

## S SUMMARY

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) provides information to the County of San Diego (County), other public agencies, and the general public regarding the potential environmental impacts of Otay Ranch Village 14 and Planning Areas 16/19 (Proposed Project). This EIR identifies, discloses, and analyzes those environmental impacts; discusses alternatives to the Proposed Project; and recommends mitigation measures that would avoid or minimize the Proposed Project's significant environmental impacts. Summary tables provided below (Table S-1, Summary of Significant Effects, and Table S-2, Summary of Project Design Features) list the significant environmental impacts and identify the mitigation measures for those impacts, as well as Project Design Features that would be implemented by the Proposed Project. This EIR also includes figures throughout that depict key aspects of the Proposed Project and proposed alternatives.

This summary briefly describes the Proposed Project, required approvals, impacts, alternatives, issues to be resolved, and mitigation measures. This summary is not intended to replace the EIR text or the important information presented in its technical appendices; the EIR text and appendices contain more detailed information than provided in this summary.

The County is the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for purposes of preparing and certifying this EIR, which is a foundational document for the requested discretionary Proposed Project approvals. The County has exercised, and will continue to exercise, its independent judgment and discretion in evaluating the Proposed Project, its impacts, its alternatives, and the proposed mitigation measures prior to taking any final actions with regard to the Proposed Project. Based on its evaluation to date, the County has completed the EIR in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, the County's CEQA Guidelines, and other published guidelines for implementing CEQA. The project applicant is GDCI Proctor Valley LP (applicant).

### **S.1 Project Synopsis**

#### Project Description

The Proposed Project is a component of the approximately 23,000-acre Otay Ranch General Development Plan/Otay Subregional Plan (GDP/SRP) master-planned community, which spans the City of Chula Vista, San Diego County, and the Otay Mesa area of the City of San Diego. The Project Area (defined in Chapter 1, Project Description, Location, and Environmental Setting) is located within the Proctor Valley Parcel of the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP planning area. Consistent with the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP (City of Chula Vista and County of San Diego 1993a), the Proposed Project refines and implements the land uses within portions of Otay Ranch Village 14 and Planning Areas 16/19.

The Proposed Project implements a master-planned community consisting of single-family residential uses, commercial uses, and a Village Core connected through a system of roadways, public parks, trails, open space, and private recreational amenities. The Proposed Project also includes conveyance of approximately 776.8 acres of Otay Ranch Resource Management Plan (RMP) Preserve, approximately 426.7 acres of which is located within the Project Area. The Otay Ranch RMP Preserve is a component of the County of San Diego Multiples Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Preserve.

The Proposed Project would include a maximum of 1,119 single-family residential units, which includes 97 residential units that could be constructed on the proposed school site, should the elementary school not be required. Construction of the elementary school is contingent on the future needs of the Chula Vista Elementary School District.

Within Village 14, a maximum of 994 single-family homes would be developed outward from the Village Core. The Village Core would include a neighborhood-serving mixed-use site with approximately 10,000 square feet of commercial/retail stores, a 2.3-acre public safety site (fire station/Sheriff's storefront), and a 7.2-acre public park and associated amenities, as well as a potential 9.7-acre elementary school site. Residential neighborhoods would all be connected to public parks and private recreation facilities via an internal pathway and trail system.

Planning Areas 16/19 is a rural, low-density residential community that relates most strongly to the existing rural community of Jamul. Planning Areas 16/19 is also referred to in the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP as the Jamul Rural Estates (City of Chula Vista and County of San Diego 1993a). Planning Area 16 would include 112 residential ranchettes with a minimum lot size of 2 acres. Planning Area 19 would include 13 residential estates with lot sizes averaging 1 acre.

As described in the Otay Ranch Village 14 and Planning Areas 16/19 Specific Plan (RH Consulting 2018), the Proposed Project is designed around an active lifestyle and wellness recreation theme, and would incorporate an extensive parks and recreation system, including four public parks totaling 15.2 acres. Private recreation facilities would include three private swim clubs (4.5 acres total) and 5 acres of private pocket parks, for a total of 9.5 acres of private park facilities. The pedestrian network would be composed of a 4.5-mile Proctor Valley Community Pathway extending from Chula Vista to Jamul along Proctor Valley Road, a 3-mile internal Park-to-Park Loop for pedestrians, and a ~~3.54.9~~ 3.54.9-mile walking path in Planning Area 16.

The Proposed Project would include 127.1 acres of Limited Development Area (LDA) in Planning Area 16. There is no LDA in Village 14 or Planning Area 19. The Proposed Project would designate approximately 72.4 acres of land as Conserved Open Space.

The Proposed Project, as a requirement of the Otay Ranch RMP (City of Chula Vista and County of San Diego 2015), would convey approximately 426.7 acres of on-site Otay Ranch RMP Preserve to the Otay Ranch Preserve Owner/Manager (POM). The POM is the entity responsible for overseeing the day-to-day and long-range Preserve management activities within the Otay Ranch RMP Preserve. In addition, 350.1 acres of Otay Ranch RMP Preserve located outside of the Project Area would be conveyed to the POM.

Figure 1-5, Village 14 and Planning Areas 16/19 Site Utilization Plan, in Chapter 1, depicts the site utilization plan for the entire Project Area. Table 1-1, Land Use Summary, describes the Proposed Project's residential and non-residential land uses and Otay Ranch RMP Preserve lands (by acreage and units).

### Project Location

The Project Area is located in an unincorporated area in southwestern San Diego County, approximately 0.25 miles east of the Chula Vista city limit and 1 mile south of Jamul. More specifically, the Project Area is located primarily southeast of Proctor Valley Road, within the Jamul Mountains U.S. Geological Survey 7.5-minute quadrangle, Township 17 South, Ranges 1 East and 1 West, Sections 8, 9, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 25, and 30. The approximate center of the Project Area is located at a latitude and longitude of 32°40'57" north and 116°54'24" west.

The Project Area encompasses approximately 1,369 acres, including all of the Proposed Project applicant's ownership in Otay Ranch Village 14 and Planning Areas 16/19 (1,283.6 acres), as noted in Figure 1-2, Vicinity Map, and 85.4 acres of off-site infrastructure, including roads and related utilities. Figure 1-3, Regional Context, depicts the boundaries of the Project Area in a regional and local context. Figure 1-4, Surrounding Land Uses, provides an aerial overview of the Project Area and surrounding areas.

The Project Area is located in the Jamul/Dulzura Subregional Plan area. However, as indicated in the Jamul/Dulzura Subregional Plan (County of San Diego 2011a), due to the size and complexity of the Otay Ranch area, the policies governing development of the Otay Ranch area (including the Project Area) within the Jamul/Dulzura planning boundary have been placed in Volume II of the Otay Ranch Subregional Plan. Therefore, although the Project Area is located in the Jamul/Dulzura Subregional Plan boundary, the Jamul/Dulzura Subregional Plan defers to the Otay Ranch Subregional Plan, specifically Volume II (the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP), for policies pertaining to the Project Area. As stated in the Jamul/Dulzura Subregional Plan, Otay Ranch Policy 15, "The policies contained in the Jamul/Dulzura Plan Text apply to the areas of the Otay Ranch located within the Jamul/Dulzura Subregion. In case of conflict, the policies contained in Volume 2 of the Otay Subregional Plan Text shall take precedence" (County of San Diego 2011a). As stated, the

policies set forth in the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP take precedence over the Jamul/Dulzura Subregional Plan in the event of any conflicts.

### Environmental Setting

The Project Area is located in Proctor Valley, a south-sloping valley that is traversed by Proctor Valley Road and the northeasterly ridges of the Jamul Mountain, which is adjacent to the community of Jamul. The Project Area is undeveloped with the exception of the existing, unimproved Proctor Valley Road. On-site elevations range from 550 to 1,345 feet above mean sea level. The Project Area is surrounded by San Miguel Mountain to the northwest and the Jamul Mountains to the southeast, with the foothills of these mountains encroaching into the Project Area. The eastern portions of Planning Area 16 are located in the foothills of the Jamul Mountains and contain the highest elevations.

The topography of Proctor Valley generally consists of broad, gentle hillsides. The terrain eastward of Proctor Valley toward the Jamul Mountains becomes increasingly rugged. Several small, narrow ephemeral drainages are present along the eastern edge of the valley. A low east/west-trending ridgeline effectively divides the valley near the northern end of the Project Area. Proctor Valley continues north of the Jamul Mountains as a broad, even meadow with rolling hillsides.

The Project Area is located north–northeast of the Upper and Lower Otay Reservoirs. The Upper and Lower Otay Reservoirs are the two major water bodies of the Otay watershed. The Otay Reservoir System serves as part of the City of San Diego’s municipal water supply system. The Upper Otay Reservoir, when full, is approximately 20 surface acres, and the Lower Otay Reservoir is approximately 1,100 surface acres when full.

As stated previously, the Proposed Project is a component of an approximately 23,000-acre Otay Ranch master-planned community that spans the City of Chula Vista, San Diego County, and the Otay Mesa area of the City of San Diego. The Project Area is located within the Proctor Valley Parcel of the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP planning area, to the north of the more urban Otay Ranch Villages (including Villages 1, 1 West, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 West, 8 East, 9, 10, and 11, and the Eastern Urban Center/Freeway Commercial) and the eastern territories of Chula Vista.

Regional circulation in the Project Area is provided by State Route (SR) 125, located approximately 3 miles to the west, and Interstate (I) 805, approximately 8 miles to the west. SR-54, approximately 6 miles to the northwest, connects to SR-125 and I-805, and provides regional east/west access. I-905, approximately 7 miles to the south, provides additional east/west access and also connects to SR-125 and I-805. SR-94, approximately 3 miles to the northeast, passes through Jamul.

### Existing Land Uses

The Project Area is designated as Specific Plan Area and Open Space (Conservation) by the County of San Diego General Plan, and zoned S88 (Specific Plan) and S80. The regional category designations are Rural and No Jurisdiction. The Project Area is currently vacant. No farming or ranching activities have occurred on the property since 1999 (County of San Diego 2011b).

Proctor Valley Road, an unimproved, two-lane Mobility Element roadway between the City of Chula Vista to the southwest and the unincorporated community of Jamul to the northeast, traverses the Project Area (County of San Diego 2011b). An informal network of unimproved dirt trails crisscrosses the Project Area. Portions of the Project Area have been and continue to be used for unauthorized uses, including off-roading, motorcycling, shooting, hiking, mountain biking, horseback riding, and illegal dumping.

Figure 1-4 in Chapter 1 depicts the surrounding land uses in proximity to the Project Area. Existing development, including the master-planned communities of Eastlake Woods, Bella Lago, Salt Creek Ranch, and Rolling Hills Ranch, is located approximately 1 mile to the southwest of the Project Area. Commercial centers are located in Eastlake Woods and Rolling Hills Ranch, and regional shopping is located in Otay Ranch. The proposed Village 13 Resort development is located to the south of the Project Area over a series of ridges. The Upper and Lower Otay Reservoirs are located to the south of the Project Area. The City of San Diego's MSCP "Cornerstone Lands" are located adjacent to the Project Area to the south. The Cornerstone Lands Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) Preserve areas include the lands surrounding the Otay Reservoir System under the jurisdiction of the City of San Diego (more specifically, the Water Utilities Department). The community of Jamul is located approximately 1 mile to the north of the Project Area. Jamul is rural, as reflected by primarily large-lot estates and horse ranches. Rancho San Diego, which is more heavily developed, is located to the northwest.

The Project Area is adjacent to the approximately 5,600-acre Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve, a component of the MSCP Preserve system in the southwestern portion of San Diego County. The Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve is owned and managed by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and abuts the western and eastern boundaries of the Project Area. In addition, publicly owned lands connect to provide a large area of conserved land. These lands include the Bureau of Land Management Otay Mountain Wilderness Area, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) San Diego-Sweetwater National Wildlife Refuge, the CDFW Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area, and various City of San Diego- and County of San Diego-owned lands.

Otay Valley Regional Park is a large open space area southwest of the Project Area linking south San Diego Bay with the Lower Otay Reservoir. Otay Valley Regional Park is a multi-jurisdictional planning effort by the County of San Diego and Cities of San Diego and Chula Vista that extends

from the salt ponds at the mouth of the Otay River, through the Otay River Valley, to the land surrounding the Otay Reservoir System.

### Requested Project Approvals

The requested Proposed Project approvals are described in detail in Section 1.2.1, Project Component Parts, in Chapter 1. A brief summary is provided below.

#### County of San Diego General Plan Amendments

The Proposed Project includes minor corrections to County GIS mapping inconsistencies on the County General Plan Land Use, Zoning, and Regional Categories maps. With these minor corrections, the County General Plan would be brought into consistency with the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP.

The Proposed Project would retain the General Plan Mobility Element's two-lane designation for Proctor Valley Road, but proposes to modify the Mobility Element classification from 2.2E Light Collector (no median two-lane undivided) to 2.2A Light Collector (raised median two-lane divided) for the segment between the City of Chula Vista/County boundary and the Village 14 Street "Y." The segment of Proctor Valley Road between Village 14 Streets "Y" and "AA" would remain consistent with the Mobility Element 2.2E Light Collector classification. The northern segment of Proctor Valley Road would be realigned and reclassified as a modified 2.2F Light Collector. The existing physical alignment of Proctor Valley Road within Otay Ranch Village 14 and to the north through Planning Area 16 is consistent with the alignment set forth in the Mobility Element of the County General Plan, and would generally be retained by the Proposed Project (see Chapter 1, Figure 1-11, Circulation Element Amendment); however, approximately 1,650 feet (0.3 miles) of the road between South Village 14 and Central Village 14 would be realigned to the east to provide a 100-foot buffer from the vernal pool watersheds that are located in the City of San Diego's Cornerstone Lands and the road.

#### County of San Diego Rezone

The Proposed Project would also include a rezone for minor amendments to correct County GIS mapping inconsistencies to the boundaries within the applicant's ownership to reflect the accurate Otay Ranch GDP/SRP development boundary. The Proposed Project is consistent with the current zoning designations and would not include any other amendments to the County Zoning Ordinance, aside from these mapping corrections.

#### Otay Ranch GDP/Otay SRP Amendments

The Proposed Project, as the first Otay Ranch project in the County unincorporated area, would include minor amendments to the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP to account for previous actions taken by

the City of Chula Vista and to update mitigation measures that were approved as part of the Final Otay Ranch GDP/SRP Program EIR (Otay Ranch PEIR) (City of Chula Vista and County of San Diego 1993b). An amendment to the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP to re-designate Proctor Valley Road to be consistent with the County Mobility Element is also proposed. Minor refinements to land use statistics are also included to further refine and reflect the Proposed Project.

For context, the Otay Ranch PEIR was prepared and certified for the entire Otay Ranch as part of the 1993 review and approval process for the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP. The certified Otay Ranch PEIR evaluated development of the entire Otay Ranch community, including the Project Area. This EIR tiers from the previously certified Otay Ranch PEIR, as permitted by Sections 15152 and 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines. Since certification of the Program EIR, changes in either the regulatory environment or physical setting have occurred and necessitated additional technical analyses, which have been performed specific to the Proposed Project. Similarly, as the development concept for the Proposed Project was refined, more precise and site-specific technical analyses were performed to determine the potential impacts of the Proposed Project, consistent with requirements of the Otay Ranch Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP). These changes are addressed in technical appendices to the EIR and in the EIR itself.

This EIR is a project-level document that evaluates the potential environmental impacts of the Proposed Project (i.e., Specific Plan, General Plan Amendments, Rezone, Tentative Map, and other land use approvals). This EIR evaluates all elements of the Proposed Project, including the construction (short-term) and operational (long-term) impacts associated with its development. Accordingly, although this EIR covers a portion of the same geographic area as the Otay Ranch PEIR, this EIR is a Project-level analysis based on more recent technical studies. As a result, this EIR's determinations regarding potential impacts and mitigation requirements are specific to the Proposed Project compared to those described in or anticipated by the Otay Ranch Program EIR and Otay Ranch MMP.

### Specific Plan

The Proposed Project seeks approval of a new Specific Plan for Village 14 and Planning Areas 16/19. The Specific Plan outlines the proposed land uses, circulation, stormwater, sewer, water, and transportation strategies; the parks, trails, open space, and conservation strategy; the infrastructure and public facilities strategy; development regulations and design guidelines; and the implementation program necessary to achieve the orderly development of the Proposed Project.

### Tentative Map/Preliminary Grading Plan

The Proposed Project includes a proposed Tentative Map that lays out lot and easement configurations, drainage facilities, utilities, and the road system for the Project Area, serving as the blueprint for the

creation of the Proposed Project. The Tentative Map includes a Preliminary Grading Plan that identifies grading quantities and drainage facilities that would serve the Project Area.

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

Table S-1 provides a summary of the EIR's impact analysis, mitigation, and level of significance after mitigation for each environmental category. Chapter 2, Significant Environmental Effects of the Proposed Project, of this EIR contains the analyses of issues found to have significant impacts and proposed mitigation for those significant impacts. This EIR identifies potentially significant impacts for the Proposed Project in the following categories: aesthetics, agricultural resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology/soils, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, noise, transportation and traffic, paleontological resources, and tribal cultural resources (under the Preserve Trails Option only).

This EIR also determined that the Proposed Project's potentially significant impacts to biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, and GHG emissions would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures. Impacts to agricultural resources, aesthetics, air quality, noise, and transportation and traffic would remain significant and unavoidable even after feasible mitigation measures are implemented.

A number of Project Design Features (PDFs) would be incorporated into the Proposed Project to reduce or minimize environmental impacts as part of Proposed Project design. Refer to Table S-2 for a full list of the PDFs.

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

As required by the County of San Diego Environmental Impact Report Format and General Content Requirements (County of San Diego 2006), the following is a brief summary of issues raised by the applicant, public, and/or by public agencies other than the County of San Diego. On December 15, 2016, the County distributed the Proposed Project's Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the EIR to public agencies and all other interested parties, and solicited agency and public comment on the proposed scope of the EIR. The NOP and letters submitted in response to the NOP are included in Appendix 1-3 of this EIR. Comments received during the EIR scoping process varied, but, in general, areas of concern include the following:

- Aesthetics and community character
- Biological resources impacts
- Cultural and tribal cultural resources impacts



- GHG emissions
- Hazards and hazardous materials (specifically, wildland fires)
- Recreation
- Traffic and circulation
- Public services and utilities (including availability/reliability of water supply)

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

An EIR is an informational document, used to inform the decision makers (County Board of Supervisors) and the public of the environmental effects of a given project. The EIR includes discussion and inclusion of alternatives and mitigation measures to reduce environmental impacts. The decision-making body must decide whether or how to avoid, minimize, or mitigate the identified significant environmental effects of a project. The EIR also must include a reasonable range of alternatives that would feasibly attain most of the objectives of a project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the identified significant environmental effects of the project. The decision-making body must determine if any of these alternatives could substantially reduce significant impacts and still meet the project's objectives.

To date, issues raised by County staff were analyzed as part of the Proposed Project throughout this EIR, and are considered "options." Chapter 1 includes a more detailed description of these options, which are as follows:

1. A wider road section width for the northern stretch of Proctor Valley Road, ranging from 8 feet to 14 feet wider between Village 14 and Planning Areas 16/19, which would provide two 12-foot-wide travel lanes, two dedicated bike lanes (City of Chula Vista to Jamul), a Community Pathway, and signage areas for this length of the Proctor Valley Road North.
2. A "perimeter trail" looping around a portion of the Development Footprint (Village 14 only) within the 100-foot-wide fuel modification zone and Preserve Edge for the Proposed Project, which may provide additional trail connections to off-site areas.
3. The Preserve Trails Option, which consists of two segments of existing, disturbed trails totaling approximately 1-mile in length within the Project Area, east of the Development Footprint. These segments would be located within the Otay Ranch RMP/MSCP Preserve. No improvements to these Preserve trails would be part of the Proposed Project.

No additional unresolved environmental issues have been identified with regard to the Proposed Project. Any issues arising during the agency/public review of this EIR will be described in the Final EIR.

## **S.5 Project Alternatives**

The Otay Ranch PEIR evaluated seven alternatives and four additional Alternative Site Location alternatives (City of Chula Vista and County of San Diego 1993b). Those Otay Ranch PEIR alternatives are briefly summarized in Chapter 4, Project Alternatives, of this EIR. Ultimately, the Otay Ranch PEIR was certified, and the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP was approved, with the same development footprints and densities as the Proposed Project. In addition, the Proposed Project was considered as part of the County General Plan Update process in 2011 (County of San Diego 2011b), and approved with the same development footprints and densities of the Proposed Project. Accordingly, the Proposed Project has already been considered with no fewer than 11 alternatives.

This EIR evaluates five additional alternatives to the Proposed Project, consistent with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines criteria, as well as an Alternate Site Alternative (Otay Ranch Village 15), which was considered and rejected. Specifically, this EIR fully evaluates the following five alternatives to the Proposed Project:

1. No Project (No Build) Alternative
2. Low Density Alternative
3. Alternate Site Location Alternative
4. Otay Ranch GDP/SRP Four-Lane Proctor Valley Road (“Four-Lane PVR”) Alternative
5. Land Exchange Alternative

These alternatives are briefly described and compared to the Proposed Project, followed by the basis for rejecting the alternative, in Chapter 4 of this EIR.

### **S.5.1 No Project Alternative**

Under the No Project (No Build) Alternative, the Project Area would remain in its existing condition. Since there would be no development, there would be no obligation to convey areas designated as Otay Ranch RMP Preserve to the Otay Ranch POM. Consequently, the 426.7 acres that the Proposed Project would convey to the Otay Ranch POM would, under this alternative, remain under private ownership. The No Project Alternative assumes that the Proposed Project would not be developed and the existing conditions at the Project Area would remain. As such, the Project Area would continue to be vacant. Note, however, that in the future, a new project could potentially be proposed for the site; however, the No Project Alternative analyzed in Section 4.4 of this EIR is a No Project/No Build Alternative in compliance with CEQA Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B).

### **S.5.2 Low Density Alternative**

The Low Density Alternative would have the same Development Footprint as the Proposed Project, except that Planning Area 19 would not be developed and instead would be designated as open space. Planning Area 16 would have 2-acre minimum lots and yield 112 residential units, similar to the Proposed Project. Village 14 would have 1-acre minimum lots and would yield 145 residential units. A total of 257 residential units would be developed under the Low Density Alternative compared to the 1,119 units under the Proposed Project. The Low Density Alternative would have a build-out population of approximately 925 residents, compared to 4,018 residents under the Proposed Project. This represents a 77% decrease in dwelling units and a 77% decrease in population compared to the Proposed Project.

Due to the decrease in dwelling units and population, the amount of park demand would be reduced such that only one 2.3-acre park would be included as part of the Low Density Alternative. There would be no school site proposed due to the minimal number of students generated by only 257 homes. No joint use public safety site (fire station/Sheriff's storefront) would be required because the future residences under the Low Density Alternative could be served within the 10-minute travel time from existing stations (City of Chula Vista Station No. 8 and County of San Diego Jamul Station No. 36), which is the County's requirement for lot sizes that are a minimum of 1 acre. In addition, fire/emergency call volumes would only be 0.2 calls for service per day. There would also not be any commercially designated land or a Village Core. Proctor Valley Road would be two lanes from the City of Chula Vista to the property line in Planning Area 19 for secondary access, similar to the Proposed Project.

### **S.5.3 Alternate Site Location Alternative**

The Alternate Site Location Alternative is included in this EIR to respond to revisions suggested by a coalition of conservation groups during meetings held with the Proposed Project applicant. The intent of the Alternate Site Location Alternative is to conserve open space in Central Proctor Valley and Planning Areas 16/19, while clustering development in the south of Proctor Valley, closer to existing development in Chula Vista and the proposed Otay Ranch Village 13. The total area of the Alternative Site Location Alternative is approximately 450.1 acres, and would also include approximate 85.4 acres of off-site improvements to Proctor Valley Road, similar to the Proposed Project. The Alternate Site Location Alternative would allow development in the southern Development Footprint of Village 14, the same as in the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP, while expanding South Village 14 development into adjacent Otay Ranch RMP Preserve lands owned by the Otay Ranch POM. No specific biological, topographical, or other environmental rationale was provided by the coalition of conservation groups other than to reduce the Development Footprint in Village 14 and Planning Areas 16/19 while allowing development closer to the existing suburban interface with the City of Chula Vista.

The Alternate Site Location Alternative would develop approximately 171.1 acres of the South Village portion of Village 14 and an adjacent area owned by the Otay Ranch POM, which is dedicated Otay Ranch RMP and MSCP Preserve land and which would require an MSCP Boundary Adjustment and RMP Amendment, as described below. More specifically, the Alternate Site Location Alternative would encompass approximately 273.4 acres of MSCP Preserve land owned and managed by the POM, and 188 acres of South Village 14 land owned by the applicant. The POM-owned land would have approximately 116 units, and the South Village 14 portion would have approximately 352 units. In total, the Alternate Site Location Alternative would have 468 single-family units, of which 358 would be traditional single-family and 110 would be single-family detached condominiums. The single-family detached condominium units would be located along Proctor Valley Road within the South Village 14 area. Compared to the Proposed Project, the Alternate Site Location Alternative would represent a 58% reduction in the total number of dwelling units.

Due to the decrease in dwelling units and population, the amount of park demand would be reduced such that one 2.9-acre park and a 2.6-acre private swim club would be included as part of the Alternate Site Location Alternative to achieve the required 4.2 acres of parkland per the Park Lands Dedication Ordinance (County of San Diego 2007). There would be no school site due to the minimal number of students generated. A 2.3-acre public safety site for a fire station and a potential future Sheriff's storefront would be sited within South Village 14 because the future residences under the Alternate Site Location Alternative could not be served within the 5-minute travel time from existing stations, which is the County's requirement for lot sizes that are less than 1 acre. Due to the limited number of dwelling units and population, there would not be any commercially designated land or a Village Core. Proctor Valley Road would be two lanes from the City of Chula Vista to the property line in Planning Area 19 to provide for secondary access, similar to the Proposed Project. An additional access road off site from Proctor Valley Road across City of San Diego MSCP Cornerstone Lands for secondary fire access requirements would be required.

#### **S.5.4 Otay Ranch GDP/SRP Four-Lane Proctor Valley Road Alternative**

The Otay Ranch GDP/SRP Proctor Valley Road Alternative would be the same as the Proposed Project except that it would implement the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP alignment and classification for Proctor Valley Road as a four-lane major road, as discussed in the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP. Due to the road widening, the GDP/SRP Proctor Valley Road Alternative would eliminate 14 residential units from Planning Area 16, bringing the total number of units to 1,105 residential units. As a result of widening Proctor Valley Road to four lanes, total roadway impacts would increase by approximately 12.8 acres, and additional temporary impacts for grading would increase by approximately 80 acres. The remaining uses would be the same as the Proposed Project, including the Village Core.

### **S.5.5 Land Exchange Alternative**

The Land Exchange Alternative proposes 1,530 homes within a development area that is limited to approximately 600 acres in Village 14. With the exception of approximately 65 acres of land owned by third parties, Planning Areas 16/19 would be converted to Otay Ranch RMP/MSCP Preserve and would not be developed. The Land Exchange Alternative would involve the transfer of property between the applicant and the State of California. Specifically, the state would transfer 278 acres of land it currently owns in Village 14 to the applicant, and the applicant, in turn, would transfer 278 acres of land in Planning Area 16 to the state. This would allow for a consolidated development area in Village 14 and more contiguous open space in Planning Area 16. The total Land Exchange Area would cover approximately 2,387.7 acres, of which the Proposed Project applicant owns 1,284 acres and the state owns approximately 1,061 acres. Within the Land Exchange Area, approximately 1,003 acres is in Village 14 and 1,345 acres is in Planning Areas 16/19. The remaining 40 acres is associated with off-site improvements not owned by the applicant or the state.

This alternative would also amend MSCP County of San Diego Subarea Plan and Otay Ranch RMP Preserve boundaries via boundary adjustments, resulting in a net increase in Otay Ranch RMP/MSCP Preserve of 268.5 acres. The Land Exchange Alternative would include a Village Core, similar to the Proposed Project, which would include a 3.5-acre mixed-use site with up to 15,000 square feet of commercial/retail uses, an 8.3-acre school site, a 2.3-acre public safety site for a fire station and Sheriff's storefront, and 20.4 acres of parks

The Land Exchange Alternative would involve a Specific Plan, General Plan amendments, rezone, Tentative Map, an Otay Ranch RMP amendment and boundary adjustment, site plans, and MSCP County Subarea Plan boundary adjustment, which have been reviewed at a project-level analysis. See Appendix 4.0 for additional information on the Land Exchange Alternative.

### **S.6 Public Outreach and EIR Preparation Process**

The County Department of Planning & Development Services circulated the NOP of the EIR (December 2016) for the Proposed Project (see Appendix 1-1). The NOP sought public and agency input on the scope and content of the environmental information to be contained in the EIR. The NOP also contained a description of the Proposed Project's probable environmental effects, and was made available at the County Department of Planning & Development Services and four local libraries (Bonita-Sunnyside Branch, Spring Valley Branch, Rancho San Diego Branch, and Otay Ranch Branch). Copies of letters received during the NOP process are included in Appendix 1-3.

Further, consistent with CEQA, the County Department of Planning & Development Services held a public scoping meeting to solicit additional comments on the EIR. The public scoping meeting was held at Oak Grove Middle School in Jamul on January 10, 2017.

Subsequent to the public scoping meeting, the applicant met with or otherwise communicated with a variety of parties interested in the Proposed Project regarding the Proposed Project and its characteristics, including the following:

- The Jamul Dulzura Community Planning Group to identify issues of concern to the group.
- Representatives of the City of San Diego Water Utilities Department, including follow-up conversations related to the potential impacts of the Proposed Project on the City of San Diego's Cornerstone Lands and Upper and Lower Otay Reservoirs in the Otay watershed.
- Representatives of an environmental coalition referred to as the Wildlife and Habitat Conservation Coalition to discuss various issues related to the Proposed Project, including Preserve design, biological resources, and trails.
- Adjacent property owners to discuss the Proposed Project in general and adjacency-related issues, such as access.
- Representatives of the Otay Water District to discuss the infrastructure needed for the Proposed Project and the available water supply.
- Representatives from USFWS and CDFW to discuss the Proposed Project and Land Exchange Alternative as they relate to the MSCP County Subarea Plan, the National Wildlife Refuge, and the Jamul Ecological Reserve.
- Representatives from the City of Chula Vista to discuss public services and potential impacts associated with the Proposed Project.
- Representatives from the San Diego Local Agency Formation Commission to discuss the Proposed Project and public services.
- Representatives from the City of Chula Vista Fire Department and the San Diego County Fire District.
- Representatives from the Chula Vista Elementary School District and the Jamul/Dulzura Unified School District to discuss the provision of school services, and, prior to circulating the NOP, with the Sweetwater Union High School District and Grossmont Union High School District.

## **S.7 EIR Organization**

This EIR is organized as follows:

This Summary provides a brief description of the Proposed Project, summarizes significant impacts and mitigation measures to reduce or avoid such impacts (see Table S-1), identifies any areas of controversy and issues to be resolved by the County Board of Supervisors, and introduces the five Proposed Project alternatives, which are further described and analyzed in Chapter 4.

Chapter 1 provides a complete description of the Proposed Project, including objectives, PDFs, land uses, location, environmental setting, and influences. The project description also identifies the intended uses of this EIR, including the pending approvals and additional future actions and permits, summarizes the cumulative projects considered by this EIR, and analyzes the Proposed Project's growth-inducing impacts.

Chapter 2 describes, by category, the existing environmental conditions that could be affected by the Proposed Project, and then analyzes the Proposed Project's impacts on those existing conditions, focusing on those impacts that qualify as potentially significant under the applicable significance criteria. The impact analysis addresses project-specific impacts and the Proposed Project's contribution to cumulative impacts. In addition, Chapter 2 specifies mitigation measures to reduce each identified significant impact, and then provides a conclusion as to whether the impact in question, once mitigated, would remain significant and unavoidable, or would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation.

Chapter 3, Environmental Effects Found Not to Be Significant, discusses those impacts that were identified as less than significant after conducting a thorough analysis of the environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Project. Each environmental issue area includes a description of existing conditions, the regulatory setting, an analysis of Proposed Project impacts, an analysis of cumulative impacts, and determinations of significance.

Chapter 4 evaluates five alternatives in detail, consistent with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. In addition, Chapter 4 discusses seven alternatives that were previously analyzed as part of the Otay Ranch PEIR.

Chapter 5, List of References, provides a list of references for documents cited in this EIR.

Chapter 6, List of EIR Preparers provides a list of individuals involved in preparing this EIR.

Chapter 7, List of Mitigation Measures and Environmental Design Considerations, provides a complete list of mitigation measures and PDFs that are relied upon to reduce impacts.

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.                                 | Impact  | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness                  |
|--|---|---|--|
| <i>Significant and Unavoidable Impacts</i> |   |   |  |
| <i>2.1 Aesthetics</i>                      |   |   |  |
| <i>Project-Level Impacts</i>               |   |   |  |
| <i>Visual Character and/or Quality</i>     |   |   |  |
| <p><b>AE-1</b></p>                         | <p>Construction activities would result in the removal or substantial adverse change of one or more features that contribute to the valued visual character of the existing Proctor Valley landscape.</p> | <p><b>M-AE-1</b> Stationary construction sites, staging, and storage areas within the Project Area shall be visually screened using temporary screening fencing. Fencing shall be of an appropriate design and color for each specific location to minimize the visibility of stationary construction sites, staging, and storage areas from off-site residential viewing locations.</p> <p><b>M-AE-2</b> The applicant, or its designee, shall prepare a Landscape Master Plan. The Landscape Master Plan shall demonstrate compliance with Otay Ranch General Development Plan/Otay Subregional Plan policies pertaining to the use of landscape materials that are complementary to the existing natural setting and that reflect the natural environment. The Landscape Master Plan shall also demonstrate compliance with San Diego County General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element policies pertaining to the minimization of visual impacts through implementation and use of appropriate scale, materials, and design to complement the surrounding natural landscape. In addition, the Landscape Master Plan shall be consistent and in compliance with the Fire Protection Plan, the Preserve Edge Plan, the Water Conservation Plan, and the design guidelines specified in the Specific Plan. The Landscape Master Plan shall identify phasing of the Proposed Project and shall be consistent with the phasing plan included in the Specific Plan. The Landscape Master Plan shall be approved by the Director of Planning &amp;</p> | <p>Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.</p> |



**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.                             | Impact  | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness           |
|--|---|---|---|
|  |   | Development Services (or his/her designee) prior to the issuance of grading permits.  |   |
| <b>AE-2</b>                            | Development of the Proposed Project would introduce features that would detract from or contrast with the existing visual character and/or quality of the existing Proctor Valley landscape.  | <b>M-AE-1</b><br><b>M-AE-2</b><br>No feasible mitigation measures exist to reduce identified impacts below a level of significance.   | Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. |
| <i>Cumulative-Level Impacts</i>        |   |   |   |
| <i>Visual Character and/or Quality</i> |   |   |   |
| <b>AE-CUM-1</b>                        | The Proposed Project would result in a cumulatively considerable impact with regard to visual contrast with the existing visual character and/or quality of the existing Proctor Valley and surrounding area landscape.   | <b>M-AE-1</b><br><b>M-AE-2</b><br>No feasible mitigation measures exist to reduce identified impacts below a level of significance.   | Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. |
| <i>2.2 Agricultural Resources</i>      |   |   |   |
| <i>Project-Level Impacts</i>           |   |   |   |
| <i>Farmland of Local Importance</i>    |   |   |   |
| <b>AG-1</b>                            | The Proposed Project would result in loss of an agricultural resource for the potential production of coastal-dependent crops, due to its location in a coast area climate zone and because the Project Area contains soils applicable to Farmland of Local Importance. | <b>M-AG-1</b> As required by the Otay Ranch General Development Plan/Otay Subregional Plan (Otay Ranch GDP/SRP), an Agricultural Plan shall be prepared by the Proposed Project applicant, or its designee, prior to approval of any Specific Plan affecting on-site agricultural resources and will be required for each subsequent development proposal (i.e., villages, Town Center, the Eastern Town Center, the University, and Rural Estate Planned Community). The Agricultural Plan shall indicate the type of agricultural activity allowed as an interim use. Specifications shall include buffering guidelines designed to prevent potential land use interface impacts related to noise, odors, dust, insects, rodents, and chemicals that may accompany agricultural activities and operations. Adequate buffering shall be provided | Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.  | Impact  | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness           |
|---|---|---|---|
|   |   | between the proposed development area and the interim agriculture use. Buffering measures may include the following: (1) a 200-foot distance between property boundaries and agricultural operations; (2) if permitted interim agricultural uses require the use of pesticide, then commercially reasonable limits shall be placed on the time of day, the type of pesticide application, and the appropriate weather conditions under which such application may occur; (3) use of vegetation along the field edges adjacent to development that can be used for shielding (i.e., corn); and (4) notification of adjacent property owners of potential pesticide applications and use of fencing. The County of San Diego department with jurisdiction over these areas shall review the Agricultural Plan to verify that proposed guidelines are adequate to prevent impacts associated with incompatible land uses from occurring. |   |
| <i>Cumulative-Level Impacts</i>                               |   |   |   |
| <i>Farmland of Local Importance</i>                           |   |   |   |
| <b>AG-CUM-1</b>   | The Proposed Project would result in a cumulatively considerable loss of an agricultural resource for the potential production of coastal-dependent crops, due to its location in a coast area climate zone and because the Project Area contains soils applicable to Farmland of Local Importance. | <b>M-AG-1</b><br>No feasible mitigation measures exist to reduce identified impacts below a level of significance.  | Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. |
| <i>2.3 Air Quality</i>  |   |   |   |
| <i>Project-Level Impacts</i>                                  |   |   |   |
| <i>Conformance to Federal and State Air Quality Standards</i> |   |   |   |
| <b>AQ-1</b>   | Project-generated maximum daily construction emissions would exceed the construction thresholds for volatile organic compounds (VOC), nitrous oxides (NO <sub>x</sub> ), and carbon monoxide (CO), and  | <b>M-AQ-1</b> Tier 4 Final Rock Crushing Equipment. Diesel-powered generators (engines greater than 750 horsepower)   | Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact   | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--|---|---|
|            | <p>particulate matter less than or equal to 10 microns in diameter (PM<sub>10</sub>) during one or more years of construction.</p> | <p>used for rock-crushing operations shall be equipped with Tier 4 Final engines.</p> <p><b>M-AQ-2</b> Blasting and Rock Crushing Notification. Prior to construction activities, the applicant or its designee shall employ a construction relations officer who shall address community concerns regarding on-site construction activity. The applicant shall provide public notification in the form of a visible sign containing the contact information of the construction relations officer, who shall document complaints and concerns regarding on-site construction activity. The sign shall be placed in easily accessible locations along Proctor Valley Road and noted on grading and improvement plans.</p> <p><b>M-AQ-3</b> Blasting and Rock Crushing Dust Controls. The following provisions shall be implemented to reduce emissions associated with blasting and rock crushing activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. During blasting activities, the construction contractor shall implement all feasible engineering controls to control fugitive dust including exhaust ventilation, blasting cabinets and enclosures, vacuum blasters, drapes, water curtains, or wet blasting. Watering methods, such as water sprays and water applications, also shall be implemented during blasting, rock crushing, cutting, chipping, sawing, or any activity that would release dust particles to reduce fugitive dust emissions.</li> <li>b. During rock-crushing transfer and conveyance activities, material shall be watered prior to entering the crusher. Crushing activities shall not exceed an opacity limit of 20% (or Number 1 on the Ringelmann Chart) as averaged over 3 minutes in any period of 60 consecutive minutes, in accordance with San</li> </ul> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation   | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|--|---|
|            |        | <p>Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) Rule 50, Visible Emissions. A qualified opacity observer shall monitor opacity from crushing activities once every 30 days while crushers are employed on site to ensure compliance with SDAPCD Rule 50. Water sprayers, conveyor belt enclosures, or other mechanisms shall be employed to reduce fugitive dust generated during transfer and conveyance of crush material.</p> <p><b>M-AQ-4</b> Tier 4 Interim Construction Equipment. Prior to the commencement of any construction activities, the applicant or its designee shall provide evidence to the County of San Diego (County) that, for off-road equipment with engines rated at 75 horsepower or greater, no construction equipment shall be used that is less than Tier 4 Interim. An exemption from these requirements may be granted by the County in the event that the applicant documents that equipment with the required tier is not reasonably available and corresponding reductions in criteria air pollutant emissions are achieved from other construction equipment.<sup>1</sup> Before an exemption may be considered by the County, the applicant shall be required to demonstrate that three construction fleet owners/operators in the San Diego Region were contacted and that those owners/operators confirmed Tier 4 equipment could not be located within the San Diego region.</p> <p><b>M-AQ-5</b> Construction Equipment Maintenance. The primary contractor shall be responsible for ensuring that all</p> |   |

<sup>1</sup> For example, if a Tier 4 Interim piece of equipment is not reasonably available at the time of construction and a lower tier equipment is used instead (e.g., Tier 3), another piece of equipment could be upgraded from a Tier 4 Interim to a higher tier (i.e., Tier 4 Final) or replaced with an alternative-fueled (not diesel-fueled) equipment to offset the emissions associated with using a piece of equipment that does not meet Tier 4 Interim standards.

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact   | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness           |
|------------|--|---|---|
|            |  | <p>construction equipment is properly tuned and maintained in accordance with manufacturer's specifications before and for the duration of on-site operation.</p> <p><b>M-AQ-6</b> Use of Electrical-Powered Equipment. Electrical hookups shall be provided on site for hand tools such as saws, drills, and compressors used for building construction to reduce the need for electric generators and other fuel-powered equipment. The use of electrical construction equipment shall be employed, where feasible.</p> <p><b>M-AQ-7</b> Best Available Control Technology. Construction equipment shall be outfitted with best available control technology (BACT) devices certified by the California Air Resources Board. A copy of each unit's BACT documentation shall be provided to the County of San Diego at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment.</p> <p><b>M-AQ-8</b> Haul Trucks. Haul truck staging areas shall be provided for loading and unloading soil and materials, and shall be located away from sensitive receptors at the furthest feasible distance.</p> |   |
| AQ-2       | Project-generated maximum daily operational emissions would exceed the thresholds for VOC and PM <sub>10</sub> . | <p><b>M-AQ-9</b> Facilitate Use of Electrical Lawn and Garden Equipment. Prior to the issuance of residential building permits, the applicant or its designee shall provide evidence to the County of San Diego that building design plans require that residential structures be equipped with outdoor/exterior electric outlets in the front and rear of the structure to facilitate use of electrical lawn and garden equipment.</p> <p><b>M-AQ-10</b> Low-VOC/Green Cleaning Product Educational Program. Prior to the occupancy of any on-site development, the applicant or its designee shall provide evidence to the County of San Diego that the applicant/phase developer has</p>   | Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.                                  | Impact  | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness           |
|---|---|---|---|
|   |   | developed a Green Cleaning Product and Paint education program to be made available at rental offices, leasing spaces, and/or on websites.  |   |
| <i>Cumulative Impacts</i>                   |   |   |   |
| <i>Construction and Operation Emissions</i> |   |   |   |
| <b>AQ-CUM-1</b>                             | The Proposed Project has a significant direct impact on air quality with regard to construction-related emissions of VOC, NO <sub>x</sub> , CO, and PM <sub>10</sub> and, therefore, would also result in a significant cumulatively considerable net increase in those emissions.                                  | <b>M-AQ-1 through M-AQ-8</b><br>No other feasible mitigation measures exist to reduce identified impacts below a level of significance.   | Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. |
| <b>AQ-CUM-2</b>                             | The Proposed Project has a significant direct impact on air quality with regard to operational-related emissions of VOC and PM <sub>10</sub> and, therefore, would also result in a significant cumulatively considerable net increase in those emissions.  | <b>M-AQ-9 and M-AQ-10</b><br>No other feasible mitigation measures exist to reduce identified impacts below a level of significance.  | Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. |
| <b>2.8 Noise</b>                            |   |   |   |
| <i>Off-Site Traffic Noise</i>               |   |   |   |
| <b>N-3</b>                                  | Roadway noise attributable to the Proposed Project would result in a substantial noise increase (more than 10 dBA) at residential receiver M8/R14, located north of the Proposed Project along Proctor Valley Road and west of Melody Road.   | No feasible mitigation measures exist to reduce identified impacts below a level of significance.   | Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. |
| <b>2.9 Transportation and Traffic</b>       |   |   |   |
| <i>Existing Plus Project</i>                |   |   |   |
| <i>Segments</i>                             |   |   |   |
| <b>TR-1</b>                                 | During Existing Plus Project Build-Out conditions, the Proposed Project would have a significant project-specific impact to one roadway segment approximately 2,100 feet in length along Proctor Valley Road between Northwoods Drive and the City of Chula Vista boundary, located within the City of Chula Vista. | <b>M-TR-1:</b> Proctor Valley Road between Northwoods Drive and the City of Chula Vista boundary (Project-Specific Impact, City of Chula Vista): The Proposed Project applicant, or its designee, shall coordinate with the City of Chula Vista to widen the roadway segment of Proctor Valley Road between Northwoods Drive and the City of Chula Vista boundary from a two-lane roadway to a Class I Collector prior to issuance of a | Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.     |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.           | Impact   | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness       |
|----------------------|--|---|---|
|                      |  | building permit for the 1,229th equivalent dwelling unit (EDU). (This mitigation measure applies under Existing Plus Project Build-Out (Impact TR-1), Year 2025 (Impact TR-3), Year 2030 Cumulative Conditions (Impact TR-5), and Year 2030 With Cumulative Conditions Plus Hypothetical Development of State Preserve Property (Impact TR-8). Under the Year 2025, Year 2030, and Year 2030 With Cumulative Conditions Plus Hypothetical Development of State Preserve Property, the building permit threshold is the 563rd EDU.)  |   |
| <i>Intersections</i> |  |   |   |
| <b>TR-9</b>          | During Existing Plus Project Build-Out conditions, traffic associated with the Proposed Project would result in a significant direct impact at the intersection of SR-94 and Lyons Valley Road in the County.  | <b>M-TR-2:</b> Intersection at SR-94 and Lyons Valley Road (Direct Impact, Cumulative Impact, Caltrans Facility: The Proposed Project applicant, or its designee, shall coordinate with Caltrans to install a traffic signal at the intersection of SR-94 and Lyons Valley Road prior to issuance of a building permit for the 741st EDU. (This mitigation measure applies under Existing Plus Project Build-Out (Impacts TR-9), Year 2025 (Impacts TR-11), Year 2030 Cumulative Condition (Impacts TR-13), and Year 2030 With Cumulative Conditions Plus Hypothetical Development of State Preserve Property (Impacts TR-15).) | Impacts would be significant and unavoidable  |
| <b>TR-10</b>         | During Existing Plus Project Build-Out conditions, traffic associated with the Proposed Project would result in a significant Project-specific impact at the intersection of Northwoods Drive/Agua Vista Drive and Proctor Valley Road in the City of Chula Vista. | <b>M-TR-3:</b> Intersection at Northwoods Drive/Agua Vista Drive and Proctor Valley Road (Project-Specific Impact, City of Chula Vista): The Proposed Project applicant, or its designee, shall coordinate with the City of Chula Vista to install a traffic signal at the intersection of Northwoods Drive/Agua Vista Drive and Proctor Valley Road prior to issuance of a building permit for the 660th EDU. (This mitigation measure applies under Existing Plus Project Build-Out (Impacts TR-10), Year 2025 (Impacts TR-12), Year 2030 Cumulative Conditions   | Impacts would be significant and unavoidable. |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.                                     | Impact  | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness       |
|--|---|---|---|
|  |   | (Impacts TR-14), and Year 2030 With Cumulative Conditions Plus Hypothetical Development of State Preserve Property (Impacts TR-24). Under the Year 2025, Year 2030 Cumulative Conditions, and Year 2030 With Cumulative Conditions Plus Hypothetical Development of State Preserve Property, the threshold is the 287th EDU.)   |   |
| <i>Year 2025 Cumulative-Conditions Impacts</i> |   |   |   |
| <i>Segments</i>                                |   |   |   |
| <b>TR-2a, 2b</b>                               | <p>The Proposed Project would have a significant cumulative impact along the following four roadway segments of Proctor Valley Road during Year 2025 Cumulative Conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proctor Valley Road between the City of Chula Vista boundary and Project Driveway #1</li> <li>• Proctor Valley Road between Project Driveway #1 and Project Driveway #2</li> </ul> | <p><b>M-TR-4:</b> The Proposed Project applicant, or its designee, shall pay the appropriate County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) to reduce the Proposed Project's identified significant cumulative impact along the following four roadway segments of Proctor Valley Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proctor Valley Road between the City of Chula Vista boundary and Project Driveway #1 (Year 2025, Year 2030)</li> <li>• Proctor Valley Road between Project Driveway #1 and Project Driveway #2 (Year 2025, Year 2030)</li> <li>• Proctor Valley Road between Project Driveway #2 and Project Driveway #3 (Year 2030)</li> <li>• Proctor Valley Road, between Project Driveway #3 to Project Driveway #4 (Year 2030)</li> </ul> <p>(This mitigation measure applies under Year 2025 and Year 2030 conditions.)</p> | Impacts would be significant and unavoidable. |
| <b>TR-3</b>                                    | The Proposed Project would result in a significant project specific impact to one roadway segment at Proctor Valley Road between Northwoods Drive and the City of Chula Vista boundary, located within the City of Chula Vista, under Year 2025 Cumulative Conditions.  | <b>M-TR-1</b> (described above)   | Impacts would be significant and unavoidable. |



**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.                                     | Impact  | Mitigation                      | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness       |
|--|---|---------------------------------|---|
| <i>Intersection</i>                            |   |                                 |   |
| <b>TR-11</b>                                   | During Year 2025 conditions, the Proposed Project would have a significant cumulative impact on the intersection of SR-94 and Lyons Valley Road within the County of San Diego.   | <b>M-TR-2</b> (described above) | Impacts would be significant and unavoidable. |
| <b>TR-12</b>                                   | During Year 2025 Cumulative Conditions, traffic associated with the Proposed Project would result in a significant Project-specific impact at the intersection of Northwoods Drive/Agua Vista Drive and Proctor Valley Road in Chula Vista.   | <b>M-TR-3</b> (described above) | Impacts would be significant and unavoidable. |
| <i>Year 2030 Cumulative-Conditions Impacts</i> |   |                                 |   |
| <i>Segments</i>                                |   |                                 |   |
| <b>TR-4a, 4b, 4c, 4d</b>                       | The Proposed Project would have a significant cumulative impact along the following four roadway segments of Proctor Valley Road during Year 2030 Cumulative Conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proctor Valley Road between the City of Chula Vista boundary and Project Driveway #1</li> <li>Proctor Valley Road between Project Driveway #1 and Project Driveway #2</li> <li>Proctor Valley Road between Project Driveway #2 and Project Driveway #3</li> <li>Proctor Valley Road between Project Driveway #3 to Project Driveway #4</li> </ul> | <b>M-TR-4</b> (described above) | Impacts would be significant and unavoidable. |
| <b>TR-5</b>                                    | During Year 2030 Cumulative Conditions, the Proposed Project would have a significant Project-specific impact to the roadway of Proctor Valley Road from Northwoods Drive to the City of Chula Vista boundary.  | <b>M-TR-1</b> (described above) | Impacts would be significant and unavoidable. |
| <i>Intersections</i>                           |   |                                 |   |
| <b>TR-13</b>                                   | During Year 2030 Cumulative Conditions, traffic associated with the Proposed Project would result in a significant cumulative impact at the intersection of SR-94 and Lyons Valley Road.  | <b>M-TR-2</b> (described above) | Impacts would be significant and unavoidable. |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.  | Impact  | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness       |
|---|---|---|---|
| TR-14   | During Year 2030 Cumulative Conditions, traffic associated with the Proposed Project would result in a significant Project-specific impact at the intersection of Northwoods Drive/Agua Vista Drive and Proctor Valley Road.  | M-TR-3 (described above)  | Impacts would be significant and unavoidable. |
| <i>Year 2030 Cumulative Conditions Plus Hypothetical Development of State Preserve Property</i> |   |   |   |
| <i>Segments</i>   |   |   |   |
| TR-6a, 6b, 6c, 6d   | <p>The Proposed Project would cause significant cumulative impacts under Year 2030 With Cumulative Conditions Plus Hypothetical Development of State Preserve Property within San Diego County on the road segments along Proctor Valley Road, between:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City of Chula Vista boundary to Project Driveway No. 1 (LOS F);</li> <li>• Proctor Valley Road, between Project Driveway No. 1 to Project Driveway No. 2 (LOS F);</li> <li>• Proctor Valley Road, between Project Driveway No. 2 to Project Driveway No. 3 (LOS F); and</li> <li>• Proctor Valley Road, between Project Driveway No. 3 to Project Driveway No. 4 (LOS F).</li> </ul> | <p><b>M-TR-5:</b> Proctor Valley Road, between the City of Chula Vista Boundary and Project Driveway No. 1 (Cumulative Impact, County of San Diego; Impact 6a): In the event development of the Rancho Jamul Preserve were to be approved, and construction commenced prior to buildout of the Proposed Project, to mitigate an over-capacity road segment, the project applicant, or it's designee, would be required to pay its fair-share of the costs to widen Proctor Valley Road from a 2-Lane Collector with Raised Median (2.2A) to a 4-Lane Major (4.1A).</p> <p><b>M-TR-6:</b> Proctor Valley Road, between Project Driveway No. 1 and Project Driveway No. 2 (Cumulative Impact, County of San Diego; Impact 6b): In the event development of the Rancho Jamul Preserve were to be approved, and construction commenced prior to buildout of the Proposed Project, to mitigate an over-capacity road segment, the project applicant, or it's designee, would be required to pay its fair-share of the costs to widen Proctor Valley Road from a 2-Lane Collector with Raised Median (2.2A) to a 4-Lane Major (4.1A).</p> <p><b>M-TR-7:</b> Proctor Valley Road, between Project Driveway No.2 Project Driveway No. 3 (Cumulative Impact, County of San Diego; Impact 6c): In the event development of the Rancho Jamul Preserve were to be approved, and construction commenced prior to buildout of the Proposed Project, to mitigate an over-capacity road segment, the project applicant,</p> | Impacts would be significant and unavoidable. |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.  | Impact   | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness              |
|-------------|--|---|--|
|             |  | <p>or it's designee, would be required to pay its fair-share of the costs to widen Proctor Valley Road from a 2-Lane Collector with Raised Median (2.2A) to a 4-Lane Major (4.1A).</p> <p><b>M-TR-8:</b> Proctor Valley Road, between Project Driveway No. 3 and Project Driveway No. 4 (Cumulative Impact, County of San Diego; Impact 6d): In the event development of the Rancho Jamul Preserve were to be approved, and construction commenced prior to buildout of the Proposed Project, to mitigate an over-capacity road segment, the project applicant, or it's designee, would be required to pay its fair-share of the costs to widen Proctor Valley Road from a 2-Lane Collector with Raised Median (2.2A) to a 4-Lane Major (4.1A).</p> |  |
| <b>TR-7</b> | <p>During Year 2030 With Cumulative Conditions Plus Hypothetical Development of State Preserve Property, the Proposed Project would result in a significant project specific impact to Proctor Valley Road, between Hunte Parkway and Northwoods Drive.</p>                    | <p><b>M-TR-9:</b> Proctor Valley Road, between Hunte Parkway and Northwoods Drive (Project Specific Impact, City of Chula Vista): If development of the Rancho Jamul Preserve is approved, and construction commenced prior to buildout of the Proposed Project, the project applicant, or its designee, shall coordinate with the City of Chula Vista to widen Proctor Valley Road between Hunte Parkway and Northwoods Drive from a four-lane roadway to a six-lane Major Street, by the issuance of the building permit for the 487th equivalent dwelling unit.</p>  | <p>Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.</p> |
| <b>TR-8</b> | <p>During Year 2030 With Cumulative Conditions Plus Hypothetical Development of State Preserve Property, the Proposed Project would result in a significant project specific impact to Proctor Valley Road, between Northwoods Drive and the City of Chula Vista Boundary.</p> | <p><b>M-TR-1</b> (described above)</p>  | <p>Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.</p> |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.           | Impact  | Mitigation   | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness       |
|----------------------|---|--|---|
| <i>Intersections</i> |   |  |   |
| <b>TR-15</b>         | During Year 2030 With Cumulative Conditions Plus Hypothetical Development of State Preserve Property, traffic associated with the Proposed Project would result in a significant cumulative impact at the intersection of SR-94 and Lyons Valley Road.                    | <b>M-TR-2</b> (described above)  | Impacts would be significant and unavoidable. |
| <b>TR-16</b>         | During Year 2030 With Cumulative Conditions Plus Hypothetical Development of State Preserve Property, traffic associated with the Proposed Project would result in a significant cumulative impact at the intersection of Paseo Ranchero and East H Street.               | <b>M-TR-15:</b> Intersection at Paseo Ranchero and East H Street (Project Specific Impact, City of Chula Vista): The Proposed Project applicant, or its designee, shall coordinate with the City of Chula Vista to restripe the eastbound approach to the intersection of Paseo Ranchero and East H Street to include an exclusive right-turn lane.                                      | Impacts would be significant and unavoidable. |
| <b>TR-17</b>         | During Year 2030 With Cumulative Conditions Plus Hypothetical Development of State Preserve Property, traffic associated with the Proposed Project would result in a significant cumulative impact at the intersection of Proctor Valley Road and Project Driveway No. 1  | <b>M-TR-10:</b> Proctor Valley Road and Project Driveway No. 1 (Cumulative Impact, County of San Diego): Signalization would mitigate the cumulative impact at the intersection. This impact would occur with the full development of the Proposed Project as well as the development of 74 additional units within the Rancho Jamul Preserve.   | Impacts would be significant and unavoidable. |
| <b>TR-18</b>         | During Year 2030 With Cumulative Conditions Plus Hypothetical Development of State Preserve Property, traffic associated with the Proposed Project would result in a significant cumulative impact at the intersection of Proctor Valley Road and Project Driveway No. 2. | <b>M-TR-11:</b> Proctor Valley Road and Project Driveway No. 2 (Cumulative Impact, County of San Diego): Widening Proctor Valley Road from two to four lanes would mitigate the cumulative impact at this intersection. This impact would occur with the full development of the Proposed Project as well as the development of 1,083 additional units within the Rancho Jamul Preserve. | Impacts would be significant and unavoidable. |
| <b>TR-19</b>         | During Year 2030 With Cumulative Conditions Plus Hypothetical Development of State Preserve Property, traffic associated with the Proposed Project would result in a significant cumulative impact at the intersection of Proctor Valley Road and Project Driveway No. 3. | <b>M-TR-12:</b> Proctor Valley Road and Project Driveway No. 3 (Cumulative Impact, County of San Diego): Signalization would mitigate the cumulative impact at this intersection. This impact would occur with the full development of the Proposed Project as well as the development of 397 additional units within the Rancho Jamul Preserve.   | Impacts would be significant and unavoidable. |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.   | Impact   | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness       |
|--------------|--|---|---|
| <b>TR-20</b> | During Year 2030 With Cumulative Conditions Plus Hypothetical Development of State Preserve Property, traffic associated with the Proposed Project would result in a significant cumulative impact at the intersection of Proctor Valley Road and Project Driveway No. 4.                  | <b>M-TR-13:</b> Proctor Valley Road and Project Driveway No. 4 (Cumulative Impact, County of San Diego): Signalization would mitigate the cumulative impact at this intersection. This impact would occur with the full development of the Proposed Project as well as the development of 563 additional units within the Rancho Jamul Preserve.  | Impacts would be significant and unavoidable. |
| <b>TR-21</b> | During Year 2030 With Cumulative Conditions Plus Hypothetical Development of State Preserve Property, traffic associated with the Proposed Project would result in a significant cumulative impact at the intersection of Proctor Valley Road and Project Driveway No. 5.                  | <b>M-TR-14:</b> Proctor Valley Road and Project Driveway No. 5 (Cumulative Impact, County of San Diego): Signalization would mitigate the cumulative impact at this intersection. This impact would occur with the full development of the Proposed Project as well as the development of 481 additional units within the Rancho Jamul Preserve.  | Impacts would be significant and unavoidable. |
| <b>TR-22</b> | During Year 2030 With Cumulative Conditions Plus Hypothetical Development of State Preserve Property, traffic associated with the Proposed Project would result in a significant project specific impact at the intersection of Mt. Miguel Road and East H Street.                         | <b>M-TR-16:</b> Intersection at Mt Miguel Road and East H Street (Project Specific Impact City of Chula Vista): The Proposed Project applicant, or its designee, shall coordinate with the City of Chula Vista to restripe the westbound approach to the intersection of Mt. Miguel Road and East H Street to include an exclusive right-turn lane prior to issuance of a building permit for the 638th equivalent dwelling unit. | Impacts would be significant and unavoidable. |
| <b>TR-23</b> | During Year 2030 With Cumulative Conditions Plus Hypothetical Development of State Preserve Property, traffic associated with the Proposed Project would result in a significant project specific impact at the intersection of Lane Avenue and East H Street.                             | <b>M-TR-17:</b> Intersection at Lane Avenue and East H Street (Project Specific Impact City of Chula Vista): The Proposed Project applicant, or its designee, shall coordinate with the City of Chula Vista to adjust the median and restripe the westbound approach at the intersection of Lane Avenue and East H Street to include a second left-turn lane.   | Impacts would be significant and unavoidable. |
| <b>TR-24</b> | During Year 2030 With Cumulative Conditions Plus Hypothetical Development of State Preserve Property, traffic associated with the Proposed Project would result in a significant project specific impact at the intersection of Northwoods Drive/Agua Vista Drive and Proctor Valley Road. | <b>M-TR-3</b> (described above)   | Impacts would be significant and unavoidable. |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.  | Impact   | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness       |
|---|--|---|---|
| <i>SB 743 Land Use Project per Capita Analysis</i>            |  |   |   |
| <b>TR-25</b>  | Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in a potentially significant impact related to vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita because the Proposed Project VMT per capita would exceed the significance threshold suggested by the SB 743 Draft Proposal currently being circulated for public review and comment, not yet in effect. | No feasible mitigation measures exist to reduce identified impacts below a level of significance.   | Impacts would be significant and unavoidable. |
| <i>Less Than Significant Impacts (With Mitigation)</i>        |  |   |   |
| <i>2.3 Air Quality</i>  |  |   |   |
| <i>Project-Level Impacts</i>                                  |  |   |   |
| <i>Conformance to Federal and State Air Quality Standards</i> |  |   |   |
| <b>AQ-1</b>   | Project-generated maximum daily construction emissions would exceed the construction thresholds for <u>particulate matter less than or equal to 10 microns in diameter (PM<sub>10</sub>)</u> and particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns in diameter (PM <sub>2.5</sub> ) during one or more years of construction.                   | <b>M-AQ-1 through M-AQ-8</b> (described above)  | Impacts would be less than significant.       |
| <i>Cumulative Impacts</i>                                     |  |   |   |
| <i>Construction and Operation Emissions</i>                   |  |   |   |
| <b>AQ-CUM-1</b>   | The Proposed Project has a significant direct impact on air quality with regard to construction-related emissions of PM <sub>2.5</sub> and, therefore, could also result in a significant cumulatively considerable net increase in those emissions.   | <b>M-AQ-1 through M-AQ-8</b> (described above)  | Impacts would be less than significant.       |
| <i>2.4 Biological Resources</i>                               |  |   |   |
| <i>Project-Level Impacts</i>                                  |  |   |   |
| <i>Sensitive Wildlife Species</i>                             |  |   |   |
| <b>BI-1</b>   | Permanent Direct Impacts to potential Quino Checkerspot Butterfly Suitable Habitat   | <b>M-BI-3 Habitat Conveyance and Preservation.</b> Prior to the approval of the first Final Map for the Proposed Project, the Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall coordinate | Impacts would be less than significant.       |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact   | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--|---|---|
|            | <p>The Proposed Project would result in the loss of 793.7 acres of Quino checkerspot butterfly potential habitat. Such impacts would be potentially significant.</p> | <p>with the County of San Diego (County) to establish and/or annex the Project Area into a County-administered Community Facilities District to fund pay for the ongoing management and maintenance of the Otay Ranch Resource Management Plan (RMP) Preserve. Prior to the recordation of the first Final Map within each Tentative Map development phase, the Proposed Project applicant shall convey land within the Otay Ranch RMP Preserve to the Otay Ranch Preserve Owner/Manager or its designee at 1.188 acres for each “developable acre” impacted, as defined by the Otay Ranch RMP. <del>At the standard 1.188 mitigation ratio, the required conveyance for this Proposed Project is 776.8 acres (653.9 acres × 1.188 = 776.8 acres). Common uses within the Project Area include 15.2 acres of public parks, the 9.6-acre elementary school site, 12.8 acres of major circulation, 3.6 acres for the on-site water tank and access road, and the 2.3-acre public safety site. In addition, Planning Area 16 contains 127.1 acres of LDA that is not subject to conveyance. Areas of Conserved Open Space are also excluded from the conveyance total (72.4 acres). Total Proposed Project impacts, less these common areas, Conserved Open Space, and LDA, and including roads within Planning Areas 16/19, is 653.9 acres. Based on the analysis in the Draft EIR, it is anticipated that the</del> The Proposed Project <del>would shall</del> convey a total of 776.8 acres, 426.7 acres of which is anticipated to be conveyed within Village 14 and Planning Areas 16/19. The actual conveyance will be based on the 1.188 mitigation ratio as determined at Final Map. The remaining 350.4 acres of required conveyance <del>needs shall</del> would be met through off-site acquisitions within the Otay Ranch RMP, which <del>will</del> would then be conveyed to the Otay Ranch RMP Preserve. In addition, the BMO analysis</p> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|---|---|
|            |        | <p>determined mitigation requirements for areas subject to the BMO (PV1, PV2 and PV3) are more stringent for certain types of habitat than the Otay Ranch RMP Preserve Conveyance Obligation. Accordingly, the BMO analysis identified an additional 24.6 acres of mitigation, beyond the 203.5 acres required by the Otay Ranch RMP Preserve Conveyance Obligation, for impacts in PV1, PV2 and PV3, for a total of 228.1 acres. The mitigation provided for impacts to PV1, PV2, and PV3 would be like-kind or up-tiered habitat.</p> <p><b>M-BI-4 Biological Open Space Easement.</b> Areas of Conserved Open Space shall be preserved on site and shall either be added to the Otay Ranch Resource Management Plan (RMP) Preserve (see M-BI-3), given to the City of San Diego to mitigate for impacts to Cornerstone Lands, or managed under a County of San Diego (County) approved RMP through the County biological open space easement to satisfy the additional mitigation requirements as a result of the BMO analysis. This easement shall be for the protection of biological resources, and all of the following shall be prohibited on any portion of the land subject to said easement: grading; excavating; placing soil, sand, rock, gravel, or other material; clearing vegetation; constructing, erecting, or placing any building or structure; vehicular activities; dumping trash; or using the area for any purpose other than as open space. Granting this biological open space easement shall authorize the County and its agents to periodically access the land to perform management and monitoring activities for species and habitat conservation. The only exceptions to this prohibition are the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Selective clearing of vegetation by hand to the extent required by written order of the fire authorities for the express purpose of reducing an identified fire hazard. Although clearing for fire management is not</li> </ol> |   |



**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|---|---|
|            |        | <p>anticipated with the creation of this easement, such clearing may be deemed necessary in the future for the safety of lives and property. All fire clearing shall be pursuant to the applicable fire code of the fire authority having jurisdiction, and the Memorandum of Understanding dated February 26, 1997, between the wildlife agencies and the fire districts and any subsequent amendments thereto.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Activities conducted pursuant to a revegetation or habitat management plan approved by the Director of Department of Planning &amp; Development Services.</li> <li>3. Vegetation removal or application of chemicals for vector control purposes where expressly required by written order of the County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health.</li> <li>4. Construction, use, and maintenance of multi-use, non-motorized trails.</li> </ol> <p>The applicant shall show the on-site biological open space easement on the Final Map and biological open space easement exhibit with the appropriate granting language on the title sheet concurrent with Final Map Review, then submit them for preparation and recordation with the Department of General Services, and pay all applicable fees associated with preparation of the documents.</p> <p>If areas of Conserved Open Space are managed through the County to provide for the long-term management of the proposed Conserved Open Space, an RMP shall be prepared and implemented prior to the approval of the Final Map. The RMP shall be submitted to the County and agencies for approval as required.</p> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|---|---|
|            |        | <p>The final RMP cannot be approved until the following has been completed to the satisfaction of the Director of Department of Planning &amp; Development Services, and, in cases where the Director of the Department of Parks and Recreation has agreed to be the owner/manager, to the satisfaction of the Director of the Department of Parks and Recreation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The RMP shall be prepared and approved pursuant to the most current version of the County of San Diego Biological Report Format and Content Requirements.</li> <li>2. The biological open space easements shall be dedicated to ensure that the land is protected in perpetuity.</li> <li>3. A resource manager shall be selected and evidence provided by the applicant as to the acceptance of this responsibility by the proposed resource manager,</li> <li>4. The RMP funding costs, including a PAR (Property Assessment Record) or other equally adequate forecast, shall be identified. The funding mechanism (endowment or other equally adequate mechanism) to fund annual costs for the RMP and the holder of the security shall be identified and approved by the County.</li> <li>5. A contract between the applicant and County shall be executed for the implementation of the RMP.</li> <li>6. Annual reports shall include an accounting of all required tasks and details of tasks addressed during the reporting period, and an accounting of all expenditures and demonstration that the funding source remains adequate.</li> </ol> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation   | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|--|---|
|            |        | <p><b>M-BI-5</b> Permanent Fencing and Signage. To protect the Otay Ranch Resource Management Plan Preserve and areas of Conserved Open Space from entry upon occupancy of any housing units, an open space fence or wall shall be installed along all open space edges where open space is adjacent to residential uses, along internal streets, and as indicated in the Proctor Valley Village 14 and Preserve Edge Plan and Proposed Fencing, Preserve Signage, and Fuel Modification Zones. The barrier shall be a minimum construction of vertical metal fencing, but may be other suitable construction material, as approved by Department of Planning &amp; Development Services and the Director of Parks and Recreation. To protect the Preserve from entry, informational signs shall be installed, where appropriate, along all open space edges where open space is adjacent to residential uses, along internal streets, and as indicated in the Proctor Valley Village 14 and Preserve Edge Plan. The signs must be corrosion resistant, a minimum of 6 inches by 9 inches, on posts not less than 3 feet in height from the ground surface, and state, "Sensitive Environmental Resources Protected by Easement. Entry without express written permission from the County of San Diego is prohibited."</p> <p><b>M-BI-8</b> Quino Checkerspot Butterfly Take Authorization. <u>The Project Applicant shall consult with USFWS to determine if</u> take authorization is required for impacts to Quino checkerspot. <u>If such take authorization is required, butterfly,</u> the Proposed Project Applicant or designee shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning &amp; Development Services (or his/her designee) and prior to the issuance of the first grading permit that impacts suitable Quino checkerspot butterfly habitat, that it has secured from any necessary take authorization. Take authorization may be obtained through the</p> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation   | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|--|---|
|            |        | <p>Section 7 Consultation or Section 10 incidental take permit requirements. The Applicant will comply with any and all conditions, including preconstruction surveys, that the USFWS may require for take of Quino checkerspot butterfly pursuant to the FESA. <del>If required as a permit condition, Preconstruction</del> <u>preconstruction surveys</u> will be conducted in accordance with USFWS protocols unless the USFWS authorizes a deviation from those protocols.</p> <p>Take may also be obtained through the County of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program Subarea Plan Quino Checkerspot Butterfly Addition, if/when approved. If the Quino checkerspot butterfly is included as an addition to the South County MSCP, and the Applicant seeks take under the Quino Addition, the Applicant will comply with any and all conditions <u>required under the County MSCP Subarea Plan for Quino Checkerspot Butterfly Addition.</u></p> <p><b>M-BI-9</b> Quino Checkerspot Butterfly Habitat Preservation. The Proposed Project shall convey 404.8 acres of potential habitat for Quino checkerspot butterfly. In addition, per M-BI-4, an open space easement shall be placed over 72.4 acres of potential habitat within Conserved Open Space. <del>As a condition of the RMP, and open space easement will be placed over 83.7 acres of potential habitat within non-graded LDA. Therefore, 560.9477.2</del> acres of potential habitat for Quino checkerspot butterfly shall be conveyed to the Otay Ranch Resource Management Plan Preserve or not be impacted by the Proposed Project. An additional 350.1 acres of conveyance is required for the Proposed Project's impacts and shall be selected to include suitable Quino checkerspot butterfly habitat. For the off-site mitigation parcel(s) to be acceptable as mitigation for sensitive plant and wildlife</p> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation   | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|--|---|
|            |        | <p>species, including Quino checkerspot butterfly, vegetation within the off-site parcel must be mapped and the site must have suitable habitat to support Quino checkerspot butterfly per the survey guidelines definition of habitat. Thus, the Proposed Project shall provide mitigation acreage at a ratio in excess of 1:1 (preservation of 1 acre for every 1 acre of impact) and shall adequately mitigate impacts to potential Quino checkerspot butterfly habitat. This mitigation measure also satisfies the mitigation requirements for those portions of the Project Area subject to the Biological Mitigation Ordinance. These areas shall be managed under a Quino Checkerspot Butterfly Management/Enhancement Plan, as discussed further in M-BI-10.</p> <p><b>M-BI-10</b> Quino Checkerspot Butterfly Management/Enhancement Plan. Prior to the issuance of the first grading permit that impacts habitat identified as suitable for Quino checkerspot butterfly, the Proposed Project shall prepare a long-term Quino Checkerspot Butterfly Management/Enhancement Plan. At a minimum that plan shall include focused surveys within suitable habitat in the Otay Ranch Resource Management Plan Preserve and Conserved Open Space to determine if the species and suitable host plants are present, and determine areas of potential habitat restoration. The plan shall be submitted to and receive approval from the Director of the Department of Planning &amp; Development Services (or her/his designee) and the Director of Parks and Recreation. The Quino Checkerspot Butterfly Management/Enhancement Plan shall either be superseded or unnecessary upon completion and adoption of a future County Multiple Species Conservation Program Subarea Plan Quino Checkerspot Butterfly Addition. Adaptive management</p> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.         | Impact  | Mitigation   | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness        |
|--------------------|---|--|--|
|                    |   | <p>techniques shall be included in the plan, with contingency methods for changed circumstances. These measures shall ensure that the loss of habitat for the species related to the proposed development are adequately offset by measures that will enhance the potential for Quino checkerspot butterfly to occupy the Preserve, and shall provide data that will help the species recover throughout its range.</p>  |  |
| <p><b>BI-2</b></p> | <p>Permanent Direct Impacts to Habitat for Special-Status Wildlife Species</p> <p>Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in the direct loss of habitat, including breeding, nesting and foraging habitat, for some of the County of San Diego Group 1, Group 2, and SSC species. These species include the following: red diamond rattlesnake, western spadefoot, Cooper's hawk, southern California rufous-crowned sparrow, grasshopper sparrow, burrowing owl, red-shouldered hawk, turkey vulture, northern harrier, California horned lark, loggerhead shrike, coastal California gnatcatcher, western bluebird, common barn-owl, monarch, San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit, mule deer, cougar, American badger, San Diegan tiger whiptail, rosy boa, long-eared owl, white-tailed kite, Blainville's horned lizard, Bell's sage sparrow, ferruginous hawk, pallid bat, western mastiff bat, western red bat, Yuma myotis, San Diego desert woodrat, big free-tailed bat, orangethroat whiptail, San Diego banded gecko, and Coronado skink (see Table 2.4-10).).</p> | <p><b>M-BI-1</b> Biological Monitoring. To prevent disturbance to areas outside the limits of grading, all grading shall be monitored by a biologist. Prior to issuance of land development permits, including clearing, grubbing, grading, and/or construction permits for any areas adjacent to the Otay Ranch Resource Management Plan (RMP) Preserve and the off-site areas, the Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall provide written confirmation that a biological monitor approved by the County of San Diego has been retained and shall be present during clearing, grubbing, and/or grading activities within sensitive resources.</p> <p>Biological monitoring shall include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Attend the preconstruction meeting with the contractor and other key construction personnel prior to clearing, grubbing, or grading to reduce conflict between the timing and location of construction activities with other mitigation requirements (e.g., seasonal surveys for nesting birds).</li> <li>b. Conduct meetings with the contractor and other key construction personnel describing the importance of restricting work to designated areas prior to clearing, grubbing, or grading. Perform weekly inspection of fencing and erosion control measures (daily during rain events) near proposed preservation areas.</li> </ol> | <p>Impacts would be less than significant.</p> |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation   | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|--|---|
|            |        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c. Discuss procedures/training for minimizing harm to or harassment of wildlife encountered during construction with the contractor and other key construction personnel prior to clearing, grubbing, or grading.</li> <li>d. Supervise and monitor vegetation clearing, grubbing, and grading to ensure against direct and indirect impacts to biological resources that are intended to be protected and preserved.</li> <li>e. Flush species (i.e., avian or other mobile species) from occupied habitat areas immediately prior to brush-clearing and earth-moving activities.</li> <li>f. Verify that the construction site is implementing the stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) best management practices. The SWPPP is described in further detail in M-BI-14.</li> <li>g. Periodically monitor the construction site in accordance with the Proposed Project's fugitive dust control plan. Periodically monitor the construction site to see that dust is minimized according to the fugitive dust control plan and that manufactured slopes are revegetated as soon as possible.</li> <li>h. Periodically monitor the construction site to verify that artificial security light fixtures are directed away from open space and are shielded.</li> <li>i. Oversee the construction site so that cover and/or escape routes for wildlife from excavated areas are provided on a daily basis. All steep trenches, holes, and excavations during construction shall be covered at night with backfill, plywood, metal plates, or other means, and the edges covered with soils</li> </ul> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|---|---|
|            |        | <p>and plastic sheeting such that small wildlife cannot access them. Soil piles shall be covered at night to prevent wildlife from burrowing in. The edges of the sheeting shall be weighed down by sandbags. These areas may also be fenced to prevent wildlife from gaining access. Exposed trenches, holes, and excavations shall be inspected twice daily (i.e., each morning and prior to sealing the exposed area) by a qualified biologist to monitor for wildlife entrapment. Excavations shall provide an earthen ramp to allow for a wildlife escape route.</p> <p><b>M-BI-3</b> (described above)<br/> <b>M-BI-4</b> (described above)<br/> <b>M-BI-5</b> (described above)<br/> <b>M-BI-6</b> Nesting Bird Survey. To avoid any direct impacts to raptors and/or any migratory birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, removal of habitat that supports active nests on the proposed area of disturbance shall occur outside of the nesting season for these species (January 15 through August 15, annually). If, however, removal of habitat on the proposed area of disturbance must occur during the nesting season, the Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall retain a biologist approved by the County of San Diego (County) to conduct a preconstruction survey to determine the presence or absence of nesting birds on the proposed area of disturbance. The preconstruction survey must be conducted within 72 hours prior to the start of construction, and the results must be submitted to the Director of Planning &amp; Development Services for review and approval prior to initiating any construction activities. If nesting birds are detected, a letter report or mitigation plan, as deemed</p> |   |



**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|---|---|
|            |        | <p>appropriate by the County, shall be prepared and include proposed measures to be implemented to ensure that disturbance of nesting activities are avoided. The report or mitigation plan shall be submitted to the County for review and approval and implemented to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning &amp; Development Services (or her/his designee). The County's mitigation monitor shall verify and approve that all measures identified in the report or mitigation plan are in place prior to and/or during construction.</p> <p><b>M-BI-13</b> Burrowing Owl Preconstruction Survey. Prior to issuance of any land development permits, including clearing, grubbing, and grading permits, the Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall retain a County of San Diego (County)-approved biologist to conduct focused preconstruction surveys for burrowing owl. The surveys shall be performed no earlier than <del>30</del><u>seven</u> days prior to the commencement of any clearing, grubbing, or grading activities. If occupied burrows are detected, the County-approved biologist shall prepare a passive relocation mitigation plan subject to review and approval by the Wildlife Agencies (i.e., California Department of Fish and Wildlife and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) and the County, including any subsequent burrowing owl relocation plans to avoid impacts from construction-related activities.</p> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.  | Impact   | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|-------------|--|---|---|
| <b>BI-3</b> | <p>Permanent Direct Impacts to Hermes Copper Butterfly Suitable Habitat:</p> <p>Although no Hermes copper butterfly were observed in the Project Area, there is the possibility that Hermes copper butterfly could use or occupy the site at some time in the future. The Proposed Project would result in impacts to 18 acres of habitat that could support future Hermes copper butterfly populations.</p> | <p><b>M-BI-3</b> (described above)<br/> <b>M-BI-4</b> (described above)<br/> <b>M-BI-5</b> (described above)</p>  | Impacts would be less than significant. |
| <b>BI-6</b> | <p>Permanent Direct Impacts to Golden Eagle:<br/> The Proposed Project would result in a potentially significant impact to <del>779.87</del><u>80.8</u> acres of suitable golden eagle foraging habitat.</p>   | <p><b>M-BI-3</b> (described above)<br/> <b>M-BI-4</b> (described above)<br/> <b>M-BI-5</b> (described above)</p>  | Impacts would be less than significant. |
| <b>BI-7</b> | <p>Temporary Direct Impacts to Habitat for Special-Status Wildlife Species:<br/> The Proposed Project would result in potentially significant temporary direct impacts to habitat for special-status wildlife species (County Group 1 or state SSC animals), including individual amphibians, reptiles, and small mammals, from construction-related activities.</p>   | <p><b>M-BI-1</b> (described above)<br/> <b>M-BI-2</b> Temporary Construction Fencing. Prior to issuance of land development permits, including clearing, grubbing, grading, and/or construction permits, the Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall install prominently colored fencing and signage wherever the limits of grading are adjacent to sensitive vegetation communities or other biological resources, as identified by the qualified monitoring biologist. Fencing shall remain in place during all construction activities. All temporary fencing shall be shown on grading plans for areas adjacent to the Preserve and for all off-site facilities constructed within the Preserve. Prior to release of grading and/or improvement bonds, a qualified biologist shall provide evidence to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning &amp; Development Services (or his/her designee) and the Director of Parks and Recreation that work was conducted as authorized under the approved land development permit and associated plans.</p> | Impacts would be less than significant. |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation   | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|--|---|
|            |        | <p><b>M-BI-6</b> (described above)</p> <p><b>M-BI-12</b> Restoration of Temporary Impacts. The Proposed Project would result in temporary impacts to sensitive upland and jurisdictional aquatic resources along the off-site portions of Proctor Valley Road, as well as temporary impacts associated within on-site road development. Road development within Village 14 would include 3.7 acres of temporary impacts to sensitive resources and 6.6 acres within the Otay Ranch Resource Management Plan (RMP) Preserve. Within Planning Areas 16/19, there would be 3.4 acres of temporary impacts within the Otay Ranch RMP Preserve. Off-site temporary impacts to sensitive resources would total 49.4 acres: 2.4 acres of temporary impacts to City of Chula Vista land, 21.1 acres of temporary impacts to City of San Diego Cornerstone Lands, and 25.9 acres of temporary impacts to California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)-owned lands. In addition, there would be minor impacts to County of San Diego lands totaling 0.1 acres. Restoration areas may incorporate salvaged materials, such as seed collection and translocation of plant materials, as determined to be appropriate. The Proposed Project biologist shall review the plant materials prior to grading and determine if salvage is warranted. Prior to grading the Proposed Project, a Conceptual Upland and Wetlands Restoration Plan for impacts within County of San Diego shall be submitted to and receive approval from the Director of the Department of Planning &amp; Development Services (or her/his designee) and the Director of Parks and Recreation. Prior to grading, a separate Conceptual Upland and Wetlands Restoration Plan shall also be prepared and</p> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|---|---|
|            |        | <p>submitted to each city's Development Services Director (or her/his designee) and CDFW for their approval.</p> <p>The Conceptual Upland and Wetlands Restoration Plans shall include the following to ensure the establishment of the restoration objectives: a 24- by 36-inch map showing the restoration areas, site preparation information, type of planting materials (e.g., species ratios, source, size of container), planting program, 80% <u>relative native cover</u> success criteria, 5-year monitoring plan, and detailed cost estimate. The cost estimate shall include planting, plant materials, irrigation, maintenance, monitoring, and report preparation. The report shall be prepared by a City of Chula Vista-, City of San Diego-, and County of San Diego-approved biologist and a California-licensed landscape architect. The habitat restored pursuant to the plan must be placed within an open space easement dedicated to the appropriate managing entity prior to or immediately following approval of the plan.</p> <p><b>M-BI-18</b> Noise. Uses in or adjacent to the Otay Ranch Resource Management Plan (RMP) Preserve with impacts that are not reduced through implementation of the Preserve Edge Plan shall be designed to minimize potential noise impacts to surrounding wildlife species by constructing berms or walls adjacent to commercial areas and any other uses, such as community parks, that may introduce noises that could impact or interfere with wildlife use of the Otay Ranch RMP Preserve.</p> <p>Construction-related activities that are excessively noisy (e.g., clearing, grading, grubbing, or blasting) adjacent to breeding/nesting areas shall incorporate noise-reduction measures (described below) or be curtailed during the breeding/nesting season of sensitive bird species.</p> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|---|---|
|            |        | <p>There shall be no construction-related activities allowed during the breeding season of migratory birds or raptors (January 15 through August 31) or coastal California gnatcatcher (February 15 through August 31). The Director of Planning &amp; Development Services may waive this condition, through written concurrence from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (i.e., Wildlife Agencies), provided that no nesting or breeding birds are present within 300 feet of the construction activities (500 feet for raptors) based on a preconstruction survey.</p> <p>If construction-related activities that are excessively noisy (e.g., clearing, grading, grubbing, or blasting) occur during the period of February 15 through August 31, a County of San Diego (County)-approved biologist shall conduct preconstruction surveys in suitable nesting habitat adjacent to the construction area to determine the location of any active nests in the area. If the habitat is suitable for raptors, the survey area shall extend to 500 feet from the impact area, and if the habitat is suitable only for nesting by non-listed and non-raptor avifauna, the survey area shall extend 50 to 300 feet from the impact area, depending on the habitat type. The survey shall begin not more than 3 days prior to the beginning of construction activities. If nesting birds are detected by the biologist, the following buffers shall be established: (1) no work within 50 feet of a non-listed and non-raptor avifauna nest; (2) no work within 300 feet of a federally or state-listed species, such as coastal California gnatcatcher; and (3) no work within 500 feet of a raptor nest. The buffer shall be flagged in the field and mapped on the construction plans. To the extent possible, the non-construction buffer zones shall be avoided until the nesting cycle is complete. However, it may be</p> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.   | Impact   | Mitigation   | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|--------------|--|--|---|
|              |  | <p>reasonable for the County to reduce these buffer widths depending on site conditions (e.g., the width and type of screening vegetation) or the existing ambient level of activity (e.g., existing level of human activity within the buffer distance). If construction-related activities must take place within these buffer widths, the Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall contact the County to determine how to best minimize impacts to nesting birds.</p> <p>Specific to coastal California gnatcatcher and nesting raptors, construction-related noise levels in coastal California gnatcatcher-occupied habitat within 500 feet of construction activity shall not exceed 60 A-weighted decibels equivalent continuous sound level (dBA Leq) or preconstruction ambient noise levels, whichever is greater. Proposed Project construction within 500 feet of occupied habitat shall occur outside of the breeding season, if possible. If necessary, construction activities during the breeding season shall be managed to limit noise levels in occupied habitat within 500 feet of the site, or noise attenuation measures, such as temporary sound walls, shall be implemented to reduce noise levels below 60 dBA Leq or below existing ambient noise levels, whichever is greater</p> |   |
| <b>BI-8</b>  | <p>Permanent Direct Impacts to Birds under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act:<br/>The Proposed Project would result in a potentially significant permanent direct impact if any active nests or the young of nesting special-status bird species are impacted.</p> | <p><b>M-BI-1</b> (described above)<br/><b>M-BI-6</b> (described above)</p>   | Impacts would be less than significant. |
| <b>BI-11</b> | Temporary Indirect Impacts to Special-Status Wildlife Species:   | <p><b>M-BI-1</b> (described above)<br/><b>M-BI-2</b> (described above)</p>   | Impacts would be less than significant. |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact   | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--|---|---|
|            | <p>The Proposed Project would have potentially significant, temporary indirect impacts to avian foraging and wildlife access to foraging, nesting, and/or water resources.</p> | <p><b>M-BI-14</b> SWPPP. Prior to issuance of grading permits in portions of the Development Footprint that are adjacent to the Preserve, the Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall develop a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP shall be developed, approved, and implemented during construction to control stormwater runoff such that erosion, sedimentation, pollution, and other adverse effects are minimized. The following performance measures contained in the Proctor Valley Preserve Edge Plan shall be implemented to avoid the release of toxic substances associated with construction runoff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sediment shall be retained within the Development Footprint by a system of sediment basins, traps, or other appropriate measures.</li> <li>• Permanent energy dissipaters shall be included for drainage outlets.</li> <li>• The best management practices contained in the SWPPP shall include silt fences, fiber rolls, gravel bags, and soil stabilization measures such as erosion control mats and hydroseeding.</li> </ul> <p>The Project Area drainage basins shall be designed to provide effective water quality control measures, as outlined in the SWPPP. Design and operational features of the drainage basins shall include design features to provide maximum infiltration; maximum detention time for settling of fine particles; maximum distance between basin inlets and outlets to reduce velocities; and maintenance schedules for periodic removal of sedimentation, excessive vegetation, and debris.</p> <p><b>M-BI-15</b> Erosion and Runoff Control. During construction, material stockpiles shall be placed such that they cause</p> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation   | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|--|---|
|            |        | <p>minimal interference with on-site drainage patterns. This shall protect sensitive vegetation from being inundated with sediment-laden runoff.</p> <p>Dewatering shall be conducted in accordance with standard regulations of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). A National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit, issued by RWQCB to discharge water from dewatering activities, shall be required prior to start of construction. This shall minimize erosion, siltation, and pollution within sensitive communities.</p> <p>Design of drainage facilities shall incorporate long-term control of pollutants and stormwater flow to minimize pollution and hydrologic changes. An Urban Runoff Plan and operational best management practices shall be approved by the San Diego County Department of Planning &amp; Development Services prior to construction.</p> <p><b>M-BI-16</b> Prevention of Invasive Plant Species. A County of San Diego (County)-approved plant list, as described in the Preserve Edge Plan, shall be used for areas immediately adjacent to the Preserve. All slopes immediately adjacent to the Preserve shall be planted with native species that reflect the adjacent native habitat. A hydroseed mix that incorporates native species, is appropriate to the area, and is without invasive species shall be used for slope stabilization in transitional areas. Per the Preserve Edge Plan, only County-approved vegetation shall be planted in streetscapes or within the 100-foot “edge” between development and the Otay Ranch Resource Management Plan Preserve.</p> <p>The Planning &amp; Development Services Landscape Architect shall require that all final landscape plans comply with the following: no invasive plant species as included on the most</p> |   |



**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|---|---|
|            |        | <p>recent version of the California Invasive Plant Council's California Invasive Plant Inventory for the Proposed Project region shall be included, and the plant palette shall be composed of native species that do not require high irrigation rates. The Proposed Project biologist shall periodically check landscape products for compliance with these requirements.</p> <p><b>M-BI-17</b> Prevention of Chemical Pollutants. Weed control treatments shall include all legally permitted chemical, manual, and mechanical methods applied with the authorization of the County of San Diego (County) agriculture commissioner. The application of herbicides shall be in compliance with all state and federal laws and regulations under the prescription of a Pest Control Adviser and implemented by a licensed applicator. Where manual and/or mechanical methods are used, disposal of the plant debris shall follow the regulations set by the County agriculture commissioner. The timing of the weed control treatment shall be determined for each plant species in consultation with the Pest Control Adviser, the County agriculture commissioner, and the California Invasive Plant Council, with the goal of controlling populations before they start producing seeds. A manual weeding program shall be implemented on the manufactured slope adjacent to the Preserve to control weeds that are likely to be encouraged by irrigation within the 100-foot Preserve edge/fuel modification zone. Weed control efforts shall occur quarterly or as needed to prevent weeds on the manufactured slopes from moving into the adjacent Preserve. Either the homeowner's association or County's landscape monitoring firm shall be responsible to check the irrigated slopes during plant establishment to</p> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.   | Impact   | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|--------------|--|---|---|
|              |  | <p>verify that excessive runoff does not occur and that any weed infestations are controlled.</p> <p>During Proposed Project operation, all recreational areas that use chemicals or animal by-products, such as manure, that are potentially toxic or impactive to sensitive habitats or plants shall incorporate best management practices on site to reduce impacts caused by the application and/or drainage of such materials into the Otay Ranch Resource Management Plan Preserve. <u>In addition, use of rodenticides will not be allowed within the 100-foot Preserve edge.</u></p> <p><b>M-BI-18</b> (described above)</p>  |   |
| <b>BI-12</b> | <p>Permanent Indirect Impacts to Special-Status Wildlife Species: The Proposed Project would have potentially significant, permanent indirect impacts to special-status wildlife species, including generation of fugitive dust; off-road-vehicle use; introduction of non-native, invasive plant and animal species; habitat fragmentation; increased human activity; alteration of the natural fire regime; <u>noise; lighting;</u> and altered hydrology.</p> | <p><b>M-BI-5</b> (described above)<br/> <b>M-BI-14</b> (described above)<br/> <b>M-BI-15</b> (described above)<br/> <b>M-BI-16</b> (described above)<br/> <b>M-BI-17</b> (described above)<br/> <b>M-BI-19</b> Fire Protection. To minimize the potential exposure of the Project Area to fire hazards, all features of the Fire Protection Plan for Otay Ranch Village 14 and Planning Areas 16/19 shall be implemented in conjunction with development of the Proposed Project.<br/> <b>M-BI-20</b> Lighting. Lighting of all developed areas adjacent to the Otay Ranch Resource Management Plan Preserve shall be directed away from the Preserve, wherever feasible and consistent with public safety. Where necessary, development shall provide adequate shielding with non-invasive plant materials (preferably native), berming, and/or other methods to protect the Preserve and sensitive species from night lighting. Consideration shall be given to the use of low-pressure sodium lighting</p> | Impacts would be less than significant. |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact  | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|---|---|---|
| N/A        | <p>Although the MSCP identifies San Diego fairy shrimp as a Covered Species, the County has taken the position that, based on a 2006 federal court decision, the plan's protections for this species are inadequate for purposes of providing FESA take coverage. Therefore, impacts to San Diego fairy shrimp or its habitat must be assessed and mitigated on a project-specific basis. The Proposed Project avoids all vernal pools/features that are known to be occupied by San Diego fairy shrimp. Consequently no significant impacts to San Diego fairy shrimp are expected. Nevertheless, the County is requiring a preventative mitigation measure for this species which, if a take permit is required, includes compliance with any permit conditions required by the USFWS for take of San Diego fairy shrimp.</p> | <p><b><u>M-BI-7 San Diego Fairy Shrimp Take Authorization.</u></b> <u>The Project Applicant shall consult with the USFWS if # take authorization is required for impacts to San Diego fairy shrimp suitable habitat. If such take authorization is required,</u> the Proposed Project Applicant or its designee shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning &amp; Development Services (or his/her designee) and prior to the issuance of the first grading permit that impacts suitable San Diego fairy shrimp habitat, that it has secured from any necessary take authorization from the USFWS. Take authorization may be obtained through the Section 7 Consultation or Section 10 incidental take permit requirements. <u>If required as a permit condition,</u> <del>Preconstruction</del> <u>preconstruction</u> surveys for San Diego fairy shrimp will be a condition of this Project if required by the USFWS pursuant to the FESA. If required by the USFWS, the surveys shall be performed prior to the commencement of any clearing, grubbing, or grading activities. The preconstruction surveys will follow protocols set by the USFWS unless the USFWS authorizes a deviation from those protocols, as permitted under Section IX, subdivision a, of the "Survey Guidelines for the Listed Large Branchiopods," issued by USFWS on May 21, 2015. Note this measure will not apply to off-site areas under the jurisdiction of the City of San Diego or the City of Chula Vista. Take for San Diego fairy shrimp is provided by the City of San Diego's Vernal Pool Habitat Conservation Plan and the City of Chula Vista's Subarea Plan.</p> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.                     | Impact   | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|--------------------------------|--|---|---|
| <i>Sensitive Plant Species</i> |  |   |   |
| BI-4                           | The Proposed Project would have potentially significant short-term direct impacts to known occurrences of County List A and B plant species, or those with a moderate to high potential to occur, at the edge of the construction and non-impacted areas interface (i.e., Otay Ranch RMP Preserve, Conserved Open Space, and non-graded LDA) (see Table 2.4-6).  | <b>M-BI-1</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-2</b> (described above)  | Impacts would be less than significant. |
| BI-5                           | Permanent Direct Impacts to Special-Status Plant Species: The Proposed Project would have potentially significant permanent direct off-site impacts to San Diego marsh-elder (a non-Covered Species within the cities of San Diego and Chula Vista) (Table 2.4-7). Additional mitigation per the BMO analysis is required for San Diego goldenstar, barrel cactus, variegated dudleya, San Diego marsh-elder and Robinson's peppergrass (Table 2.4-7). | <b>M-BI-1</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-2</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-3</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-4</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-11</b> Biological Resource Salvage Plan. Mitigation requirements for the Proposed Project's impacts on special-status plants are based on the analysis within Section 2.4.3.1 (Impacts BI-4, BI-5, BI-9, and BI-10) and the Biological Mitigation Ordinance (BMO) analysis provided in Appendix A of the Biological Resources Technical Report for the Proposed Project. Prior to the issuance of land development permits, including clearing or grubbing and grading permits, for areas with salvageable sensitive biological resources, including San Diego goldenstar, variegated dudleya, San Diego barrel cactus, San Diego marsh-elder, and Robinson's pepper grass (including plant materials and soils/seed bank), the Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall prepare a Biological Resource Salvage and Restoration Salvage Plan. The Resource Salvage and Restoration Plan shall be prepared by a biologist approved by the City of Chula Vista and County of San Diego, to the satisfaction of the Development Services Director (or her/his designee) and | Impacts would be less than significant. |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.   | Impact            | Mitigation   | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness              |         |                  |                     |  |                |     |                |  |                |     |                 |  |                |     |  |   |                   |     |                   |  |
|--|-------------------|--|--|---------|------------------|---------------------|--|----------------|-----|----------------|--|----------------|-----|-----------------|--|----------------|-----|--|---|-------------------|-----|-------------------|--|
|  |                   | <p>in conjunction with the POM. Mitigation ratios for impacts to plant populations subject to the BMO are more robust than those required under the RMP. The mitigation for impacts to species subject to the BMO and the City of Chula Vista and County of San Diego subarea plans shall be provided as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1060 686 1669 1408"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1060 686 1222 849">Species Scientific Name/<br/>Common Name</th> <th data-bbox="1222 686 1371 849">Impacts</th> <th data-bbox="1371 686 1495 849">Mitigation Ratio</th> <th data-bbox="1495 686 1669 849">Mitigation Provided</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1060 849 1222 1036"><i>Bloomeria clevelandii</i><br/>San Diego Goldenstar<br/>(<i>Bloomeria clevelandii</i>)</td> <td data-bbox="1222 849 1371 1036">17 individuals</td> <td data-bbox="1371 849 1495 1036">3:1</td> <td data-bbox="1495 849 1669 1036">51 individuals</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1060 1036 1222 1161"><i>Dudleya variegata</i><br/>Variegated dudleya</td> <td data-bbox="1222 1036 1371 1161">35 individuals</td> <td data-bbox="1371 1036 1495 1161">3:1</td> <td data-bbox="1495 1036 1669 1161">105 individuals</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1060 1161 1222 1286"><i>Ferocactus viridescens</i><br/>San Diego barrel cactus</td> <td data-bbox="1222 1161 1371 1286">36 individuals</td> <td data-bbox="1371 1161 1495 1286">2:1</td> <td data-bbox="1495 1161 1669 1286">70 individuals (2 individuals are preserved on site)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1060 1286 1222 1408"><i>Iva hayesiana</i><br/>San Diego marsh-elder</td> <td data-bbox="1222 1286 1371 1408">1,057 individuals</td> <td data-bbox="1371 1286 1495 1408">1:1</td> <td data-bbox="1495 1286 1669 1408">1,057 individuals</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Species Scientific Name/<br>Common Name              | Impacts | Mitigation Ratio | Mitigation Provided | <i>Bloomeria clevelandii</i><br>San Diego Goldenstar<br>( <i>Bloomeria clevelandii</i> ) | 17 individuals | 3:1 | 51 individuals | <i>Dudleya variegata</i><br>Variegated dudleya | 35 individuals | 3:1 | 105 individuals | <i>Ferocactus viridescens</i><br>San Diego barrel cactus | 36 individuals | 2:1 | 70 individuals (2 individuals are preserved on site) | <i>Iva hayesiana</i><br>San Diego marsh-elder | 1,057 individuals | 1:1 | 1,057 individuals |  |
| Species Scientific Name/<br>Common Name  | Impacts           | Mitigation Ratio   | Mitigation Provided                                  |         |                  |                     |  |                |     |                |  |                |     |                 |  |                |     |  |   |                   |     |                   |  |
| <i>Bloomeria clevelandii</i><br>San Diego Goldenstar<br>( <i>Bloomeria clevelandii</i> ) | 17 individuals    | 3:1  | 51 individuals                                       |         |                  |                     |  |                |     |                |  |                |     |                 |  |                |     |  |   |                   |     |                   |  |
| <i>Dudleya variegata</i><br>Variegated dudleya   | 35 individuals    | 3:1  | 105 individuals                                      |         |                  |                     |  |                |     |                |  |                |     |                 |  |                |     |  |   |                   |     |                   |  |
| <i>Ferocactus viridescens</i><br>San Diego barrel cactus                                 | 36 individuals    | 2:1  | 70 individuals (2 individuals are preserved on site) |         |                  |                     |  |                |     |                |  |                |     |                 |  |                |     |  |   |                   |     |                   |  |
| <i>Iva hayesiana</i><br>San Diego marsh-elder  | 1,057 individuals | 1:1  | 1,057 individuals                                    |         |                  |                     |  |                |     |                |  |                |     |                 |  |                |     |  |   |                   |     |                   |  |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.  | Impact | Mitigation   |                 |     | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness               |  |
|---|--------|--|-----------------|-----|---|--|
|   |        | <i>Lepidium virginicum</i> var. <i>robinsonii</i><br>Robinson's pepper-grass | 112 individuals | 2:1 | 218 individuals (6 individuals are preserved on site) |  |
| <p><u>The Resource Salvage and Restoration Plan will also include compliance with the mitigation standards set forth in the RMP, including those related to restoration and translocation for San Diego goldenstar (translocation 758 of impacted individuals), San Diego marsh-elder in drainages (0.65 acres of impacts at a 2:1 ratio), and San Diego County needle grass (translocation of 93 impacted individuals). The mitigation requirements for variegated dudleya and San Diego barrel cactus are satisfied with the BMO mitigation requirements.</u></p> <p>The Resource Salvage and Restoration Plan shall, at a minimum, evaluate options for plant salvage and relocation, including individual plant salvage, native plant mulching, selective soil salvaging, application of plant materials on manufactured slopes, and application/relocation of resources within the Otay Ranch Resource Management Plan Preserve. The Resource Salvage and Restoration Plan shall include incorporation of relocation and restoration efforts for <u>San Diego goldenstar, San Diego County needle grass, variegated dudleya, San Diego goldenstar and San Diego barrel cactus, and include San Diego marsh-elder, and Robinson's pepper-grass within restoration areas associated with M-BI-12 or other suitable sites within the Otay Ranch RMP Preserve.</u> Relocation efforts may include seed collection and/or transplantation to a suitable receptor site, and shall be based</p> |        |  |                 |     |   |  |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|---|---|
|            |        | <p>on the most reliable methods of successful relocation. The program shall also include a recommendation for method of salvage and relocation/application based on feasibility of implementation and likelihood of success. The program shall include, at a minimum, an implementation plan, maintenance and monitoring program, estimated completion time, success criteria, and any relevant contingency measures to ensure that no-net-loss is achieved. The program shall also be subject to the oversight of the Development Services Director (or her/his designee). In addition to relocation of existing populations for <u>San Diego goldenstar</u>, <u>variegated dudleya</u> and <u>San Diego barrel cactus</u>, the <u>Biological Resource Salvage and Restoration Plan</u> shall also include additional plantings of these species to achieve a 3:1 and 2:1 mitigation ratio, <u>respectively</u> (see the table above).</p> <p>If populations of San Diego marsh-elder, and Robinson's pepper-grass are found within the <u>350.1 acres of off-site mitigation</u>, preservation of these populations may be used for mitigation instead of restoration activities.</p> <p><u>As required per RMP Policy 3.2, the Project Applicant will coordinate with the Otay Ranch POM to meet the restoration requirements for Munz's sage and San Diego viguiera dominated coastal sage scrub.</u></p> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.  | Impact   | Mitigation   | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|---|--|--|---|
| BI-9  | Temporary Indirect Impacts to Special-Status Plant Species: The Proposed Project would have a potentially significant temporary indirect impact to special-status plant species in the Project Area from construction activities, and would include impacts related to, or resulting from, the generation of fugitive dust; changes in hydrology resulting from construction, including sedimentation and erosion; and the introduction of chemical pollutants (including herbicides).           | <b>M-BI-1</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-2</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-14</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-15</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-17</b> (described above)   | Impacts would be less than significant. |
| BI-10   | Permanent Indirect Impacts to Special-Status Plant Species: The Proposed Project would have a potentially significant permanent indirect impact from the proximity of the Proposed Project to special-status plants after construction. Permanent indirect impacts that could affect special-status plant species include generation of fugitive dust, chemical pollutants, altered hydrology, non-native invasive species, increased human activity, and alteration of the natural fire regime. | <b>M-BI-5</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-15</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-16</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-17</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-19</b> (described above)  | Impacts would be less than significant. |
| <i>Riparian Habitat and Sensitive Natural Community and Jurisdictional Wetlands and Waterways</i> |  |  |   |
| BI-13   | Temporary Direct Impacts to Riparian Habitat or Sensitive Vegetation Communities within the Project Area (including off-site impacts)<br>The Proposed Project would have potentially significant, temporary direct impacts to vegetation communities from construction activities, including grading that would be restored following completion of the Proposed Project. Temporary impacts total 67.1 acres.  | <b>M-BI-1</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-2</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-12</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-21</b> Federal and State Agency Permits. Prior to impacts occurring to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) (collectively, the Resource Agencies) jurisdictional aquatic resources, the Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall obtain the following permits: ACOE 404 permit, RWQCB 401 Water Quality Certification, and CDFW Fish and Game Code 1600 Streambed Alteration Agreement. The overall ratio of wetland/riparian habitat mitigation shall be 3:1. Impacts shall | Impacts would be less than significant  |



**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|---|---|
|            |        | <p>be mitigated at a 1:1 impact-to-creation ratio by either the creation, or purchase of credits for the creation, of jurisdictional habitat of similar functions and values. An addition 2:1 enhancement-to-impact ratio shall be required to meet the overall 3:1 impact-to-mitigation ratio for impacts to wetlands/riparian habitat. Impacts to unvegetated and ephemeral stream channels shall occur at a 1:1 impact-to-creation ratio. A suitable mitigation site shall be selected and approved by the Resource Agencies during the permitting process.</p> <p>If mitigation is proposed to occur within the Project Area or within the additional off-site areas needed for conveyance, then a Wetlands Mitigation and Monitoring Plan shall be prepared. Prior to issuance of land development permits, including clearing, grubbing, and grading permits for activities that would impact jurisdictional aquatic resources, the Proposed Project applicant shall prepare a Wetlands Mitigation and Monitoring Plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning &amp; Development Services (or his/her designee), the Director of Parks and Recreation, ACOE, RWQCB, and CDFW. The Conceptual Wetlands Mitigation and Monitoring Plan shall, at a minimum, prescribe site preparation, planting, irrigation, and a 5-year maintenance and monitoring program with qualitative and quantitative evaluation of the revegetation effort and specific criteria to determine successful revegetation.</p> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.   | Impact  | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|--------------|---|---|---|
| <b>BI-14</b> | Permanent Direct Impacts to Sensitive Vegetation Communities within Village 14 and Planning Areas 16/19:<br>The Proposed Project would have a potentially significant permanent, direct impacts to 689.7 acres of vegetation communities within Village 14 and Planning Areas 16/19.  | <b>M-BI-1</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-2</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-3</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-4</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-5</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-21</b> (described above) | Impacts would be less than significant  |
| <b>BI-15</b> | Off-Site Permanent and Temporary Direct Impacts to Sensitive Vegetation Communities: City of San Diego MSCP Cornerstone Lands:<br>The Proposed Project would have potentially significant temporary and permanent direct impacts to lands in the MSCP City of San Diego Cornerstone Lands as a result of the improvements to Proctor Valley Road (11.1 acre of permanent impact and 21.1 acres of temporary impacts). | <b>M-BI-1</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-2</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-12</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-21</b> (described above)  | Impacts would be less than significant  |
| <b>BI-16</b> | Off-Site Permanent and Temporary Direct Impacts to Sensitive Vegetation Communities: Lands within City of Chula Vista.<br>The Proposed Project would have potentially significant temporary and permanent, direct impacts to lands in the City of Chula Vista as a result of the improvements to Proctor Valley Road (0.1 acre of permanent impacts and 2.3 acres of temporary impacts)                               | <b>M-BI-1</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-2</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-12</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-21</b> (described above)  | Impacts would be less than significant  |
| <b>BI-17</b> | Off-Site Permanent and Temporary Direct Impacts to Sensitive Vegetation Communities: Off-Site Private Lands.<br>The Proposed Project would have potentially significant temporary and permanent, direct impacts to lands in off-site private lands as a result of the improvements to Proctor Valley Road (0.2 acre of permanent impacts and 0.6 acres of temporary impacts).   | <b>M-BI-1</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-2</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-12</b> (described above)  | Impacts would be less than significant  |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.   | Impact  | Mitigation   | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|--------------|---|--|---|
| <b>BI-18</b> | Off-Site Permanent and Temporary Direct Impacts to Sensitive Vegetation Communities: County of San Diego Road Easement. The Proposed Project would have potentially significant temporary and permanent direct impacts to County roads as a result of the improvements to Proctor Valley Road North, less than 0.1 acres would be to sensitive upland communities (coastal sage scrub and grassland). | <b>M-BI-1</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-2</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-12</b> (described above)   | Impacts would be less than significant  |
| <b>BI-19</b> | Off-Site Permanent and Temporary Direct Impacts to Sensitive Vegetation Communities: Off-Site CDFW-Owned Lands: The Proposed Project would have potentially significant direct impacts to sensitive vegetation within CDFW-owned lands as a result of road grading (6.7 acres temporary and 9.1 acres permanent).   | <b>M-BI-1</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-2</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-12</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-21</b> (described above)                                     | Impacts would be less than significant  |
| <b>BI-20</b> | Temporary Direct Impacts to Jurisdictional Aquatic Resources within the Project Area (including off site): The Proposed Project would have potentially significant temporary direct impacts to jurisdictional aquatic resources, primarily from construction activities (0.73 acres of wetlands/riparian habitat and 0.35 acres of non-wetland waters/streambed).                                     | <b>M-BI-1</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-2</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-12</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-21</b> (described above)                                     | Impacts would be less than significant  |
| <b>BI-21</b> | Permanent Direct Impacts to Jurisdictional Aquatic Resources within the Project Area (including off site): The Proposed Project would permanently impact 1.43 acres of non-wetland waters/streambed and open water as well as 1.45 acres of wetlands/riparian habitat within the Project Area.  | <b>M-BI-21</b> (described above)   | Impacts would be less than significant  |
| <b>BI-22</b> | Temporary Indirect Impacts to Jurisdictional Aquatic Resources within the Project Area (including off site): The Proposed Project would have potentially significant, temporary indirect impacts to jurisdictional resources in the Project Area from construction activities, including impacts related to or resulting from the generation of fugitive dust; changes in hydrology resulting from    | <b>M-BI-1</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-2</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-14</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-15</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-17</b> (described above) | Impacts would be less than significant  |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.   | Impact  | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|--------------|---|---|---|
|              | construction, including sedimentation and erosion; and the introduction of chemical pollutants (including herbicides).  |   |   |
| <b>BI-23</b> | Permanent Indirect Impacts to Jurisdictional Aquatic Resources within the Project Area (including off site):<br>The Proposed Project would have potentially significant, permanent indirect impacts that could affect jurisdictional resources, including generation of fugitive dust, introduction of chemical pollutants, altered hydrology, introduction of non-native invasive species, increased human activity, alteration of the natural fire regime, and shading..  | <b>M-BI-5</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-14</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-15</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-16</b> (described above))<br><b>M-BI-17</b> (described above)                                    | Impacts would be less than significant  |
| <b>BI-24</b> | Temporary Indirect Impacts to Sensitive Vegetation Communities within the Project Area (including off site):<br>The Proposed Project would have potentially significant, temporary indirect impacts to sensitive vegetation communities in the Project Area (including off-site areas) from construction activities, including impacts related to or resulting from the generation of fugitive dust; changes in hydrology resulting from construction, including sedimentation and erosion; and the introduction of chemical pollutants (including herbicides). | <b>M-BI-1</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-2</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-14</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-15</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-17</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-21</b> (described above)  | Impacts would be less than significant  |
| <b>BI-25</b> | Permanent Indirect Impacts to Sensitive Vegetation Communities within the Project Area (including off site):<br>The Proposed Project would have potentially significant, permanent indirect impacts resulting from the proximity of the Proposed Project (including off-site areas) to sensitive vegetation communities after construction (e.g., maintenance of roads, residential units, commercial space, school, parks, and trails).  | <b>M-BI-5</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-14</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-15</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-16</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-17</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-19</b> (described above) | Impacts would be less than significant  |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.                                 | Impact  | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|--|---|---|---|
| <i>Wildlife Movement and Nursery Sites</i> |   |   |   |
| <b>BI-26</b>                               | Temporary Direct Impacts to Habitat Connectivity and Wildlife Corridors:<br>The Proposed Project would have potentially significant, temporary direct impacts to potential foraging and breeding habitat for species that use the Project Area (e.g., special-status birds), primarily resulting from construction activities.  | <b>M-BI-1</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-2</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-12</b> (described above)  | Impacts would be less than significant. |
| <b>BI-27</b>                               | Temporary Indirect Impacts to Habitat Connectivity and Wildlife Corridors:<br>The Proposed Project would have potentially significant temporary indirect impacts to habitat connectivity and wildlife corridors resulting from increased human activity, lighting, and noise during construction and Proposed Project occupancy.  | <b>M-BI-1</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-2</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-18</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-20</b> (described above)  | Impacts would be less than significant. |
| <b>BI-28</b>                               | Permanent Indirect Impacts to Habitat Connectivity and Wildlife Corridors:<br>The Proposed Project would have potentially significant permanent indirect impacts to habitat connectivity and wildlife corridors, including habitat fragmentation, human activity, lighting, and noise from the proposed urban development, recreational facilities, and human activity. | <b>M-BI-3</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-4</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-5</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-18</b> (described above)<br><b>M-BI-20</b> (described above)   | Impacts would be less than significant. |
| <i>2.5 Cultural Resources</i>              |   |   |   |
| <i>Archaeological Resources</i>            |   |   |   |
| <i>Construction Impacts</i>                |   |   |   |
| <b>CR-1</b>                                | The Proposed Project's development activities could affect cultural resources within 50 feet of the Area of Direct Impact (ADI) or within resource-specific, predetermined buffers.   | <b>M-CR-1</b> Temporary Fencing - To prevent inadvertent disturbance of archaeological sites within the avoidance areas (open space), temporary fencing shall be installed where resources are located within 50 feet of the ADI. The temporary fencing shall include the following requirements: | Impacts would be less than significant. |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.  | Impact   | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|-------------|--|---|---|
|             |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prior to the commencement of any grading and/or clearing in association with the grading and/or improvement plan, temporary orange construction fencing shall be placed to protect archaeological sites from inadvertent disturbance within the avoidance areas (open space) and the unimpacted portions of sites outside of the ADI during earth-disturbing activities. Temporary fencing shall be installed prior to the pre-construction meeting and any clearing, grubbing, trenching, grading, or land disturbances; remain for the duration of earth-disturbing activities; and include the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Temporary fencing is required in all locations of the Proposed Project where proposed grading or clearing is within 50 feet of any archaeological site within avoidance areas (open space) or the unaffected portions of sites outside of the ADI.</li> <li>○ The placement of such fencing shall be approved by the County of San Diego (County). Upon approval, the fencing shall remain in place until the conclusion of grading activities, after which the fencing shall be removed.</li> <li>○ <u>Installation of temporary fencing shall require the presence of monitor(s) (Archaeological &amp; Native American) pursuant to M-CR-2.</u></li> </ul> </li> </ul> |   |
| <b>CR-2</b> | The Proposed Project has the potential to affect 57 cultural resources which, although not recommended as eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or the Local | <p><del>M-CR-1 (described above)</del><br/> <b>M-CR-2</b> Archaeological Monitoring - To mitigate for potential impacts to undiscovered buried archaeological resources in</p>  | Impacts would be less than significant. |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact  | Mitigation   | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|---|--|---|
|            | <p>Register, are considered significant under the County's CEQA Guidelines.</p> | <p>the Project Area, an archaeological monitoring program and potential data recovery program shall be implemented pursuant to the County of San Diego's Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Requirements for Cultural Resources and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and shall include the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Pre-Construction                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Project Applicant shall contract with a County approved archaeologist to perform Archaeological Monitoring. The Project Archaeologist shall contract with a Kumeyaay monitor to conduct Native American monitoring for the Proposed Project.</li> <li>• The pre-construction meeting shall be attended by the project Archaeologist, the Kumeyaay Native American monitor.</li> </ul> </li> <li>b. Construction                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring. Both the project archaeologist and Kumeyaay Native American monitor are to be on site during all earth-disturbing activities. The frequency and location of monitoring of native soils shall be determined by the project archaeologist and the Kumeyaay Native American monitor. The project archaeologist and the Kumeyaay Native American monitor shall evaluate fill soils to ensure that they are negative for cultural resources.</li> <li>• Inadvertent Discoveries:</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|---|---|
|            |        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The project archaeologist and the Kumeyaay Native American monitor have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area of the discovery.</li> <li>○ The Project Archaeologist shall contact the County Archaeologist.</li> <li>○ The Project Archaeologist, in consultation with the County Archaeologist and the Kumeyaay Native American monitor, shall determine the significance of discovered resources.</li> <li>○ Construction activities shall be allowed to resume after the County Archaeologist has agreed with the significance evaluation.</li> <li>○ Isolates and non-significant deposits shall be minimally documented in the field. If the isolates and non-significant deposits are not be collected by the project archaeologist, the Kumeyaay Native American monitor may collect the cultural material for transfer to a tribal curation facility or repatriation program.</li> <li>○ If cultural resources are determined to be significant, a research design and data recovery program shall be prepared by the project archaeologist in consultation with the Kumeyaay Native American monitor and approved by the County archaeologist. The program shall include reasonable efforts to preserve (avoid) unique cultural</li> </ul> |   |



**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|---|---|
|            |        | <p>resources of sacred sites, to cap identified sacred sites or unique cultural resources and to place development over the cap if avoidance is infeasible; and to perform data recovery for non-unique cultural resources. The preferred option is preservation (avoidance).</p> <p>c. Human Remains.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The property owner or their representative shall contact the County coroner and the County Planning &amp; Development Services staff archaeologist.</li> <li>• Upon identification of human remains, no further disturbance shall occur in the area of the find until the County coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin.</li> <li>• If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the most likely descendant (MLD), as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), shall be contacted by the property owner or their representative to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains.</li> <li>• The immediate vicinity where the Native American human remains are located is not to be damaged or disturbed by further development activity until consultation with the MLD regarding their recommendations as required by California Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98, has been conducted.</li> </ul> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation   | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|--|---|
|            |        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• California Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98; CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5; and California Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5, shall be followed in the event that human remains are discovered.</li> <li>d. Rough Grading               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Upon completion of rough grading, a monitoring report identifying whether resources were encountered shall be prepared. A copy of the monitoring report shall be provided to any culturally affiliated tribe that requests a copy.</li> </ul> </li> <li>e. Final Grading               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A final report substantiating that earth-disturbing activities are completed and whether cultural resources were encountered shall be prepared. A copy of the final report shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) and any culturally affiliated tribe that requests a copy.</li> </ul> </li> <li>f. Disposition of Cultural Material. The final report shall include:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Evidence that all prehistoric materials have been curated at a San Diego curation facility or tribal curation facility that meets federal standards according to Title 36, Part 79, of the Code of Federal Regulations or alternatively have been repatriated to a culturally affiliated tribe.</li> <li>▪ Evidence that historic materials have been curated at a San Diego curation facility that meets federal standards according to Title 36, Part 79, of the Code of Federal Regulations.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact   | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--|---|---|
| CR-3       | The Proposed Project has the potential to affect one cultural resource (CA-SDI-12397 East) which has been determined to be significant under CEQA and County guidelines, and eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources and the Local Register. | <p><del>M-CR-1 (described above)</del><br/> <b>M-CR-2</b> (described above)<br/> <b>M-CR-3</b> Data Recovery - To mitigate potential impacts to the eastern portion of sites CA-SDI-12397 and CA-SDI-12373, a phased data recovery program shall be implemented prior to construction by a County of San Diego (County)-approved archaeologist. The phased data recovery (prepared as a separate document) would involve either surface collection and curation/repatriation to prevent looting (CA-SDI-12373 (Locus A), or excavation of a series of shovel test pits (STPs) to identify subsurface deposits and then excavation of control units (CUs) within those areas where subsurface deposits are identified. The number of CUs to be excavated would depend on the quantity and variety of artifacts and features identified and the presence/absence of a midden deposit because the data potential of the site is contained within those components of the site. Archaeological materials recovered during the data recovery efforts shall be cleaned, sorted, cataloged, and analyzed following standard archaeological procedures and shall be documented in a data recovery report. Upon completion of fieldwork, the County-approved archaeologist shall submit a letter report summarizing the field work efforts and stating that the scientifically significant sample of the site has been recovered. Upon approval from the County archaeologist, construction may begin at this location</p> | Impacts would be less than significant. |
| CR-4       | The Proposed Project has the potential to affect undiscovered cultural resources that may qualify as significant under the County's CEQA Guidelines.   | <p><del>M-CR-1 (described above)</del><br/> <b>M-CR-2</b> (described above)</p>   | Impacts would be less than significant. |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.                   | Impact  | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------------------------|---|---|---|
| CR-5                         | If the Preserve Trails Option is selected, the Proposed Project has the potential to indirectly affect one cultural resource (CA-SDI-12373, Locus A) that has been determined to be significant under CEQA and County Guidelines and eligible for listing in the CRHR and local register. | M-CR-3 (described above)  | Impacts would be less than significant  |
| <i>2.6 Geology and Soils</i> |   |   |   |
| <i>Liquefaction</i>          |   |   |   |
| GE-1                         | Liquefaction associated with seismic events could result in damage to structures and thereby impact human health and safety.  | <p><b>M-GE-1</b> Prior to issuance of a grading permit, a final geotechnical report shall be prepared by a registered civil or geotechnical engineer. The report shall include any additional field efforts, including borings, sampling, and associated laboratory testing, to determine whether liquefaction, rockfall, landslides, and/or expansive soils are concerns for the Proposed Project. The report shall specify foundation designs that are adequate to preclude substantial damage to the proposed structures due to liquefaction. Mapping and evaluation of hard rock slopes shall be performed by an engineering geologist prior to and during site development. The report shall be submitted with the building plans, and all recommendations of the report shall be incorporated into the design of the buildings.</p> <p>Measures developed in the geotechnical report shall be based on site-specific conditions. Measures would likely include the following, which are provided as examples only:</p> <p><u>Liquefaction</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deposits of concern shall be over-excavated and recompacted.</li> <li>• Deposits of concern shall be replaced with engineered fill.</li> </ul> | Impacts would be less than significant. |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|---|---|
|            |        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fill shall be surcharged (temporary overloading with fill) to facilitate settlement.</li> <li>• Densification of deposits of concern shall be performed in place, potentially including any combination of placement of vibra-stone columns and use of wick and blanket drains, compaction grouting, and dynamic compaction.</li> <li>• Subdrains shall be incorporated.</li> </ul> <p><u>Rockfall</u><br/>Impacts related to rockfall are not anticipated; therefore, this example measure would only apply if unforeseen rockfall hazards are encountered during the clearing, grubbing, and grading stages of construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scaling of the slope faces shall occur.</li> <li>• Construction of catchment areas or debris fences shall occur.</li> <li>• Removal of precariously situated boulders shall occur.</li> </ul> <p><u>Landslides</u><br/>Impacts related to landslides are not anticipated; therefore, this example measure would only apply if unforeseen landslides are encountered during the clearing, grubbing, and grading stages of construction:<br/>Design features to reduce the potential effects of landslides shall include remedial grading and removal of landslide debris or slope stabilization in the areas of proposed development. In areas where landslide debris would be left in place, the construction of buttress fills shall be required to mitigate the potential for instability of cut slopes composed of landslide debris.</p> <p><u>Expansive Soil</u></p> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.                                    | Impact  | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|---|---|---|---|
|   |   | Highly expansive soils (typically the upper 3 feet below finish grade) shall be removed and replaced with soils with low expansion potential, lime treatment shall be applied, or moisture conditioning shall occur, in accordance with the standards contained within the then-current edition of the California Building Code. Concrete slabs shall be used in structure foundations, as necessary.   |   |
| <i>Landslides</i>                             |   |   |   |
| <b>GE-2</b>                                   | Portions of the Project Area may be susceptible to rockfall, which could result in damage to structures, and thereby impact human health and safety.                    | <b>M-GE-1</b> (described above)   | Impacts would be less than significant. |
| <b>GE-3</b>                                   | Construction of buildings on or within landslide debris, or downslope from landslides, could result in damage to structures and thereby impact human health and safety. | <b>M-GE-1</b> (described above)   | Impacts would be less than significant. |
| <i>Expansive Soils</i>                        |   |   |   |
| <b>GE-4</b>                                   | Development in areas with high or very high soil expansion potential could result in damage to structures and thereby impact human health and safety.                   | <b>M-GE-1</b> (described above)   | Impacts would be less than significant. |
| <i>2.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i>           |   |   |   |
| <i>Construction and Operational Emissions</i> |   |   |   |
| <b>GHG-1</b>                                  | The Proposed Project would generate GHG emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment.  | <b>M-GHG-1</b> <u>As to construction greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, prior to the County of San Diego's (County) issuance of each grading permit, the Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall purchase and retire carbon offsets in a quantity sufficient to offset 100% of the Proposed Project's construction emissions (including sequestration loss from vegetation removal) associated with each such grading permit, consistent with the performance standards and requirements set forth below.</u> | Impacts would be less than significant. |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|---|---|
|            |        | <p><b>First</b>, "carbon offset" shall mean an instrument issued by any of the following: (i) the Climate Action Reserve, the American Carbon Registry, and Verra <del>the</del>(previously, Verified Carbon Standard); <del>or</del> (ii) any registry approved by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to act as a registry under the state's cap-and-trade program; <del>or (iii) if no registry is in existence as identified in options (i) and (ii), above, then any other reputable registry or entity that issues carbon offsets.</del></p> <p><b>Second</b>, any carbon offset used to reduce the Proposed Project's <del>greenhouse gas</del> (GHG) emissions shall be a carbon offset that represents the <u>past or forecasted</u> reduction or sequestration of one metric ton of carbon dioxide equivalent that is "not otherwise required" (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(c)(3)).</p> <p><b>Third</b>, "Proposed Project applicant" shall mean Jackson Pendo Development Company's or its designee.</p> <p><b>Fourth</b>, as to construction and from vegetation removal GHG emissions, prior to the County's issuance of each grading permit, the Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall provide evidence to the satisfaction of the Director of the Planning &amp; Development Services Department (PDS) that the Proposed Project applicant has purchased and retired carbon offsets in a quantity sufficient to offset 100% of the construction GHG emissions and sequestration loss from vegetation removal generated by the Proposed Project, as associated with each such grading permit. The emissions reduction obligation associated with each grading permit shall be calculated by reference to the certified environmental impact report's Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report (Appendix 2.7-1), which determined total construction-related emissions as equaling <u>21,845,276</u> metric tons of carbon</p> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation   | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|--|---|
|            |        | <p>dioxide equivalent (<u>MT CO<sub>2</sub>e</u>). This would increase to <u>21,85422,769</u> MT CO<sub>2</sub>e if the Proctor Valley Road North Option is selected. In making such a determination, the Director of the PDS shall require the Project applicant or its designee to provide an attestation or similar documentation from the selected registry(ies) that a sufficient quantity of carbon offsets meeting the standards set forth in this measure have been purchased and retired, thereby demonstrating that the necessary emission reductions are realized.</p> <p><b>Fifth</b>, the purchased carbon offsets used to reduce construction and vegetation removal GHG emissions shall achieve real, permanent, quantifiable, verifiable, and enforceable reductions (California Health &amp; Safety Code Section 38562(d)(1)).</p> <p><b>Sixth</b>, <del>the County of San Diego Planning &amp; Development Services shall consider, all carbon offsets required to reduce the Proposed Project's construction and vegetation removal emissions shall be associated with reduction activities that are geographically prioritized according to the following locational attributes to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS, the following geographic priorities for GHG reduction features, and GHG reduction projects and programs: (1) project design features/on-site reduction measures; (2) off-site, within the unincorporated areas of the County of San Diego; (3) off-site, incorporated areas of within the County of San Diego; (34) off-site areas within California; (45) off-site areas within the United States; and (56) off-site internationally areas.</del> As listed, geographic priorities would focus first on local reduction options/features (including projects and programs that would reduce GHG emissions) to ensure that reduction efforts achieved locally would provide cross-over, co-benefits related to other environmental resource areas/air quality criteria</p> |   |



**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation   | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|--|---|
|            |        | <p>pollutant reductions within the San Diego Air Basin, and to aid in San Diego County jurisdictions' efforts to meet their GHG reduction goals.</p> <p>The Director of the PDS shall issue a written determination Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall first pursue offset projects and programs locally within unincorporated areas of the County of San Diego to the extent such offset projects and programs are financially competitive in the global offset market; that offsets are unavailable and/or fail to meet the feasibility factors defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15364 in a higher priority geographical category before allowing offsets from the next lower priority category. In making such a determination, the Director of the PDS shall consider information available at the time each Project-related grading permit request is submitted, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>The availability of in-State emission reduction opportunities, including funding and partnership opportunities with the County, other public agencies, or environmental initiatives with demonstrated integrity;</u></li> <li>• <u>The geographic attributes of carbon offsets that are listed for purchase and retirement;</u></li> <li>• <u>The temporal attributes of carbon offsets that are listed for purchase and retirement;</u></li> <li>• <u>The pricing attributes of carbon offsets that are listed for purchase and retirement; and/or,</u></li> <li>• <u>Any other information deemed relevant to the evaluation, such as periodicals and reports addressing the availability of carbon offsets.</u></li> </ul> <p><b>Seventh</b>, over the course of the construction period, the Project applicant or its designee shall submit annual reports to PDS that</p> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|---|---|
|            |        | <p><u>identify the quantity of emission reductions required by this mitigation measure, as well as the carbon offsets retired to achieve compliance with this measure. The annual reports shall identify the locational attributes of the carbon offsets in order to allow PDS to track and monitor the implementation of the geographic priority provision. Such tabulation and tracking shall be to the satisfaction of the Director of the PDS.</u></p> <p><b>M-GHG-2</b>As to operational greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, prior to the County of San Diego’s (County) issuance of building permits for each implementing Site Plan (“D” Designator), the applicant or its designee shall purchase and retire carbon offsets for the incremental portion of the Proposed Project within the Site Plan in a quantity sufficient to offset, for a 30-year period, the operational greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from that incremental amount of development to net zero, consistent with the performance standards and requirements set forth below.</p> <p><b>First</b>, “carbon offset” shall have the same meaning as set forth in M-GHG-1.</p> <p><b>Second</b>, any carbon offset used to reduce the Proposed Project’s GHG emissions shall be a carbon offset that represents the <u>past or forecasted</u> reduction or sequestration of <del>one</del> metric ton of carbon dioxide equivalent that is “not otherwise required” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(c)(3)).</p> <p><b>Third</b>, “the Proposed Project applicant” shall have the same meaning as set forth in M-GHG-1.</p> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation   | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|--|---|
|            |        | <p><b>Fourth</b>, as to operational emissions, prior to the County of San Diego’s issuance of building permits for each implementing Site Plan (“D” Designator), the Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall provide evidence to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning &amp; Development Services Department (PDS) that it has purchased and retired carbon offsets for the incremental portion of the Proposed Project within the Site Plan in a quantity sufficient to offset, for a 30-year period, the operational GHG emissions from the incremental amount of development to net zero. The “project life” is 30 years. This methodology is consistent with the 30-year project life time frame used by the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s GHG guidance (SCAQMD 2008), <u>as well as the methodological parameters used by the California Air Resources Board when reviewing AB 900 projects. (For more information on the evidence supporting the 30-year temporal period, please see Section 8.4.5, Use of Carbon Offsets, and Response to Comment O-5-90.)</u></p> <p>The emissions reduction obligation associated with each building permit shall be calculated by reference to the certified environmental impact report’s (EIR) Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report (Appendix 2.7-1), which determined total <del>operational</del>construction-related emissions as equaling 16,159 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MT CO<sub>2e</sub>) annually, which equates to 484,770 MT CO<sub>2e</sub> over 30 years.</p> <p><u>In making such a determination, the Director of the PDS shall require the Project applicant or its designee to provide an attestation or similar documentation from the selected registry(ies) that a sufficient quantity of carbon offsets</u></p> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation   | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|--|---|
|            |        | <p><u>meeting the standards set forth in this measure have been purchased and retired, thereby demonstrating that the necessary emission reductions are realized.</u></p> <p><b>Fifth</b>, the purchased carbon offsets used to reduce operational GHG emissions shall achieve real, permanent, quantifiable, verifiable, and enforceable reductions (California Health &amp; Safety Code Section 38562(d)(1)).</p> <p><b>Sixth</b>, the amount of carbon offsets required for each implementing Site Plan shall be based on the GHG emissions with the implementing Site Plan, and shall include operational GHG emissions as identified in the approved Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report.</p> <p><b>Seventh</b>, each implementing Site Plan shall include a tabulation that identifies the overall carbon offsets required to mitigate the entire Proposed Project's GHG emissions <u>(i.e., Table 2.3-13)</u>, and shall identify: <u>(1) the amount of carbon offsets purchased to date as a result of prior Site Plan approvals, (2) the amount of carbon offsets required to be purchased and retired for the incremental portion of the Proposed Project within the Site Plan in a quantity sufficient to offset, for a 30-year period, the operational greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from that incremental amount of development to net zero, as well as and (3) the remaining carbon offsets required to reduce the Proposed Project's remaining emissions to net zero. The Project applicant or its designee shall submit annual reports to PDS that identify the quantity of emission reductions required by this mitigation measure, as well as the carbon offsets retired to achieve compliance with this measure.</u></p> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|---|---|
|            |        | <p>The annual reports shall identify the locational attributes of the carbon offsets in order to allow PDS to track and monitor the implementation of the geographic priority provision. Such tabulation and tracking shall be to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS.</p> <p>For clarity, the following example is provided to illustrate the Proposed Project's operational GHG emissions purchase and retirement strategy. If 100 single-family residential units are proposed to be developed in conjunction with an implementing Site Plan ("D" Designator), GHG emissions for those land uses would be calculated and carbon offsets for those emissions would be secured for a 30-year period. To facilitate implementation of this strategy, the Proposed Project's total emissions have been allocated on a per dwelling unit basis; this methodological approach ensures that, when each dwelling unit is developed, the emissions from the Proposed Project's resident-serving non-residential facilities will also be offset. Thus, the 100-single family-residential units contemplated by this example would be multiplied by 15.81 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/dwelling unit (total project emissions / total # of dwelling units = 16,159 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e /yr / 1,022 dwelling units = 15.81 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e /yr/du). This value would then be multiplied by 30, to calculate the total carbon offsets required for that phase of development (e.g., 100 single-family residential units × 15.81 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e /du × 30 = 47,430 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e of carbon offsets).</p> <p><b>Eighth</b>, this EIR acknowledges that the Proposed Project's GHG emissions estimates are conservative because the Proposed Project's GHG emissions are expected to decrease beyond the estimates presented in the EIR's analysis, in part,</p> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|---|---|
|            |        | <p>due to reasonably foreseeable improvements in fuel efficiency, vehicle fleet turnover, technological improvements related to transportation and energy, and updates to emissions models and methodologies. Thus, subject to County oversight, <u>and the processes described below</u>, the operational emission estimates that govern implementation of this Proposed Project are subject to a “true up” at the election of the Proposed Project applicant (as defined above) or its designee and subject to the satisfaction of the <del>Director of PDS</del>County’s Board of Supervisors, as considered pursuant to a noticed public hearing process that accords with applicable legal requirements, including those set forth in CEQA for the post-approval modification of mitigation implementation parameters.</p> <p>Specifically, <del>if the Project applicant elects to process and a</del> “true-up” exercise <u>subsequent to the County’s certification of the Final EIR and approval of the Proposed Project</u>, the Proposed Project applicant shall provide an operational GHG emissions inventory of the Proposed Project’s operational emissions for the “true up” operational conditions, including emissions from mobile sources, energy, area sources, water consumption, and solid waste. Subject to the satisfaction of the <del>Director of PDS</del>Board of Supervisors, these calculations shall be conducted using a County-approved model and/or methodology <u>and must validate the continuing adequacy of modeling inputs used in the EIR that are not proposed to be altered as part of the “true-up” exercise.</u> <u>The inclusion of the validation requirement ensures that any updated operational GHG emissions inventories for the Project fully account for then-existing information that is relevant to the emissions modeling.</u> Alternatively, the Proposed Project applicant may purchase all carbon offset credits to reduce</p> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|---|---|
|            |        | <p>operational GHG emissions at issuance of the first building permit.</p> <p>The “true up” operational GHG emissions inventory, if conducted, will be provided in the form of a project-specific Updated Emissions Inventory and Offset Report to the County’s <del>Director of PDS</del>Board of Supervisors (or its designee) prior to the issuance of building permits for the next build-out phase. The subject technical documentation shall be prepared by a County-approved, qualified air quality and greenhouse gas technical specialist. <del>If the Director of PDS (or its designee) determines that the technical documentation demonstrates that the quantity of project-related GHG emissions would be lower than the quantity identified in the certified Final EIR for the Proposed Project, and finds that the technical documentation is supported by substantial evidence, the Director of PDF may authorize a reduction in the total carbon offsets value required for the Proposed Project.</del></p> <p>In all instances, substantial evidence must confirm that any reduction to the total carbon offsets value as identified in the certified Final EIR for the Proposed Project is consistent with the Proposed Project commitment to achieve and maintain carbon neutrality (i.e., net zero emissions) for the 30-year life of the Proposed Project.</p> <p><u>Ninth, the County of San Diego Planning &amp; Development Services shall consider all carbon offsets required to reduce the Project’s operational emissions shall be associated with reduction activities that are geographically prioritized according to the following locational attributes to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS, the following geographic priorities for GHG reduction features, and GHG reduction</u></p> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation   | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|--|---|
|            |        | <p>projects and programs: (1) <u>project design features/on-site reduction measures</u>; (2) <u>off-site, within the unincorporated areas of the County of San Diego</u>; (3) <u>off-site, incorporated areas within the County of San Diego</u>; (4) <u>off-site areas within California</u>; (5) <u>off-site areas within the United States</u>; and (6) <u>off-site internationally areas</u>. As listed, geographic priorities would focus first on local reduction options features (including projects and programs that would reduce GHG emissions) to ensure that reduction efforts achieved locally would provide cross-over, co-benefits related to other environmental resource areas air quality criteria pollutant reductions within the San Diego Air Basin, and to aid in San Diego County jurisdictions' efforts to meet their GHG reduction goals. The Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall first pursue offset projects and programs locally within unincorporated areas of the County of San Diego to the extent such offset projects and programs are financially competitive in the global offset market.</p> <p>The Director of the PDS shall issue a written determination that offsets are unavailable and/or fail to meet the feasibility factors defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15364 in a higher priority geographic category before allowing offsets from the next lower priority category. In making such a determination, the Director of the PDS shall consider information available at the time each Project-related building permit request is submitted, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The availability of in-State emission reduction opportunities, including funding and partnership opportunities with the County, other public agencies,</li> </ul> |   |



**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|---|---|
|            |        | <p><u>or environmental initiatives with demonstrated integrity;</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>The geographic attributes of carbon offsets that are listed for purchase and retirement;</u></li> <li>• <u>The temporal attributes of carbon offsets that are listed for purchase and retirement;</u></li> <li>• <u>The pricing attributes of carbon offsets that are listed for purchase and retirement; and/or,</u></li> <li>• <u>Any other information deemed relevant to the evaluation, such as periodicals and reports addressing the availability of carbon offsets.</u></li> </ul> <p><b>M-GHG-3</b> Prior to the issuance of residential building permits, the applicant or its designee shall provide evidence to the County of San Diego that the design plans for residential structures include electrical outlets in the front and rear of the structure to facilitate use of electrical lawn and garden equipment.</p> <p><b>M-GHG-4</b> To reduce greenhouse gas emissions, the applicant or its designee shall provide evidence to the County of San Diego that the following project design features identified for the Proposed Project in Table 2.7-5 and Table 1 of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), <del>herein</del> will be implemented: PDF-AQ/GHG-1 (<u>Wood-Burning Stoves and Fireplaces</u>), PDF-AQ/GHG-2 (<u>Zero Net Energy Residences</u>), PDF-AQ/GHG-3 (<u>Non-Residential Energy Improvement Standards</u>), PDF-AQ/GHG-4 (<u>Energy Star Appliances</u>), PDF-AQ/GHG-5 (<u>Solar Water Heating</u>), PDF-AQ/GHG-6 (<u>Efficient Outdoor Lighting</u>), PDF-AQ/GHG-7 (<u>New</u></p> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.  | Impact   | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|---|--|---|---|
|   |  | Resident Information Packet), PDF-AQ/GHG-8 (Cool Roofs), PDF-AQ/GHG-9 (Cool Pavement), PDF-AQ/GHG-10 (Electric Vehicle Charging Stations), PDF-TR-1 (TDM Program), PDF-UT-1 (Hot Water Pipe Insulation – Residential and Non-Residential), PDF-UT-2 (Pressure Reducing Valves – Residential and Non-Residential), PDF-UT-3 (Water Efficient Dishwashers), and PDF-UT-4 (Residential Landscaping), and PDF-UT-5 (Water Conservation).  |   |
| <i>Conflict with Applicable Plan, Policy, or Regulation</i> |  |   |   |
| <b>GHG-2</b>  | The Proposed Project would generate GHG emissions that may interfere with the implementation of GHG reduction goals for 2030 and 2050.   | <b>M-GHG-1</b> (described above)<br><b>M-GHG-2</b> (described above)<br><b>M-GHG-3</b> (described above)<br><b>M-GHG-4</b> (described above)  | Impacts would be less than significant  |
| <i>2.8 Noise</i>  |  |   |   |
| <i>On-Site Traffic Noise</i>                                |  |   |   |
| <b>N-1</b>  | The traffic noise modeling results indicate that Future Plus Project traffic noise levels would exceed the County of San Diego's exterior noise standard of 60 dBA CNEL along some of the outdoor residential living areas located near Proctor Valley Road.                         | <b>M-N-1</b> The single-family residential lots shown in Figure 2.8-4 with rear- or side-yard exposures adjacent to Proctor Valley Road shall include minimum 6-foot-high solid noise barriers along the exposure. The noise barriers may be constructed as a wall or berm, or a combination of both. The materials used in construction of the barrier shall have a minimum surface density of 4 pounds per square foot. They may consist of masonry material, 0.625-inch-thick Plexiglas, 0.25-inch-thick plate glass, or a combination of these materials. The barriers must be designed so there are no openings or cracks. | Impacts would be less than significant. |
| <b>N-2</b>  | The Proposed Project's second-floor exterior noise levels would range from 55 to 69 dBA CNEL at proposed residential lots, which implies that interior noise levels at second-floor elevations would range from approximately 40 to 54 dBA CNEL. Therefore, the interior noise level | <b>M-N-2</b> Prior to issuance of building permits (and after preparation of detailed building plans) for proposed single-family residential units directly adjacent to Proctor Valley Road, as shown in Figure 2.8-4, the building permit applicant or its designee shall demonstrate that interior noise levels will  | Impacts would be less than significant. |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.  | Impact   | Mitigation   | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|---|--|--|---|
|   | for habitable spaces potentially would exceed the County of San Diego's 45 dBA CNEL interior noise criterion.  | <p>not exceed the applicable County of San Diego noise ordinance standard of 45 dBA CNEL for the subject land use. In addition to the installation of sound walls that shall be constructed under mitigation measure M-N-1, it is anticipated that compliance with the applicable standard shall be achieved by structure setbacks, acoustically rated windows and doors, and/or air conditioning or equivalent forced air circulation to allow occupancy with closed windows, which, for most construction, would provide sufficient exterior-to-interior noise reduction. A supplemental acoustical study shall be prepared to demonstrate and verify that interior noise levels will be below 45 dBA CNEL within habitable residential rooms.</p> <p><b>Implementation:</b> Applicant or its designee, and primary contractor(s) of all Proposed Project phases for the single-family residential units directly adjacent to Proctor Valley Road.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> A Noise Restriction Easement shall be dedicated to the Final Map, required prior to issuance of building permits for development of on-site single-family residential units directly adjacent to Proctor Valley Road, and after detailed building plans are available and model numbers/types have been sited on a precise grading plan.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> County of San Diego</p> |   |
| <i>Operational Impacts (Non-Construction Noise)</i> |  |  |   |
| <b>N-4</b>  | Noise levels attributed to unshielded HVAC mechanical systems could exceed the County of San Diego's daytime property line noise limit for occupied noise-sensitive land uses (NSLUs) (50 dBA $L_{eq}$ ) within 250 feet of the source. In addition, sources within 450 feet of an occupied NSLU property line could exceed the County's nighttime noise limit (45 dBA $L_{eq}$ ) for stationary-source noise. | <b>M-N-3</b> Prior to the issuance of any building permit for stationary noise-generating equipment such as heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems, the Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall prepare a supplemental acoustical study of the proposed stationary noise sources associated with the HVAC systems for submittal to the County of San Diego (County) for  | Impacts would be less than significant. |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.                | Impact   | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|---------------------------|--|---|---|
|                           |  | <p>review and approval. Best engineering practices shall be implemented, and the placement of noise-generating equipment and shielding shall be considered when installing stationary noise sources associated with HVAC systems. The acoustical study shall identify noise-generating equipment and predict noise levels from identified equipment at the applicable property lines. Where predicted noise levels would exceed those levels deemed acceptable as established by the County's Noise Ordinance, Section 36.404, the acoustical study shall identify mitigation measures shown to effectively reduce noise levels (e.g., enclosures, barriers, site orientation) to comply with Section 36.404. Such mitigation measures shall be implemented by the applicant or its designee prior to issuance of any building permits.</p> <p><b>Implementation:</b> Applicant or its designee, and primary contractor(s) of all Proposed Project phases.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Prior to issuance of building permits</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> County of San Diego</p> |   |
| <i>Construction Noise</i> |  |   |   |
| <b>N-5</b>                | Construction activities associated with Proctor Valley Road improvements could result in exceedances of the County of San Diego's 75 dBA $L_{eq}(8-hr)$ noise standard at the nearest existing noise-sensitive land uses in Jamul (County of San Diego). | <p><b>M-N-4</b> The Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall take those steps necessary to ensure that construction equipment is properly maintained and equipped with noise-reduction intake, exhaust mufflers, and engine shrouds in accordance with manufacturer recommendations. Equipment engine shrouds shall be closed during equipment operation.</p> <p><b>M-N-5</b> The Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall take those steps necessary to ensure that, whenever feasible, electrical power shall be used to run air compressors and similar power tools.</p> <p><b>M-N-6</b> The Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall take those steps necessary to ensure that equipment staging areas</p>  | Impacts would be less than significant. |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact  | Mitigation   | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|---|--|---|
|            |   | <p>are located as far as feasible from occupied residences and schools.</p> <p><b>M-N-7</b> The Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall take those steps necessary to ensure that for construction activities on and off the Project Area, noise attenuation techniques are employed to ensure that noise levels remain below 75 dBA <math>L_{eq}</math> at existing noise-sensitive land uses. Such techniques shall include use of sound blankets on noise-generating equipment and construction of temporary sound barriers adjacent to construction sites near affected uses to achieve noise levels below 75 dBA <math>L_{eq}</math>.</p> <p><b>Implementation:</b> Applicant, or its designee, and primary contractor(s) of all Proposed Project phases involving construction</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Prior to and during Proposed Project construction</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> County of San Diego</p> |   |
| <b>N-6</b> | Construction activities associated with Proctor Valley Road improvements would exceed ambient existing noise levels at the nearest existing noise-sensitive land uses in the City of Chula Vista.                   | <p><b>M-N-4</b> (described above)</p> <p><b>M-N-5</b> (described above)</p> <p><b>M-N-6</b> (described above)</p> <p><b>M-N-7</b> (described above)</p>  | Impacts would be less than significant. |
| <b>N-7</b> | Construction activities associated with Proctor Valley Road in Village 14 could result in exceedances of the County of San Diego's 75 dBA $L_{eq(8-hr)}$ noise standard at adjacent on-site residences.             | <p><b>M-N-4</b> (described above)</p> <p><b>M-N-5</b> (described above)</p> <p><b>M-N-6</b> (described above)</p> <p><b>M-N-7</b> (described above)</p>  | Impacts would be less than significant. |
| <b>N-8</b> | Construction activities associated with Proctor Valley Road in Planning Areas 16/19 could result in exceedances of the County of San Diego's 75 dBA $L_{eq(8-hr)}$ noise standard for adjacent existing residences. | <p><b>M-N-4</b> (described above)</p> <p><b>M-N-5</b> (described above)</p> <p><b>M-N-6</b> (described above)</p> <p><b>M-N-7</b> (described above)</p>  | Impacts would be less than significant  |
| <b>N-9</b> | Based on a preliminary estimate of the nearest potential areas where rock blasting may be necessary within approximately 140 feet of  | <p><b>M-N-4</b> (described above)</p> <p><b>M-N-5</b> (described above)</p>  | Impacts would be less than significant  |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.                    | Impact  | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|-------------------------------|---|---|---|
|                               | existing residences, a maximum noise level of up to 89 dBA $L_{max}$ from the rock drilling and up to 85 dBA $L_{max}$ from the blasting could occur. These levels would exceed County of San Diego's threshold of significance for impulsive sounds at residential land uses of 82 dBA $L_{max}$ .   | <b>M-N-6</b> (described above)<br><b>M-N-7</b> (described above)  |   |
| <b>N-10</b>                   | The closest existing off-site residence property line (Planning Areas 16/19) or noise-sensitive land use could be located within approximately 140 feet of the proposed rock crushing. At this distance, the noise level (both 8-hour average and impulsive noise) associated with the rock-crushing activities would be approximately 77 dBA $L_{eq}$ and approximately 85 dBA $L_{max}$ . These noise levels would exceed County of San Diego's 8-hour construction noise and impulsive noise thresholds.                                 | <b>M-N-9</b> Prior to approval of the grading permit for any portion of the Proposed Project, the Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall take those steps necessary to ensure that on-site rock-crushing facilities are located a minimum of 250 feet from the property line of occupied residences or other noise-sensitive uses.<br><b>Implementation:</b> Applicant or its designee, and primary contractor(s) of all Proposed Project phases involving rock crushing.<br><b>Timing:</b> Prior to and during Proposed Project related rock-crushing activities.<br><b>Enforcement:</b> County of San Diego   | Impacts would be less than significant  |
| <i>Groundborne Vibrations</i> |   |   |   |
| <b>N-11</b>                   | The nearest sensitive receptors to Proposed Project construction activities that could produce high vibration levels would be at residences to the north and west of off-site Proctor Valley Road improvements in Jamul and the City of Chula Vista, located approximately 60 feet and 140 feet away. At a distance of 60 feet and greater, vibration levels from grading activities are anticipated to exceed 0.004 inches per second root mean square or 0.1 inches per second peak particle velocity at the nearest off-site residences. | <b>M-N-10</b> Prior to beginning construction of any Proposed Project component within 300 feet of an existing or future occupied residence, the Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall require preparation of a Vibration Monitoring Plan (VMP) for submittal to the County of San Diego (County) noise control officer for review and approval. At a minimum, the VMP shall require data to be sent to the County noise control officer or designee on a weekly basis or more frequently as determined by the noise control officer. The data shall include vibration-level measurements taken during the previous work period.<br>In the event that the County noise control officer determines there is reasonable probability that future measured vibration levels would exceed allowable limits, the County noise control officer or | Impacts would be less than significant  |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation   | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|--|---|
|            |        | <p>designee shall take the necessary steps to ensure that future vibration levels do not exceed such limits, including suspending further construction activities that could result in excessive vibration levels, until either alternative equipment or alternative construction procedures can be used that generate vibration levels that do not exceed 0.004 inches per second root mean square (RMS) or 0.1 inches per second peak particle velocity (PPV) at the nearest residential structure. Construction activities not associated with vibration generation could continue.</p> <p>The VMP shall be prepared and administered by a County-approved noise consultant. In addition to the data described previously, the VMP shall include the location of vibration monitors, the vibration instrumentation used, a data acquisition and retention plan, and exceedance notification and reporting procedures. A description of these plan components is as follows:</p> <p><b>Location of Vibration Monitors:</b> The VMP shall indicate monitoring locations, including the location of measurements to be taken at construction site boundaries and at nearby residential properties.</p> <p><b>Vibration Instrumentation:</b> Vibration instrumentation shall be capable of measuring maximum unweighted RMS and PPV levels triaxially (in three directions) over a frequency range of 1 to 100 Hertz. The vibration instrumentation shall be set to automatically record daily events during working hours, and to record peak triaxial PPV values in 5-minute-interval histogram plots. The method of coupling the geophones to the ground shall be described and included in the VMP. The vibration instrumentation shall be calibrated within 1 year prior to the measurement, and a certified laboratory conformance report shall be included in the VMP.</p> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact  | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|---|---|---|
|            |   | <p><b>Data Acquisition:</b> The information to be provided in the data reports shall include, at a minimum, daily histogram plots of PPV versus time of day for three triaxial directions, and maximum peak vector sum PPV and maximum frequency for each direction. The reports shall also identify the construction equipment in operation during the monitoring period, and their locations and distances to vibration measurement locations.</p> <p><b>Exceedance Notification and Reporting Procedures:</b> The VMP shall include a description of the notification of exceedance and reporting procedures, and the follow-up procedures taken to reduce vibration levels to below the allowable limits.</p> <p><b>Implementation:</b> Applicant or its designee, and primary contractor(s) of all Proposed Project phases involving the use of heavy construction equipment within 300 feet of existing or future occupied residences.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Prior to and during construction activities</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> County of San Diego</p> |   |
| N-12       | <p>The occupied Proposed Project phases have the potential to be impacted by vibration from ongoing construction activities. Location-specific phasing schedules are not available at this time; it is, therefore, possible that construction of a new phase of the Proposed Project could take place as near as 50 feet from an occupied phase. In such an instance, short-term vibration levels as high as 0.03 inches per second root mean square (RMS) could result. Therefore, vibration levels from grading activities may exceed 0.004 inches per second RMS at the nearest on-site residence.</p> | M-N-10 (described above)  | Impacts would be less than significant  |
| N-13       | <p>Because the exact blasting locations, necessary geotechnical data, and blasting and materials handling plans are not known at this time, it is not possible to conduct a noise analysis assessing the</p>  | M-N-8 Prior to approval of the grading permit issued for any portion of the Project Area, the Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall direct that the designated contractor prepare a  | Impacts would be less than significant  |



**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact  | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|---|---|---|
|            | <p>proposed blasting and materials handling associated with the Proposed Project. Therefore, for purposes of this analysis, impacts are considered potentially significant.</p> | <p>blasting and monitoring plan with an estimate of noise and vibration levels of each blast at noise-sensitive land uses within 1,000 feet of each blast. Where potential exceedance of either the County of San Diego's (County) Noise Ordinance or the City of Chula Vista's Noise Control Ordinance is identified, the blast drilling and monitoring plan shall identify mitigation measures shown to effectively reduce noise and vibration levels (e.g., altering orientation of blast progression, increased delay between charge detonations, presplitting) to be implemented to comply with the noise level limits of the County's Noise Ordinance, Sections 36.409 and 36.410; the Chula Vista Noise Control Ordinance, Chapter 19.68; and the vibration-level limits of 1 inch per second peak particle velocity. Such measures shall be implemented by the Proposed Project applicant or its designee prior to the issuance of the grading permit. Additionally, Proposed Project phases involving blasting shall conform to the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Blasting activities shall be performed by a blast contractor and blasting personnel licensed to operate in the County.</li> <li>• Each blast shall be monitored and recorded with an air-blast overpressure monitor and groundborne vibration accelerometer that is located outside the closest residence to the blast and is approved by the County. Blasting shall not exceed 0.1 inch per second peak particle velocity at the nearest occupied residence, in accordance with County of San Diego's Noise Guidelines, Section 4.3.</li> </ul> <p><b>Implementation:</b> Applicant or its designee, and primary contractor(s) of all Proposed Project phases involving blasting</p> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.                            | Impact   | Mitigation   | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|
|                                       |  | <b>Timing:</b> Prior to and during Proposed-Project-related blasting activities<br><b>Enforcement:</b> County of San Diego   |   |
| <i>Cumulative Impact</i>              |  |  |   |
| <b>N-CUM- N-1</b>                     | The Proposed Project's contribution to increases in noise levels at off-site noise-sensitive land uses could be cumulatively considerable due to construction noise. | <b>M-N-4</b> (described above)<br><b>M-N-5</b> (described above)<br><b>M-N-6</b> (described above)<br><b>M-N-7</b> (described above)   | Impacts would be less than significant  |
| <i>2.10 Paleontological Resources</i> |  |  |   |
| <b>PR-1</b>                           | Excavation in areas underlain by the Otay Formation would result in potentially significant impacts to paleontological resources.                                    | <b>M-PR-1:</b> A Qualified Paleontologist shall supervise a Paleontological Monitoring Program. A Qualified Paleontologist is a person who has, to the satisfaction of the County of San Diego Director of Planning & Development Services: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a Ph.D. or M.S. or equivalent in paleontology or closely related field (e.g., sedimentary or stratigraphic geology, evolutionary biology);</li> <li>• demonstrated knowledge of Southern California paleontology and geology; and</li> <li>• documented experience in professional paleontological procedures and techniques.</li> </ul> The Qualified Paleontologist shall conduct or supervise the following mitigation tasks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring of excavation operations to discover unearthened fossil remains, generally involving monitoring of ongoing excavation activities (e.g., sheet grading pads, cutting slopes and roadways, basement and foundation excavations, and trenching). A Paleontological Resources Monitor</li> </ul> | Impacts would be less than significant  |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|---|---|
|            |        | <p>must have at least 1 year of experience in field identification and collection of fossil materials.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Salvaging of unearthed fossil remains, typically involving simple excavation of the exposed specimens, but possibly also plaster-jacketing of individual large and/or fragile specimens, or more elaborate quarry excavation of richly fossiliferous deposits.</li> <li>• Recording of stratigraphic, geologic, and geographic data to provide a context for the recovered fossil remains, including accurate plotting (mapping) on grading plans and standard topographic maps of all fossil localities, description of lithologies of fossil-bearing strata, measurement and description of the overall stratigraphic section (unless considered by the Project Paleontologist to be infeasible), and photographic documentation of the geologic setting.</li> <li>• Laboratory preparation (cleaning and repair) of collected fossil remains to the point of identification (not exhibition), generally involving removal of enclosing sedimentary rock material, stabilization of fragile specimens (using glues and other hardeners), and repair of broken specimens.</li> <li>• Curating prepared fossil remains, typically involving scientific identification and cataloguing of specimens, and entry of data into one or more accredited institutional (museum or university) collection (specimen/species lot and/or locality) databases. Curation is necessary so that the specimens are available for scientific research.</li> </ul> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation   | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|------------|--------|--|---|
|            |        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transferal, for archival storage, of cataloged fossil remains and copies of relevant field notes, maps, stratigraphic sections, and photographs to an accredited institution (museum or university) in California that maintains paleontological collections, preferably one of the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ San Diego Natural History Museum</li> <li>○ Los Angeles County Museum</li> <li>○ San Bernardino Museum of Natural History</li> <li>○ University of California Museum of Paleontology, Berkeley</li> <li>○ Anza-Borrego Desert State Park (if the fossils were salvaged in the desert)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Preparation of a final report summarizing the results of the field investigation, laboratory methods, stratigraphic information, types and importance of collected fossils, and any necessary graphics to document the stratigraphy and precise fossil collecting localities.</li> </ul> |   |

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects**

| Impact No.                            | Impact   | Mitigation  | Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| <i>2.11 Tribal Cultural Resources</i> |  |   |   |
| TCR-1                                 | Implementation of the Preserve Trails Option would result in a potentially significant indirect impact to a possible tribal cultural resource. | <b>M-TCR-1 Data Recovery</b> - To mitigate potential indirect impacts to the eastern portion of site CA-SDI-12373, a phased data recovery program shall be implemented by a County of San Diego (County) approved archaeologist prior to granting any easement for trail uses. The phased data recovery (prepared as a separate document) shall involve implementation of surface collection and curation/repatriation of artifacts to prevent looting. All archaeological materials recovered during the data recovery efforts shall be cleaned, sorted, cataloged, and analyzed following standard archaeological procedures, and shall be documented in a data recovery report. Upon completion of fieldwork, the County-approved archaeologist shall submit a letter report summarizing the field work efforts and stating that the scientifically significant sample of the site has been recovered. Upon approval from the County archaeologist, the trail easement may be granted. | Impacts would be less than significant  |

**Table S-2  
Summary of Project Design Features**

| PDF No.             | Project Design Feature  |
|---------------------|---|
| <b>PDF-AQ-1</b>     | <p>Fugitive Dust Control – The Proposed Project shall implement the following measures to minimize fugitive dust (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>), comply with County Code Section 87.428 (Grading Ordinance), and comply with SDAPCD Rule 55 (Fugitive Dust Control):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Water or another SDAPCD-approved dust control non-toxic agent shall be used on the grading areas at least three times daily.</li> <li>b. All main roadways shall be constructed and paved as early as possible in the construction process.</li> <li>c. Building pads shall be finalized as soon as possible following site preparation and grading activities;</li> <li>d. Grading areas shall be stabilized as quickly as possible.</li> <li>e. Chemical stabilizer shall be applied, a gravel pad shall be installed, or the last 100 feet of internal travel path within the construction site shall be paved prior to public road entry and for all haul roads.</li> <li>f. Wheel washers shall be installed adjacent to the apron indicated in (c) for tire inspection and washing prior to vehicle entry on public roads.</li> <li>g. Visible track-out into traveled public streets shall be removed with the use of sweepers, water trucks or similar method within 30 minutes of occurrence.</li> <li>h. Sufficient perimeter erosion control shall be provided to prevent washout of silty material onto public roads.</li> <li>i. Unpaved construction site egress points shall be graveled to prevent track-out.</li> <li>j. Construction access points shall be wet-washed at the end of the workday if any vehicle travel on unpaved surfaces has occurred.</li> <li>k. Transported material in haul trucks shall be watered or treated.</li> <li>l. All soil disturbance and travel on unpaved surfaces shall be suspended if winds exceed 25 miles per hour.</li> <li>m. On-site stockpiles of excavated material shall be covered.</li> <li>n. A 15-mile-per-hour speed limit on unpaved surfaces shall be enforced.</li> <li>o. Haul truck staging areas shall be provided for loading and unloading of soil and materials and shall be located away from sensitive receptors at the farthest feasible distance.</li> </ul> <p>Construction Traffic Control Plans shall route delivery and haul trucks required during construction away from sensitive receptor locations and congested intersections to the extent feasible. Construction Traffic Control plans shall be finalized and approved prior to issuance of grading permits.</p> |
| <b>PDF-AQ-2</b>     | <p>Construction Architectural Coating Limits – The Proposed Project shall comply with the SDAPCD volatile organic compound (VOC) content limits for architectural coatings during construction.</p>   |
| <b>PDF-AQ/GHG-1</b> | <p>Wood Burning Stoves and Fireplaces – Prior to the issuance of residential building permits, the Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall submit building plans illustrating that no wood burning stoves or fireplaces would be constructed.</p>  |
| <b>PDF-AQ/GHG-2</b> | <p>Zero Net Energy Residences – Prior to the issuance of residential building permits, the Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall submit building plans illustrating compliance with the ZNE design standards defined by the California Energy Commission.</p>  |
| <b>PDF-AQ/GHG-3</b> | <p>Non-Residential Energy Improvement Standards – Prior to the issuance of non-residential building permits, the Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall submit building plans illustrating that the Proposed Project's non-residential land uses shall achieve a 10% greater building energy efficiency than required by the 2016 State energy efficiency standards in Title 24, Part 6 of the California Code of Regulations.</p>  |
| <b>PDF-AQ/GHG-4</b> | <p>Energy Star Appliances – All appliances (washer/dryers, refrigerators, and dishwashers) that will be installed by builders in residences and commercial businesses shall be Energy Star rated or equivalent.</p>   |

**Table S-2  
Summary of Project Design Features**

| PDF No.               | Project Design Feature  |
|-----------------------|---|
| <b>PDF-AQ/GHG-5</b>   | Solar Water Heating – Prior to the issuance of private recreation center building permits, the Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall submit swimming pool heating design plans to the County of San Diego for review and approval. The design plans shall demonstrate that all swimming pools located at private recreation centers in the Project Area are designed and shall be constructed to use solar water heating or other technology with an equivalent level of energy efficiency.  |
| <b>PDF-AQ/GHG-6</b>   | <u>Efficient Outdoor Lighting - Prior to the issuance of building permits, the Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall submit building plans that demonstrate that all outdoor lighting shall be LED (light emitting diodes) or other high efficiency lightbulbs.</u>  |
| <b>PDF-AQ/GHG-7</b>   | <u>New Resident Information Package - Prior to the issuance of Certificates of Occupancy for new residences, the Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall submit certification that it has provided information on energy efficiency, energy efficient lighting and lighting control systems, energy management, and existing energy incentive programs to new homebuyers.</u>  |
| <b>PDF-AQ/GHG-8</b>   | <p><u>Cool Roofs - Prior to the issuance of residential building permits, the Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall submit building plans illustrating that residential structures shall meet the U.S. Green Building Council standards for cool roofs. This is defined as achieving a three-year solar reflectance index (SRI) of 64 for a low-sloped roof and an SRI of 32 for a high- sloped roof.</u></p> <p><u>Prior to the issuance of non-residential building permits, the Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall submit building plans illustrating non-residential structures shall meet the U.S. Green Building Council standards for cool roofs. This is defined as achieving a three-year SRI of 64 for a low-sloped roof and 32 for a high- sloped roof.</u></p>   |
| <b>PDF-AQ/GHG-9</b>   | <u>Cool Pavement - Prior to the issuance of building permits, the Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall submit building plans illustrating that outdoor pavement, such as walkways and patios shall use paving materials with three-year SRI of 0.28 or initial SRI of 0.33.</u>   |
| <b>PDF-AQ/GHG-106</b> | Electric Vehicle Charging Stations – Prior to the issuance of residential building permits, the Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall submit plans for the installation of <u>a dedicated 208/240 dedicated branch circuit in each garage of every residential unit and one Level 2 electric vehicle (EV) charging station in the garage of half of all residential units</u> to the County of San Diego for review and approval. Prior to the issuance of non-residential building permits, the applicant or its designee shall submit plans for the installation of ten (10) Level 2 EV charging stations in parking spaces located in the Village Core’s commercial development area and P1 through P4 park area parking spaces to the County of San Diego for review and approval.   |
| <b>PDF-TR-1</b>       | <p>Transportation Demand Management (TDM). The Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall implement a Transportation Demand Management program to facilitate increased opportunities for transit, bicycling, and pedestrian travel, as well as provide the resources, means, and incentives for ridesharing and carpooling. The following components are to be included in the Transportation Demand Management program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a comprehensive pedestrian network designed to provide safe bicycle and pedestrian access between the various Proposed Project phases, land uses, parks/open spaces, schools, and the Village Core. Where approved by the appropriate jurisdiction, the pedestrian network would also provide connections to the various recreational trails and multi-modal facilities accessing the Project Area.</li> <li>• Provide bicycle racks along main travel corridors adjacent to commercial developments and at public parks and open spaces within the Project Area.</li> <li>• Coordinate with the San Diego Association of Governments’ (SANDAG) iCommute program for carpool, vanpool, and rideshare programs that are specific to the Proposed Project.</li> </ul> |

**Table S-2  
Summary of Project Design Features**

| PDF No.         | Project Design Feature  |
|-----------------|---|
|                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote available websites providing transportation options for residents and businesses.</li> <li>• Create and distribute a “new resident” information packet addressing alternative modes of transportation.</li> <li>• Coordinate with San Diego Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and SANDAG about the future sighting of transit stops/stations within the Project Area.</li> <li>• Provide a school carpool program by coordinating with the local school district and SANDAG. Provide dedicated parking space for the school carpool program in the Village Core.</li> <li>• Implement a school bus program in coordination with the school district.</li> <li>• Require homeowner’s associations within the Project Area to coordinate with the local school district and partner with the on-site elementary school to create a “walking school bus program” for neighborhood students to safely walk to and from school. The Proposed Project applicant would also coordinate with the local school district to encourage the provision of bicycle storage facilities at the on-site elementary school.</li> <li>• <u>To ensure that the TDM Program strategies are implemented and effective, a transportation coordinator (likely as part of a homeowner’s association (HOA)) would be designated to monitor the TDM Program, and would be responsible for developing, marketing, implementing, and evaluating the TDM Program.</u></li> </ul> |
| <b>PDF-UT-1</b> | Hot Water Pipe Insulation. Hot water pipes shall be insulated, and hot and cold water piping shall be separated. Resulting in annual savings of 2,400 gallons per unit.   |
| <b>PDF-UT-2</b> | Pressure Reducing Valves. The maximum service pressure shall be set to 60 [pounds per square inch] to reduce potential leakage and prevent excessive flow of water from appliances and fixtures resulting in annual water savings of 1,800 gallons per unit.  |
| <b>PDF-UT-3</b> | Water Efficient Dishwashers. Water efficient dishwashers that carry the Energy Star label shall be installed in residential units resulting in an estimated yearly water savings of 650 gallons per unit.   |
| <b>PDF-UT-4</b> | Residential Landscaping. Residential landscaping shall comply with the Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance, California Code of Regulations Title 23, Division 2, Chapter 2.7 (Section 490 et seq.). By complying with this ordinance, it is estimated that outdoor water use at single family residences will be reduced by approximately 10%. <del>With an estimated total water use of 500 gpd per home and approximately 50% of this water used outdoors, the estimated annual water savings is 9,125 gallons per home.</del> Residential water use can vary widely based on the size of lots; however, based on OWD factors for the Proposed Project, estimated water sue for a typical single family home is 435 gpd for densities of 3.0 to 10 units per acre, 700 gpd for densities of 1.0 to 3.0 units per acre, and 1,000 gpd for densities of less than 1.0 units per acre. <u>With an estimated 50% of this water used outdoors, the estimated annual water savings is 7,940 gallons per single-family residence where densities are from 3.0 to 10 units per acre, 12,775 gallons per single-family residence where densities are from 1.0 to 3.0 units per acre, and 18,250 gallons per single-family residence where densities are less than 1.0 units per acre based on these assumptions.</u>   |
| <b>PDF-UT-5</b> | <u>Outdoor Water Use. Homeowners Association. The Home Owner’s Associations shall appropriately regulate the use of water for cleaning outdoor surfaces and vehicles through the Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions.</u>   |