conducted by a qualified biologist as appropriate to determine

whether gnatcatcher occur within the areas potentially impacted by noise. If it is determined at the completion of pre-construction surveys that active nests belonging to this species are absent from the potential impact area, construction shall be allowed to proceed. If pre-construction surveys determine the presence of active nests belonging to this species, then construction shall: (1) be postponed until a qualified biologist determines the nest(s) is no longer active or until after the respective breeding season; or (2) not occur until a temporary noise barrier or berm is constructed at the edge of the development footprint and/or around the piece of equipment to ensure that noise levels are reduced to below 60 dBA or ambient, whichever is greater. Decibel (dB) output will be confirmed by a County-approved noise specialist and intermittent monitoring by a qualified biologist to ensure that conditions have not changed will be required. All grading permits, improvement plans, and the final map shall state the same. (FPEIR p. 2-37).

**Rationale:** Impacts to coastal California gnatcatcher habitat (i.e., Diegan coastal sage scrub) would be reduced to less than significant through the preservation of sensitive habitat deemed acceptable by the County and Wildlife Agencies. Potential impacts to nesting California gnatcatcher resulting from grading, clearing, and/or noise-generating activities during construction would be reduced to below a level of significance through prohibiting the removal of habitat that may support active nests during the breeding season, or through conducting pre-construction nesting bird surveys within and adjacent to the construction area if habitat removal must occur during the breeding season. If active nests are found, construction activities will be prohibited until after the nest is no longer active or the young have fledged. The implementation of these measures will minimize the potential for impacts to active nests to occur as a result of the Proposed Project.

**Significant Impact: Impact BI-2 – The Proposed Project would impact 3.1 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub (including disturbed). This would be considered a significant impact to the sensitive vegetation community (FPEIR p. 2-31).** Construction of the vehicle service road and future shift of the runway would impact 3.1 acres of occupied Diegan coastal sage scrub, which would be considered a significant direct impact.

**Finding:** Pursuant to Public Resources Code, section 21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**M-BI-2:** If the NC MSCP is adopted at the time project impacts would occur, mitigation for impacts to 3.1 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub shall occur at a 2:1 ratio (if not otherwise mitigated as part of M-BI-1a) in accordance with the adopted NC MSCP and the mitigation strategy described in a joint letter from USFWS and CDFW (2011 Hardline letter). Mitigation will be provided through the preservation of 6.2 acres of southern maritime chaparral on County-owned lands on or contiguous with the eastern parcel (APN 209-050-25), or at another location deemed acceptable by the County and Wildlife Agencies.

If the NC MSCP is not adopted at the time project impacts would occur, mitigation for impacts to Diegan coastal sage scrub shall also occur at a 2:1 ratio pursuant to habitat mitigation ratios applied for areas outside of approved MSCP Plans as defined by the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biological Resources dated September 15, 2010. (FPEIR p. 2-37).

**Rationale:** Significant permanent impacts to Diegan coastal sage scrub habitat would be reduced to below a level of significance through preservation at a suitable location deemed acceptable by the County and Wildlife Agencies, as applicable. The proposed mitigation ratios are consistent with those outlined in the County Biological Resources Guidelines for Determining Significance (for areas outside an approved MSCP) and NC MSCP, if applicable.

**Significant Impact: Impact BI-3 – The Proposed Project would impact approximately 0.36 acre of area mapped as vernal pool habitat. This would be considered a significant impact to the sensitive vegetation community (FPEIR p. 2-31).** Impacts to vernal pools would occur in association with construction of the vehicle service road and shift of the runway in the northwestern portion of the Airport.

**Finding:** Pursuant to Public Resources Code, section 21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**M-BI-3:** If the NC MSCP is adopted at the time project impacts would occur, mitigation for impacts up to 0.36 acre of areas mapped as vernal pool habitat shall occur at a minimum 1:1 ratio in accordance with the adopted NC MSCP and mitigation strategy described in a joint letter from USFWS and CDFW (2011 Hardline letter). Mitigation will be provided through vernal pool creation/restoration on County-owned lands on or adjacent to the eastern parcel, or at another location deemed acceptable by the County and other regulating agencies, as applicable.

If the NC MSCP is not adopted at the time project impacts would occur, then mitigation for impacts to vernal pools shall occur at a 5:1 ratio pursuant to habitat mitigation ratios as defined by the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biological Resources dated September 15, 2010. As required by the regulating agencies, including the USACE and RWQCB, impacts to vernal pools may require issuance of a CWA Section 404 permit and either a CWA Section 401 Water Quality Certification or State Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act Water Discharge Requirements (WDRs). Federally listed species have not been detected in onsite vernal pools, thus take authorization under the Endangered Species Act is not anticipated to be required. (FPEIR p. 2-38).

**Rationale:** Significant permanent impacts to vernal pool habitat would be reduced to below a level of significance through habitat creation/restoration at a suitable location deemed acceptable by the County and other regulating agencies, as applicable. The proposed mitigation ratios are consistent with those outlined in the County Biological Resources Guidelines for Determining Significance (for areas outside an approved MSCP) or NC MSCP, if applicable.

**Significant Impact: Impact BI-4 – The Proposed Project would impact 0.2 acre of granitic chamise chaparral. This would be considered a significant impact to the sensitive vegetation community (FPEIR p. 2-31).** Impacts to granitic chamise chaparral would occur in association of the construction of the Precision Approach Path Indicator for future relocation in the northwestern portion of the Airport.

**Finding:** Pursuant to Public Resources Code, section 21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**M-BI-4:** If the NC MSCP is adopted at the time project impacts would occur, mitigation for impacts to 0.2 acre of chamise chaparral shall occur at a 2:1 ratio in accordance with the adopted NC MSCP and mitigation strategy described in a joint letter from USFWS and CDFW (2011 Hardline letter). Mitigation will be provided through the preservation of 0.4 acre of southern maritime chaparral on County-owned lands on or contiguous with the eastern parcel (APN 209-050-25), or at another location deemed acceptable by the County and Wildlife Agencies.

If the NC MSCP is not adopted at the time project impacts would occur, then mitigation for impacts to granitic chamise chaparral shall occur at a 0.5:1 ratio pursuant to habitat mitigation ratios applied for areas outside of approved MSCP Plans as defined by the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biological Resources dated September 15, 2010. (FPEIR p. 2-38).

**Rationale:** Significant permanent impacts to granitic chamise chaparral would be reduced to below a level of significance through preservation at a suitable location deemed acceptable by the County and Wildlife Agencies, as applicable. The proposed mitigation ratios are consistent with those outlined in the County Biological Resources Guidelines for Determining Significance (for areas outside an approved MSCP) and NC MSCP, if applicable.

**Significant Impact: Impact BI-5 – The Proposed Project would impact approximately 0.36 acre mapped as vernal pool habitat that could be determined to be wetlands regulated pursuant to the CWA during future coordination with USACE and applicable jurisdictional agencies. If these vernal pools are determined to be wetlands, this would be considered a significant impact (FPEIR p. 2-32).** A total of 18 vernal pools of varying sizes were identified and mapped in the northwestern portion of the Airport totaling 0.36 acre. While direct impacts are not anticipated to occur to all 0.36 acre of existing vernal pool habitat, degradation of remaining pools that are adjacent to construction is anticipated to occur, thus, all vernal pool habitat on site is considered impacted under this analysis. Impacts to vernal pool habitat would occur in association with construction of the vehicle service road and shift of the runway in the northwestern portion of the Airport.

**Finding:** Pursuant to Public Resources Code, section 21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**M-BI-5:** On-site vernal pools impacted by future individual projects would be mitigated at a minimum 1:1 ratio per mitigation measure M-BI-3. If the NC MSCP is not adopted at the time project impacts would occur, then mitigation for impacts to vernal pools shall occur at a 5:1 ratio pursuant to habitat mitigation ratios as defined by the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biological Resources dated September 15, 2010. As required by the regulating agencies, including the USACE and RWQCB, impacts to vernal pools may require issuance of a CWA Section 404 permit and either a CWA Section 401 Water Quality Certification or State Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act WDRs. Federally listed species have not been detected in onsite vernal pools, thus take authorization under the Endangered Species Act is not anticipated to be required. (FPEIR p. 2-38).

**Rationale:** Significant permanent impacts to vernal pool habitat would be reduced to below a level of significance through habitat creation/restoration at a suitable location deemed acceptable by the County and other regulating agencies, as applicable. The proposed mitigation

ratios are consistent with those outlined in the County Biological Resources Guidelines for Determining Significance (for areas outside an approved MSCP) or NC MSCP, if applicable.

**Significant Impact: Impact BI-6 – Construction activities may result in impacts to migratory birds or active migratory bird nests and/or eggs protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). This would conflict with the policies of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and be considered a significant impact (FPEIR p. 2-35).** Implementation of the project could require construction during the avian breeding season, which could potentially result in impacts to migratory birds, active migratory bird nests, and/or eggs protected under the MBTA. Project construction could directly impact individuals or cause breeding birds to temporarily or permanently leave their territories, which could lead to reduced reproductive success and increased mortality.

**Finding:** Pursuant to Public Resources Code, section 21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**M-BI-6:** If grubbing, clearing, or grading must occur during the general avian breeding season (February 15–September 15), a pre-construction survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than three days prior to the commencement of the activities to determine if active bird nests are present in the affected areas. If there are no nesting birds (includes nest building or other breeding/nesting behavior) within this area, clearing, grubbing, and grading shall be allowed to proceed. Furthermore, if construction activities are to resume in an area where they have not occurred for a period of seven or more days during the breeding season, an updated survey for avian nesting will be conducted. If active nests or nesting birds are observed within the area, the biologist shall flag the active nests and construction activities shall avoid active nests until nesting behavior has ceased, nests have failed, or young have fledged. (FPEIR p. 2-39)

**Rationale:** Potential impacts to the nesting success of migratory birds resulting from grading, clearing, and/or noise-generating activities during construction would be reduced to below a level of significance by prohibiting the removal of habitat that may support active nests during the breeding season, or through conducting pre-construction nesting bird surveys within and adjacent to the construction area if habitat removal must occur during the breeding season. If active nests are found, construction activities will be prohibited until after the nest is no longer active or the young have fledged. The implementation of these measures will minimize the potential for impacts to active nests to occur as a result of the Proposed Project.

**Significant Impact: Impact BI-7 – The Proposed Project would impact 0.3 acre of southern maritime chaparral. This would be considered a significant impact to the sensitive vegetation community (FPEIR p. 2-32).** These impacts would occur in association with relocation of the existing MALSR navigational lighting system on the Eastern Parcel.

**Finding:** Pursuant to Public Resources Code, section 21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**M-BI-7:** If the NC MSCP is adopted at the time project impacts would occur, mitigation for impacts to 0.3 acre of southern maritime chaparral shall occur at a 3:1 ratio in accordance with the adopted NC MSCP and mitigation strategy described in a

joint letter from USFWS and CDFW (2011 Hardline letter). Mitigation will be provided through the preservation of 0.9 acre of southern maritime chaparral on County-owned lands on or contiguous with the eastern parcel (APN 209-050-25), or at another location deemed acceptable by the County and Wildlife Agencies.

If the NC MSCP is not adopted at the time project impacts would occur, mitigation for impacts to southern maritime chaparral shall also occur at a 3:1 ratio pursuant to habitat mitigation ratios applied for areas outside of approved MSCP Plans as defined by the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biological Resources dated September 15, 2010. (FPEIR p. 2-39).

**Rationale:** Significant permanent impacts to southern maritime chaparral would be reduced to below a level of significance through preservation at a suitable location deemed acceptable by the County and Wildlife Agencies, as applicable. The proposed mitigation ratios are consistent with those outlined in the County Biological Resources Guidelines for Determining Significance (for areas outside an approved MSCP) and NC MSCP, if applicable.

**Significant Impact: Impact BI-8 – The Proposed Project would impact 0.3 acre of non-native grassland. This would be considered a significant impact to the sensitive vegetation community (FPEIR p. 2-32).** These impacts would occur in association with relocation of the existing MALSR navigational lighting system on the Eastern Parcel. Impacts would occur within lands identified as PAMA in the Draft NC MSCP Plan.

**Finding:** Pursuant to Public Resources Code, section 21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

#### **Mitigation Measures:**

**M-BI-8:** If NC MSCP is adopted at the time project impacts would occur, mitigation for impacts to non-native grassland shall occur at the applicable ratio defined in the NC MSCP. The aforementioned joint letter from USFWS and CDFW (2011 Hardline letter) did not identify impacts or mitigation to non-native grassland.

If the NC MSCP is not adopted at the time project impacts would occur, mitigation for impacts to non-native grassland shall occur at a 0.5:1 ratio pursuant to habitat mitigation ratios applied for areas outside of approved MSCP Plans as defined by the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biological Resources dated September 15, 2010. Mitigation for impacts to 0.3 acre of non-native grassland would occur through the preservation of 0.15 acre of non-native grassland on County-owned lands on or contiguous with the eastern parcel (APN 209-050-25), or at another location deemed acceptable by the County and Wildlife Agencies. (FPEIR p. 2-39).

**Rationale:** Significant permanent impacts to non-native grassland would be reduced to below a level of significance through preservation at a suitable location deemed acceptable by the County and Wildlife Agencies, as applicable. The proposed mitigation ratios are consistent with those outlined in the County Biological Resources Guidelines for Determining Significance (for areas outside an approved MSCP) and NC MSCP, if applicable.

### **3. Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

**Significant Effect: Impact HZ-1 – Grading or excavation on the site may disturb an underlying inactive landfill presenting a potential hazard to the public or the environment**

**(FPEIR p. 2-71).** Three units of an inactive solid waste landfill underlay portions of the Airport. Construction activities would include runway and taxi improvements over landfill Unit 3, and potential general aviation parking over landfill Unit 1.

**Finding:** Pursuant to Public Resources Code, section 21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**M-HZ-1:** Prior to grading or excavation over the inactive landfill units or other areas of known contaminated soil and/or groundwater, a Soil Management Plan (or equivalent remediation plan) shall be prepared in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local requirements for the purpose of removing, treating, or otherwise reducing potential contaminant concentrations to below human or ecological health risk thresholds. The Soil Management Plan (or equivalent remediation plan) shall outline methods for characterizing and classifying soil for off-site disposal, as needed, during site development. Due to a possible vapor encroachment condition (VEC) at the Airport for petroleum, hydrocarbon, and non-petroleum hydrocarbon contaminants, the Soil Management Plan (or equivalent remediation plan) shall also include a Tier 2 VEC assessment according to ASTM E 2600-10. The timing of this mitigation measure's implementation will vary depending on the timing, funding, and priorities of individual project elements under the Airport Master Plan Update; however, this mitigation measure would be implemented prior to or at the time of impact. (FPEIR p. 2-75).

**Rationale:** Potential impacts from the use, storage, disposal, and transport of hazardous materials during construction would be reduced to less than significant by the preparation of a Soil Management Plan (or equivalent remediation plan). The plan would be prepared in accordance with required regulations and also implement appropriate training regarding work practices of construction contractors, compliance with Title 27 CCR, Section 21190(g) to ensure there is no release of methane, reducing potential impacts to less than significant.

**Significant Effect:** **Impact HZ-2 – Grading or excavation on the site may disturb contaminated soil and/groundwater, presenting potential health risks to personnel during construction (FPEIR p. 2-71).** Volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and metals were detected in groundwater below landfill Units 1 and 3; therefore, there is a potential for encountering these contaminants in the soil and/or groundwater during construction.

**Finding:** Pursuant to Public Resources Code, section 21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**M-HZ-2:** Refer to M-HZ-1. (FPEIR p. 2-75).

**Rationale:** Potential impacts from the use, storage, disposal, and transport of hazardous materials during construction would be reduced to less than significant by the preparation of a Soil Management Plan (or equivalent remediation plan). The plan would be prepared in accordance with required regulations, including implementation of appropriate training regarding work practices of construction contractors, ensuring a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan is prepared and implemented, compliance with Regional Water Quality Control Board regulations, thereby reducing potential impacts to less than significant.

#### 4. Noise

**Significant Effect: Impact N-1 – General construction noise during project elements 2, 5, and 9 would be significant (FPEIR p. 2-90).** Construction noise from general construction equipment was modeled to be above the significant threshold for phases 2, 5, and 9 along the airport's northern boundary. General construction noise impacts would be potentially significant for nearby offices.

**Finding:** Pursuant to Public Resources Code, section 21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

#### Mitigation Measures:

**M-N-1:** Noise levels from project-related demolition, grading, and construction activities shall not exceed the noise limit specified in San Diego County Code Sections 36.408 and 36.409 of 75 dBA (8-hour average), when measured at the boundary line of the property where the noise is located or any occupied property where noise is being received. A Demolition and Construction Management Plan that describes the measures included on the construction plans to ensure compliance with the noise limit shall be prepared. The following measures may be included to reduce construction/demolition noise:

- Construction equipment to be properly outfitted and maintained with manufacturer-recommended noise reduction devices.
- Diesel equipment to be operated with closed engine doors and equipped with factory-recommended mufflers.
- Mobile or fixed "package" equipment (e.g., arc-welders and air compressors) to be equipped with shrouds and noise control features that are readily available for that type of equipment.
- Electrically powered equipment to be used instead of pneumatic or internal-combustion powered equipment, where feasible.
- Unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines (e.g., in excess of 5 minutes) to be prohibited.
- Material stockpiles and mobile equipment staging, parking, and maintenance areas to be located as far as practicable from noise sensitive receptors.
- The use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells, shall be for safety warning purposes only.
- No project-related public address or music system shall be audible at any adjacent sensitive receptor.
- Temporary sound barriers or sound blankets may be installed between construction operations and adjacent noise-sensitive receptors. A sound wall at least 10 feet in height above grade, located along the northern airport boundary line between the North Apron and neighboring offices would mitigate noise levels to within acceptable levels. To reduce noise levels effectively, the sound barrier should be constructed of a material with a minimum weight of two pounds per square foot with no gaps or

perforations and remain in place until the conclusion of demolition, grading, and construction activities.

- The County shall notify businesses within 100 feet of the construction area in writing within one week of any construction activity such as demolition, hard rock handling, concrete sawing, asphalt removal, and/or heavy grading operations. The notification shall describe the activities anticipated, provide dates and hours, and provide contact information with a description of a complaint and response procedure.
- The on-site construction supervisor shall have the responsibility and authority to receive and resolve noise complaints. A clear appeal process for the affected resident shall be established prior to construction commencement to allow for resolution of noise problems that cannot be immediately solved by the site supervisor. (FPEIR p. 2-93).

**Rationale:** Potential temporary impacts from construction noise would be reduced to below a level of significance through the preparation and implementation of a Demolition and Construction Management Plan. In addition, measures to reduce construction noise would ensure compliance with the noise limits in the San Diego County Code. This would ensure that potential impacts from construction noise are reduced to a less than significant level.

**Significant Effect: Impact N-2: Construction noise associated with pavement crushing during project elements 2, 5, 9, 12, 13, and 14 would be significant (FPEIR p. 2-90).** Pavement crushing would be above the significant thresholds; if on-site rock crushing is required at the North Apron staging area, impacts would be potentially significant for nearby offices.

**Finding:** Pursuant to Public Resources Code, section 21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**M-N-2:** If an on-site use of a crusher at the north apron staging area is required, it should be located at the furthest safely feasible point from nearby offices and residences, where it will have minimal impact on occupied buildings. A temporary sound barrier shall be placed around the rock crusher to shield receivers to the north. All barriers should stand at least as tall as the highest part of the crusher, with a minimum of 8 feet. In addition to the construction hours mandated by the County Noise Ordinance, pavement crushing shall not occur Monday through Friday after 6 p.m., or on Saturday before 8 a.m. In the event construction is required at night or Sundays, County Airport staff shall consult with the County Noise Officer, who has the discretion to grant a Noise Variance Permit in accordance with the County Noise Ordinance Section 36.423. (FPEIR p. 2-94).

**Rationale:** Potential temporary impacts from a rock crusher at the North Apron staging area would be reduced to below a level of significance by placing a temporary sound barrier around the rock crusher and only crushing pavement during hours mandated by the County Noise Ordinance. Placement of the crusher at the furthest feasible point from the offices, and by implementing the mitigation measure, potential impacts from the crusher would be reduced to a less than significant level.

## 5. Transportation/Traffic

**Significant Effect: Impact TR-1 – Addition of the Proposed Project traffic combined with cumulative traffic to the intersection of Palomar Airport Road/Camino Vida Roble would increase the delay by 4.8 seconds (PM peak hour). This is greater than the significance threshold of more than 2.0 seconds over existing conditions for Level of Service (LOS) E/F, and is therefore considered a significant cumulative impact (FPEIR p. 2-121).** The amount of peak hour traffic that would trigger a cumulative impact was correlated to daily enplanements; a cumulative impact at the intersection of Palomar Airport Road/Camino Vida Roble is not estimated to occur until the Airport reaches 1,260 daily enplanements.

**Finding:** Pursuant to Public Resources Code, section 21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**M-TR-1:** Cumulative impacts would be mitigated below the level of significance by financially contributing a fair-share payment to the City of Carlsbad towards the installation of signal improvements along Palomar Airport Road, alternative improvements such as adding a southbound right-turn overlap phase, or other Transportation System Management strategy to improve signal operations. Based on the Proposed Project's traffic contribution, this would equate to an estimated fair-share payment of 10.7 percent of the cost to implement signal improvements or other Transportation System Management strategy in consultation with the City.

Mitigation Measure M-TR-1 would not be required to be implemented until the number of Airport enplanements incrementally produce a cumulative traffic impact at the intersection of Palomar Airport Road/Camino Vida Roble. (FPEIR p. 2-122),

**Rationale:** Paying a financial fair-share of the Proposed Project's contribution (10.7%) towards the installation of a Transportation System Management strategy that improves signal operations along Palomar Airport Road would address the operating deficiencies and mitigate the significant cumulative impact.

**Significant Effect: Impact TR-2: Addition of the Proposed Project traffic combined with cumulative traffic to the intersection of Palomar Airport Road/ El Camino Real would increase the delay by 2.7 seconds (AM peak hour) and 4.8 seconds (PM peak hour). These are greater than the significance threshold of more than 2.0 seconds over existing conditions for LOS E/F, and is therefore considered a significant cumulative impact (FPEIR p. 2-121).** The amount of peak hour traffic that would trigger a cumulative impact was correlated to daily enplanements; a cumulative impact at the intersection of Palomar Airport Road/El Camino Real is not estimated to occur until the Airport reaches 670 daily enplanements.

**Finding:** Pursuant to Public Resources Code, section 21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**M-TR-2:** Cumulative impacts would be mitigated below the level of significance by financially contributing a fair-share payment to the City of Carlsbad towards the installation of signal improvements along Palomar Airport Road or other Transportation System Management strategy to improve signal operations.

Based on the Proposed Project's traffic contribution, this would equate to an estimated fair-share payment of 7.5 percent of the cost to implement signal improvements or other Transportation System Management strategy in consultation with the City.

Mitigation Measure M-TR-2 would not be required to be implemented until the number of Airport enplanements incrementally produce a cumulative traffic impact at the intersection of Palomar Airport Road/El Camino Real. (FPEIR p. 2-122).

**Rationale:** Paying a financial fair-share of the Proposed Project's contribution (7.5%) towards the installation of a Transportation System Management strategy that improves signal operations along Palomar Airport Road would address the operating deficiencies and mitigate the significant cumulative impact.