SUMMARY

S.1 Project Synopsis

S.1.1 Location

The Harmony Grove Village South Project (hereafter referred to as "Proposed Project," "Project," or "HGV South") is located in the unincorporated portion of northern San Diego County in the community of Harmony Grove; approximately 2.5 miles west of Interstate 15 (I-15) and approximately 2.6 miles south of State Route 78 (SR-78). Escondido Creek flows east-west just north of the Project, and the City of Escondido is located to the east. County open-space parcels (the Del Dios Highland Preserve [DDHP]) abut the southern boundary of the Project. Primary access to the Project vicinity is provided by Harmony Grove Road (the nearest east-west connector) and Country Club Drive (a north-south connector that abuts the Project's western boundary).

The community of Elfin Forest is located approximately 4 miles to the west. The Proposed Project site vicinity is bordered by more intensive urban development in the cities of San Marcos and Escondido to the north and east, respectively. Palomar Medical Center is located approximately 2 miles to the north and Stone Brewery is located approximately 1.5 miles to the north as a crow flies. Both are part of the Escondido Research and Technology Center (ERTC), an industrial/ commercial, employment and services locus located within 1 mile north-northeast of the Project. The ERTC is accessed by Harmony Grove Road, as are large big box uses, located at Valley Parkway and I-15 and along Auto Park Way. Two transit centers – "Nordahl Road" and "Escondido Transit Center" – are also located nearby. The historic and well-known Harmony Grove Spiritualist Association (HGSA) is located approximately 0.25 mile west of the site, at the terminus of Country Club Drive.

S.1.2 Description

The Proposed Project is located on property that is connected topographically to the Harmony Grove Village (HGV), as it would be sited on the southeastern-most portion of the valley within which HGV is building. It is part of the same drainage basin and is located within the valley viewshed.

A number of overall planning considerations guided development of the HGV South Project plan. These considerations included: contiguity and integration into the HGV development; consolidation of Project footprint to provide the greatest amount of green space; circulation improvements that would benefit the entire Harmony Grove community located south of Harmony Grove Road; support of community-wide necessary services; and Project sustainability.

The Proposed Project consists of a land use plan that includes four use categories on an approximately 111-acre Project Plan Area; including residential, limited retail/commercial/civic, utilities/institutional, and open space/recreation uses, that are predominantly similar to the uses of the approved HGV. The residential portions of the Project would contain 453 residential units in five different home types, which would be clustered to allow for the greatest incorporation of green space. Cottages, Bungalows, and Harmony Court structures would be single-family residences;

Farmhouses and Granaries would be multi-family residences. Structures would range from 28 to 45 feet in height, with some architectural projections to provide visual interest and interrupt structural massing. Home sites have been designed to maximize protection from fires and accommodate a substantial brush management zone. The Project would satisfy 100 percent of its electrical/energy needs through on-site installation of solar photovoltaic (PV) systems on Project residences and the Center House.

The Project overall would contain approximately 75 acres, or 68 percent of the site, in undeveloped uses such as green space. This would include proposed biological open space (BOS), park areas and homeowner's association (HOA) maintenance district areas. The Project proposes to set aside BOS lots totaling approximately 34.8 acres that would be dedicated for permanent preservation on site, and would consist of natural (non-irrigated) areas located beyond the Project brush management zones. Thirteen parks (approximately 4.1 acres) are planned to be developed in HGV South, including seven public parks ranging from approximately 0.08 to 0.54 acre in size, and six private parks ranging from approximately 0.1 to 0.82 acre in size that would be operated and maintained by an HOA. Community gardens may be incorporated into one of the private park areas.

The "Center House" would provide a recreational gathering space and some retail commercial uses just south of the primary Project entry. The total square footage of structures associated with this use is approximately 5,000 square feet (s.f.; with a minimum of 1,500 s.f. of commercial use) to be accommodated within a small footprint and two stories (up to 40 feet, including any architectural projections) in height. This limited commercial land use category is intended to accommodate a private clubhouse that residents can join as well as small public commercial uses. An electric charging station would be provided.

The proposed development is consistent with the County's Community Development Model (CDM) whereby compact development is concentrated in and around a core area and then feathers out into lower density development and open space. The Project is compact enough to encourage residents to walk to amenities and services, as all residences would be within 0.5 mile or less (a less than 10-minute walk) from the Project's commercial and community center at the Center House to the HGV Village Core. The Project generally locates the lower-intensity residential uses around the perimeter of the site, providing transitions into the surrounding Semi-Rural uses.

In addition to the on-site uses, the Proposed Project would require the construction of on- and off-site infrastructure improvements associated with roads, water, and sewer. Circulation improvements include improving Country Club Drive to three lanes and improving the southern portion of the Harmony Grove Road and Country Club Drive intersection; participating in improvements to the crossing of Escondido Creek; and trail, road and pathway amenities as additionally summarized below. A system of public and private multi-use trails and pathways intended to serve pedestrians, equestrians, and other non-motorized forms of travel would weave throughout the Project; providing links to the existing and planned off-site San Diego County trail system and to HGV via the bridge over Escondido Creek.

The Proposed Project would improve the southern leg of the Country Club Drive and Escondido Creek Bridge intersection, meeting the intersection at right angles and providing both left- and right-turn lanes, a through lane for northbound traffic, and a southbound lane. This would

contribute to improvements to the overall intersection functioning, and would benefit all users passing through this intersection.

The improvements to Country Club Drive would continue to the south as the Project also would implement third-lane roadbed improvements from the intersection with Harmony Grove Road to the southern Project entrance, as well as the shoulder and pathway on the east side of the road, where Country Club Drive is sited along Project frontage. This width would accommodate Project traffic, as well as future loading anticipated during equestrian events at the HGV Equestrian Ranch (located contiguous to HGV South on the west side of Country Club Drive). As an ancillary benefit, emergency access (to allow emergency response vehicles in/residents, visitors and animals out) also would be improved for the Project, future HGV Equestrian Ranch and all others south of Escondido Creek.

Country Club Drive also currently includes a crossing of Escondido Creek. The County Department of Public Works (DPW) has reviewed implementation of a bridge at this location. The HGV South Project has taken this parallel planning process into account. The Project analyzes potential impacts associated with bridge construction, providing conservative footprint impacts and/or design detail as necessary. Although exact planning specifics have not been determined, a number of fundamental design items can be assumed. The bridge will need to (minimally) accommodate a 100-year storm as well as the potential for rising waters based on increased runoff relative to global climate change. The bridge also will need to accommodate connections to a planned regional trail identified for Country Club Drive in the County Community Trails Master Plan (CTMP), as well as in the approved HGV project, and a Project pathway on the east side of Country Club Drive. This anticipated design would wholly fit within the footprint of the Project-designed bridge analyzed in the EIR.

The Proposed Project would require the extension of waste water, recycled and potable water pipelines, as well as gas, electric, and phone/cable lines throughout the development and (excluding waste water under the Proposed Project) to off-site connection points. Wastewater treatment facilities needed to accommodate the proposed HGV South development would be built by the Project. The construction of a stand-alone wastewater treatment and water reclamation facility (WTWRF) within the Project would allow for treatment of HGV South sewage within the Proposed Project. The WTWRF would either comprise a wastewater treatment plant to match the HGV wastewater reclamation facility (WRF) in design or a new package membrane bioreactor plant (currently assumed for Project analyses). All Project wastewater is proposed to be reclaimed and reused for irrigation of on-site parks, parkways, and common areas (excluding the community gardens).

Discretionary actions and permits anticipated for the Proposed Project are detailed in the Discretionary Approval/Permit matrix in Chapter 1.0. Approving agencies include the County of San Diego (County), as well as the: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) and Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO). Local detachments/attachments or approvals to service districts would occur with regard to Rincon del Diablo Municipal Water District (Rincon MWD), San Diego County Sanitation District, and the Rancho Santa Fe Fire Protection District (RSFFPD). School

district authorizations would be required from the Escondido Union High School District (EUHSD) and Escondido Union School District (EUSD).

S.1.3 Setting

In 2007, the County approved the designation of an approximately 500-acre area of land in the center of Harmony Grove Valley to become a new village to contain 742 single-story and two-story homes in village massing. (HGV's approved entitlements assumed first occupancy as early as 2008, with full build out of the Village occurring as early as 2013). The entire site has been rough graded, and approximately half of the site has been finish-graded. The construction of homes is under way, the WRF that will serve HGV has been constructed, major infrastructure has been installed and homes have been available for sale since May 2015. HGV straddles three sides of the area's literal "crossroads" at Harmony Grove Road and Country Club Drive; providing a focal point/center of the valley. Relative to HGV, the Project completes the fourth quadrant of the crossroads intersection; sited approximately 400 feet south of Harmony Grove Road, it is part of the HG "valley floor," and shares the valley's watershed and viewshed.

The HGV land use plan includes a pedestrian-oriented Village Center of public amenities, convenience retail, and commercial uses surrounded by a variety of single-family residential units, open space, and multi-use trails. HGV will contain an approximately 40,000 s.f. commercial core adjacent to Country Club Drive less than 0.4 mile (approximately 2,100 feet) north of the planned commercial/civic center located in HGV South and within 0.5 mile to its most dense residential uses. HGV's Village Center area is surrounded by a variety of single-family residential uses on lots ranging in size from approximately 2,500 s.f. to 1.5 acres, with residential densities generally decreasing as one moves away from the core. The HGV WRF is located at the northeast corner of Harmony Grove Road and Country Club Drive, approximately 550 feet north of HGV South's northern boundary. All of these uses are planned to be connected via the multi-use trail approved in the HGV EIR and shown on the County Trails Plan, and the improved creek crossing. This would additionally connect through the Project to the major open space recreational uses to the south (DDHP and EFRR). The HGV future Equestrian Ranch is located immediately across the street from Country Club Drive, west of the Proposed Project. That facility will feature a variety of equestrian uses along with limited commercial and residential components. Buildings on that site are anticipated to be one- and two-story structures.

County-owned community park areas built as part of HGV are located south of Harmony Grove Road and west of Country Club Drive. The easternmost of these facilities, which is equestrian themed, is close to the northwest corner of the Project (i.e., located just across the street and within 250 feet) from HGV South. The 2.8-acre site is designated Village Regional Category and provides an additional community gathering place for both HGV and the Project that is focused on equestrian exercise activities. An additional 2.9-acre Community Park area in HGV is located just west of the equestrian facilities and includes active recreation and parking.

Surrounding Areas

Other areas west of the Project include a diverse array of residential uses. The 39-lot Harmony Grove Spiritualist Association (HGSA) includes single-story residences on higher density lots (as small as 1,300 s.f.). One- and two-story homes are located on lots in the 5,000- to 10,000-s.f. range

in the flatter areas of this sector, and multiple story (three- and four-story) residences are present on much larger parcels. Moving easterly from the Proposed Project, there are large residences that can reach up to 40 feet height in terms of massing, even if there are as few as two stories. HGV South is planned to complete HGV; and as the "Village" designation and CDM direct, focus clustered residential and supporting village land uses on the valley floor. The Village is then surrounded by the lower density Semi-rural and Rural land uses, as the CDM directs. HGV South would offer building massing compatible with the overall valley character.

As indicated above, the Proposed Project is sited in the Harmony Grove Valley, located at the eastern foot of Mount Whitney, south of SR-78 and west of I-15. Within the above-referenced mixed residential and topographic setting, the Project is within a few minutes of drive time to the cities of Escondido and San Marcos.

The above-described areas in the Project site vicinity are bordered by more intensive urban development in the cities of San Marcos and Escondido to the north and east, respectively; and large expanses of natural open space to the west, south and southwest (refer to Figure 1-3). Uses within the region include a mix of agricultural, suburban, and urban developments. Palomar Medical Center is located approximately 2 miles to the north and Stone Brewery is located approximately 1.5 miles to the north, and are both part of the ERTC. The overall ERTC, (an industrial/commercial, employment and services locus), is located within 1 mile north-northeast of the Project. It is accessed by Harmony Grove Road. Other opportunities include the large big box uses at Valley Parkway and I-15 and along Auto Park Way and other light industrial and commercial uses between these locales and the Project. As described above, this Project is within 3 miles of the Nordahl Transit Station. That proximity allows residents to walk, bike or drive to the station, before accessing bus service or the SPRINTER light rail line to other points (both within the County, but also points north of the County) and other carriers, such as Amtrak. The SPRINTER light rail line runs every 30 minutes in each direction Monday through Friday, from approximately 4:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. The Escondido Transit Center (also with parking available) serves as the current eastern terminus of the North County Transit District's (NCTD's) SPRINTER and the northern terminus of the Breeze Rapid bus rapid transit line. It is also in the Project's general vicinity, being located just east of 1-15 and south of SR-78. Express bus service to downtown San Diego is available at the Center, as is local bus service to inland North County.

The Project site is surrounded on all sides, except to the immediate northwest, by a continuing series of hills and canyons, with approximately 20 ridgetops. Figure 1-5 in Chapter 1.0 shows the ridgelines that surround the valley, and unite all valley areas, including HGV and HGV South. These range from approximately 600 feet above mean sea level (amsl) to a high point of over 1,735 feet amsl at the top of Mt. Whitney, located to the west-northwest. Peaks with elevations approaching 1,300 feet amsl occur to the west and south of the Project site. This transition from ridgetop to valley floor provides a dramatic physical setting to the valley. Lower hills and knolls, ranging up to approximately 1,040 feet amsl, occur due east of the property. The one area that does not contain numerous hills and canyons in close proximity to each other is in the northwest quadrant of the Harmony Grove Road and Country Club Drive intersection.

Escondido Creek, which begins at the upper headwaters in Bear Valley above Lake Wohlford, trends southwesterly through the community, eventually flowing into the San Elijo Lagoon. The creek provides an important link between the unincorporated areas of Harmony Grove,

Questhaven, Elfin Forest, and Rancho Santa Fe. It offers recreational opportunities and numerous existing and planned trails traverse the area.

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

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

Environmental design considerations that have been incorporated into the project include measures to reduce environmental impacts. All of these environmental design measures are detailed in in Table 1-2, *Project Design Features*, of this EIR.

S.3 Areas of Controversy

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) was distributed on August 27, 2015 for a 30-day public review and comment period (refer to Appendix A for the NOP). Public comments were received on the NOP for this EIR and reflect concern or controversy over a number of environmental issues. In addition, a public scoping meeting was held on September 16, 2015 at the Elfin Forest-Harmony Grove Fire Department, located at 20223 Elfin Forest Road. A number of comment forms were collected from that meeting, as well as subsequent comments via e-mail or mail. These forms, e-mails, and letters are also included in Appendix A.

A total of 46 communications were received on the NOP from state agencies, groups and organizations, and individuals. State agencies include the CDFW and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Groups and organizations include the Elfin Forest Harmony Grove Town Council, Escondido Creek Conservancy, San Dieguito Planning Group, and San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians.

Issues raised in the NOP comment letters include concerns regarding the following issue areas:

- Visual impacts
- Greenhouse gases
- Noise associated with traffic
- Air quality and odor
- Traffic
- Cultural resources and tribal cultural resources
- Land use density
- Biological resources
- Community character
- Fire hazards
- Alternatives
- Geology and liquefaction
- Growth inducing impacts
- Hazards associated with the wastewater reclamation facility
- Water quality and hydrology
- Groundwater
- Water availability
- Wastewater treatment
- Recreation
- School impacts
- Utility districts, annexation for sewer
- Public services and utilities (fire, police, water, sewer)
- Agricultural resources

Issues raised within these letters are evaluated in this EIR in Chapters 2.0 through 4.0.

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

An EIR is an informational document intended to inform the public agency decision makers and the public of the significant effects of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Project. The lead agency (in this case the County) must respond to each significant effect identified in this EIR by making "Findings" for each significant effect. The issues to be resolved include whether or how to mitigate the associated significant effects, including whether to implement a project alternative, the determination of which is to be made by the decision makers. Preparation of a Statement of Overriding Considerations (explaining the overriding value of the Project despite adverse effects) would be required for any remaining significant and unmitigated impacts (i.e., those likely to be associated with short-term aesthetics, air quality impacts related to plan conformance, and traffic effects requiring approval by the City of Escondido, another lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act [CEQA]).

Issues to be resolved that are directly related to the Proposed Project include the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate the significant effects. In particular, the County must decide if the significant and unmitigated effects identified for the issues of aesthetics, transportation/traffic and air quality can be reduced further, and determine if the significant impacts associated with aesthetics, transportation/traffic, biological resources, cultural resources, and noise have been fully mitigated to below a level of significance. In addition, the County must determine whether any of the Project alternatives would substantially reduce significant aesthetics, transportation/traffic, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, and air quality effects while still meeting key Project objectives.

S.5 Project Alternatives

CEQA requires an EIR to consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that would lessen significant impacts identified with the Proposed Project and to foster informed decision making. Chapter 4.0 of this EIR considers a no project (no build) alternative, as well as a total of four full development alternatives and a focused sewer alternative that addresses two sewer options.

The No Project/No Development Alternative evaluates the environmental effects of maintaining the property in its current condition in the long-term. Two development alternatives (the General Plan Consistent with Septic and General Plan Consistent with Sewer alternatives) propose residential uses allowed under existing General Plan land use designations. One alternative would increase density adjacent to the existing HGV Village through a General Plan Amendment (GPA), while being able to substantially reduce impacts associated with traffic (the Senior Care Traffic Reduction Alternative). One alternative proposes increases in density, but would minimize footprint impacts within a consolidated build footprint in order to preserve biological resources to a greater extent than the Proposed Project (the Biologically Superior Alternative). The No Project/No Development Alternative, as well as each of the full build alternatives, lowers impacts from the Proposed Project to a minimum of three resource areas. The Off-site and Combined On-/Off-site Sewer Options Alternative include two potential sewer options in lieu of constructing an on-site full WTWRF and was included to disclose the impacts that would occur if either of these two sewer options were to be approved instead of constructing a stand-alone plant within the Project.

If the environmentally superior alternative is the "no project" alternative, Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines requires identification of another environmentally superior alternative. Based on impact comparison between the Proposed Project and evaluated alternatives, an environmentally superior alternative, other than the no project alternative, has been identified as the General Plan Consistent with Sewer Alternative. The discussion below starts with the environmentally superior alternative and continues with summaries of the remaining alternatives. Full analysis of impact comparisons is provided in Chapter 4.0.

S.5.1 General Plan Consistent with Sewer Alternative

S.5.1.1 *Description*

The General Plan Consistent with Sewer Alternative would allow development in accordance with the General Plan Land Use designation of the Semi-Rural Regional Category. Approximately 110 acres is designated Semi-Rural Residential (SR-0.5) and the remaining portion of the Project site is designated Rural Lands (RL-20). This alternative would implement the County's Conservation Subdivision Program (CSP) over the 110 acres designated as SR-0.5 in conjunction with Planned Development Regulations. The remaining approximately 1 acre would remain outside the CSP and be maintained as open space.

The intent of the CSP is to encourage residential subdivision design that improves the preservation of sensitive environmental resources and community character. Planned Development Regulations allow for reductions in lot size and other design restrictions for conservation subdivisions when a

certain percentage of open space is provided. Under Planned Development regulations, all properties within SR designations must contain a minimum of 40 percent of conservation/group open space. In addition, each lot must contain a minimum of 1,000 s.f. of private usable open space.

As shown on Figure 4-2, *General Plan Consistent with Sewer Alternative*, the CSP and PD Regulations would apply to the 110 acres designated as SR-0.5. This alternative would yield 119 single-family homes constructed on minimum 6,500-s.f. lots and sited to preserve sensitive biological resources. Some lots in the north of the alternative, all along the eastern and southern extents, and along the western site boundary south of the curve in Country Club Drive, would be larger, ranging from approximately 0.5 acre to 2.0 acres in size. Approximately 738,000 cy of cut and fill soil would be required for this alternative. This is approximately 13 percent less than the 850,000 cy assumed for the Proposed Project. This alternative would grade approximately 62 acres (59 percent of the site) and develop approximately 49 acres (approximately 44 percent). Approximately 44 percent of the site (49 acres of open space) also would be dedicated for conservation/preservation, and each of the lots would be required to include 1,000 s.f. of private open space. Also, steep natural slopes outside the development footprint would be preserved to a greater degree than under the Proposed Project. Despite this, a waiver for encroachment into insignificant RPO steep slopes as well as an exception for roadways would be required, similar to the Proposed Project.

Due to the fewer number of units, this alternative would not include trails, a community center or commercial mixed use. Six parks would be provided, however, consistent with the County Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) and Subdivision Ordinance requirements. Because of the efficient footprint within the heart of the alternative, benching and retaining walls would be required to support alternative pads. All internal roadways would be private and would be constructed to the same standard as proposed by the Proposed Project.

The General Plan Consistent with Sewer Alternative would require connection to a WRF because the smaller lot sizes make individual septic units impossible. Because the HGV Specific Plan and Community Plan currently require that HGV's WRF be used only for HGV to provide sewage service to Village homes, this alternative would require a GPA to allow for connection to the HGV sewage treatment facility and also would require an amendment to the HGV Specific Plan and an Elfin Forest/Harmony Grove Community Plan Amendment to allow sewer services to be provided to Semi-rural designated areas beyond the HGV Village boundaries.

The purpose of this alternative would be to avoid or reduce impacts to sensitive resources (steep slopes and biology) in the block of open space surrounded on two sides by DDHP, as well as steep slope impacts in the northeast portion of the alternative, traffic and aesthetic impacts associated with the Proposed Project. It also would provide consistency with the existing general plan land use designation with a greater number of units through utilization of the CSP and PD regulations.

S.5.1.2 *Environmental Impact Comparison with Proposed Project*

In terms of environmental impacts, the General Plan Consistent with Sewer Alternative would result in less aesthetic, transportation/traffic, air quality, and noise impacts than the Proposed

Project. CEQA conclusions for impacts to cultural and biological resources and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions would be similar.

Although this alternative would reduce impacts it does not achieve all of the Project objectives to the same degree as the Proposed Project. It would not provide an efficient development pattern in close proximity to an existing village consistent with the CDM that creates one complete and vibrant village community and enhances and supports the economic and social success of the existing village and the alternative. The low density single-family pattern represented in this alternative has limited ability to support the economic and social success of the existing village and the alternative because it would not increase the number and diversity of residents and land uses when compared to the Proposed Project.

The single-family land use pattern represented in this alternative, with its associated reduced number of units and auto-dependent development pattern (no trails and pathways) would not contribute to the establishment of a community that encourages and supports multi-modal transportation. Similarly, this alternative's land use pattern (single family) is inferior to the Proposed Project relative to encouraging a mix of residential units and a broad range of housing choices which result in a diversity of residents. Also as a result of having substantially fewer units when compared to the Project, this alternative is less effective in optimizing the operational effectiveness of public facilities and services of the existing village. When compared to the full range of passive and active recreational opportunities provided by the Proposed Project, including the Center House community area and multiple parks throughout the Proposed Project, as well as trail heads and trails, the alternative would be less effective in providing a variety of passive and active recreational opportunities to support a healthy and active lifestyle. This alternative would not create a destination gathering place with a variety of land uses, such as the Project's Center House, that would encourage walkability, social interaction and economic vitality.

This alternative would develop a larger footprint than the Project because the lots are generally larger, more spread out and under individual owner control. (The Project would cover approximately 32 acres in lots and streets and the alternative would cover approximately 49 acres.) Within the development footprint, the more intensive engineered nature of the grading – with additional benching and retaining walls, and lessened contour/adaptive grading – would not respond to the site's physical variables to the extent of the Proposed Project. Topographic variation and visibility to existing site characteristics would be lessened from that achieved by the Proposed Project because, rather than consolidating development in areas that can be contoured by design, the lots would be uniformly spread across the developed portion of the site; uniformly requiring access and usable pads on each lot. Views to developed lots and streets would be increased under the alternative and sight-lines into the site and between structures afforded by the Proposed Project would be reduced, although balanced somewhat by a reduction in building on steep slopes in the northeastern portion of the property, and the potential for some sight-lines between homes on the larger lots on the central bench. Overall, this alternative would not be as responsive as the Proposed Project in selectively placing development in a manner that visually and physically responds to the site's physical variables.

This alternative would preserve and enhance biological resources, and it would accomplish this to an extent greater than the Proposed Project in the southern area abutting DDHP.

S.5.2 No Project/No Development Alternative

S.5.2.1 *Description*

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, the Project site would remain in its current condition. The native and non-native habitat throughout the site would remain intact. The above-ground transmission line that currently bisects the property, the paved and dirt roads providing access to single-family residential uses east of the Project, and the unimproved trail access to DDHP, would continue to exist. Some encroachment into the property by abutting parcels along Cordrey Drive, with related uncontrolled runoff into Escondido Creek, also would be likely to continue.

The Proposed Project residential and commercial uses would not be constructed; nor would supporting infrastructure such as improved road elements, the WTWRF, and other utility upgrades. In addition, the Project-proposed BOS preserve, and HOA-maintained landscaped areas (as well as larger community serving amenities such as pathway and trail connections and the destination gathering location at the Center House and multiple park areas) would not be created.

S.5.2.2 *Environmental Impact Comparison with Proposed Project*

As shown in Table S-2, the No Project/No Development Alternative would avoid a number of significant impacts associated with the Proposed Project, including: (1) significant and unmitigated aesthetics, air quality, and transportation/traffic impacts; and (2) significant but mitigated impacts related to aesthetics, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, and transportation/traffic. GHG impacts would be similar to the No Project in that (although there would be emissions associated with the Project that would not occur under the alternative), Project emissions would be mitigated to carbon neutral net zero, with the overall global effect on climate change being similar.

The No Project/No Development Alternative would fail to meet all of the Proposed Project objectives, however, relative to provision of housing and support of facilities and services provided by HGV, provision of mixed residential uses to support diversity of resident and land uses, or creation of a mixed-use development. It also would not provide any of the amenities offered to the community at large relative to support of multi-modal transportation options, provision of a variety of passive and active recreational opportunities, or provision of a destination gathering place for the Project and surrounding areas. Permanent set aside of important and managed biological resources that would contribute to the block of preserved habitat located in the DDHP and EFRR also would not occur. Specifically, the long-term preservation of resources could not be assured as would occur under the Project, which would include dedication of land in permanent open space. Also, the management of conservation values including large segments of coast live oak woodland and southern mixed chaparral (containing wart-stemmed ceanothus), that would result from the permanent preservation of open space on the site, would not occur under this alternative. Improvements to potential wildlife movement by Project implementation of the bridge over Escondido Creek (allowing wildlife to pass under the bridge rather than crossing the vehicular travel way), as well as improvements to creek water quality resulting from removal of the at-grade crossing and underlying culverts and re-creation of a free-flowing creekbed, also would not be expected to occur. In addition, improvement of Country Club Drive roadbed and pathway and

related improvement of emergency access to areas south of the creek, would not occur, and off-sets to the north and south approaches to the Harmony Grove Road and Country Club Drive intersection would continue, retaining this awkward formation.

S.5.3 General Plan Consistent with Septic Alternative

S.5.3.1 *Description*

The General Plan Consistent with Septic Alternative would be consistent with the existing General Plan land use designation of Semi-Rural and would avoid substantially more RPO steep slopes than the Proposed Project. Almost 90 percent of the home pads are sited wholly out of steep slopes. This alternative would not require a GPA. The purpose of this alternative would be to provide consistency with the existing general plan land use designation and avoid, or reduce, traffic and noise impacts associated with the Proposed Project.

This alternative includes 49 single-family residential homes on 1-acre or greater lots. Larger lot sizes are needed in order to meet the County's septic system requirements with respect to the Project's unique geologic/soils characteristics. The residential lots would have approximately 5,000-s.f. pads that would be sited throughout the property parcels in a dispersed, rather than consolidated, pattern that is based upon the soils characteristics found on the site. This alternative assumes an advanced on-site wastewater treatment septic system, requiring approximately 3,500 s.f. per lot.

The manufactured slope located along Country Club Drive south of the WTWRF would not be built, and grading quantities overall are expected to total approximately 660,000 cubic yards (22 percent less than the Proposed Project grading of 850,000 cy), within approximately 25 acres of surface disturbance (approximately 63 percent less surface ground disturbance than would result from the Proposed Project). This alternative would initially grade approximately 56 acres (50 percent of the site), and develop on approximately 56 acres (or 50 percent of the site).

Approximately 55 acres (also approximately 50 percent of the site) would be placed into open space set-aside containing some steep slopes and biological resources associated with the lots. This open space would not be placed into a preserve managed by an independent land manager, but would be restricted in use on each individual lot. This alternative would not include any commercial, parks, or other recreational uses, including a community gathering locale, given the small number of residential units on site. While there are fewer homes under this alternative, larger lots spread over the entire site would still require an extensive road system and utility lines (e.g., potable water).

S.5.3.2 *Environmental Impact Comparison with Proposed Project*

As shown in Table S-2, the General Plan Consistent with Septic Alternative would result in reduced impacts to transportation/traffic, noise and air quality when compared to the Proposed Project. CEQA impact conclusions would be similar for long-term aesthetics, cultural resources and GHG emissions. Biological resources impacts would be less for habitat impacts and greater for biological function.

Although this alternative would reduce some impacts and be consistent with the General Plan, it would not achieve the underlying purpose of the Project of accommodating a portion of the projected population growth and housing needs in San Diego County by expanding an existing village that will further enhance and support the success of that village. Also, the alternative would not meet the Project objectives to the same degree as the Proposed Project, as described below.

The low density, dispersed pattern of development provided in this alternative not provide an efficient development pattern in close proximity to an existing village consistent with the Community Development Model (CDM). The General Plan Consistent with Septic Alternative has a limited ability to support the economic and social success of the existing village when compared to the Proposed Project because the substantial decrease in number of residents would not provide the same level of support to HGV's commercial uses and the alternative would lack the diversity in land uses needed to promote social interaction. Similarly, the alternative's land use pattern (dispersed large-lot single-family) would not provide a mix of residential units and a broad range of housing choices resulting in a diversity of residents and land uses. With substantially fewer units, this alternative would be less effective in optimizing the operational effectiveness of public facilities and services of the alternative or the existing village.

The low density dispersed land use pattern would not contribute to the establishment of a community that encourages and supports multi-modal transportation including walking or bicycling. Similarly, it would not create a destination gathering place with a variety of land uses, such as the Project's Center House, that encourages walkability, social interaction and economic vitality. The alternative would not provide the full range of passive and active recreational opportunities provided by the Proposed Project. The alternative appears to better physically respond to the site's physical variables through use of less grading, but would encroach into visible areas that would be retained as open space by the Proposed Project as a site feature.

Due to reduced grading and surface disturbance, the General Plan Consistent with Septic Alternative would impact fewer acres of habitat than the Proposed Project. It would include lots further to the south than the Proposed Project, however, would result in additional impacts to wart-stemmed ceanothus and potentially coast live oak woodland, and would bring residential units closer to DDHP. This alternative would result in a greater level of fragmentation to preserved open space than the Proposed Project. This is because the retained habitats would contain dispersed housing and roads to access them, resulting in fingers of preserve being located within and throughout the alternative development scenario. These interspersed preserve areas would be subject to greater levels of edge effects than under the Proposed Project. Similar to the Proposed Project, therefore, the General Plan Consistent with Septic Alternative would preserve and enhance biological habitat and landforms in dedicated open space easements. It would not, however, enhance sensitive biological resource function to the same extent as the Proposed Project.

S.5.4 Senior Care Traffic Reduction Alternative

S.5.4.1 *Description*

The Senior Care Traffic Reduction Alternative is intended to substantially reduce impacts associated with traffic in the context of providing a development pattern that would increase density adjacent to the existing HGV Village through a GPA. This alternative consists of a senior

citizen community made up of 266 single-family age-restricted residences and five two-story structures totaling 120 units of managed care facility. The trip generation rates for-age restricted residential units and a managed care facility are substantially less than non-age-restricted residential units. The Proposed Project is projected to result in 4,530 ADT based on 10 trips per residence. The trip rates for age-restricted and managed care facilities are 4 trips per residence and 2.5 trips per unit, respectively. Using this generation rate, development under the Senior Care Traffic Reduction Alternative would result in 1,364 ADT, or 3,166 (70 percent) fewer trips than the Proposed Project per day.

This alternative would incorporate the unique design requirements for this type of development. All 266 single-family residences would be one story due to the age-related nature of the development. Also, given the demand for security features in such projects, the single-family residential units as well as the managed care units would be clustered into discrete gated neighborhoods. Public pedestrian access between the neighborhoods and provision of a sense of connection between the neighborhoods and HGV would be provided. Each of the neighborhoods, including the numerous **(**17) small parks, would be located in a manner that complies with the County's PLDO requirements and allows accessibility to the public.

No commercial uses or community gathering locale would be provided because the fewer number of single-family dwelling units in this alternative would not be able to support such uses on site. This alternative would include an on-site WTWRF and all roads within the community would be private, similar to the Proposed Project. A landscaping plan would be implemented as part of this alternative. Due to the lower-density design (generally single-story residences that appeal to the age-restricted market) the grading footprint would be greater than the Proposed Project. This alternative would grade approximately 82 acres (74 percent of the site), and develop on approximately 66 acres (60 percent) of the site. This alternative also would have greater grading quantities (1,450,000 cy) than the Proposed Project; approximately 71 percent more than the Proposed Project at 850,000 cy. Area retained in undisturbed open space would be approximately 30 acres, or 27 percent, of the site. Combined with parks and other internal landscaped area (approximately 15 acres) would result in a total of approximately 45 acres (41 percent of the site) in open space. In order to accommodate the alternative's more dispersed development design, two of the gated neighborhoods would be extended into a small portion of the area that is preserved as open space by the Proposed Project and on the portion of the project that contains insignificant RPO steep slopes; this would extend into a large block of open space in the southern part of the site that would be avoided by the Proposed Project. The alternative would also require a waiver under RPO. Similar to the Proposed Project, the Senior Care Traffic Reduction Alternative would require a GPA, rezone and approval of a Specific Plan.

S.5.4.2 *Environmental Impact Comparison with Proposed Project*

Overall, the Senior Care Traffic Reduction Alternative reduces several impacts, but also increases several impacts, in comparison to the Proposed Project. The alternative would result in substantially less transportation/traffic, which would result in related decreases in noise, and reduced air quality emissions, from the Proposed Project. Biological resources impacts would be greater than the Proposed Project. Cultural resources and aesthetic impacts would be similar for this alternative in comparison to the Proposed Project. GHG impacts also would be similar to the Proposed Project in that the alternative's emissions also would be mitigated to net zero.

The Senior Care Traffic Reduction Alternative does not achieve all of the Project objectives to the same degree as the Proposed Project. The alternative would not provide an efficient development pattern in close proximity to an existing village because of its dispersed development pattern. Also, when compared to the Proposed Project, the alternative offers a substantially fewer number of units and a singular product type, which limits the ability to fully support the economic and social success of the existing village and this alternative. Although the alternative would be located near regional employment and transit centers, the lower density and dispersed land use pattern represented in this alternative comprises an auto-dependent development pattern that would not contribute to the establishment of a community that encourages and supports multi-modal transportation through walking and bicycling. Similarly, the alternative's limited product offering would not provide a mix of residential units and a broad range of housing choices; encouraging a greater diversity of residents or providing a wider range of housing opportunities to complement the adjacent village's land uses. Also, with substantially fewer units, the alternative is less effective in optimizing the operational effectiveness of public facilities and services of the existing village. When compared to the full range of passive and active recreational opportunities provided by the Proposed Project, this alternative also is less effective in supporting healthy and active lifestyles. The increased grading footprint for the alternative is inferior to the Proposed Project relative to preservation and enhancement of biological resources, as well as increased fragmentation of that open space when compared to the Proposed Project.

This alternative would not create a destination gathering place with a variety of land uses, such as the Project's Center House, that would encourage walkability, social interaction and economic vitality. Finally, the alternative would require modification of 600,000 cy of soil more than the Proposed Project, have a larger grading footprint, and, ultimately, result in more area developed long-term in lots and streets than the Proposed Project. As a result, the amount of topographic variation and visibility to existing site characteristics would be lessened from that achieved by the Proposed Project due to the greater acreage allotted to lots and streets under the alternative, the obscuring of site soils with structures, and the reduced sight-lines into the site and between structures afforded by the Proposed Project.

S.5.5 Biologically Superior Alternative

S.5.5.1 *Description*

The Biologically Superior Alternative utilizes the densities of the Village designation relative to Diegan coastal sage scrub and Diegan coastal sage scrub-dependent species while addressing the issues that were raised by the wildlife agencies during Project batching meetings and an on-site meeting held in 2015. The alternative does not extend the development footprint as far to the east as the Proposed Project, and would preserve a larger portion of Diegan coastal sage scrub than would be preserved by the Proposed Project.

In order to accommodate the densities of the Village designation within a restricted development footprint, the Biologically Superior Alternative would locate a total of 425 multi-family residences within 54 three-story structures. The westernmost of the buildings would be sited closer to Country Club Drive than the Proposed Project. Particularly along the northern portion of the Project, there would be a correspondingly lesser breadth of landscaping between the public street and alternative structures. All of the 54 buildings would be similar in height to the tallest buildings in the Proposed

Project. An HOA building (including a pool and small structure) would be located in the center of the development footprint and would only be available to the residents of the alternative. Landscaping would be provided throughout the alternative site. Public parks would be located within this alternative, and would be consistent with the County PLDO and Subdivision Ordinance, but no public destination gathering space would be provided because of the lack of space afforded this development footprint. All internal roads would be private, the same as the Proposed Project. Assumptions for the WTWRF and off-site utilities also would be the same as for the Proposed Project. Approximately 46.5 acres of BOS (approximately 42 percent of the site) would be permanently preserved under this alternative.

This alternative would reduce steep slope impacts from those of the Proposed Project due to the footprint eliminating some northeastern portions of the Project, and generally being north of most on-site RPO steep slope areas. Despite this, a waiver for encroachment into insignificant RPO steep slopes as well as an exception for roadways would be required, similar to the Proposed Project. This alternative would grade approximately 65 acres (59 percent of the site), and develop approximately 50 acres (45 percent) of the site. Under this alternative, specific development locales would be additionally graded to provide the most efficient use of the limited development footprint on the site. As a result, topographic variation would remain, but not to the same extent as under the Proposed Project. Although this alternative could additionally modify more steep slopes within the development footprint than the Project, the encroachment per lot could be restricted to 10 percent. Similar to the Proposed Project, this alternative would require a GPA, rezone and approval of a Specific Plan.

S.5.5.2 *Environmental Impact Comparison with Proposed Project*

The Biologically Superior Alternative would result in fewer impacts to biological resources, noise, and air quality than the Proposed Project. Impacts to cultural resources would remain the same (unlikely but mitigable if occurring), and GHG emissions impacts also would be similar (mitigated to net zero). Aesthetic impacts would be greater for this alternative in comparison to the Proposed Project.

The Biologically Superior Alternative would not achieve all of the Project objectives to the same degree as the Proposed Project. The number of units and clustering provided in this alternative would provide an efficient development pattern by utilizing a compact form of development that avoids the most sensitive biological resources on the site and is located adjacent to an existing village. However, the alternative would not comply with the CDM because of the consistent massing created by its three-story structures and the lack of notable swaths of landscaped areas, providing no transition into the less dense existing development to the west and east. The alternative also would provide only a singular product type (stacked multi-family flats), with no commercial uses incorporated into the HOA building. Therefore, this alternative would not encourage development of a complete and vibrant community that would enhance and support the economic and social success of HGV village and the Project by providing a diversity of residents and land uses to the same extent as the Proposed Project.

The higher density clustered development pattern of the Biologically Superior Alternative is one attribute of a community that encourages and supports multi-modal transportation. It would be inferior to the Proposed Project, however, due to the lack of alternative trails or inclusion of a

commercial component into the HOA building that would provide additional incentives for biking and walking within the community. This alternative would not provide a mix of residential uses that would which encourages a broad range of housing choices to support a diversity of residents and land uses.

This alternative may contribute to optimizing the operational effectiveness of public facilities and services of the existing village through increasing the number of residents, but would not increase the diversity of its residents, because it would provide only one type of housing product. Nor would it be compatible with existing development to the east and west of the site. The massing created by the alternative's three-story structures would not provide the same transition into existing uses as the Proposed Project. Long-term visual impacts also would result due to the structural massing of buildings located immediately adjacent to Country Club Drive that would be visible from the immediate vicinity of the property.

When compared to the full range of passive and active recreational opportunities provided by the Proposed Project (reduced recreation facilities to accommodate the smaller construction footprint), this alternative would be less effective at supporting healthy and active lifestyles. This alternative would not create a destination gathering place with a variety of land uses, such as the Project's Center House, that would encourage walkability, social interaction and economic vitality. Although the alternative would have a smaller footprint than the Proposed Project, the alternative would have less topographic variation and visibility of existing site characteristics than the Proposed Project. This is the result of greater acreage allotted to development under the alternative, the need for focused additional grading to attain the most efficient development pattern within the reduced site envelope, and the reduced sight-lines into the site and between structures.

The Biologically Superior Alternative would preserve and enhance biological resources to a greater extent than the Proposed Project.

S.5.6 Off-site and Combined On-/Off-site Sewer Options Alternative

S.5.6.1 *Description*

The Off-site and Combined On-/Off-site Sewer Options Alternative provides two sewer scenarios for the Project. It includes an optional design scenario for the provision of sewer service, in lieu of the proposed on-site WTWRF and related facilities, as well as an optional design scenario to provide a combined on-/off-site wastewater treatment program. The full Project WTWRF (approximately 0.4 acre in size) would not be constructed under these scenarios. All other aspects of the Off-site Sewer Options Alternative are the same as the Proposed Project, and the wastewater treatment options would be incorporated within the overall build program. These potential off-site sewer options are summarized below.

<u>Connection to the HGV WRF</u>

Under this option, if use rates at the HGV WRF demonstrate that it could accommodate the flows from both the Proposed Project and HGV as it is currently built, the existing HGV WRF would be used to serve the Proposed Project. The sizing of the existing HGV facility, or its site, would not be increased to accommodate the Proposed Project. This option would only be utilized if it could accommodate both projects under its current design. In order to utilize the same wastewater

treatment facility, HGV South would either annex into HGV's existing community financing district or establish another financing mechanism that would provide additional funding to support the services required for HGV and this project. Project sewage would be transferred to the HGV pump station located west of Country Club Drive on the south side of Harmony Grove Road. The HGV pump station facility sizing and emergency generator also would accommodate the Project. No changes are proposed to the emergency generator at the pump station. From the existing HGV pump station, an existing redundant system (two force mains, only one of which would be active at any one time) extending from the pump station within Harmony Grove Road to Country Club Drive and then northerly along Country Club Drive to enter the Harmony Grove WRF on the east side of Country Club Drive would be utilized. A maximum of 8,127,000 gallons of wet weather storage required for the Project would be provided through use of the on-site storage proposed for the Project. Alternatively, other scenarios could be explored in the future, as appropriate, such as by expanding the existing wet weather storage on HGV, or it could be on another site (e.g., Rincon MWD 3-million gallon tank just north of the Village Road, east of Country Club Drive).

Combined On-/Off-site Wastewater Treatment

Each of the specifics described above regarding the HGV WRF existing facilities and capacities applies to this option as well. This design scenario would integrate HGV South facilities into the existing HGV WRF, but not assume full transfer of all operations to the existing facility. It would increase the efficiencies of both facilities by avoiding redundancies that would result in constructing identical facilities that would not be needed to serve the additional sewage generated by the Project, such as an operations or administration building. Thus, the Project would construct only those facilities that would complement the existing system in place at HGV and that may be needed to serve the additional sewage generated by the Project.

This approach would be able to utilize existing solids processing facilities on the HGV site, reducing the volume of solids to be delivered by truck elsewhere. Under this option, the existing laboratory at the Harmony Grove WRF would also be utilized by the on-site facility (similar to the Proposed Project). A pump station would be included within the on-site facilities, and off-site utilities would include the gravity feed lines to the existing pump station on Harmony Grove Road, as well as a sewage solids line and potential fiber optics line extending from the Project north along Country Club Drive into the HGV WRF.

S.5.6.2 *Environmental Impact Comparison with Proposed Project*

The Off-site and Combined On-/Off-site Sewer Options Alternative was included to disclose the impacts that would occur if either of these two sewer options were to be approved instead of constructing a stand-alone plant within the Project. The analysis of these two options includes all of the issue areas that are needed to allow the decision maker to adopt either of the options in lieu of the stand-alone plant without the need for additional analysis under CEQA.

Potential impacts of the sewage treatment options would be largely short-term (construction-related) in nature and otherwise subsidiary to the larger impacts of the development alternatives. The off-site sewer option, which would replace the on-site WTWRF, as well as the combined on-/off-site option, would be expected to result in generally similar impacts to those described for the Proposed Project when combined with the residentially related portions of the Project.

Specifically, this would include potentially significant and unmitigable impacts related to aesthetics, transportation/traffic and air quality, as well as significant (or potentially significant) but mitigated impacts for the issues of aesthetics, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, GHGs, and transportation/traffic. No additional cumulative GHG impacts would occur.

Potential operational impacts identified for noise associated with operation of the WTWRF, and to non-native grassland impacts, would be eliminated for the off-site option included under this alternative, but would remain for the combined on-/off-site option. Unlikely, but potential cultural resources impacts would remain for both options. A number of these impacts may vary slightly from those identified for the Proposed Project; however, these variations would be relatively minor and would not alter overall Project impact levels or associated need for mitigation or implementation of specified Project Design Features. Both of the sewer options identified under this alternative would meet the identified Project objectives when combined with the Proposed Project and would differ from the Proposed Project to the same level as each of the three development alternatives addressing sewer, if combined with those development alternatives.

S.5.7 Environmentally Superior Alternative

Although the No Project alternative would result in reduced environmental impacts, Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires identification of an alternative other than the No Project as the environmentally superior alternative. Table S-2, *HGV South Full-Build Alternatives Comparison of Impacts*), summarizes each of the full-build alternatives (i.e., those alternatives that would result in substantially different development patterns and uses as a whole for the Project property).[1]

Based on the above CEQA requirement, the General Plan Consistent with Sewer Alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative. When compared to the Proposed Project this alternative would have similar or reduced impacts to aesthetics, biological resources, transportation/traffic, cultural resources and tribal cultural resources, noise, air quality and GHGs. It would also reduce the Proposed Project's significant and unavoidable impact to traffic and air quality.

This is the result of the lessened encroachment into sensitive biological habitat both on the southern extent of the Project, minimization of steep slopes impacts associated with eastern and southern extents of the Project, conformance with the 2016 RAQS, and fewer projected daily vehicular trips associated with the alternative, resulting in no significant and unmitigated traffic impacts in the City of Escondido and fewer significant and mitigable impacts in the County.

[1] Because the potential sewer treatment design scenarios are limited in geographic scope, and only would be implemented as part of one of the full-build alternatives, they are not included in Table S-2. They do, however, receive relevant discussion in Chapter 4.0, *Alternatives*, of this EIR.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table S-1 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	**Impact**	**Mitigation**	**Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness**
SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS			
Project-level Impacts			
Subchapter 2.1, Aesthetics			
2.1.2.1 ***Potential Conflict with Important Visual Elements or Inconsistency with Applicable Design Guidelines***			
AE-2	Visual effects during and following the Project construction period related to vegetation removal, grading, bridge construction and vertical development would be substantial until buildout occurs and all vegetation is installed and reaches visual maturity in approximately 10 years.	**None:** No mitigation is available to reduce the short-term visual impacts during and immediately following construction. While temporary in nature and ultimately addressed through Project design and landscaping over the long-term, short-term adverse visual impacts to the Project site's visual character associated with Project construction would be significant and unmitigable.	**Significant and Unmitigable (temporary)**
Subchapter 2.2, Transportation/Traffic			
2.2.2.3 ***Roadway Segments***			
TR-1a	The Proposed Project would have a direct impact at the roadway segment of Country Club Drive from Auto Park Way to Hill Valley Drive in the City of Escondido (LOS D).	**M-TR-1a:** Prior to occupancy of 80 Project units, Country Club Drive shall be widened to provide a paved width of 36 feet consisting of two travel lanes and a 10-foot striped center turn lane starting 220 feet southwest of Auto Park Way for a length of approximately 830 feet. Improvements will include connecting the existing sidewalk along the northern side of this roadway section with a 5-foot sidewalk complete with a 6-inch curb and gutter and providing a 4-foot decomposed granite pathway along the south side of this segment with a 6-inch asphalt berm. With the additional 12 feet added to the paved width, the roadway capacity of this Local Collector would increase to 15,000 ADT.	**Significant and Unmitigated***

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	**Impact**	**Mitigation**	**Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness**
SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.6, Air Quality			
2.6.2.1 ***Conformance to the RAQS***			
AQ-1a	The Proposed Project is proposing an increase in housing units beyond what was included for the site in the RAQS.	**M-AQ-1:** The County shall provide a revised housing forecast to SANDAG to ensure that any revisions to the population and employment projections used by the SDAPCD in updating the RAQS and SIP will accurately reflect anticipated growth due to the Proposed Project.	**Significant and Unmitigated***
Cumulative-level Impacts			
Subchapter 2.2, Transportation/Traffic			
2.2.3.1 ***Existing Plus Cumulative Plus Project Impacts***			
TR-1b	The Proposed Project would have a cumulative impact at the roadway segment of Country Club Drive from Auto Park Way to Hill Valley Drive in the City of Escondido (LOS F).	Mitigation for cumulative impacts to the noted segment of Country Club Drive shall be provided through implementation of roadway improvement as described in M-TR-1a.	**Significant and Unmitigated***
TR-8	The Proposed Project would have a cumulative impact at the intersection of Auto Park Way and Country Club Drive in the City of Escondido (LOS D during the a.m. peak hour).	**M-TR-8:** Prior to occupancy of 293 Project units, the Project shall restripe the eastbound approach of the Auto Park Way/Country Club Drive intersection to provide one left-turn lane, one shared left-turn/through lane, and one right-turn lane with a signal timing modification to change the east/west approach to "split" phasing.	**Significant and Unmitigated***
TR-9	The Proposed Project would have a cumulative impact at the intersection of Valley Parkway and Citracado Parkway in the City of Escondido (LOS D during the a.m. peak hour).	**M-TR-9:** Prior to occupancy of 54 Project units. the Project shall pay a fair share toward the approved Citracado Parkway Extension Project, which would improve the intersection operations with an additional through lane in the southbound direction	**Significant and Unmitigated***

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	**Impact**	**Mitigation**	**Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness**
SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS (cont.)			
Cumulative-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.6, Air Quality			
2.6.3.2 ***Operation***			
AQ-1b	Operation of the Proposed Project would not conform to the RAQS.	Mitigation for cumulative impacts to the RAQS shall be provided through implementation of M-AQ-1.	**Significant and Unmitigated***
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT			
Project-level Impacts			
Subchapter 2.1, Aesthetics			
2.1.2.1 ***Potential Conflict with Important Visual Elements or Inconsistency with Applicable Design Guidelines***			
AE-1	Landform modification associated with blasting/rock breaking is expected to result in newly exposed rocks and horizontal drainage features across cut slopes that would contrast with the adjoining natural hillsides and would be visible from existing and planned trails on and off site.	**M-AE-1:** Exposed newly cut rocks and horizontal drainage features shall be stained in earth tones (through spraying or dripping onto fresh rock face) to soften their contrast on Project cut slopes. Staining of rock shall occur during slope landscape installation and shall be in colors that match the surrounding rock. Application of stain shall be overseen by a qualified expert. Before staining, several test sections will be completed on the rock cut to determine the type of stain that will create the best match with the surrounding rock (i.e., pigmented stains, or creation of new color by leaching minerals from the rock or through photo-reactivity). The slope shall be dry and all loose material and vegetation shall be removed before stain is applied. If necessary, the slope face will be pressure-washed to remove fine-grained particles that could inhibit the stain penetration. Horizontal hillside drainage features will contain color-integrated cement as part of the installation.	**Less than Significant**

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.2, Transportation/Traffic			
2.2.2.3 ***Roadway Segments***			
TR-2a	The Proposed Project would result in a direct impact to one County signalized intersection, Country Club Drive/Harmony Grove Road (LOS F during the p.m. peak hour).	**M-TR-2a**: Prior to occupancy of 23 Project units, the Project shall widen the northbound approach of Country Club Drive to Harmony Grove Road to provide one left-turn, one through lane, and one dedicated right-turn lane with an overlap phase in order to mitigate this direct impact to the Harmony Grove Road Country Club intersection.	**Less than Significant**
Subchapter 2.3, Biological Resources			
2.3.2.1 ***Special Status Species***			
BI-1a	The Project will result in impacts to 10.4 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub, a sensitive natural community type.	**M-BI-1a**: Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the Project Applicant shall preserve 34.8 acres of on-site BOS determined to support sensitive species and habitat functions and values contiguous with the Del Dios Highlands Preserve to the south through the establishment of a conservation easement and the preparation of an RMP approved by the County and Wildlife Agencies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Wildlife) to address long-term monitoring, maintenance, management, and reporting directives, in perpetuity, by a qualified entity approved by the County and Wildlife Agencies. The 34.8-acre BOS is depicted on Figure 1-9 and Figure 2.3-5. The habitat types within the BOS are summarized within Table 11 of Appendix E. The RMP shall address the location of the mitigation sites that meet the specific mitigation requirement for	**Less than Significant**

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	**Impact**	**Mitigation**	**Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness**
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.3, Biological Resources (cont.)			
2.3.2.1 ***Special Status Species (cont.)***			
BI-1a (cont.)		the type of habitat (e.g., in-kind habitat preservation, no net loss, presence of special status species, etc.) within the Project site. The open space easement shall be owned by a conservancy, the County, or other similar, experienced entity subject to approval by the County. Funding shall be provided through a non-wasting endowment, Community Facility District or other finance mechanism approved by the County. Should a regional entity to manage biological open space be formed, the natural habitat areas within the Project site could be dedicated to that entity and managed as part of an overall preserve system for northern San Diego County.	
BI-1b	A single, breeding pair of coastal California gnatcatchers was determined to occupy portions of the on-site Diegan coastal sage scrub that would be impacted by the Project. Impacts to gnatcatcher individuals; occupied habitat; and foraging, migration and dispersal habitat would result in a potentially significant impact to listed species.	**M-BI-1b:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, mitigation for 10.4 acres of impacts to Diegan coastal sage scrub occupied by coastal California gnatcatcher shall occur at a 2:1 ratio for a total of 20.8 acres of occupied habitat through a combination of on-site preservation of 0.5 acre, on-site restoration and preservation of 1.8 acres, and off-site preservation of 18.5 acres through land acquisition and/or purchase of conservation bank credits, as specified below and approved by the County and Wildlife Agencies as part of the required HLP process. An additional 18.5 acres of occupied, Intermediate Value or High Value coastal sage scrub, and/or other like-functioning habitat as approved by the County and Wildlife Agencies, shall be provided through one or a combination of the following:	**Less than Significant**

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	**Impact**	**Mitigation**	**Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness**
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.3, Biological Resources (cont.)			
2.3.2.1 ***Special Status Species (cont.)***			
BI-1b (cont.)		• Off-site preservation of mitigation land, through the recordation of a BOS easement, and preparation of an RMP to address long-term monitoring, maintenance, management, and reporting directives, in perpetuity, approved by the County and Wildlife Agencies. To the extent the land is available for preservation, off-site mitigation shall occur within land designated as PAMA in the Draft MSCP North County Plan and located in the Elfin Forest-Harmony Grove Planning Area, northern coastal foothills ecoregion. The location shall be deemed acceptable by the County and Wildlife Agencies. Long-term management shall be funded through a non-wasting endowment in an amount determined through preparation of a PAR or similar method for determining funding amount. The open space easement shall be owned by a conservancy, the County or other similar, experienced entity subject to approval by the County. Should a regional entity to manage biological open space be formed, the natural habitat areas within the Project site could be dedicated to that entity and managed as part of an overall preserve system for northern San Diego County. If demonstrated to the satisfaction of the County and Wildlife Agencies that off-site preservation of mitigation land is not feasible to fulfill all or a portion of mitigation obligations, then the Project shall include purchase of occupied coastal	

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.3, Biological Resources (cont.)			
2.3.2.1 ***Special Status Species (cont.)***			
BI-1b (cont.)		sage scrub credits at an approved conservation bank, such as the Red Mountain Conservation Bank, Buena Creek Conservation Bank, or other bank deemed acceptable by the County and Wildlife Agencies. To further prevent inadvertent direct impacts to coastal California gnatcatcher individuals during construction, no grading or clearing shall occur of occupied Diegan coastal sage scrub during the species' breeding season (February 15 to August 31). All grading permits, improvement plans, and the final map shall state the same. If clearing or grading would occur during the breeding season for the gnatcatcher, a pre-construction survey shall be conducted to determine whether gnatcatchers occur within the impact area(s). To avoid take under the federal ESA, impacts to occupied habitat shall within riparian habitat during the breeding season of the least Bell's vireo (March 15 to September 15). All grading permits, improvement plans, and the final map shall state the same. If clearing or grading would occur during the breeding season for the least Bell's vireo, a pre-construction survey shall be conducted to determine whether vireos occur within the impact area(s). To avoid take under the federal and California ESAs, impacts to be avoided. If there are no gnatcatchers nesting (includes nest	

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.3, Biological Resources (cont.)			
2.3.2.1 ***Special Status Species (cont.)***			
BI-1b (cont.)		building or other breeding/nesting behavior) within that area, grading and clearing shall be allowed to proceed. If, however, any gnatcatchers are observed nesting or displaying breeding/nesting behavior within the area, construction in that area shall be postponed until all nesting (or breeding/nesting behavior) has ceased or until after August 31. (See also M-BI-4 for mitigation for indirect noise effects.)	
BI-1c	Least Bell's vireo has been observed using Project-adjacent riparian habitat for foraging and other non-breeding activities. Because there is a potential for use of the area by a breeding pair and for foraging, the Project could result in a potentially significant impact to listed species.	**M-BI-1c:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, mitigation for impacts to less than 0.01 acre of mule fat scrub and 0.71 acre of southern riparian forest suitable for least Bell's vireo shall occur at a 3:1 ratio through one or a combination of the following: on- and/or off-site establishment, re-establishment, rehabilitation, enhancement and preservation of riparian habitat and/or other like-functioning habitat; and/or off-site purchase of riparian habitat mitigation and/or other like-functioning habitat at an approved mitigation bank in the local area, such as the Brook Forest Mitigation Bank, San Luis Rey Mitigation Bank, or other location deemed acceptable by the County and Regulatory Agencies (USACE, RWQCB, and CDFW), as applicable. The establishment/creation component must be at least 1:1 while the remaining 2:1 can be restoration and enhancement.	**Less than Significant**

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.3, Biological Resources (cont.)			
2.3.2.1 ***Special Status Species (cont.)***			
BI-1c (cont.)		To further prevent inadvertent direct impacts to least Bell's vireo individuals during construction, no grading or clearing shall occur occupied habitat shall be avoided. If there are no vireos nesting (includes nest building or other breeding/nesting behavior) within that area, grading and clearing shall be allowed to proceed. If, however, any vireos are observed nesting or displaying breeding/nesting behavior within that area, construction shall be postponed until all nesting (or breeding/nesting behavior) has ceased or until after September 15. (See also M-BI-4 for mitigation for indirect noise effects.)	
BI-2a	The Project would impact 7 individuals of summer holly, a County List A plant, and 1,963 wart-stemmed ceanothus, a County List B plant.	**M-BI-2a**: Prior to issuance of a grading permit, mitigation for impacts to seven summer holly and 1,963 wart-stemmed ceanothus individuals shall occur at a minimum ratio of 3:1 for summer holly and 1:1 for wart-stemmed ceanothus through the preservation of at least 21 summer holly and 1,963 wart-stemmed ceanothus within the BOS easement, (which includes preparation of an RMP and monitoring, maintenance, management, and reporting directives) described above in M-BI-1a.	

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.3, Biological Resources (cont.)			
2.3.2.1 *Special Status Species (cont.)*			
BI-2b	A single red-shouldered hawk was observed perching in a tree near Escondido Creek. This species could nest at off-site locations within 500 feet of Project impact areas and may forage over the site. The Project would impact non-native grassland that serves as raptor foraging habitat. A potentially significant impact was assessed to loss of this habitat, which could impact the survival of a local population of Species of Special Concern.	**M-BI-2b**: Prior to issuance of a grading permit, mitigation for impacts to 44.2 acres of non-native grassland that provides suitable nesting and foraging habitat for several bird species, including raptors, shall occur at a 0.5:1 ratio through the preservation of 0.2 acre on site within the BOS easement, (which includes preparation of an RMP and monitoring, maintenance, management, and reporting directives) as required by M-BI-1a, in addition to one or a combination of the following: off-site preservation of 21.9 acres of grassland habitat and/or other like-functioning habitat through the recordation of a BOS easement, and the preparation of an RMP to address long-term monitoring, maintenance, management, and reporting directives, in perpetuity, approved by the County and Wildlife Agencies. To the extent the land is available for preservation, off-site mitigation shall occur within land designated as PAMA in the Draft MSCP North County Plan and located in the Elfin Forest-Harmony Grove Planning Area, or northern coastal foothills ecoregion. The location shall be deemed acceptable by the County and Wildlife Agencies. The proposed open space easement shall be owned by a conservancy, the County or other similar, experienced entity subject to approval by the County. Should a regional entity to manage BOS be formed, the natural habitat areas within the Project site could be dedicated to that entity and managed as part of an overall preserve system for northern San Diego County. If demonstrated to the	**Less than Significant**

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.3, Biological Resources (cont.)			
2.3.2.1 ***Special Status Species (cont.)***			
BI-2b (cont.)		satisfaction of the County and Wildlife Agencies that off-site preservation of mitigation land is not feasible to fulfill all or a portion of mitigation obligations, then the Project shall include purchase of 21.9 acres of grassland credits or like-functioning habitat at an approved conservation bank such as the Brook Forest Conservation Bank or other location deemed acceptable by the County. (See also M-BI-9 addressing breeding season avoidance.)	
BI-2c	The Project would result in the significant loss of potential nesting and foraging habitat for yellow-breasted chat, which is designated as State Species of Special Concern and County Group 1 species. A potentially significant impact was assessed to loss of mule fat scrub and willow riparian forest, impacting the survival of a local population of Species of Special Concern.	**M-BI-2c:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, mitigation for impacts to yellow-breasted chat nesting and foraging habitat, including less than 0.01 acre of mule fat scrub and 0.71 acre of southern riparian forest, shall be provided at a 3:1 ratio through implementation of mitigation M-BI-1c. (See also M-BI-9 addressing breeding season avoidance.)	**Less than Significant**
BI-3a	The Project would result in loss of 44.2 acres of non-native grassland that serves as potential foraging habitat for the barn owl and white-tailed kite. This loss of habitat could significantly affect long-term survival of County Group 2 Animal Species.	**M-BI-3a:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, mitigation for loss of foraging area that could impact long-term survival of County Group 2 animals shall be provided through implementation of mitigation for impacts to 44.2 acres of non-native grassland at a 0.5:1 ratio, as described in M-BI-2b.	**Less than Significant**

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.3, Biological Resources (cont.)			
2.3.2.1 ***Special Status Species (cont.)***			
BI-3b	The Project would result in the significant loss of potential nesting and foraging habitat for yellow warbler, which is designated as State Species of Special Concern and County Group 2 species. A potentially significant impact was assessed to loss of mule fat scrub and willow riparian forest, impacting the survival of a local population of Species of Special Concern.	**M-BI-3b:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, mitigation for impacts to yellow warbler nesting and foraging habitat, including less than 0.01 acre of mule fat scrub and 0.71 acre of southern riparian forest at a 3:1 ratio, shall be provided through implementation of mitigation M-BI-1c. (See also M-BI-9 addressing breeding season avoidance.)	**Less than Significant**
BI-3c	The Project would result in a significant loss of 44.2 acres of non-native grassland that serves as foraging habitat for common species such as red-tailed hawk.	**M-BI-3c:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, mitigation for loss of raptor foraging habitat shall be provided through implementation of mitigation for impacts to 44.2 acres of non-native grassland at a 0.5:1 ratio, as described in M-BI-2b.	**Less than Significant**
BI-4	Construction-related noise (including the use of heavy equipment, potential blasting, potential use of a rock crusher, and potential use of cast-in-drilled holes or a pile driver) may significantly impact sensitive bird species such as coastal California gnatcatcher and least Bell's vireo, as well as raptors, which may be nesting within an area where construction noise at the nest exceeds 60 dBA.	**M-BI-4:** If operation of construction dozers, excavators, rock crushers, pile drivers or cast-in-drilled-hole equipment occurs during the breeding seasons for the coastal California gnatcatcher (February 15 to August 31), nesting raptors (January 15 to July 15), or least Bell's vireo (March 15 to September 15), pre-construction survey(s) shall be conducted by a qualified biologist as appropriate prior to issuance of a grading permit, to determine whether these species occur within the areas potentially impacted by noise. If it is determined at the completion of pre-construction surveys that active nests belonging to these sensitive species are absent from the potential impact area, construction shall be allowed to proceed. If pre-construction surveys determine the	**Less than Significant**

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	**Impact**	**Mitigation**	**Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness**
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.3, Biological Resources (cont.)			
2.3.2.1 ***Special Status Species (cont.)***			
BI-4 (cont.)		presence of active nests belonging to these sensitive species, then operation of the following equipment shall not occur within the specified distances from an active nest during the respective breeding seasons: a dozer within 400 feet; an excavator within 350 feet; rock crusher equipment within 1,350 feet; a breaker within 500 feet; a pile driver within 2,600 feet; and cast-in-drilled holes equipment within 350 feet. All grading permits, improvement plans, and the final map shall state the same. Operation of construction dozers, excavators, rock crushers, pile drivers, cast-in-drilled-hole equipment and other noise-generating activities shall: (1) be postponed until a qualified biologist determines the nest(s) is no longer active or until after the respective breeding season; or (2) not occur until a temporary noise barrier or berm is constructed at the edge of the development footprint and/or around the piece of equipment to ensure that noise levels are reduced to below 60 dBA or ambient. Decibel output will be confirmed by a County-approved noise specialist and intermittent monitoring by a qualified biologist to ensure that conditions have not changed will be required. If pre-construction surveys identify coastal California gnatcatcher, nesting raptors, or least Bell's vireo, blasting will be restricted to the non-breeding season for the identified birds (September 1 to February 14 for coastal California gnatcatcher; July 16 to January 14 for nesting raptors; and September 16 to March 14 for least Bell's vireo) or be completed using wholly chemical means.	

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.3, Biological Resources (cont.)			
2.3.2.2 ***Riparian Habitat and Sensitive Natural Communities***			
BI-5a	The Project would result in significant direct impacts to less than 0.01 acre of mule fat scrub and 0.71 acre of southern willow riparian forest.	**M-BI-5a:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, mitigation for impacts to less than 0.01 acre of mule fat scrub and 0.71 acre of southern riparian forest shall occur at a 3:1 ratio with at least 1:1 creation as specified in M-BI-1c, above.	**Less than Significant**
BI-5b	The Project would result in significant direct impacts to 10.4 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub (including disturbed).	**M-BI-5b:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, mitigation for 10.4 acres of impacts to occupied Diegan coastal sage scrub shall occur at a 2:1 ratio as specified in M-BI-1a and M-BI-1b, above.	**Less than Significant**
BI-5c	The Project would result in significant direct impacts to 4.5 acres of coastal sage-chaparral transition.	**M-BI-5c:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, mitigation for 4.5 acres of impacts to coastal sage-chaparral transition shall occur at a 2:1 ratio through one or a combination of the following: off-site preservation of 9.0 acres of coastal sage-chaparral scrub and/or other like-functioning habitat, through the recordation of a BOS easement, and the preparation of an RMP to address long-term monitoring, maintenance, management, and reporting directives, in perpetuity, approved by the County and Wildlife Agencies. To the extent the land is available for preservation, off-site mitigation shall occur within land designated as PAMA in the Draft MSCP North County Plan and located in the Elfin Forest-Harmony Grove Planning Area, or northern coastal foothills ecoregion. The location shall be deemed acceptable by the County and Wildlife Agencies. The open space easement shall be owned by a conservancy, the County or other similar, experienced entity subject to approval by the County. Should a regional entity to manage biological open space be formed, the natural habitat areas within the Project site could be dedicated to that entity and	**Less than Significant**

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.3, Biological Resources (cont.)			
2.3.2.2 ***Riparian Habitat and Sensitive Natural Communities (cont.)***			
BI-5c (cont.)		managed as part of an overall preserve system for northern San Diego County. If demonstrated to the satisfaction of the County and Wildlife Agencies that off-site preservation of mitigation land is not feasible to fulfill all or a portion of mitigation obligations, then the Project shall include purchase of 9.0 acres of coastal sage-chaparral scrub credits or like-functioning habitat at an approved mitigation bank such as the Red Mountain Conservation Bank, Buena Creek Conservation Bank, Brook Forest Conservation Bank, or other location deemed acceptable by the County and Wildlife Agencies.	
BI-5d	The Project would result in significant direct impacts to 15.6 acres of southern mixed chaparral.	**M-BI-5d:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, mitigation for 15.6 acres of impacts to southern mixed chaparral shall occur at a 0.5:1 ratio through the preservation of a minimum 7.8 acres on site within BOS easement (which shall include preparation and implementation of an RMP and monitoring, maintenance, management, and reporting directives), as required by M-BI-1a.	**Less than Significant**
BI-5e	The Project would result in significant direct impacts to 44.2 acres of non-native grassland.	**M-BI-5e:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, mitigation for 44.2 acres of impacts to non-native grassland shall occur through implementation of M-BI-2b, above.	**Less than Significant**

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.3, Biological Resources (cont.)			
2.3.2.2 ***Riparian Habitat and Sensitive Natural Communities (cont.)***			
BI-5f	The Project would result in significant direct impacts to 0.2 acre of upland coast live oak woodland.	**M-BI-5f:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, mitigation for 0.2 acre of impacts to upland coast live oak woodland shall occur at a 3:1 ratio through the preservation of 0.6 acre on site within BOS easement (which shall include preparation and implementation of an RMP and monitoring, maintenance, management, and reporting directives) as required by M-BI-1a.	**Less than Significant**
BI-6a	The Project would result in significant direct impacts to 0.31 acre of wetland waters of the U.S. (southern riparian forest) and 0.01 acre of non-wetland waters of the U.S. regulated by the USACE.	**M-BI-6a:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, demonstration that regulatory permits from the USACE and RWQCB have been issued or that no such permits are required shall be provided to the County. Impacts to 0.31 acre of USACE/RWQCB-jurisdictional wetland waters of the U.S./State shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio as described in M-BI-1c, above, unless otherwise required by the USACE and RWQCB. Impacts to 0.03 acre of USACE/ RWQCB-jurisdictional non-wetland waters of the U.S./State shall be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio through the preservation of a minimum 0.03 acre on site within BOS easement (which shall include preparation implementation of an RMP and monitoring, maintenance, management, and reporting directives) as described in M-BI-1a, unless otherwise required by the USACE and RWQCB. If required by the USACE and/or RWQCB during regulatory permitting for the Project, alternative mitigation shall be provided through purchase of mitigation credits at the Brook Forest Mitigation Bank, San Luis Rey Mitigation Bank, or other location deemed acceptable by the USACE and RWQCB.	**Less than Significant**

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.3, Biological Resources (cont.)			
2.3.2.2 ***Riparian Habitat and Sensitive Natural Communities (cont.)***			
BI-6b	The Project would result in significant direct impacts to 0.78 acre of CDFW-jurisdictional vegetated-streambed, comprised of 0.71 acre of southern riparian forest, less than 0.01 acre of mule fat scrub, and 0.05 acre of coast live oak woodland. The Project would also impact 0.02 acre of CDFW-jurisdictional, unvegetated streambed.	**M-BI-6b:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, demonstration that regulatory permits from CDFW have been issued or that no such permits are required shall be provided to the County. Impacts to 0.80 acre of CDFW-jurisdictional areas will be mitigated as follows. Impacts to less than 0.01 acre mule fat scrub and 0.71 acre southern riparian forest shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio, as described in M-BI-1c, unless otherwise required by CDFW. Impacts to 0.05 acre of CDFW-jurisdictional coast live oak woodland and 0.04 acre of CDFW-jurisdictional streambed shall be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio through the preservation of a minimum 0.05 acre of CDFW-jurisdictional coast live oak woodland and 0.04 acre of CDFW-jurisdictional streambed on site within BOS easement (which shall include preparation of an RMP and monitoring, maintenance, management, and reporting directives) as described in M-BI-1a, unless otherwise required by CDFW. If required by CDFW during regulatory permitting for the Project, alternative mitigation shall be provided through purchase of mitigation credits at the Brook Forest Mitigation Bank, San Luis Rey Mitigation Bank, or other location deemed acceptable by CDFW.	**Less than Significant**

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.3, Biological Resources (cont.)			
2.3.2.2 ***Riparian Habitat and Sensitive Natural Communities (cont.)***			
BI-6c	The Project would result in significant direct impacts to 0.72 acre of County RPO wetlands comprised of 0.71 acre of southern riparian forest, less than 0.01 acre of mule fat scrub, and 0.01 acre of coast live oak woodland associated with Escondido Creek.	**M-BI-6c:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, impacts to 0.72 acre of RPO wetland (less than 0.01 acre mule fat scrub, 0.71 acre southern riparian forest, and 0.01 acre RPO-jurisdictional coast live oak woodland) shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with at least 1:1 creation. Impacts to mule fat scrub and southern riparian forest shall be mitigated as described in M-BI-1c, above. Impacts to 0.01 acre RPO coast live oak woodland shall be provided through purchase of establishment or re-establishment mitigation credits at the Brook Forest Mitigation Bank, San Luis Rey Mitigation Bank, or other location deemed acceptable by the County.	**Less than Significant**
BI-7	The Project would result in significant impacts to federally protected wetlands.	**M-BI-7:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, impacts to 0.31 acre of federal wetlands shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio as described in M-BI-1c, M-BI-5a and M-BI-6a, above, unless otherwise required by USACE.	**Less than Significant**
BI-8	The Project would result in significant impacts to County RPO-protected wetlands.	**M-BI-8:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, impacts to 0.72 acre of RPO-protected wetland shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio as described in M-BI-1c, M-BI-5a and M-BI-6c, above.	**Less than Significant**

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.3, Biological Resources (cont.)			
2.3.2.5 ***Local Policies, Ordinances and Adopted Plans***			
BI-9	If clearing or grubbing takes place in occupied nesting habitat during the avian breeding season, it could result in a significant killing of migratory birds or destruction of their nests.	**M-BI-9:** No grubbing, clearing, or grading shall occur during the general avian breeding season (February 15 to August 31). All grading permits, improvement plans, and the final map shall state the same. If grubbing, clearing, or grading would occur during the general avian breeding season, a pre-construction survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if active bird nests are present in the affected areas. If there are no nesting birds (includes nest building or other breeding/nesting behavior) within this area, clearing, grubbing, and grading shall be allowed to proceed. If active nests or nesting birds are observed within the area, the biologist shall flag the active nests and construction activities shall avoid active nests until nesting behavior has ceased, nests have failed, or young have fledged.	**Less than Significant**
Subchapter 2.4, Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources			
2.4.2.1 ***Archaeological Sites***			
CR-1	There is a potential for significant direct impacts related to undiscovered buried archaeological resources on or off the Project site during Project-related grading. Impacts to these resources would represent significant environmental effects.	**M-CR-1 and 2**: An archaeological monitoring and data recovery program would be implemented to mitigate potential impacts to undiscovered buried archaeological resources on the Project site to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS. This program shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following actions:	**Less than Significant**

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	**Impact**	**Mitigation**	**Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness**
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.4, Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources (cont.)			
2.4.2.1 ***Archaeological Sites (cont.)***			
CR-1 (cont.)		• Pre-Construction o Provide evidence that a County approved archaeologist has been contracted to implement the Archaeological Monitoring program. o The Project Archaeologist shall contract with a Luiseno Native American monitor. o The pre-construction meeting shall be attended by the Project Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American monitor to explain the monitoring requirements. • Construction o Monitoring. Both the Project Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American monitor are to be on site during earth disturbing activities. The frequency and location of monitoring of native soils will be determined by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Luiseno Native American monitor. Monitoring of previously disturbed soils will be determined by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Luiseno Native American monitor. o If cultural resources are identified: ▪ Both the Project Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American monitor have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area of the discovery.	

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	**Impact**	**Mitigation**	**Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness**
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.4, Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources (cont.)			
2.4.2.1 ***Archaeological Sites (cont.)***			
CR-1 (cont.)		▪ The Project Archaeologist shall contact the County Archaeologist. ▪ The Project Archaeologist in consultation with the County Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American shall determine the significance of discovered resources. ▪ Construction activities will be allowed to resume after the County Archaeologist has concurred with the significance evaluation. ▪ Isolates and non-significant deposits shall be minimally documented in the field. Should the isolates and non-significant deposits not be collected by the Project Archaeologist, the Luiseno Native American monitor may collect the cultural material for transfer to a Tribal curation facility or repatriation program.	

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.4, Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources (cont.)			
2.4.2.1 ***Archaeological Sites (cont.)***			
CR-1 (cont.)		▪ 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 Luiseno Native American monitor and approved by the County Archaeologist. The program shall include reasonable efforts to preserve (avoid) unique cultural resources of Sacred Sites; the capping of identified Sacred Sites or unique cultural resources and placement of development over the cap if avoidance is infeasible; and data recovery for non-unique cultural resources. The preferred option is preservation (avoidance). o Human Remains ▪ The Property Owner or their representative shall contact the County Coroner and the PDS Staff Archaeologist. ▪ 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.	

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	**Impact**	**Mitigation**	**Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness**
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.4, Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources (cont.)			
2.4.2.1 ***Archaeological Sites (cont.)***			
CR-1 (cont.)		▪ 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 in order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains. ▪ 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 Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 has been conducted. ▪ Public Resources Code §5097.98, CEQA §15064.5 and Health & Safety Code §7050.5 shall be followed in the event that human remains are discovered. • Rough Grading o Upon completion of Rough Grading, a monitoring report shall be prepared identifying whether resources were encountered.	

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	**Impact**	**Mitigation**	**Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness**
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.4, Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources (cont.)			
2.4.2.1 ***Archaeological Sites (cont.)***			
CR-1 (cont.)		• Final Grading o A final report shall be prepared substantiating that earth-disturbing activities are completed and whether cultural resources were encountered. o Disposition of Cultural Material ▪ The final report shall include evidence that all prehistoric materials have been curated at a San Diego curation facility or culturally affiliated Tribal curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79, or alternatively has been repatriated to a culturally affiliated Tribe. ▪ The final report shall include evidence that all historic materials have been curated at a San Diego curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79.	
2.4.2.2 ***Human Remains***			
CR-2	There is an unlikely but possible potential for significant direct impacts related to discovery of unknown burials on or off the Project site during Project-related grading. Impacts to these resources would represent significant environmental effects.	Mitigation for potential impacts related to unknown burials shall be provided through implementation of applicable elements of M-CR-1 and 2, above.	**Less than Significant**

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.5, Noise			
2.5.2.1 ***Transportation Noise Levels***			
N-1	Noise levels could exceed the 60 dBA CNEL maximum allowable noise level for two single-family residences that are located in the westernmost portion of the Project site that face Country Club Drive.	**M-N-1**: Noise levels at exterior use areas for the proposed residences identified as R9 and R10 on Figure 2.5-1 shall be reduced to the most restrictive County Noise Element threshold of 60 dBA CNEL or below. Noise reduction for on-site exterior traffic noise impacts, which could lead to interior noise impacts, could be accomplished through on-site noise barriers. One 5-foot high sound wall along the northern perimeter of the affected lot would be installed, with approximately 20-foot long return walls along the western perimeter of the western residence (R9) and the eastern perimeter of the eastern residence (R10). The sound attenuation fence or wall must be solid. It can be constructed of masonry, wood, plastic, fiberglass, steel, or a combination of those materials, as long as there are no cracks or gaps through or below the wall. Any seams or cracks must be filled or caulked. If wood is used, it can be tongue and groove and must be at least 1-inch total thickness or have a density of at least 3.5 pounds per square foot. Where architectural or aesthetic factors allow, glass or clear plastic ⅜ of an inch thick or thicker may be used on the upper portion, if it is desirable to preserve a view. Sheet metal of 18 gauge (minimum) may be used, if it meets the other criteria and is properly supported and stiffened so that it does not rattle or create noise itself from vibration or wind. Any door(s) or gate(s) must be designed with overlapping closures on the	**Less than Significant**

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	**Impact**	**Mitigation**	**Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness**
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.5, Noise (cont.)			
2.5.2.1 ***Transportation Noise Levels (cont.)***			
N-1 (cont.)		bottom and sides and meet the minimum specifications of the wall materials described above. The gate(s) may be of 1-inch thick or better wood, solid-sheet metal of at least 18-gauge metal, or an exterior-grade solid-core steel door with prefabricated doorjambs.	
N-2	The second stories of the two residential units identified for Impact N-1 may be exposed to noise in excess of 60 CNEL; given a typical exterior to interior attenuation of 15 CNEL, the interior noise levels of these residents may be exposed to noise levels that exceed the 45 CNEL threshold.	**M-N-2**: In accordance with standard County requirements, additional exterior-to-interior noise analysis shall be conducted for the residential units identified as R9 and R10 (where exterior noise levels may exceed 60 CNEL within the second stories) to demonstrate that interior levels do not exceed 45 CNEL. The information in the analysis shall include wall heights and lengths, room volumes, window and door tables typical for a building plan, as well as information on any other openings in the building shell. With this specific building plan information, the analysis shall determine the predicted interior noise levels at the planned on-site buildings. If predicted noise levels are found to be in excess of 45 CNEL, the report shall identify mitigation shown to be effective in reducing noise levels (e.g., architectural materials or techniques that could be included to reduce noise levels to 45 CNEL in habitable rooms. Standard measures such as glazing with Sound Transmission Class (STC) ratings from a STC 22 to STC 60, as well as walls with appropriate STC ratings (34 to 60), should be considered.	**Less than Significant**

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.5, Noise (cont.)			
2.5.2.1 ***Transportation Noise Levels (cont.)***			
N-2 (cont.)		Appropriate means of air circulation and provision of fresh air would be provided to allow windows to remain closed for extended intervals of time so that acceptable interior noise levels can be maintained. The mechanical ventilation system would meet the criteria of the International Building Code (Chapter 12, Section 1203.3 of the 2001 California Building Code).	
2.5.2.2 ***Operational Noise Levels***			
N-3	WTWRF equipment would have the potential to create noise in excess of allowable limits to on-site NSLUs. The piece of WTWRF equipment that would generate the most noise would be the standby diesel generator. The generator would produce noise levels ranging from 90 to 105 dBA at 23 feet, and thus noise levels of 45 dBA (the nighttime allowable limit) could be experienced at distances of up to 23,000 feet.	**M-N-3:** The WTWRF shall be enclosed by a solid 6-foot high wall. Final design for the WTWRF and the noise wall shall demonstrate that exterior noise levels generated from all stationary WTWRF equipment combined shall not exceed the one-hour exterior noise level of 45 dBA L_{EQ} at the property line. The Applicant shall be required to provide a final noise impact analysis as part of the facilities design submittal package for the WTWRF and noise wall prepared by a County approved noise consultant. The final noise impact analysis shall demonstrate compliance with the County 45 dBA L_{EQ} property line nighttime limit completed to the satisfaction of the County PDS.	**Less than Significant**

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	**Impact**	**Mitigation**	**Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness**
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.5, Noise (cont.)			
2.5.2.3 ***Construction Noise Levels***			
N-4	If a breaker operates within 125 feet of the nearest NSLU, the noise level would exceed the County's impulsive noise limit of 82 dBA L_{MAX}.	**M-N-4**: If a breaker is required as part of Project construction, then it shall not generate maximum noise levels that exceed 82 dBA L_{MAX} when measured at the property line for 25 percent of a one-hour period or be used within 125 feet of the property line for any occupied residence. Material that would require a breaker shall be moved a minimum distance of 125 feet from the nearest residence.	**Less than Significant**
N-5	If a rock crusher operates within 250 feet of the nearest NSLU, the noise level would exceed the County's 8-hour noise level limits of 75 dBA L_{EQ}.	**M-N-5**: If a rock crusher is required as part of Project construction, then it shall not be used within 250 feet of the property line for any occupied residence until a temporary noise barrier or berm is constructed at the edge of the development footprint or around the piece of equipment to reduce noise levels below 75 dBA L_{EQ} at the property line for the occupied residences. If a barrier or berm is used, decibel output will be confirmed by a County approved noise specialist. Otherwise, a rock crusher shall be moved a minimum distance of 250 feet from the nearest residence before use.	**Less than Significant**
N-6	Because project-specific details regarding blasting operations are not available at this time, impacts to off-site residences and other land uses from blasting are conservatively assessed as significant.	**M-N-6**: The following measures would be implemented to reduce impacts from blasting: • The number of blasts would be limited to three blasting events per week. • The Project would also include a blasting management plan due to the blasting that is likely to occur on site. All blast planning must be done by a San Diego County Sheriff approved blaster, with the appropriate San Diego County	**Less than Significant**

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	**Impact**	**Mitigation**	**Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness**
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.5, Noise (cont.)			
2.5.2.3 ***Construction Noise Levels (cont.)***			
N-6 (cont.)		Sheriff blasting permits, in compliance with the County Consolidated Fire Code SEC. 96.1.5601.2 (County 2014a), and all other applicable local, state, and federal permits, licenses, and bonding. The blasting contractor or owner must conduct all notifications, inspections, monitoring, and major or minor blasting requirements planning with seismograph reports, as necessary. • If boulders must be reduced in size with blasting within 200 feet of the closest residence, the use of chemical expansion via a chemical cracking agent shall be performed instead.	
Cumulative-level Impacts			
Subchapter 2.2, Transportation/Traffic			
2.2.3.1 ***Existing Plus Cumulative Plus Project Impacts***			
TR-2b	The Proposed Project would have a cumulative impact to one County signalized intersection, Country Club Drive/Harmony Grove Road (LOS F during the p.m. peak hour).	Mitigation for cumulative impacts to the noted intersection shall be provided through implementation of roadway improvements as described in M-TR-2a. In addition, the Project shall make a payment toward the County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program to address cumulative impacts to the Country Club Drive/Harmony Grove Road signalized intersection.	**Less than Significant**

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	**Impact**	**Mitigation**	**Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness**
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Cumulative-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.2, Transportation/Traffic (cont.)			
2.2.3.1 ***Existing Plus Cumulative Plus Project Impacts (cont.)***			
TR-3	The Proposed Project would have a cumulative impact on Country Club Drive from Hill Valley Drive to Kauana Loa Drive (LOS E).[2]	**M-TR-3**: Prior to occupancy of 80 Project units, the Project shall widen Country Club Drive at the Country Club Drive/Eden Valley Lane intersection to provide a dedicated northbound left-turn lane onto Eden Valley Lane.	**Less than Significant**
TR-4	The Proposed Project would have a cumulative impact on Harmony Grove Road from Country Club Drive to Harmony Grove Village Parkway (LOS E).	**M-TR-4:** The Project shall make a payment toward the County of San Diego TIF program to address cumulative impacts to the segment of Harmony Grove Road between Country Club Drive and Harmony Grove Village Parkway.	**Less than Significant**
TR-5	The Proposed Project would have a cumulative impact on Harmony Grove Road from Harmony Grove Village Parkway to Kauana Loa Drive (LOS E).	**M-TR-5:** The Project shall make a payment toward the County of San Diego TIF program to address cumulative impacts to the segment of Harmony Grove Road between Harmony Grove Village Parkway and Kauana Loa Drive.	**Less than Significant**
TR-6	The Proposed Project would have a cumulative impact on Harmony Grove Road from Kauana Loa Drive to Enterprise Street (LOS F).	**M-TR-6:** Project payment toward the County of San Diego TIF program as part of mitigation provided under M-TR-10, below, will mitigate impacts to this segment of Harmony Grove Road between Kauana Loa Drive and Enterprise Street.	**Less than Significant**
TR-7	The Proposed Project would have a cumulative impact on Harmony Grove Village Parkway from Harmony Grove Road to Citracado Parkway (LOS E).	**M-TR-7:** Prior to occupancy of 135 Project units, the Project shall provide a northbound to eastbound right-turn overlap phase at the Harmony Grove Road/Harmony Grove Village Parkway signalized intersection.	**Less than Significant**

[2] Subsequent to Project modeling, the Valiano project (one of the cumulative projects along Country Club Drive) revised a primary project entrance, resulting in additional trips between Hill Valley Drive and Kauana Loa Drive. As a result, the existing plus cumulative plus project loading would be LOS F rather than LOS E. Both LOS E and LOS F comprise significant cumulative impacts and require mitigation. The mitigation identified for Impact TR-3 also adequately mitigates LOS F conditions to acceptable LOS.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Cumulative-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.2, Transportation/Traffic (cont.)			
2.2.3.1 ***Existing Plus Cumulative Plus Project Impacts (cont.)***			
TR-10	The Proposed Project would have a cumulative impact on Harmony Grove Road/Kauana Loa Drive (LOS E and F during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours, respectively).	**M-TR-10:** The Project shall make a payment toward the County of San Diego TIF program to address cumulative impacts to the Harmony Grove Road/Kauana Loa Drive signalized intersection.	**Less than Significant**
Subchapter 2.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
GHG-1	The Project's total estimated construction and operation GHG emissions would be 1,037.72 MT CO_2e after implementation of all PDFs when taking vehicular emissions into account. Therefore, the Project would generate greenhouse gas emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment.	**M-GHG-1:** Prior to issuance of the first grading permit for the Project, compliance with M-GHG-1 shall be as follows: a. Solar panel(s), capable of generating a total of 1,720 KW, shall be installed on an existing building(s) that does not currently utilize solar energy, located within the County of San Diego, that is not otherwise required by law or regulation through statute, regulation, existing local program, or requirement to install such solar panels. The building shall have an estimated life of at least 30 years as verified by a third-party building inspector. The solar system installation shall be completed by a licensed, bonded and insured installer; and equipped with a monitoring system to notify the property owner upon which the building is located (property owner), the installer, and the HGV South Homeowners Association (HOA) with monitoring data. The solar panels will be registered with an extended warranty for the maximum period of time feasible, not less than 30 years and the panels will be dated at the time of installation. Consistent with the North American Board of Certified Energy Practitioners (NABCEP)	**Less than Significant**

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Cumulative-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions (cont.)			
GHG-1 (cont.)		standards, the installation company shall have a minimum of three years' experience. b. The identified building(s) shall be located within the County boundaries. A Covenant shall be recorded against the property, for the benefit of the Project site, stating that the Project-installed solar panel(s) must remain on the building(s) and operational for a period of 30 years. This Covenant runs with the land, not the owner, and will pass with the parcel in the event of a sale. The Covenant shall also require the property owner to allow the HOA or representative (including the County) to conduct annual baseline maintenance inspections, monitor, repair or replace the system as described in e), below, during that 30-year period. The Covenant shall also include the following provisions: i) the property owner shall allow the HOA or County to access the system if maintenance is indicated by the monitoring system or when issues are otherwise noted by the property owner; ii) the property owner shall notify the HOA and County if any repair or maintenance events become known to the property owner;	

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Cumulative-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions (cont.)			
GHG-1 (cont.)		iii) the property owner shall maintain a policy of insurance (or include the addition of such panels to the coverage limits of the building's current insurance policy) to cover against the repair or replacement of the solar system resulting from physical damage (e.g., caused by severe weather conditions, vandalism, fire and other events) and name the HOA and County as additional insureds; iv) the property owner shall maintain and/or replace such panels with an equivalent or higher rated panel as necessary if the repair work is not completed by the HOA; v) if the identified building is vacated or abandoned, or the building is demolished before the 30-year period, the property owner shall be required to install an equivalent unit (and provide insurance for the same) on one or more existing buildings that meet the same criteria identified in a); within the County, that would generate an equivalent amount of solar power for the remaining term of the 30-year period. The property owner shall be required to record a Covenant with the same provisions against the property upon which the new building with the replacement solar unit is located, for the remaining term of the 30-year period and notify the HOA and the County of the same, prior to the vacation, abandonment, or demolition of the existing building; and	

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Cumulative-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions (cont.)			
GHG-1 (cont.)		vi) any new purchaser of the property shall notify the HOA and County that it has acquired the site and acknowledge its obligations under the Covenant, including allowing access for solar panels maintenance for the duration of the 30-year term. c. The Applicant is required to fund and provide a report to the County that provides the following information: i) the address of the specific building(s) upon which the installation of the solar panels required by 2024 M-GHG-1 have been installed; ii) evidence that the building(s) is/are not required by law or regulation through statute, regulation, existing local program, or requirement to install such solar panels (i.e., additional); iii) the amount of GHG emissions that will be reduced by the installation of such panels; iv) a copy of the Covenant recorded against the property that includes the information required by M-GHG-1 b) above; v) a copy of the third-party building inspector (verification) that the life of the building be at least 30 years; and	

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Cumulative-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions (cont.)			
GHG-1 (cont.)		vi) a copy of the Project "Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions" (CC&Rs or Declaration) of the HOA that include the provisions identified in paragraph e) below, including the HOA's budget that shows the reserve set aside for the purposes described in paragraph f) below, and vii) a copy of the solar installation contract with a licensed and bonded installer, and warranty and insurance policy along with the approved solar permit. The report shall include calculations conducted by a technical GHG expert using County-approved models and/or methodologies. d. The Applicant shall comply with County Code Section 6954, Solar Energy Systems, and obtain any required permits. The installation of such PV system shall be required to qualify for a CEQA exemption, such as PRC 21080.35 at the time of application for installation. e. The CC&Rs for the Project shall be submitted to the County for its review prior to the approval of the first grading permit that includes the following provisions: 1. The HOA shall monitor the solar system using the module-level monitoring application described above for a 30-year period that commences from the Project's start	

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Cumulative-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions (cont.)			
GHG-1 (cont.)		of operations. The HOA shall keep records of solar power production during this period. 2. If any solar equipment is found to need repair or replacement, the HOA shall be responsible for such work being completed as needed in order to maintain the equivalent amount of solar power generated by such panels. The HOA shall work with the property owner, installation company and/or insurance entity to ensure that the repairs are completed in a timely manner. If the repair work is not covered by the warranty or paid for by the insurance carrier, the HOA shall be responsible for ensuring that the repair work is completed. 3. An annual maintenance and monitoring program shall be conducted by a licensed and bonded solar company (the Covenant requires the property owner to allow this annual inspection). A report shall be prepared by the solar company with the results of the inspection, including whether any repairs are needed and the amount of solar power generated by such panels. The report will be provided to the HOA, property owner, and County. 4. During maintenance, the HOA or representative shall replace (with an equivalent or higher rated panel) or repair any of the solar panels as needed in order to maintain the	

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Cumulative-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions (cont.)			
GHG-1 (cont.)		equivalent amount of solar power generated by such panels. 5. Any revisions to the above-described provisions of the CC&Rs shall be approved by the County, require the consent of 100 percent of the holders of first mortgages or the property owners within the HOA, and require the HOA to retain the same amount of funds set aside by this mitigation measure for the same purposes for the 30-year period. 6. The County shall be named as a party to said Declaration authorizing the County to enforce the terms and conditions of the Declaration in the same manner as the HOA or any owner within the subdivision. 7. The HOA shall maintain the budgeted reserve described in paragraph f) below for the exclusive uses described below. The County may use such funds should it decide to enforce said obligations. 8. These CC&Rs shall be confirmed by the County prior to recording the first subdivision map. f. Applicant shall submit the initial HOA budget, subject to Department of Real Estate (DRE) rules, for review and	

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Cumulative-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions (cont.)			
GHG-1 (cont.)		approval by the County, that includes a set aside fund of $300,000.00, for the purpose of repairing or replacing any solar panels (see Appendix J1), should such work not be eligible for reimbursement from the property owner's insurance policy or warranty. The set aside funds may also be used to enforce the provisions of the Covenant and any insurance claim if needed. The amount of the set aside funds shall be adjusted each year by the HOA, based on the annual indexed increases in construction costs and expenses consistent with the California Construction Cost Index or similar construction industry standard index, through a reserve study prepared by a qualified consultant, hired by the HOA as required by the DRE, provided however, in no event shall the reserve fund be increased more than three percent (3 percent) in a given year. This budgeted reserve amount shall be designated and restricted exclusively for the sole purposes set forth herein and may be used by the County should it decide to enforce the obligations of the property owner. If any amount of the set aside is used by the HOA or County for such purposes, the HOA shall replenish the fund in an amount equal to what has been withdrawn.	

* Each of the significant and unmitigated impacts identified for transportation/traffic is associated with an impact in the City of Escondido. Mitigation is identified in this EIR that would lower the identified significant impacts to less than significant levels. Because the City is its own lead agency under CEQA, however, and because the County cannot guarantee that the City will allow the applicant to implement this mitigation, it is conservatively assessed as significant and unmitigated in this EIR. Similarly, the inconsistency with the RAQS will be cured upon transmittal by the County of revised housing forecasts and action by the San Diego Air Pollution Control District. Although these actions by other lead agencies are conservatively assessed as unmitigated at this time, it is anticipated that they will be mitigated in the future with actions by those agencies.

Table S-2
HGV SOUTH FULL-BUILD ALTERNATIVES COMPARISON OF IMPACTS

Environmental Issue	Proposed Project (453 SFR and MFR)	No Project/ No Development	General Plan Consistent with Septic Alternative (49 SFR)	General Plan Consistent with Sewer Alternative (119 SFR)	Senior Care/ Traffic Reduction Alternative (386 units)	Biologically Superior Alternative (424 MFR)
Aesthetics	SU Construction Period, SM Long-term	Less	Similar	Less	Similar	Greater
Transportation/Traffic	SU (City of Escondido), SM (County of San Diego)	Less	Less	Less	Less	Similar
Biological Resources	SM	Less	Greater	Similar	Greater	Less
Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources	SM	Less	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Noise	SM	Less	Less	Less	Less	Less
Air Quality	LTS Construction Period, SU Long-term	Less	Less	Less	Less	Less
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	SM	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK