
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

S.1 Project Synopsis

Project Location

The proposed 389.5-acre Meadowood Project Site is located just north of State Route 76 (SR-76), approximately one-quarter mile east of Interstate 15 (I-15) in the Fallbrook Community Planning Area. The Meadowood project (Proposed Project) is located directly east and adjacent to the approved Palomar College campus project and the Campus Park and Campus Park West properties, which are planned communities active in the planning process. Southeast of the Project Site is Rosemary's Mountain Rock Quarry site, which has an approved Major Use Permit (MUP). The land to the north and east is undeveloped and consists of citrus and avocado orchards and natural open space.

Project Description

The Proposed Project entails the development of a residential community of up to 844 units (up to 886 dwelling units if the Bonsall School District decides not to build on the school site) with an overall density of 2.3 dwelling units per acre (du/ac). Residential density within the planning areas ranges from 2.7 du/ac for the single-family units, to 13.5 du/ac for a portion of the multi-family units. The higher density planning areas are clustered in the flatter, western portions of the property, adjacent to the more urban uses proposed in the Campus Park and Campus Park West projects; while single-family residences are proposed in the higher elevations below the groves and open space.

The Proposed Project will consist of a mix of single-family and multi-family units, an elementary school site, a neighborhood park, pocket parks, 5.9 miles of multi-use trails and supporting infrastructure, including a wastewater treatment plant (WWTP), water storage tanks, and nine detention basins. Open space is proposed to retain 49.3 acres of the existing citrus and avocado groves, along with 122.4 acres of sensitive biological habitat.

The main access will be taken via Horse Ranch Creek Road, which will extend north from SR-76 and connect to Pankey Road, which will then connect to Stewart Canyon Road. The internal street system would consist of two-lane residential streets to serve future residents. These streets are planned to ensure adequate circulation with the Campus Park, Palomar Community College District, and Campus Park West projects. A paved road, extending northeasterly from Street E to Rice Canyon Road, will provide fire access.

Development of the Proposed Project will be phased over several years. Phasing would be coordinated with the availability of water, sewer, fire protection, and school services. The Proposed Project would also be phased by recording several different final maps, but all the proposed development areas would be graded at one time. Each recorded map would be required to comply with the provisions and guidelines within the proposed Meadowood Specific Plan Amendment, which includes a Community Design Element containing policies to address visual quality aspects of the proposed common areas, including streetscape, entry treatments, parks, pedestrian circulation, lighting, signs, and landscaping.

Currently, the Proposed Project is partially within the San Luis Rey Municipal Water District (SLRMWD) and the remaining portion is not within the jurisdiction of any water or wastewater service provider. The Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) will examine the suitability of the three agencies in the project vicinity, the SLRMWD, the Rainbow Municipal Water District (RMWD), and the Valley Center Municipal Water District (VCMWD), as potential service providers. Upon LAFCO's determination, the Proposed Project must be annexed into the appropriate Municipal Water District (MWD), as well as into the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) and the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MET). Regardless of the MWD that is selected, the applicant would construct all needed water and wastewater facilities to serve the Proposed Project.

The required facilities for each MWD are shown on Figures 1-5 and 1-6 and itemized in Tables 1-3 and 1-4. All on- and off-site impacts associated with the construction of the preferred alignment of water supply facilities related to individual resource areas are detailed throughout the following chapters: Aesthetics (Chapter 2.1), Air Quality (Chapter 2.2), Traffic (Chapter 2.3), Biology (Chapter 3.1), Geology and Soils (Chapter 3.2), Cultural Resources (Chapter 3.3), Noise (Chapter 3.4), and Hazards (Chapter 3.5).

The Proposed Project seeks the following discretionary actions from the County:

- General Plan Amendment (GPA)
- Specific Plan Amendment (SPA)
- Rezone
- Vesting Tentative Map (VTM)
- MUP for operation of a WWTP
- Three site plans

In addition, annexation of the Proposed Project into the North County Fire Protection District (NCFPD) for fire protection services, into a MWD for water and wastewater service, and into the SDCWA and the MET for water service requires LAFCO's approval.

Project Objectives

The primary goal of the Proposed Project is to accommodate housing demand based on projected population increases while retaining the existing rural atmosphere in the area. Overall, the Proposed Project seeks to balance population and housing needs with open space, agricultural land use, and the development of infrastructure for the community. The specific project objectives are summarized as follows:

1. Provide a variety of residential land uses to allow for residential development that meets the demand for housing in the region consistent with the rustic charm of Fallbrook.
2. Provide an opportunity for home ownership by increasing the housing supply with a variety of owner occupied housing types in Fallbrook.

3. Provide for preservation of significant environmental and visual resources by conserving environmentally sensitive lands, prominent ridgelines, and regional wildlife corridors while recognizing and mitigating for wildfire potential.
4. Provide for land uses that relate to the community in conjunction with the three neighboring projects.
5. Maintain agricultural uses as a buffer to natural lands.
6. Provide educational and recreational opportunities in close proximity to residential uses, accessible by public roads and trails.
7. Coordinate public facilities and infrastructure with adjacent landowners and ensure availability concurrent with need.
8. Require permanent preservation of natural open space areas, while allowing public recreational opportunities.
9. Through LAFCO's Sphere of Influence (SOI) determination, identify the most efficient service provider to ensure provision of water, wastewater, and recycled water to support anticipated growth consistent with County of San Diego (County) land use decisions.
10. To provide fire and emergency services, potable water service, and wastewater service to the Project Site through annexation into the NCFPD and into a MWD, SDCWA, and MET.

Environmental Setting

The Project Site is within the unincorporated area of northern San Diego County, within the Fallbrook Community Planning Area. The topography is characterized by the east-west San Luis Rey River Valley along the SR-76 corridor and the north-south I-15 corridor. Both the San Luis Rey River floodplain and the I-15 corridor are flanked by rolling hills, which have historically been used for citrus and avocado groves, estate residences, and open space, with cattle grazing also occurring in the more rugged terrain. Row-crop agriculture is practiced to the east of the Monserate Mountain ridgeline, within Rice Canyon. A rocky outcrop, known as Rosemary's Mountain, comprises the southernmost toe of the Monserate Mountain ridge and abuts the southeastern corner of the Project Site.

Several hundred homes of varying types exist in the area surrounding the Project Site, including farm homes on large parcels with citrus and avocado groves, detached single-family homes in the Lake Rancho Viejo subdivision, and mobile homes in the Rancho Monserate Mobile Home Park.

There are several other development projects planned within the immediate vicinity of the Proposed Project. Campus Park is the proposed project immediately adjacent to the Proposed Project on the west and includes single-family and multi-family residential uses, a town center, parks, office professional uses, and recreational facilities. Additionally, the Palomar Community College District proposes to build its North Education Center campus within a portion of the Campus Park project site. The

proposed Campus Park West project is located at the northeast corner of I-15 and SR-76. The land comprising these three projects is currently primarily open space and pastureland.

The land to the north and east of the Project Site is undeveloped and consists of citrus and avocado groves and natural open space. South of SR-76 and the San Luis Rey River is the Lake Rancho Viejo residential project. West of I-15 and south of the San Luis Rey River are the Rancho Monserate Mobile Home Park and the RMWD offices and work yard. There is a gas station, a restaurant, and a park-and-ride facility in the northwest quadrant of the I-15/SR-76 intersection. Additionally, to the west of I-15 are several residential and resort projects including Pala Mesa Highlands, Pala Mesa Condominiums, and the Pala Mesa Shopping Center.

The Project Site is characterized by diverse topography and a variety of vegetation types and habitats. It occupies the eastern portion of a well-defined valley surrounded by steep hills. The dominant feature is Monserate Mountain, the southern ridgeline of which occupies the eastern portion of the site. The topography of the Project Site ranges from gently sloping, sparsely vegetated terrain approximately 260 feet above mean sea level (MSL) at the southwestern end of the site, nearest to the San Luis Rey River, to the steeply sloping ridgeline along the northeastern portion of the site, which is the southern flank of Monserate Mountain with an elevation of approximately 840 feet above MSL. The eastern boundary descends into Rice Canyon, most of which is farther to the east. The site generally drains to the south and west and eventually into the San Luis Rey River.

The rugged and undeveloped terrain in the northern and eastern portions of the Project Site support disturbed and undisturbed southern mixed chaparral, coastal sage scrub vegetation, disturbed coastal sage scrub, and coast live oak woodland. Wetland areas on the Project Site support mixed willow-mule fat riparian scrub at the western boundary and two isolated freshwater ponds with limited vegetation. These ponds are artificial and are used to irrigate the crops. In addition, the Project Site includes non-native annual grassland and a network of graded dirt roads and other disturbed or developed areas.

Current land uses on-site include agricultural activities, consisting mostly of citrus and avocado orchards. These activities take up most of the central and southern portions, or about 54 percent of the site. There are 13 homes, sheds, and agricultural buildings scattered throughout the site, none of which are historic.

Environmental Constraints

Environmental issues constraining development that were considered in the design of the Proposed Project include the following:

- **Sensitive Biological Resources.** The Project Site is part of a regional network of significant biological resources along the San Luis Rey River. Resources include wetlands, coastal sage scrub, and chaparral. The Proposed Project has been designed to conserve key habitat and wildlife corridors through the dedication of 122.4 acres of open space.
- **Utility Services.** Water and wastewater services are not currently available to the Project Site. The applicant has coordinated with the appropriate MWDs to identify

options for the provision of these services. A condition of approval of the Proposed Project will be the annexation into a MWD.

- **Steep Slopes.** Much of the Project Site contains steep slopes, as defined by County Ordinance, which includes a slope of 25 percent or greater which have a minimum rise of 50 feet. The Proposed Project has been designed to minimize development encroachment into these slopes.
- **Visual Quality.** The Project Site, especially the steeper slopes and ridges at the higher elevations, is visible from I-15 and adjacent homes and businesses along Pala Road. The visual characteristics of the property were considered in the Proposed Project design, which plans the more intense uses on the flatter portions of the Project Site at lower elevations. The prominent ridges and steeper slopes would be preserved in open space.
- **Wildfire Hazards.** The Project Site is in an area subject to wildfires and is within the SOI of the NCFPD. A Fire Protection Plan (FPP) has been prepared for the Proposed Project to reduce risks of wildfire hazards.
- To avoid impacting sensitive resources including agriculture, biology, steep slopes, and visual quality, the Proposed Project's design uses lot area averaging, in conformance with policies and regulations of the County of San Diego and the Fallbrook Community Plan.

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

Table S-1 summarizes the results of the environmental analysis completed for the Proposed Project. Table S-1 also includes mitigation measures to reduce or avoid the environmental effects, with a conclusion as to whether the impact has been mitigated to below a level of significance. Detailed analysis of significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided if the Proposed Project is implemented are discussed in Chapter 2, significant environmental effects that can be mitigated are found in Chapter 3; and effects found not be significant during preparation of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or the initial study process are found in Chapter 4.

Environmental design considerations that have been incorporated into the Proposed Project are listed in Table 1-5. These include standard measures to reduce environmental impacts associated with air quality, erosion, and water quality during grading and construction of the Proposed Project. Additional measures specifically related to the Proposed Project to address impacts associated with transportation, aesthetics, agriculture, biological resources, geology, and hazards are also included. All of these environmental design measures are detailed in Chapters 2, 3, and 4 and are also included in Chapter 8 of this EIR.

S.3 Areas of Controversy

The Notice of Preparation (NOP) was distributed in April 2004 for a 30-day public review and comment period. In addition, a public scoping meeting was held in April 2004 at the County of San Diego Department of Planning and Land Use. The NOP and all of the comment letters received are included in this EIR as Appendix B. The issues that were

raised in the comments and forms by the public agencies, local groups, and individuals are evaluated in the Draft EIR in Chapters 2 through 5.

Issues of concern associated with the Proposed Project include the change in aesthetics and community character; land use intensity relative to the adopted County General Plan, the proposed General Plan Update, and the Fallbrook Community Plan; transportation/traffic, and the provision of water and sewer service to the Project Site.

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

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

S.5 Project Alternatives

A number of alternatives were considered during preparation of this EIR, including the following alternatives to the Proposed Project:

- No Project (No Development) Alternative
- No Project (Development Consistent with the Adopted General Plan) Alternative
- Groundwater Dependent (Consistent with the Groundwater Ordinance) Alternative
- Reduced Grading Alternative
- Proposed General Plan Update Draft Land Use Map Alternative (Development Consistent with the San Diego County General Plan Update)
- Proposed General Plan Update Referral Map Alternative (Development Consistent with the San Diego County General Plan Update)

In addition, following the discovery of human remains in late January 2011, three additional alternatives were examined to consider the possible realignment and/or reconfiguration of Horse Ranch Creek Road. The discussion of these alternatives is provided to further California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) goals of public disclosure, although these alternatives are not required in order to reduce significant impacts associated with the remains, as those impacts can be mitigated consistent with

the CEQA Guidelines by preservation in place, as discussed below. These three additional alternatives include the following:

1. Raised Elevation of Horse Ranch Creek Road Alternative
2. Western Alignment of Horse Ranch Creek Road Alternative
3. Reconfigured Alignment of Horse Ranch Creek Road Alternative

A summary of the conclusions is provided below with the full analysis found in Chapter 5 of the EIR.

Analysis of the No Project (No Development) Alternative (Subchapter 5.2)

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e), the No Project Alternative includes a discussion of the existing conditions at the time the NOP is published and no development would occur (Alternative 1) or a discussion of a circumstance in which the Proposed Project does not proceed, but taking into account what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future (Alternative 2). The EIR considers both scenarios.

Under the No Project (No Development) Alternative, the Project Site would remain as it is today, consisting primarily of agricultural uses. The No Project (No Development) Alternative is environmentally superior to the Proposed Project because it would avoid significant unmitigated impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, and transportation/traffic, as well as reduce significant and mitigated impacts associated with biological and agricultural resources, geology and soils, cultural resources, noise, and hazards/hazardous materials for the Proposed Project. This alternative would not develop housing nor meet any of the Proposed Project's objectives.

Analysis of the No Project (Development Consistent with the Adopted General Plan) Alternative (Subchapter 5.3)

The No Project (Development Consistent with the Adopted General Plan) Alternative applies the two existing General Plan Designations, (18) Multiple Rural Use and (21) Specific Plan Area, with an overall density of 2.75 du/ac. There are 297.5 acres in the (18) Multiple Rural Use area, which requires a minimum lot size of 4, 8, or 20 acres, depending on slope. The (18) Multiple Rural Use area would yield approximately 33 dwelling units on 4-, 8-, or 20-acre lots. There are 92 acres in the (21) Specific Plan Area portion of the Project Site, which would yield approximately 229 single-family dwelling units on 10,000-square-foot and half-acre lots. Therefore, the No Project (Development Consistent with the Adopted General Plan) Alternative would produce approximately 262 single-family dwelling units.

The No Project (Development Consistent with the Adopted General Plan) Alternative would result in reducing significant and unmitigated air quality impacts to a level which would be mitigated. Significant unmitigated aesthetics and transportation/traffic would remain. Impacts related to biological resources and agricultural resources would be greater. Significant and mitigated impacts anticipated are associated with geology and soils, cultural resources, noise, and hazards/hazardous materials would be similar to the Proposed Project. This alternative would not attain the following five of the ten project

objectives. This alternative would not provide a variety of housing types (Objectives 1), preserve biological and visual resources (Objective 3), preserve ongoing agriculture (Objective 5), provide educational and recreational opportunities (Objective 6), or provide permanent preservation of natural open spaces (Objective 8).

Analysis of the Groundwater Dependent (Consistent with the Groundwater Ordinance) Alternative (Subchapter 5.4)

The Groundwater Dependent (Consistent with the Groundwater Ordinance) Alternative relies on groundwater to sustain development consistent with the San Diego County Groundwater Ordinance. Under this alternative, the Groundwater Ordinance would restrict lot sizes based on annual average rainfall. The ordinance would require a minimum lot size of eight acres. Therefore, 46 eight-acre single-family lots could be accommodated on the site and would be dependent on private wells and on-site septic systems instead of sanitary sewer and water.

The Groundwater Dependent (Development Consistent with the Groundwater Ordinance) Alternative would yield 46 residences, most likely dependent on private wells and on-site septic systems instead of sanitary sewer and water. An elementary school site and park would not be provided under this alternative. This alternative would avoid significant unmitigated impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, and transportation/traffic, as well as reduce significant and mitigated impacts associated with, geology and soils, cultural resources, noise, and hazards/hazardous materials for the Proposed Project. Impacts related to biological resources and agricultural resources would be greater as there would be no provision for dedication of open space easements.

This alternative would not attain the following eight of the ten project objectives. This alternative would not provide a variety of housing types (Objective 1), provide a great increase in housing supply (Objective 2); preserve biological and visual resources (Objective 3); preserve ongoing agriculture (Objective 5); provide educational and recreational opportunities (Objective 6), and provide permanent preservation of natural open spaces (Objective 8). This alternative will not require a LAFCO SOI determination or selection of MWD to serve the Project Site (Objectives 9 and 10).

Analysis of the Reduced Grading Alternative (Subchapter 5.5)

The rationale for the selection of a Reduced Grading Alternative is to minimize alteration of the topography and maximize the preservation of biological and agricultural resources. The Reduced Grading Alternative would entail clustering development on the area of the Project Site with less than 15 percent slope gradient with all remaining land (approximately 300 acres) preserved as open space. Such development is likely to include three-story multi-family buildings, with possible underground parking. The remaining 38.5-acre area would be utilized as a combined park and elementary school. The Reduced Grading Alternative would yield 1,138 multi-family residential units, an increase of 241 units. This alternative would result in reducing the Proposed Project's significant and mitigated impacts related to biological resources and agricultural resources. It would result in similar significant and unmitigated impacts to aesthetics, air quality, and transportation/traffic, and to significant and mitigated impacts to geology and soils, cultural resources, noise, and hazards/hazardous materials.

This alternative would attain all but two project objectives. It would not meet the objective of providing a variety of housing because it would only offer a multi-family option (Objective 1). It would also not provide an opportunity for increasing a variety of housing (Objective 2).

Analysis of the Proposed General Plan Update Draft Land Use Map (Development Consistent with the San Diego County General Plan Update) Alternative (Subchapter 5.6)

The General Plan Update Draft Land Use Map Alternative would allow the construction of a community consisting of 1,168 single- and multi-family units and 1.8 acres of neighborhood commercial.

Due to the fact that the development footprint would be the same as the Proposed Project, impacts associated with aesthetics (significant and unmitigable), and impacts to biological resources, agricultural resources, and cultural resources, geology and soils and hazards/hazardous materials (significant and mitigated) would be similar to the Proposed Project. Due to the increase in the number of units and addition of neighborhood commercial use, this alternative would have greater impacts associated with air quality, transportation/traffic and noise. Significant unmitigated impacts associated with the Proposed Project would remain. This alternative would attain all of the project objectives.

Analysis of the Proposed General Plan Update Referral Map (Development Consistent with the San Diego County General Plan Update Referral Map) Alternative (Subchapter 5.7)

The General Plan Update Referral Map Alternative would allow the construction of a community with a 1.8-acre neighborhood commercial center and single and multi-family residences totaling 536 dwelling units.

Due to the fact that the development footprint would be the same as the Proposed Project, impacts associated with significant and unmitigated aesthetics, and impacts to significant and mitigated biological resources, agricultural resources, and cultural resources would be similar to the Proposed Project. This alternative would also result in similar impacts associated with geology and soils and hazards/hazardous materials (significant and mitigated). Given the reduction in the number of traffic trips, this alternative would have less impacts associated with air quality and transportation/traffic, although they would remain significant and unmitigated. With the addition of the neighborhood commercial use, this alternative would have greater impacts associated with noise.

This alternative would attain all of the project objectives. However, Objectives 1 (variety of residential land uses) and 2 (increasing housing supply) would not be reached at the same level as the Proposed Project.

Analysis of the Raised Elevation of Horse Ranch Creek Road Alternative (Subchapter 5.8.1)

The Raised Elevation of Horse Ranch Creek Road Alternative would be conditioned to elevate the profile of Horse Ranch Creek Road by roughly two to six feet over the area of concern associated with the discovery of human remains in order to reduce the need for further excavation. Due to the fact that all other aspects of the Proposed Project would remain the same, environmental impacts would be similar for the issues of aesthetics, air quality, traffic/transportation, biology, geology and soils, noise, and hazards.

This alternative could reduce less than significant impacts to Cultural Resources so long as the raising of the roadway's elevation would not encroach into on-site Loci in proximity to the roadway due to increased slopes along Horse Ranch Creek Road. This alternative would attain all of the project objectives.

Analysis of the Western Alignment for Horse Ranch Creek Road Alternative (Subchapter 5.8.2)

The Western Alignment for Horse Ranch Creek Road Alternative would realign Horse Ranch Creek Road approximately 450 feet west of the currently proposed alignment in order to avoid additional excavation in proximity to the discovered human remains. Under this alternative the number of multi-family units in Planning Area 1 would be reduced by approximately 140 units, from 164 units to approximately 24 units, and it would reduce the total number of housing units in the project from 844 units to approximately 704 units. Additionally, the WWTP would be located along SR-76 slightly to the east of the currently proposed location.

This alternative would not reduce any significant impacts associated with the Proposed Project. Environmental impacts would be similar for the issues of aesthetics, air quality, biology, geology and soils, cultural resources, noise and hazards. Impacts to traffic/transportation, specifically related to safety, would be increased over the Proposed Project due to conflicts with Caltrans standard specification requirements associated with the placement of Horse Ranch Creek Road. The Western Alignment Alternative would meet most of the Proposed Project objectives; however, the removal of the multi-family homes currently located in the southern portion of the Proposed Project would result in the project's inability to meet objectives relating to providing a variety of housing types (Objectives 1 and 2).

Analysis of the Reconfigured Alignment of Horse Ranch Creek Road Alternative (Subchapter 5.8.3)

The Reconfigured Alignment of Horse Ranch Creek Road Alternative would eliminate the southern segment of Horse Ranch Creek Road (from Pankey Place south to SR-76). The elimination of Horse Ranch Creek Road at this location would also remove access to the WWTP as currently proposed. Access to the WWTP would be provided either via entrance from SR- 76 or via connection to an existing private road to the east. In order to accommodate the reconfigured roadways and access to the WWTP, the proposed 164 multi-family units would not be developed within Planning Area 1, reducing the total housing provided by the project from 844 units to 680 units.

This alternative would increase the utilization of the existing Pankey Road/SR-76 intersection. As indicated by Caltrans, this alternative would require the following road improvements to accommodate the traffic flow: dual left-turn lanes for eastbound to northbound traffic at Pankey Road/SR-76; six lanes of through traffic from I-15 east through the Pankey Road/SR-76 intersection; and the widening of the SR-76 overcrossing Horse Ranch Creek Road. Additionally, Pankey Place would be widened from a two-lane road to a Major 4-lane road (as defined by the County) to accommodate the additional traffic. The Reconfigured Alignment Road Alternative would result in similar impacts for the issues of aesthetics, air quality, geology and soils, cultural resources, noise, and hazards. Due to the reduction in land uses, air quality impacts would be reduced due to reduced emissions; however, Traffic/Transportation impacts would be increased. Project and cumulative traffic would be directed to one intersection along SR-76 and likely cause the segments and intersections to operate at failing levels. Biological impacts would also be increased due to road improvements and increased traffic.

The Reconfigured Alignment Alternative would meet the majority of the Proposed Project's objectives. The removal of the multi-family homes currently located in the southern portion of the Proposed Project would result in the project's inability to meet objectives relating to providing a variety of housing types (Objectives 1 and 2) and preserve sensitive habitat (Objective 3).

Environmentally Superior Alternative

Although the No Project (No Development) Alternative and the No Project (Adopted General Plan) Alternative would result in minimal or substantially reduced environmental impacts, Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires identification of an alternative other than the No Project Alternative as the environmentally superior alternative. As such, the Reduced Grading Alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative due to its potential for maximizing retention of the natural landform and steep hillsides and preservation of biological and agricultural resources.

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.1 Aesthetics	<u>A-1.</u> Visible construction activities would significantly contrast with the existing visual environment due to removal of existing vegetation and the introduction of new, visually dominant elements such as newly cut or fill slopes, construction fencing, construction equipment, and construction materials stockpiling and storage.	<u>M-A-1.</u> Direct impacts resulting from short-term construction would remain significant. There is no feasible mitigation available to lessen these short-term effects.	Significant and unmitigable
	<u>A-2.</u> The cumulative introduction (Campus Park, Campus Park West, Palomar College, Pala Mesa Highlands, along with the Proposed Project) of a large number of buildings and suburban elements into areas that are currently undeveloped or used for agriculture would create a major change in the existing visual character of the viewshed.	<u>M-A-2:</u> Design measures have been incorporated into the Proposed Project that would reduce direct impacts to existing visual character and quality. However, there is no feasible mitigation available to lessen the cumulative effects.	Significant and unmitigable
	<u>A-3.</u> Some or all of the four nearby projects, Campus Park, Campus Park West, Palomar College, Pala Mesa Highlands, along with the Proposed Project, would be visible from the proposed San Luis Rey River Trail, the Engle Family Preserve, and Monserate Mountain Trail. The proposed cumulative projects would create a major change to the views from the surrounding areas and trails.	<u>M-A-3:</u> Design measures have been incorporated into the Proposed Project that would reduce direct impacts to existing visual character and quality. However, there is no feasible mitigation available to lessen the cumulative effects.	Significant and unmitigable
2.2 Air Quality	<u>AQ-1.</u> Densities included in the Proposed Project are not consistent with the existing, adopted San Diego County General Plan and the Fallbrook CP, and were not considered in the development of the Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) for the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB).	<u>M-AQ-1.</u> The Proposed Project is not considered in SANDAG growth projects and thus is not consistent with the existing RAQS and the SIP. Until SANDAG updates the RAQS and SIP, there is no feasible mitigation available to reduce this impact.	Significant and unmitigable

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.2 Air Quality (cont.)	<p><u>AQ-2.</u> The Proposed Project has the potential to result in emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOC) during the architectural coating (painting) phase of construction which exceeds thresholds.</p>	<p><u>M-AQ-2.</u> During the architectural coatings (painting) phase of construction, the applicant shall use interior coatings with a VOC content less than or equal to 50 grams per liter; residential exterior coatings with a content less than or equal to 100 grams per liter; and non-residential exterior and interior coatings with a content less than or equal to 250 grams per liter.</p>	Less than significant
	<p><u>AQ-3.</u> On-site operational and source emissions of reactive organic gas (ROG) and particulates (PM₁₀) will continue to violate air quality standards.</p>	<p><u>M-AQ-3.</u> The Proposed Project design would promote walking, bicycle riding, and horseback riding as alternative forms of transportation to motorized vehicles and would reduce the projected operational emissions. However, this will not completely reduce emissions to a level below significance. No additional feasible mitigation is available, thus impacts would remain significant and unmitigatable.</p>	Significant and unmitigatable
	<p><u>AQ-4.</u> Health risks associated with construction-related activities due to emissions from diesel equipment would be significant.</p>	<p><u>M-AQ-4.</u> To utilize Toxic-Best Available Control Technology (T-BACT) and mitigate for impacts, the applicant shall ensure that 10 percent of the construction fleet uses any combination of diesel catalytic converters, diesel oxidation catalysts, diesel particulate filters and/or CARB certified Tier I, II, or III equipment.</p>	Less than significant
	<p><u>AQ-5.</u> The Proposed Project, together with other projects in the area would result in growth not represented in SANDAG growth forecasts nor included in the current RAQS or SIP, thus representing a significant impact.</p>	<p><u>M-AQ-5.</u> Until SANDAG updates the RAQS and SIP, there is no feasible mitigation available to reduce this impact, thus impacts would be significant and unmitigatable.</p>	Significant and unmitigatable

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.2 Air Quality (cont.)	<u>AQ-6.</u> Construction of the Proposed Project, together with other projects would result in emissions of diesel-fired particulate matter and result in a significant cumulative impact.	<u>M-AQ-6.</u> To ensure the use of T-BACT and mitigate for impacts, the applicant shall have 10 percent of the construction fleet use any combination of diesel catalytic converters, diesel oxidation catalysts, diesel particulate filters and/or CARB certified Tier I, II, or III equipment.	Less than significant
	<u>AQ-7.</u> Implementation of the Proposed Project, along with other projects will result in the violation of air quality standards related to PM ₁₀ and ROG and creating a significant cumulative impact..	<u>M-AQ-7.</u> There is no feasible mitigation available to reduce this impact, thus impacts would be significant and unmitigable.	Significant and unmitigable
2.3 Transportation / Traffic	<u>TR-1.</u> The Proposed Project is calculated to have direct impacts at the intersection of Old Highway 395/ Reche Road	<u>M-TR-1.</u> The applicant shall install a traffic signal at the intersection of Old Highway 395 and Reche Road to the satisfaction of the Director of DPW.	Less than significant
	<u>TR-2.</u> The Proposed Project is calculated to have direct impacts at the following street segments: SR-76 from Via Monserate to Gird Road SR-76 from I-15 SB Ramp to I-15 NB Ramp	<u>M-TR-2.</u> Direct impacts to study area street/State Route segments shall be mitigated through the construction of one additional travel lane in each direction. The Caltrans SR-76 project proposes the widening of SR-76 from Via Monserate to Gird Road and SR-76 from the I-15 SB ramp to I-15 the NB ramp. Should the Caltrans project not be completed prior to the Proposed Project, the applicant shall make a fair share contribution to be allocated to the widening of SR-76, if feasible.	If the first residential unit within the Proposed Project is occupied prior to completion of the Caltrans SR-76 Middle project or SR-76 East project, impacts could remain significant and unmitigable
	<u>TR-3.</u> The Proposed Project is calculated to have cumulative impacts at the following intersections: SR-76 (Pala Rd) / Via Monserate SR-76 (Pala Rd) / Gird Road SR-76 (Pala Rd) / Sage Road SR-76 (Pala Rd) / Old Highway 395 SR-76 (Pala Rd) / I-15 SB Ramp	<u>M-TR-3.</u> Cumulative impacts to study area intersections shall be mitigated through applicant participation in the TIF program.	Less than significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
	SR-76 (Pala Rd) / I-15 NB Ramp		
	SR-76 (Pala Rd) / Pankey Road		
	SR-76 (Pala Rd) / Rice Canyon Road		
	SR-76 (Pala Rd) / Couser Canyon Road		
	Old Highway 395 / Pala Mesa Drive		
	Old Highway 395 / Stewart Canyon Road		
	Old Highway 395 / Reche Road		
	Mission Road / Old Highway 395		
	Mission Road / I-15 Southbound Ramp		
	Mission Road / I-15 Northbound Ramp		
	SR-76 (Mission Ave) / E Vista Way		
	SR-76 (Mission Ave) / North River Road		
	SR-76 (Mission Ave) / Olive Hill Road		
	SR-76 (Mission Ave) / S. Mission Road		
2.3 Transportation / Traffic (cont.)	<p><u>TR-4.</u> The Proposed Project is calculated to have cumulative impacts to the following street segments:</p> <p>Old Highway 395 from E. Mission Rd to Reche Rd</p> <p>Old Highway 395 from Reche Rd to Stewart Canyon Rd</p> <p>Old Highway 395 from Pala Mesa Dr to SR-76</p> <p>SR-76 from E Vista Way to North River Road</p> <p>SR-76 from North River Road to Olive Hill Road</p> <p>SR-76 from Olive Hill Road to S Mission Road</p>	<p><u>M-TR-4.</u> Cumulative impacts to study area street/State Route segments shall be mitigated through applicant participation in the TIF program.</p>	Less than significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
	SR-76 from S Mission Road to Via Monserate SR-76 from Via Monserate to Gird Road SR-76 from Gird Road to Sage Road SR-76 from Sage Road to Old Highway 395 SR-76 from I-15 SB Ramp to I-15 NB Ramp SR-76 from Horse Ranch Creek Road to Rice Canyon Road SR-76 from Rice Canyon Road to Couser Canyon Road SR-76 from Couser Canyon Road to Pala Mission Road		
3.1 Biological Resources	<u>BR-1</u> . Construction activities in the vicinity of arroyo toads and their habitat may result in indirect impacts caused by increased nighttime lighting, erosion, and debris or construction equipment in the preserved habitat.	M-BR-1. To mitigate indirect construction-related impacts on the arroyo toad, the owner/permittee shall, using a qualified biologist, implement the following mitigation measure(s): a. The project biologist shall meet with the owner, permittee or designee, and the construction crew to conduct an on site educational session regarding the need to avoid impacts outside of the approved development area and identify locations for placement of protective fencing. The project biologist shall continue to monitor grading activities. b. During grading activities, Best Management Practices for erosion control shall be implemented and monitored as needed to prevent any significant sediment transport. These practices may include, but may not be limited to, the following: the use of materials such	Less than significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		<p>as sandbags; sediment fencing and erosion control matting to stabilize disturbed areas; and installation of erosion control materials, particularly on the downslope side of disturbed areas, to prevent soil loss.</p> <p>c. All construction activities shall take place only inside the fenced area. Grading materials shall be stored either inside the fenced development area or in an area approved by the project biologist.</p> <p>d. A storm drain system and detention basins shall be constructed to restrict excess water flow from proposed roads and structures associated with the Meadowood project. Filter devices shall be installed at the appropriate points to ensure that run-off is cleansed before reaching the basins. All water-catchment features shall be located above graded and natural slopes.</p> <p>e. Nighttime lighting shall be shielded and directed away from riparian and upland habitat adjacent to the development.</p>	
3.1 Biological Resources (cont.)	<p><u>BR-2.</u> The Proposed Project would remove a total of 14.5 acres of gnatcatcher habitat, including 13.5 acres of Designated Critical Habitat and 1.0 acres of gnatcatcher habitat are outside the Critical Habitat boundaries.</p>	<p><u>M-BR-2.</u> Permanent direct impacts to a total of 14.5 acres on- and off-site, of suitable habitat for California gnatcatcher shall be mitigated on-site at a ratio of 2:1 for a total of 29.0 acres. <u>If Palomar Community College mitigates for impacts associated with Horse Ranch Creek, this would reduce impacts to gnatcatcher habitat by 0.7 acres and mitigation by 1.4 acres, for a total mitigation requirement of 27.6 acres.</u> A total of 74.5 acres of habitat shall be preserved in the proposed on-site open space easement. The mitigation land shall also cover impacts to designated Critical Habitat for the</p>	Less than significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		California gnatcatcher as detailed in the Conceptual Resource Management Plan (Appendix F-3).	
		Temporary direct impacts to a total of 0.3 acre on- and off-site shall be mitigated through revegetation of the coastal sage scrub with the same species present within the impact area. The revegetation areas are shown on the Conceptual Landscape Plan.	
		Take authorization of the California gnatcatcher and removal of coastal sage scrub habitat shall be obtained through the <u>Section 7 Consultation with the USFWS or through the County Habitat Loss Permit Ordinance and compliance with the Coastal Sage Scrub NCCP.</u> consultation with the USFWS.	
3.1 Biological Resources (cont.)	<u>BR-3.4a.</u> Construction activities in the vicinity of California gnatcatchers and their habitat may result in indirect impacts caused by increased noise, increased nighttime lighting, erosion, and debris or construction equipment in the preserved habitat.	<u>M-BR-3.4a.</u> Indirect impacts on the California gnatcatcher shall be mitigated by the following measures to be implemented by the project applicant: a. The project biologist shall meet with the owner, permittee or designee, and the construction crew to conduct an on site educational session regarding the need to avoid impacts outside of the approved development area. b. During grading activities, Best Management Practices for erosion control shall be implemented and monitored as needed to prevent any significant sediment transport. These practices may include, but may not be limited to, the following: the use of materials such as sandbags; sediment fencing and erosion control matting to stabilize disturbed areas; and	Less than significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		<p>installation of erosion control materials, particularly on the downslope side of disturbed areas, to prevent soil loss.</p> <p>c. All construction activities shall take place only inside the fenced area. Grading materials shall be stored either inside the fenced development area or in an area approved by the project biologist.</p> <p>d. Nighttime lighting shall be shielded and directed away from coastal sage scrub habitat adjacent to the development. <u>This shall be implemented through a Lighting Plan.</u></p> <p>e. Permanent fencing and signage shall be placed along the trails and/or between the development open space interface in compliance with County standards and as shown on the Landscape Concept Plans.</p>	
3.1 Biological Resources (cont.)	<p>BR-3-2b. Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would result in significant direct impacts to the California gnatcatcher.</p>	<p>M-BR-3-2b. Direct impacts on the California gnatcatcher shall be mitigated by the following measures to be implemented by the project applicant:</p> <p>a. Direct impacts to California gnatcatcher shall be mitigated in accordance with M-BR-2. Habitats shall be mitigated on site at a ratio of 2:1 for coastal sage scrub and disturbed coastal sage scrub for a total of 29.0 acres or in accordance with the County guidelines. If Palomar Community College mitigates for impacts associated with Horse Ranch Creek, this would reduce impacts to gnatcatcher habitat by 0.7 acres and mitigation by 1.4 acres, for a total mitigation requirement of 27.6 acres. Temporary impacts would be mitigated through revegetation</p>	Less than significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		<p>of the coastal sage scrub with the same species present within the impact area. The revegetation areas are shown on the Conceptual Landscape Plan. This mitigation shall be incorporated into the Section 7 consultation.</p> <p>b. A qualified biologist shall supervise the placement of orange construction fencing or equivalent along the boundary of the development area as shown on the approved grading plans. The location and design for fencing shall be recommended and subsequently installed by a qualified biologist.</p> <p><u>c. To avoid impacts to nesting gnatcatchers, vegetation clearing and grubbing within 500 feet of coastal sage scrub shall no occur in potential nesting habitat during the breeding season from February 15 through August 31. If project construction (other than clearing and grubbing of sensitive habitats) is necessary adjacent to preserved on- and off-site habitat during the gnatcatcher breeding (or sooner if a Wildlife Agency-approved biologist demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Wildlife Agencies that all nesting is complete), a Wildlife Agency-approved biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys in the adjacent habitat to determine the location of any active gnatcatcher nests in the area. The survey shall begin not more than three days prior to the beginning of construction activities. The Agencies shall be notified if any nesting gnatcatcher are found. During construction, no activity shall occur within 500 ft (152.4 m) of active gnatcatcher nesting territories, unless measures are implemented to minimize the noise and disturbance to those adjacent birds.</u></p>	

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		<p><u>Exceptions to this measure includes cases where surveys confirm that adjacent habitat is not occupied or where noise studies confirm that construction noise levels are below 60 dBA hourly Leq along the edge of adjacent habitat. If construction activities are not completed prior to the breeding season and noise levels exceed this threshold, noise barriers shall be erected to reduce noise impacts to occupied habitat to below 60 dBA hourly Leq and/or the culpable activities will be suspended.</u></p> <p>e. Prior to any grading or native vegetation clearing associated with construction, a "directed" survey shall be conducted to confirm the presence or absence of the California gnatcatcher on site and, if found to be present, to locate active nests (if any). If active nests are present, no grading or removal of habitat shall take place within 500 feet of active nesting sites during the nesting/breeding season (February 15 through August 31). Should active nests be abandoned prior to the end of the expected breeding season, grading and construction may proceed within approved grading limits.</p> <p>d. Construction noise shall continue to be monitored to verify that noise levels are not adversely affecting behavior and are maintained below 60 dB(A) hourly average or to the ambient noise level if it already exceeds 60 dB(A) hourly average. Sound barriers shall be put in place if construction noise exceeds 60 db(A) in the immediate vicinity of an active gnatcatcher nest.</p>	

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
3.1 Biological Resources (cont.)	<p><u>BR-4.</u> The Proposed Project would result in significant permanent direct impacts resulting from off-site improvement areas would remove approximately 3.7 acres of occupied least Bell's vireo habitat (southern willow scrub and southern arroyo willow riparian forest) and temporary impacts to 2.2 acres.</p>	<p><u>M-BR-4.</u> Impacts to least Bell's vireo habitat shall be mitigated at a ratio of 3:1 for a total of 11.1 acres to be purchased off-site. This mitigation shall be incorporated into the Section 7 consultation. The habitat shall be a southern willow scrub or willow riparian forest habitat which can be occupied by least Bell's vireo as detailed in the <u>Conceptual Wetlands Mitigation Plan. If Palomar Community College mitigates for impacts associated with Horse Ranch Creek, this would reduce impacts to vireo habitat by 0.7 acres and mitigation by 2.1 acres for a total mitigation requirement of 9.1 acres. This mitigation shall be incorporated into the Section 7 consultation.</u></p> <p>Temporary direct impacts to 2.2 acres shall be mitigated through revegetation of the riparian habitat with the same species present within the impact area. The revegetation areas are shown on the Conceptual Landscape Plan.</p>	Less than significant
	<p><u>BR-5.1a.</u> Construction activities in the vicinity of least Bell's vireo and their habitat may result in indirect impacts caused by increased noise, increased nighttime lighting, erosion, and debris or construction equipment in the preserved habitat.</p>	<p><u>M-BR-5.1a.</u> Indirect impacts to least Bell's vireo shall be mitigated by the following measures to be implemented by the project applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The project biologist shall meet with the owner, permittee or designee, and the construction crew to conduct an on site educational session regarding the need to avoid impacts outside of the approved development area. b. During grading activities, Best Management Practices for erosion control shall be implemented and monitored as needed to prevent any significant sediment transport. These practices may include, but may not be 	Less than significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		<p>limited to, the following: the use of materials such as sandbags; sediment fencing and erosion control matting to stabilize disturbed areas; and installation of erosion control materials, particularly on the downslope side of disturbed areas, to prevent soil loss.</p> <p>c. All construction activities shall take place only inside the fenced area. Grading materials shall be stored either inside the fenced development area or in an area approved by the project biologist.</p> <p>d. Nighttime lighting shall be shielded and directed away from riparian habitat adjacent to the development. <u>This shall be implemented through a Lighting Plan.</u></p>	
3.1 Biological Resources (cont.)	<u>BR-5-2b.</u> Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would result in significant direct impacts to the least Bell's vireo.	<p><u>M-BR-5-2b.</u> Direct impacts to least Bell's vireo shall be mitigated by the following measures to be implemented by the project applicant:</p> <p>a. <u>Direct impacts to least Bell's vireo habitat shall be mitigated in accordance with M-BR-4Vireo habitat shall be mitigated at 3:1 for riparian vegetation types for a total of 11.1 acres. Temporary impacts shall be mitigated through revegetation of the riparian vegetation with the same species found within the impact area. The revegetation areas are shown on the Conceptual Landscape Plan. This mitigation shall be incorporated into the Section 7 consultation. The off-site location, land manager, and conservation status of the mitigation land shall be identified prior to Final Map recordation. The habitat shall be a southern willow scrub or willow riparian forest habitat occupied by least Bell's vireo</u></p>	Less than significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		<p>similar to that affected by the Proposed Project and as detailed in the Wetland Mitigation Plan (Appendix F-4).</p> <p>b. A qualified biologist shall supervise the placement of orange construction fencing or equivalent along the boundary of the development area as shown on the approved grading plans. The location and design for fencing shall be recommended and subsequently installed by a qualified biologist.</p> <p>c. <u>To avoid impacts to nesting vireos, vegetation clearing and grubbing shall not occur within 500 feet of riparian habitat during the breeding season from March 15 to September 15. If project construction (other than clearing and grubbing of sensitive habitats) is necessary adjacent to preserved on- and off-site habitat during the vireo breeding (or sooner if a Wildlife Agency-approved biologist demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Wildlife Agencies that all nesting is complete), a Wildlife Agency-approved biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys in the adjacent habitat to determine the location of any active vireo nests in the area. The survey shall begin not more than three days prior to the beginning of construction activities. The Agencies shall be notified if any nesting vireos are found. During construction, no activity shall occur within 500 ft (152.4 m) of active vireo nesting territories, unless measures are implemented to minimize the noise and disturbance to those adjacent birds. Exceptions to this measure includes cases where surveys confirm that adjacent habitat is not occupied or where noise studies confirm that construction</u></p>	

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
3.1 Biological Resources (cont.)	<p><u>BR-6.</u> The permanent removal of 3.7 acres of suitable habitat and temporary impacts to 2.20 acres of suitable habitat for southwestern willow flycatcher would be considered a significant impact.</p>	<p><u>noise levels are below 60 dBA hourly Leq along the edge of adjacent habitat. If construction activities are not completed prior to the breeding season and noise levels exceed this threshold, noise barriers shall be erected to reduce noise impacts to occupied habitat to below 60 dBA hourly Leq and/or the culpable activities will be suspended.</u></p> <p>c. Prior to any grading or native vegetation clearing associated with project construction, a "directed survey" shall be conducted to confirm the presence or absence of the least Bell's vireo on-site and, if found to be present, to locate active nests (if any). If active nests are present, no grading or removal of habitat shall take place within 500 feet of active nesting sites during the nesting/breeding season (March 15 through September 15). Should active nests be abandoned prior to the end of the expected breeding season, grading and construction may proceed within approved grading limits.</p> <p>d. Construction noise shall continue to be monitored to verify that noise levels are not adversely affecting behavior and are maintained below 60 dB(A) hourly average or to the ambient noise level if it already exceeds 60 dB(A) hourly average. Sound barriers shall be put in place if construction noise exceeds 60 db(A) in the immediate vicinity of an active vireo nest.</p> <p><u>M-BR-6.</u> Impacts to southwestern willow flycatcher habitat shall be mitigated at a ratio of 3:1 for a total of 11.1 acres to be purchased off-site as detailed in the <u>Conceptual Wetland Mitigation Plan</u> (Appendix</p>	Less than significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		<p>F-4). <u>If Palomar Community College mitigates for impacts associated with Horse Ranch Creek, this would reduce impacts to southwestern willow flycatcher habitat by 0.7 acres and mitigation by 2.1 acres, for a total mitigation requirement of 9.1 acres.</u> This mitigation shall be incorporated into the Section 7 consultation.</p>	
		<p>Temporary direct impacts to 2.2 acres of suitable habitat shall be mitigated through revegetation of the riparian habitat with the same species present within the impact area. The revegetation areas are shown on the Conceptual Landscape Plan.</p>	
3.1 Biological Resources (cont.)	<p><u>BR-7.4a.</u> Construction activities in the vicinity of least southwestern willow flycatcher and their habitat may result in indirect impacts caused by increased noise, increased nighttime lighting, erosion, and debris or construction equipment in the preserved habitat.</p>	<p><u>M-BR-7.4a.</u> Indirect impacts on the southwestern willow flycatcher shall be mitigated by the following measures to be implemented by the project applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The project biologist shall meet with the owner, permittee or designee, and the construction crew to conduct an on site educational session regarding the need to avoid impacts outside of the approved development area. b. During grading activities, Best Management Practices for erosion control shall be implemented and monitored as needed to prevent any significant sediment transport. These practices may include, but may not be limited to, the following: the use of materials such as sandbags; sediment fencing and erosion control matting to stabilize disturbed areas; and installation of erosion control materials, particularly on the downslope side of disturbed areas, to prevent soil loss. 	Less than significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
3.1 Biological Resources (cont.)	<u>BR-7.2b.</u> Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would result in significant direct impacts to the southwestern willow flycatcher.	<p>c. All construction activities shall take place only inside the fenced area. Grading materials shall be stored either inside the fenced development area or in an area approved by the project biologist.</p> <p>d. Nighttime lighting shall be shielded and directed away from riparian habitat adjacent to the development. <u>This shall be implemented through a Lighting Plan.</u></p> <p><u>BR-7.2b.</u> Direct impacts on the southwestern willow flycatcher shall be mitigated by the following measures to be implemented by the project applicant:</p> <p>a. <u>Direct impacts to southwestern willow flycatcher habitat shall be mitigated in accordance with M-BR-6. Impacts to flycatcher habitat shall be mitigated at 3:1 for riparian vegetation types for a total of 11.1 acres. Temporary impacts shall be mitigated through revegetation of the riparian vegetation with the same species found within the impact area. The revegetation areas are shown on the Conceptual Landscape Plan. This mitigation shall be incorporated into the Section 7 consultation.</u></p> <p>b. A qualified biologist shall supervise the placement of orange construction fencing or equivalent along the boundary of the development area as shown on the approved grading plans. The location and design for fencing shall be recommended and subsequently installed by a qualified biologist.</p> <p>c. <u>To avoid impacts to nesting southern willow flycatchers, vegetation clearing and grubbing</u></p>	Less than significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		<p><u>within 500 feet of riparian habitat shall not occur from May 1 to September 1. If project construction (other than clearing and grubbing of sensitive habitats) is necessary adjacent to preserved on- and off-site habitat during the flycatcher breeding (or sooner if a Wildlife Agency-approved biologist demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Wildlife Agencies that all nesting is complete), a Wildlife Agency-approved biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys in the adjacent habitat to determine the location of any active flycatcher nests in the area. The survey shall begin not more than three days prior to the beginning of construction activities. The Agencies shall be notified if any nesting flycatchers are found. During construction, no activity shall occur within 500 ft (152.4 m) of active flycatcher nesting territories, unless measures are implemented to minimize the noise and disturbance to those adjacent birds. Exceptions to this measure includes cases where surveys confirm that adjacent habitat is not occupied or where noise studies confirm that construction noise levels are below 60 dBA hourly Leq along the edge of adjacent habitat. If construction activities are not completed prior to the breeding season and noise levels exceed this threshold, noise barriers shall be erected to reduce noise impacts to occupied habitat to below 60 dBA hourly Leq and/or the culpable activities will be suspended. Prior to any grading or native vegetation clearing associated with project construction, a "directed" survey shall be conducted to confirm the presence or absence of the southwestern willow flycatcher on-site and, if found to be present, to locate active nests (if</u></p>	

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
3.1 Biological Resources (cont.)	<p><u>BR-8.</u> Development of the Proposed Project will permanently (direct and indirect) impact foraging habitat on- and off-site. These impacts include 14.5 acres of coastal sage scrub, 2.2 acres of southern mixed chaparral, 30.2 acres of pasture and 15.3 acres of non-native grassland for a total of 62.2 acres of habitat. Temporary impacts include 0.3 acre coastal sage scrub, 0.2 acre of southern mixed chaparral, and 5.0 acres of pasture and non-native grassland for a total of 5.5 acres of habitat..</p>	<p>any). If active nests are present, no grading or removal of habitat shall take place within 500 feet of active nesting sites during the nesting/breeding season (May 1 through September 1). Should active nests be abandoned prior to the end of the expected breeding season, grading and construction may proceed within approved grading limits.</p> <p>d. Construction noise shall continue to be monitored to verify that noise levels are not adversely affecting behavior and are maintained below 60 dB(A) hourly average or to the ambient noise level if it already exceeds 60 dB(A) hourly average. Sound barriers shall be put in place if construction noise exceeds 60 db(A) in the immediate vicinity of an active flycatcher nest.</p> <p><u>M-BR-8.</u> Permanent direct impacts to 62.2 acres of foraging habitat for birds of prey and other special status species shall be mitigated through preservation of 122.4 acres of open space on-site within a regional open space network as detailed in the Conceptual Resource Management Plan (Appendix F-3).</p> <p>Temporary impacts would be mitigated through revegetation of foraging habitat with the same plant species found within the impact area. The revegetation areas are shown on the Conceptual Landscape Plan.</p> <p>Indirect impacts shall be mitigated by the following measures:</p> <p>a. Shielding lighting away from the open space.</p> <p>b. Monitoring noise levels during construction.</p>	Less than significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
3.1 Biological Resources (cont.)	<u>BR-9</u> . The Proposed Project could result in impacts to marginal, yet occupied habitat for the western spadefoot.	<p>c. Use of range construction fencing, and silt fencing.</p> <p>d. Permanent fencing and signage shall be placed along the trails and/or between the development open space interface in order to be compliant with County standards and as shown on the Landscape Concept Plans.</p> <p><u>M-BR-9</u>. Impacts to the western spadefoot shall be mitigated by the purchase of 11.1 acres of riparian forest and scrub habitat and the <u>122.4 acres of open space on-site within a regional open space network as detailed in the Conceptual Resource Management Plan (Appendix F-3)</u>. If Palomar Community College mitigates for impacts associated with Horse Ranch Creek, this would reduce impacts to western spadefoot habitat by 0.7 acres and mitigation by 2.1 acres, for a total mitigation requirement of 9.1 acres.</p> <p>Additionally, prior to grading, a written relocation plan shall be prepared and approved by the County and CDFG. In accordance with the plan, western spadefoot toads shall be trapped and relocated. The timing and duration of the relocation program shall be based on the activity period of the western spadefoot (generally associated with rainfall and temperature) and proposed construction schedule.</p> <p>Trapping shall occur along the existing pitfall traps located along the western and southern property boundaries and monitored prior to and during proposed construction activities. Any western spadefoot found in the traps shall be collected, noted and relocated to predetermined receptor sites within the region. Trapping and relocation shall be</p>	Less than significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		conducted by a biologist familiar with the biological natural history of the western spadefoot and possesses a CDFG Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for conducting these activities. At the end of the relocation effort, the biologist shall prepare a summary report noting the number of western spadefoot relocated, the location of the area to which they were moved, and other pertinent facts. The report shall be submitted to the County and CDFG.	
3.1 Biological Resources (cont.)	<u>BR-10.</u> Development of the Proposed Project will permanently and temporarily impact on- and off-site foraging habitat potentially supporting special status wildlife.	<u>M-BR-10.</u> Permanent and temporary impacts to the 14 special status wildlife species identified on-site shall be mitigated through preservation of 122.4 acres of open space on-site within a regional open space network as detailed in the Conceptual Resource Management Plan (Appendix F-3).	Less than significant
	<u>BR-11.</u> The Proposed Project would impact habitat for a variety of native bird species including raptors and nests of species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.	<u>M-BR-11.</u> Impacts to nesting birds shall be mitigated through the following measures: a. <u>Native and naturalized vegetation clearing shall not occur during the breeding season from - February 15 to -September 15; However, Project construction activities may occur within this period. Vegetation clearing shall take place outside of the nesting season, roughly defined as mid-February to mid-September. Vegetation clearing activities could occur within potential nesting habitat during the breeding season with</u> written concurrence from the Director of the Department of Planning and Land Use (DPLU), the USFWS, and the CDFG that nesting birds would be avoided. If vegetation removal is to take place during the nesting season, a biologist shall be present during vegetation clearing operations to search for and flag active nests so	Less than significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		that they can be avoided.	
		<p>b. <u>To avoid impacts to nesting raptors, any vegetation clearing or grubbing within 500 feet of trees suitable for raptor nesting shall not occur from February 1 to July 15. However, Project construction activities may occur within this period with written concurrence from the Director of the Department of Planning and Land Use (DPLU), the USFWS, and the CDFG that nesting birds would be avoided. A County-approved biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys in the adjacent habitat to determine the location of any active raptor nests in the area. The survey shall begin not more than ten days prior to the beginning of construction activities. During construction, no activity shall occur within 500 ft (152.4 m) of active raptor nests, unless measures are implemented to minimize the noise and disturbance to those adjacent birds. Prior to any grading or native vegetation clearing during the nesting/breeding season for raptors (roughly from mid-February through mid-July), a "directed" survey shall be conducted to locate active raptor nests, if any. If active raptor nests are present, no grading or removal of habitat shall take place within 500 feet of any active nesting sites. The project proponent may seek approval from the Director of DPLU if nesting activities cease prior to July 15.</u></p>	
		<p>c. <u>Potential impacts to nesting California gnatcatcher, least Bell's vireo, and southern willow flycatcher will be implemented through agency permitting and with M-BR-3b(c), M-BR-5b(c), and M-BR-7b(c). Prior to any grading or native vegetation clearing associated with project</u></p>	

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
3.1 Biological Resources (cont.)	<p><u>BR-12.</u> External community lighting may have an effect on species near the edge of open space if it is allowed to shine into preserved areas.</p>	<p>construction, a "directed" survey shall be conducted to confirm the presence or absence of the California gnatcatcher, least Bell's vireo, and southwestern willow flycatcher on-site and, if found to be present, to locate active nests (if any). If active nests are present, no grading or removal of habitat shall take place within 500 feet of active nesting sites during the nesting/breeding season (February 15 through August 31 for gnatcatcher, March 15 through September 15 for vireo, and May 1 through September 1 for flycatcher). Should active nests be abandoned prior to the end of the expected breeding season, grading and construction may proceed within approved grading limits.</p> <p><u>M-BR-12.</u> General indirect impacts associated with external community lighting shall be mitigated through the requirement that all communal lighting be shielded and directed away from the urban/natural edge. The Proposed Project shall be designed to be in compliance with the San Diego County Light Pollution Code (Sections 59.101-59.115). A lighting plan shall be included in the grading plans which shows required lighting adjacent to the open space as being shielded, unidirectional, low pressure sodium illumination (or similar), and directed away from preserve areas using appropriate placement and shields.</p>	Less than significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
3.1 Biological Resources (cont.)	<u>BR-13.</u> The Proposed Project would permanently remove approximately 12.6 acres on-site, and approximately 1.9 acres off-site, for a total of 14.5 acres of coastal sage scrub. Temporary impacts include 0.2 acre on-site and 0.1 acres off-site.	<u>M-BR-13.</u> Permanent impacts to coastal sage scrub and disturbed coast sage scrub shall be mitigated at the ratio of 2:1 totaling 29.0 acres within the 122.4 acre proposed on-site open space easement as detailed in the Conceptual Resource Management Plan (Appendix F-3). (Actual amount of coastal sage scrub preserved on-site is 74.5 acres). <u>If Palomar Community College mitigates for impacts associated with Horse Ranch Creek, this would reduce impacts to disturbed coastal sage scrub by 0.7 acres and mitigation by 1.4 acres, for a total mitigation requirement of 27.6 acres.</u> Temporary impacts shall be mitigated through revegetation with the same plant species found within the impact area. The revegetation areas are shown on the Conceptual Landscape Plan.	Less than significant
	<u>BR-14.</u> The Proposed Project would remove approximately 2.2 acres of southern mixed chaparral vegetation on-site.	<u>M-BR-14.</u> Permanent impacts to southern mixed chaparral shall be mitigated at the ratio of 0.5:1 totaling 1.1 acres within the 122.4 acre proposed on-site open space easement as detailed in the Conceptual Resource Management Plan (Appendix F-3). (Actual amount of southern mixed chaparral preserved on-site is 17.5 acres).	Less than significant
	<u>BR-15.</u> The Proposed Project would remove approximately 0.1 acre on-site and approximately 0.2 acre off-site, for a total of 0.3 acre.	<u>M-BR-15.</u> Permanent impacts to coast live oak shall be mitigated at the ratio of 3:1 totaling 0.9 acres within the 122.4 acre proposed on-site open space easement as detailed in the Conceptual Resource Management Plan (Appendix F-3). (Actual amount of coast live oak woodland preserved on-site is 1.7 acres).	Less than significant
	<u>BR-16.</u> The Proposed Project would remove approximately 9.9 acres of non-native grassland on-site and approximately 5.4 acres off-site for a total of 15.3 acres. Temporary impacts include less than	<u>M-BR-16.</u> Permanent impacts to non-native grassland shall be mitigated at the ratio of 0.5:1 totaling 7.7 acres within the 122.4 acre proposed on-site open space easement as detailed in the	Less than significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
	0.1 acre onsite and 2.1 acres off-site.	Conceptual Resource Management Plan (Appendix F-3). (Actual amount of non-native grassland preserved on-site is 22.0 acres).	
<u>3.1 Biological Resources (cont.)</u>	<u>BR-17.</u> Proposed development would result in the removal of approximately 1.5 acres of pastureland on-site and 28.7 acres off-site for a total of 30.2 acres. Temporary impacts include 2.8 acres off-site.	<u>M-BR-17.</u> Permanent impacts to pastureland shall be mitigated at the ratio of 0.5:1 totaling 15.1 acres of non-native grassland. A portion of the mitigation shall be on-site within the proposed open space easement. An additional 2.7 acres of mitigation land is required and shall be preserved off-site as detailed in the Conceptual Resource Management Plan (Appendix F-3). <u>If Palomar Community College mitigates for impacts associated with Horse Ranch Creek, this would reduce impacts to pastureland by 16.7 acres and mitigation by 8.3 acres, for a total mitigation requirement of 6.8 acres.</u>	Less than significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
3.1 Biological Resources (cont.)	<p><u>BR-18.</u> Proposed development would result in the removal of 0.1 acres of willow/mule fat scrub on-site and less than one acre southern willow scrub, 3.7 acres southern arroyo willow riparian forest, and 0.9 acre freshwater marsh off-site.</p>	<p><u>M-BR-18.</u> Impacts willow/mule fat scrub, southern willow scrub, southern arroyo willow riparian forest, and freshwater marsh off-site shall be mitigated through dedication, restoration, creation and/or enhancement of wetlands at a ratio of 3:1 for a total of 12.3 acres or as defined through required state and federal wetland permits as detailed the <u>Conceptual Wetland Mitigation Plan (Appendix F-4).</u> <u>The Conceptual Wetlands Mitigation Plan will be updated to account for the impacted Jurisdictional Vegetated Wetlands separately from the impacted Vegetation Communities Impacts.</u></p> <p><u>-If Palomar Community College mitigates for impacts associated with Horse Ranch Creek, this would reduce impacts to willow/mule fat scrub, southern willow scrub, southern arroyo willow riparian forest, and freshwater marsh by 1 acre and mitigation by 3 acres, for a total mitigation requirement of 9.3 acres.</u> Temporary impacts shall be mitigated through revegetation with the same plant species found within the impact area. The revegetation areas are shown on the Conceptual Landscape Plan.</p>	Less than significant
	<p><u>BR-19.</u> Proposed development would result in the on- and off-site impacts to jurisdictional wetlands.</p>	<p><u>M-BR-19.</u> <u>Permanent</u> impacts to jurisdictional wetlands shall follow the terms and conditions of permits and agreements with ACOE and CDFG.</p> <p>Permanent impacts shall be mitigated at a ratio of 3:1 and shall consist of purchase and dedication of replacement habitat, creation of wetlands, and revegetation of disturbed riparian habitat. Mitigation measures for impacts to ACOE jurisdictional wetlands, CDFG vegetated riparian habitat, and County wetlands are listed as follows:</p>	Less than significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1052 443 1608 711">• ACOE jurisdiction: Permanent impacts to 0.83 acre on-site and 2.29 acres off-site, for a total of 3.12 acres of ACOE jurisdictional waters and wetlands shall be mitigated with 9.36 acres of ACOE jurisdictional waters and wetlands. <u>If Palomar Community College mitigates for impacts associated with Horse Ranch Creek, this would reduce impacts to ACOE jurisdiction by 0.11 acre and mitigation by 0.33 acres, for a total mitigation requirement of 9.25 acres.</u> <li data-bbox="1052 751 1608 1044">• CDFG jurisdiction: Permanent impacts to 0.93 acres on-site and 2.29 acres off-site, for a total of 3.22 acres of CDFG jurisdictional waters and vegetated riparian habitat shall be mitigated with 9.66 acres of CDFG jurisdictional waters and vegetated riparian habitat. <u>If Palomar Community College mitigates for impacts associated with Horse Ranch Creek, this would reduce impacts to CDFG jurisdiction by 0.11 acre and mitigation by 0.33 acres, for a total mitigation requirement of 9.25 acres.</u> <li data-bbox="1052 1084 1608 1304">• RPO jurisdiction: Permanent impacts to 2.29 acres of RPO wetlands off-site shall be mitigated with 6.87 acres of RPO wetlands. <u>If Palomar Community College mitigates for impacts associated with Horse Ranch Creek, this would reduce impacts to RPO jurisdiction by 0.11 acre and mitigation by 0.33 acres, for a total mitigation requirement of 9.25 acres.</u> <p data-bbox="1052 1336 1583 1412"><u>The Conceptual Wetlands Mitigation Plan will be updated to account for the impacted Jurisdictional Vegetated Wetlands separately from the impacted</u></p> 	

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
3.1 Biological Resources (cont.)	<u>BR-20.</u> Temporary impacts to jurisdictional wetlands on- and off-site totaling 2.04 acres.	<u>Vegetation Communities Impacts. Details are contained within the Wetlands Mitigation Plan (Appendix F-4).</u> <u>M-BR-20.</u> Temporary impacts to 2.04 acres of jurisdictional wetlands shall be mitigated through revegetation with the same plant species found within the impact area. The revegetation areas are shown on the Conceptual Landscape Plan.	Less than significant
3.2 Agriculture Resources	<u>AG-1.</u> The implementation of the Proposed Project would result in the conversion of 6.3 acres of Prime Farmland, 99.9 acres of Unique Farmland, and 54.2 acres of Farmland to non-agricultural use. <u>AG-2.</u> The Proposed Project, together with other projects, would result in a significant cumulative loss of agricultural land.	<u>M-AG-1/M-AG-2.</u> The Proposed Project shall retain 49.3 acres of existing citrus and avocado groves in agricultural open space, thereby providing for the continued growth of citrus and avocado groves..	Less than significant Less than significant
3.3-2 Geology and Soils	<u>GE-1.</u> Standard design measures would not completely eliminate the risks associated with liquefaction within the Project Site. <u>GE-2.</u> The potential exists for rockfall from the west-facing slope of Rosemary's Mountain due to seismic or erosional events. The project design will incorporate features to reduce impacts from rockfall and soil instability, but these standard project design measures would not completely eliminate risks associated with rockfall.	<u>M-GE-1.</u> The applicant shall raise the existing grade while also removing and re-compacting the alluvium above the groundwater table to increase the overburden pressure over the liquefiable deposits as recommended by the geotechnical engineer. <u>M-GE-2. Mitigation of rockfall potential shall consist of the following:</u> • <u>The boulders identified as having a high potential of rockfall in the Response to County of San Diego Review Comments for Rockfall prepared by Geocon Incorporated dated March 31, 2011 shall be broken and removed from the slope, or alternatively rock bolted to the slope as part of the grading of the site.</u> • <u>Boulders identified as having a less than</u>	Less than significant Less than significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		<p><u>significant rockfall potential shall be tested by applying pressure with an excavator. If the boulders move they shall be mitigated using the same techniques described for boulders with high potential for rockfall. Boulders identified as having a less than significant rockfall potential shall be monitored during grading after any heavy rains if they should occur. If any undermining on the downhill side of any of the boulders has occurred, removal and/or breaking of the boulder(s) as recommended shall be performed to mitigate the rockfall hazard.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>A letter of certification shall be provided by a California Registered Professional Engineer or Certified Engineering Geologist to the [DPLU, PCC], which states that the identified rockfall hazards at the site have been mitigated to a level of less than significant and any proposed buildings are safe for human occupancy.</u> • <u>The above certification letter shall be provided prior to approval of any building plans and issuance of any building permit. The [DPLU, PCC] shall review the rockfall hazard certification report for compliance with this condition.</u> <p><u>Mitigation of rockfall potential shall consist of: (1) identifying boulders that have a high potential for rockfall and breaking and/or removing these rocks from the hillside; (2) identifying boulders that have a less significant rockfall potential, testing these rocks with excavation equipment, and removing rocks that</u></p>	

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		<p>move or appear to be unstable; and (3) monitoring rocks during development of the Proposed Project.</p> <p>1) Boulders identified as having a high potential (eroded at the base or entirely free from the soil) shall be broken and removed from the slope, or alternatively rock bolted to the slope. This will require use of an excavator with a rock breaking device or drilling the rock and using chemicals that break rock, or the use of anchors to pin the rock to the slope. Large rocks that are impractical to completely remove or anchor to the slope shall be broken down such that they are relatively flat or on contour with the slope face to create a rock with a shape that will not roll.</p> <p>2) Boulders identified as having a less significant rockfall potential shall be tested by applying pressure with the excavator. If the boulders move they shall be mitigated as recommended under No. 1. Boulders that are small enough such that they can easily be moved shall be pushed or rolled down the slope.</p> <p>3) During the monitoring period after a period of heavy rain, the boulders shall be observed to assess if runoff has caused undermining of the downhill side of the boulder. Removal and/or breaking of the boulders as recommended shall be performed if undermining occurs.</p>	

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
3.43 Cultural Resources	<p><u>CR-1.</u> Project construction could impact significant subsurface deposits associated with the Monserate Adobe.</p>	<p><u>M-CR-1.</u> A County approved archaeologist and a Luiseno Native American monitor professional archaeologist shall monitor grading in the vicinity of the mapped location of the Monserate Adobe, as well as the area north of SR-76. A Monitoring Discovery Plan shall be prepared prior to commencement of construction activity, to be put in use in the event historic deposits are discovered. All artifacts recovered during all phases of survey, testing, and grading monitoring shall be curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within San Diego County that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.</p>	Less than significant
	<p><u>CR-2.</u> Cultural resources on the Project Site include archaeological site CA-SDI-682 which is identified as a CEQA and RPO significant resource. Loss of this site would be a significant impact.</p>	<p><u>M-CR-2a.</u> To preserve the integrity of CA-SDI-682, the applicant shall cap Loci A and B per County of San Diego standards, landscaped as part of the overall development and placed in an open space easement. A Preservation Plan describing the methods and ultimate disposition of the capped site area has been prepared and is included as Appendix I of the Cultural Resources Report. The location of the conservation open space easement is shown in Figure 4 of the Preservation Plan. <u>If Palomar Community College mitigates for impacts associated with Horse Ranch Creek, they will be responsible for mitigation associated with Locus B which entails capping, temporary fencing and open space easement dedication.</u></p> <p><u>M-CR-2b.</u> For the protection of archaeological site CA-SDI-682, Loci A and Loci B, the applicant shall prepare and implement a temporary fencing plan</p>	Less than significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		<p>during any grading activities with one hundred feet. The fencing plan shall be prepared in consultation with <u>County approved archaeologist and a Luiseño Native American representative</u> a qualified archaeologist to the satisfaction of the Director of the Department of Planning and Land Use. The fenced area shall include a buffer sufficient to protect the archaeological site. The fence shall be installed under the supervision of the qualified <u>approved</u> archaeologist prior to commencement of grading or brushing and be removed only after grading operations have been completed.</p>	
3.43 Cultural Resources (cont.)	<p><u>CR-3.</u> Locus C of CA-SDI-682 consists of sparse, deeply buried deposits and it is possible that significant undetected, intact archaeological deposits exist below the ground surface.</p>	<p><u>M-CR-3.</u> A <u>County approved archaeologist and a Luiseño Native American representative professional archaeologist</u> shall monitor grading in the vicinity of Loci C, as well as the area north of existing SR-76. A Monitoring Discovery Plan shall be prepared prior to commencement of construction activity, to be put in use in the event archeological deposits are discovered. All artifacts recovered during all phases of survey, testing, and grading monitoring shall be curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility with San Diego County <u>that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79</u>, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.</p>	Less than significant
	<p><u>CR-4.</u> Due to the large number of cultural resources in the vicinity, there is a potential for buried deposits to be uncovered during grading within the off-site areas.</p>	<p><u>M-CR-4.</u> A <u>County approved archaeologist and a Luiseño Native American representative professional archaeologist</u> shall monitor grading and subsurface excavation in off-site areas. All artifacts recovered during all phases of survey, testing and grading monitoring shall be curated according to current professional repository standards. The</p>	Less than significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
<u>3.43 Cultural Resources (cont.)</u>	<u>CR-5.</u> Due to the large number of cultural resources in the vicinity, there is a potential for significant human remains to be uncovered during grading.	collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility with San Diego County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation. <u>M-CR-5. A County approved archaeologist and a Luiseño Native American representative professional archaeologist shall monitor grading and subsurface excavation in on- and off-site areas not covered by CR-1 and CR-3. All artifacts recovered during all phases of survey, testing, and grading monitoring shall be curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility with San Diego County that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.</u>	Less than significant
<u>3.54 Noise</u>	<u>N-1.</u> Exterior noise levels adjacent to the major roadways are projected to exceed the County's standard of 60 community noise equivalent level (CNEL) and result in a significant impact.	<u>M-N-1.</u> The Proposed Project shall construct noise attenuation barriers ranging from three to ten feet along the edge of the residential pads, as shown in Figures 3.54-4 and 3.54-7. Barriers shall be free of cracks and holes. The transmission loss through a barrier should be at least 10 decibels greater than the estimated barrier attenuation (Federal Highway Administration 1979:34). If a barrier attenuates noise levels by 10 decibels at a receiver location, the barrier transmission loss must be at least 20 decibels to prevent audible noise from traveling through the barrier and adding to the acoustical environment. Examples of acceptable barrier materials include, but are not limited to, masonry block, wood frame with stucco, 0.5-inch-thick Plexiglas, or 0.25-inch-thick plate glass. If transparent barrier materials are used, no gaps shall	Less than significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		<p>occur between the panels.</p> <p>Figure 3.54-6 shows the barriers that would be required if the Campus Park project was constructed before the Proposed Project. As shown in Figure 3.54-6 several noise barriers at the southwest portion of Planning Area 1 as shown on Figure 3.54-4 would not be required with development of the Campus Park project.</p>	
3.54 Noise (cont.)	<p><u>N-2.</u> Second-floor exterior noise levels in the multi-family units are projected to exceed 60 dB(A) CNEL. Therefore, interior noise levels may exceed the 45 CNEL standard.</p>	<p><u>M-N-2</u> A noise protection easement shall be placed on those lots where exterior noise levels exceed 60 CNEL to assure that at such time as architectural plans are available, and prior to the issuance of building permits, an interior acoustical analysis shall be conducted in accordance with the State Building Code and County standards. If interior allowable noise levels are met by requiring that windows be unopenable or closed, the design for the structure must also specify a ventilation or air-conditioning system to provide a habitable interior environment, as specified <u>stated</u> in the State Building Code. <u>For exterior balconies, the acoustical analysis will determine the height and make up of acoustical barriers, also in accordance with State Building Code and County standards.</u></p>	Less than significant
	<p><u>N-3.</u> Noise level at the residences directly north of the WWTP would be exceed County standard .</p>	<p><u>M-N-34.</u> <u>To reduce noise levels from the WWTP, the Proposed Project shall construct a nine-foot barrier at the property line south of Planning Area 1 and north of SR-76 and a seven-foot barrier proposed south of the WWTP site.</u> To reduce noise levels from the WWTP, the Proposed Project shall construct a 10-foot barrier at the property line south of Planning Area 1 and north of SR-76.</p>	Less than significant
3.6-5 Hazards	<u>HZ-1.</u> Two irrigation ponds on-site that were not	<u>M-HZ-1.</u> Prior to grading, irrigation water shall be	Less than significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
	sampled have the potential for levels of chemical residues that would be significant.	removed from the two on-site irrigation ponds and soil samples from the bottom of the ponds shall be collected and analyzed for potential agricultural residues, to the satisfaction of the Director of DEH. If contamination is present, evidence shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Director of DEH that all contaminated soils from the irrigation ponds have been remediated under the oversight of the DEH's SAM Program or removed and properly disposed of at an appropriately permitted facility, in accordance with government agency regulations.	
3-6.5 Hazards (cont.)	<u>HZ-2.</u> Smudge pots are located at several locations within the Project Site and they appear to have been impacted by total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH).	<u>M-HZ-2.</u> Prior to grading, surficial soil in the vicinity of the smudge pots and elsewhere on the property where minor surficial staining is evident shall be excavated, removed from the site, and properly disposed of at an appropriately permitted facility, in accordance with government agency regulations and to the satisfaction of the County DEH.	Less than significant
	<u>HZ-3.</u> Demolition of existing structures on the Project Site could result in the release of asbestos and/or lead.	<u>M-HZ-3a.</u> Prior to issuance of a building permit that includes demolition of on-site structures and prior to commencement of demolition or renovation activities, a facility survey shall be performed to determine the presence or absence of asbestos containing materials (ACMs). Suspect materials that will be disturbed by the demolition or renovation activities shall be sampled and analyzed for asbestos content, or assumed to be asbestos containing. The survey shall be conducted by a person certified by Cal/OSHA pursuant to regulations implementing subdivision (b) of Section 9021.5 of the Labor Code, and shall have taken and passed an EPA-approved Building Inspector Course. Should regulated asbestos containing materials be found, it shall be handled in compliance with the San Diego County Air Pollution Control	Less than significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		<p>District Rule 361.145 – Standard for Demolition and Renovation. Evidence of completion of the facility survey shall consist of a signed, stamped statement from the person certified to complete the facility survey <u>and shall be submitted to County DEH</u> indicating that the survey has been completed and that either regulated asbestos is present or absent. If present, the letter shall describe the procedures that shall be taken to remediate the hazard.</p> <p><u>M-HZ-3b.</u> Prior to issuance of a building permit that includes demolition of on-site structures and prior to commencement of demolition or renovation activities, a survey shall be performed by a California Department of Health Services (DHS) certified lead inspector/risk assessor to determine the presence or absence of lead based paint (LBP). All lead containing materials scheduled for demolition must comply with applicable regulations for demolition methods and dust suppression. Lead containing materials shall be managed in accordance with applicable regulations including, at a minimum, the hazardous waste disposal requirements (Title 22 California Code of Regulations [CCR] Division 4.5), the worker health and safety requirements (Title 8 California Code of Regulations Section 1532.1), and the State Lead Accreditation, Certification, and Work Practice Requirements (Title 17 CCR Division 1, Chapter 8). <u>The survey must be submitted to and deemed complete by the County DEH.</u></p>	<p>Less than significant</p>