EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

S.1 Project Synopsis

S.1.1. Project Location

The proposed 608-acre Lilac Hills Ranch project site is located in the westernmost portion of the Valley Center Community Plan (VCCP) area and Bonsall Community Plan (BCP) area, approximately 2.0 miles to Interstate 15 (I-15) and Old Highway 395. From the northwest project corner, West Lilac Road serves as the northern boundary of the project site, while Rodriguez Road serves generally as the project boundary to the south and east. From the southwest project corner, the western boundary of the project runs along Shirey Road and extends to Standell Lane. From there, the project site extends back to Shirey Road, which serves as the northwestern project boundary.

The project site is generally characterized by agricultural lands and gently rolling knolls, with steeper hillsides and ridges running north and south along the western edge. Existing land uses in the surrounding area include residential dwellings that range from suburban to semi-rural densities, along with agricultural uses and vacant lands.

S.1.2 Project Description

The project encompasses 608 acres and would consist of a mix of residential, commercial, and institutional uses, along with parks and open space. Specifically, the project would include: 90,000 square feet of commercial, office, and retail, including a 50-room country inn; 903 traditional single-family detached homes; 164 single-family attached homes, 211 residential units within the commercial mixed-use areas; and 468 single-family detached age-restricted residential units within a senior citizens neighborhood; necessary facilities and amenities to serve the senior population (including a senior community center, a group residential and group care facility, and a dementia care facility for Alzheimer patients); and civic facilities that may a include a fire station, a school (K-8), public and private parks, a private recreational facility, and other recreational amenities. Also planned within the project site are a Recycling Facility (RF), a Water Reclamation Facility (WRF), and other supporting infrastructure. The mixed-use, commercial, and civic uses, with parks, would form a Town Center and two Neighborhood Centers, to which residents can walk for various social and commercial needs. Open space is proposed that would retain some of the existing citrus and avocado groves and sensitive biological/wetland habitat (103.6 acres).

The project includes three options for the provision of fire protection services as follows:

- Option 1: This includes DSFPD and/or San Diego County Fire Authority (SDCFA) and CAL FIRE agreeing that CAL FIRE's Station 15 would provide primary response to project emergencies. This option would include adding an appropriately sized fire station on the existing Station 15 site, and would provide primary response to project emergencies. This option would include adding an appropriately sized fire station on the existing Station 15 site, and a new Type I engine. This would require a new agreement between DSFPD and/or SDCFA, and CAL FIRE.

- Option 2: This option would include a new separate DSFPD fire station on the CAL FIRE Station 15 site in order for such facility to be completely independent from CAL FIRE. This option would include an agreement between DSFPD with CAL FIRE to either remodel Station 15 to co-locate and staff a DSFPD Type I paramedic engine on the site with CAL FIRE or the construction of a completely separate DSFPD station. The new station or remodel would accommodate an engine from station 11 or a new engine purchased for the new facility. This would require an amendment to the existing Amador Agreement with CAL FIRE.

- Option 3: If an agreement cannot be reached between SDCFA and/or DSFPD and CAL FIRE (Option 1) or between DSFPD and CAL FIRE (Option 2), a new fire station would be constructed within the Lilac Hills Ranch Project. A Type I paramedic engine would be added at the station. The engine could either be reassigned from Station 11 or a new Type I purchased for the Station. The construction of a new fire station would be triggered upon the construction of any lot outside the 5 minute response time, equivalent to the 54th unit in Phase 1. If DSFPD agrees, a temporary on-site fire station could be constructed at the same trigger.

Primary access to the project site would be provided via West Lilac Road, which connects to Old Highway 395 to the west of the project site. From Old Highway 395, freeway access to I-15 exists. Additional access to the County-maintained road system would be provided by West Lilac Road via Covey Lane (the on-site portion would be a private road and the off-site portion would be a public road) and gated access would provide emergency access south of the project site to Circle R Drive via Mountain Ridge Road. The Institutional site (proposed church) would have direct access to Mountain Ridge Road and emergency access to Rodriguez Road. The gate would be north of the Institutional site.

The project includes a comprehensive circulation plan that provides access to the project site and improves vehicular circulation throughout the project site in accordance with County standards. To minimize impediments to fire apparatus access, all streets within the project site would be designed in accordance with the County private road standards and in compliance with the County Consolidated Fire Code. The needs of truck traffic, fire apparatus, and loading activities related to commercial structures would also be incorporated in the design of the roadways.

Initial development of the project would be accessed through two connections along West Lilac Road with unrestricted internal roads throughout Phases 1, 2, and 3. Additional gated access points are proposed throughout Phases 4 and 5, for use by residents and/or emergency apparatus. The specific location of gated access points are detailed in subchapter 2.7. All gates proposed for the project would be in compliance with DSFPD guidelines and County Consolidated Fire Code, Section 503.6. The gates on roads that will be used by residents to go in and out of the project would have automatic openers (for exiting) that are triggered by either a buried sensor or an optical sensor. In this condition the gates would remain open to accommodate a stream of traffic. These gates would also be equipped with an approved emergency traffic control activating strobe light sensor or other device approved by the fire code official, which would activate the gate on the approach of emergency apparatus. During an emergency requiring evacuation of residents, the gates would be put in an open position allowing

surrounding residents to use Lilac Hills Ranch roads. This would be done by the HOA using a special code that can be entered remotely.

Development of the project would be phased over approximately 10 years. Phasing would occur in accordance with a logical and orderly expansion of roadways, public utilities, and infrastructure. Grading would take place throughout all of the project's five phases. Phasing would be implemented through the recording of the Final Maps. Each recorded map would be required to comply with the provisions and guidelines within the Lilac Hills Ranch Specific Plan, which includes a Community Design section containing policies to address visual quality aspects of the project including streetscape, entry treatments, parks, pedestrian circulation, lighting, signs, and landscaping.

The project site is located entirely within the Valley Center Municipal Water District, which would provide potable water service to the project. As part of the initial development phase, the project includes construction of improvements needed to provide sufficient redundant reservoir capacity within the zone to serve the project. To provide the redundancy, improvements would be made within the existing Country Club Reservoir site, subject to the discretion of Valley Center Municipal Water District (VCMWD). To provide the redundancy, three options could be implemented within the existing site of either the 10 million gallon (MG) Country Club Reservoir or the 0.1 MG Old Country Club Reservoir. These options include:

(1) Construction of a dividing wall within the existing Country Club Reservoir to effectively create two, 5 MG reservoirs;

(2) Replacement of the Country Club Reservoir with two, 5 MG reservoirs; or

(3) Replacement of the Old Country Club Reservoir with a 3 MG reservoir. Implementation of any of these alternatives would provide adequate redundancy and will be pursued at the discretion of VCMWD.

Discussions related to redundancy are included in Chapter 3.0.

The applicant would construct an on-site wastewater collection system such that water could either be transferred to the Lower Moosa Canyon WRF or treated, to some level, at an on-site water reclamation facility. The specific wastewater treatment options are as follows:

(1) Construction of a WRF that would treat all wastewater and solids generated by the project and would provide reclaimed water for on-site use;

(2) Construction of a WRF on-site that would provide reclaimed water for on-site uses while sending solids to the Lower Moosa Canyon WRF for treatment;

(3) Construction of a WRF on-site to serve the northern portion of the project (reclaimed water would be generated on-site and the solids sent to the Lower Moosa Canyon WRF) with the southern portion sending its wastewater to the Lower Moosa Canyon WRF.

(4) Off-site treatment of all of the project's wastewater at the Lower Moosa Canyon WRF.

These options are discussed in detail in Chapter 3.0.

The project would require the following discretionary actions from the County:

- General Plan Amendment
- Specific Plan
- Master and Implementing Tentative Maps
- Rezone
- Open Space Easement Vacations
- Blasting Permits
- "B" Designator Site Plan(s) (Design Review)
- "D" Special Area Development Regulator Site Plan(s)
- "V" Setback Regulator Site Plan(s)
- Major Use Permit(s)
- Grading Plan (L-Grading Permit)
- Habitat Loss Permit

The project would also require discretionary approval from other agencies for the following:

- Streambed Alteration Agreement (California Department of Fish and Game);
- Clean Water Act – Section 404 Permit (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers)
- Clean Water Act – Section 401 Certification (Regional Water Quality Control Board [RWQCB])
- Statewide National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit (RWQCB)
- Waste Discharge Permit or Master Reclamation Permit (Water Reclamation Plant) (RWQCB)
- Major Encroachment Permit (SDCWA)
- Encroachment Permit (VCMWD).

S.1.3 Environmental Setting

The environmental setting of the project site is viewed from both a local and regional perspective. The project site is within the unincorporated area of northern San Diego County, within the Valley Center and Bonsall Community Plan areas. Communities in proximity to the project site include: Fallbrook, Bonsall and Hidden Meadows to the west; the Pala-Pauma Community Plan area to both the north and east; and the North County Metro Community Plan Area and the city of Escondido to the south.

The topography is characterized by the east-west San Luis Rey river valley along the SR-76 corridor and the north-south I-15 corridor. Both the San Luis Rey River floodplain and the I-15 corridor are flanked by rolling hills which have historically been used for citrus and avocado groves, estate residences, and open space, with cattle grazing also occurring in the more rugged terrain.

The localized surrounding land uses include agricultural, residential, open space, and commercial uses. Varying types of homes exist in the project area ranging from small lot

townhomes to farm homes on large parcels with mostly citrus and avocado groves. Single-family residential homes are located on parcels ranging from less than 5,000 square feet to 40 acres. Agriculture uses in the vicinity include primarily orchards and nurseries, but also row crops. Other uses in the vicinity include commercial and office buildings; a trailer park and storage; and an industrial rock manufacturing and concrete batch plant. To the southwest of the project site is an area containing the Castle Creek Inn and Resort as well as a golf course.

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

Table S-1 summarizes the results of the environmental analysis completed for the 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 that cannot be avoided if the project is implemented are discussed in Chapter 2.0, and effects found not to be significant during preparation of the Environmental Impact Report (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 Table 1-3.

S.3 Areas of Controversy

The Notice of Preparation (NOP) was distributed in May 2012 for a 30-day public review and comment period. In addition, a public scoping meeting was held on July 17, 2012 at the Valley Center Community Library. The NOP and all of the comment letters received are included in this EIR as Appendices A and B, respectively. The issues that were raised in the comments and forms by the public agencies, local groups, and individuals are evaluated throughout Chapters 2 and 3 of the EIR, addressing both direct and cumulative impacts.

Issues of concern associated with the project include the change in aesthetics and community character; land use intensity relative to the County General Plan, and the Valley Center and Bonsall Community Plans; health and safety due to blasting and silica minerals released during grading; wildfire risk; Native American cultural resources; transportation/traffic impacts to roadways, schools and private roads; indirect agricultural resource impacts from lighting; geology and soils liquefaction; cumulative impacts associated with multiple issue areas; and the provision of school, water, and sewer service to the project site.

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

Issues to be resolved include whether or how to mitigate the significant impacts that would be created by the implementation of the project. The County of San Diego Board of Supervisors will decide if the significant and unavoidable effects associated with aesthetics, air quality, transportation/traffic, and noise can be reduced, whether feasible mitigation is available, and whether overriding considerations should be adopted. Additionally, the Board of Supervisors will determine whether the significant impacts associated with the environmental issues of agricultural resources, biological resources,

cultural resources, and hazards have been fully mitigated to below a level of significance. The Board of Supervisors will also decide whether the project conforms with the criteria set out in land use regulations and policies, including the Valley Center and Bonsall Community Plans, and take into consideration the premise for the General Plan Amendment. Lastly, the Board of Supervisors will decide whether any of the project alternatives substantially reduces significant impacts while still meeting the key project objectives and whether one of the alternatives could be approved.

S.5 Project Alternatives

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires an EIR to consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making. A number of alternatives to the project were considered during preparation of this EIR, including:

- No Project/No Development Alternative
- Legal Lot Alternative
- General Plan Consistent Alternative
- Reduced Footprint Alternative
- Reduced Intensity Alternative
- 2.2C Alternative

In addition to the fully analyzed alternatives to the project, other alternatives were considered; however, rejected as infeasible. These include:

- Off-site Location Alternative

A summary of each fully analyzed alternative and the conclusions reached regarding each alternative's impacts and ability to meet project objectives compared to the project is provided below. The full alternatives' analysis is found in Chapter 4.0 of the EIR.

Analysis of the No Project/No Development Alternative

The No Project/No Development Alternative, detailed in subchapter 4.2, considers the continuation of existing uses on the site. The current 16 single-family homes would remain and no new construction would occur. This alternative was selected as the No Project Alternative required by CEQA and would avoid both construction-period and long-term impacts associated with development of the proposed project.

Implementation of the No Project/No Development Alternative would result in less potentially significant and significant impacts than the project. This alternative would avoid significant unavoidable impacts related to: visual (dominance, scale, diversity, and continuity, construction, and cumulative viewshed impacts); air quality (compatibility with the RAQS and operational emissions); noise (traffic-generated), and cumulative traffic impacts. This alternative would also avoid significant and mitigated impacts associated with: direct and cumulative roadway segments and intersections; air quality (construction emissions); agricultural resources, biological resources, cultural resources, noise (construction, stationary and vibration), and hazards/fire safety. The No Project/No Development Alternative would avoid potential agricultural conflicts completely and the loss of farmland of Prime or Statewide Importance. This alternative would not develop housing nor meet any of the project's objectives.

Analysis of the Legal Lot Alternative

The Legal Lot Alternative, detailed in subchapter 4.3, is included as another form of the No Project Alternative under CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e) and illustrates how the project site would develop subject to existing land use regulations. This alternative would allow development consistent with existing legal lots. Under this alternative there would be a total of 49 single-family homes constructed on 2-acre minimum lots within the 608 acres.

This alternative would avoid significant unavoidable impacts related to visual (dominance, scale, diversity, and continuity, construction, and cumulative viewshed impacts); air quality (compatibility with RAQS and operational emissions); noise (traffic-generated), and cumulative traffic impacts. This alternative would also avoid significant and mitigated impacts associated with direct and cumulative roadways and intersections, noise, and agricultural and cultural resources. Similar impacts associated with fire hazards would occur. This alternative could, however, result in greater impacts to biological resources. This alternative would not meet any of the project's objectives.

Analysis of the General Plan Consistency Alternative

The General Plan Consistent Alternative would allow development in accordance with the General Plan Land Use designation, Semi-Rural. This alternative also would be subject to the County's Conservation Subdivision Ordinance (CSO), which requires the preservation of 75 percent of the project site within the SR-10 as open space. The CSO applies to the 131 acres within the SR-10 designation within Valley Center and the 78 acres within the SR-10 designation with Bonsall. Compliance with the CSO would thus require the preservation of 156.75 acres of open space on-site within the SR-10. Overall, this alternative would yield approximately 110 single-family dwelling units. The single-family homes would be clustered as to preserve sensitive biological resources. A total of 98 acres of open space would be preserved within the SR-4 land use designation, and 159 acres would be preserved within the SR-10, thus conforming to the requirements of the CSO. The General Plan Consistent Alternative also would reflect half-width improvements of the existing West Lilac Road on the project site, consistent with General Plan Circulation Element roadway network standard Road 2.2C. All other internal roadways would be constructed to the same standard as proposed by the project. No gates would be included in this alternative.

Compared to the project, the General Plan Consistent Alternative would result in reduced visual impacts due to the reduced density/intensity of development that would occur within the site. This alternative also would reduce significant and unavoidable air quality impacts because it would conform to the existing air quality plans and result in fewer operational emissions due to fewer average daily traffic (ADT). Likewise, significant and unavoidable cumulative traffic impacts would be reduced to less than significant. Significant mitigable air quality impacts associated with short-term construction would remain, but be reduced from those of the project. Significant and mitigated impacts associated with direct and cumulative roadways and intersections, agricultural, biological and cultural resources, noise, and hazards/hazardous materials and would be less than the project. No impacts would be greater. This alternative would only meet three of the eight project objectives (3, 4, and 5).

Analysis of the Reduced Footprint Alternative

The Reduced Footprint Alternative, detailed in subchapter 4.5, is designed to reduce the development footprint in order to increase preservation of sensitive biological resources on-site. The Reduced Footprint Alternative would entail clustering development on approximately 441.3 acres and the preservation of 166.7 acres of on-site biological open space. Residential development would be removed from the upland habitat in Phases 1, 2, and 3 of the project, and wetland buffers would be increased from 50 to 100 feet throughout the site. Development of this alternative would include 1,251 residential dwelling units, including 783 single-family detached homes and 468 senior housing units. No single-family attached or mixed-use would be provided under this alternative due to the reduced amount of developable area. The alternative would include 25,000 square feet of specialty commercial located on 6 acres within Phase 2 only. No recycling facility and trailhead, private recreation facility or group care would be provided under this alternative. This alternative would include the WRF, a school site, 18 acres of institutional uses in Phase 5, and 16 acres of parkland, approximately 8 acres less than provided by the project due to fewer number of on-site residents. Under this alternative 166.7 acres of biological open space would be provided on-site, along with 20.2 acres of common area and agriculture. All roadways would be private for this alternative, similar to the project. Also, under this alternative an on-site fire station or renovation to a nearby station would be required as for the project. Like the project, the Reduced Footprint Alternative would require both a General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan and would include the preparation of a Site Plan for any type of development permit.

The Reduced Footprint Alternative would reduce the significant and unavoidable visual quality impacts associated with the project. Because this alternative would place fewer lots adjacent to the northern project perimeter, visual impacts to views along the existing West Lilac Road would be less under this alternative than for the project. Significant and unavoidable cumulative traffic impacts would also be reduced under this alternative. Due to the fewer number of units and fewer ADT, operational air quality, traffic, and noise impacts would be less under this alternative as compared to the project. Due to the smaller development footprint and reduced quantity of grading required, impacts related to biological and cultural resources would be less under this alternative as compared to the project. Agricultural resource impacts also would be reduced under this alternative, as there would be fewer areas for potential agricultural adjacency conflicts. Finally, both the Reduced Footprint Alternative and the project would result in similar impacts relative to hazards, and each would be required to prepare a Fire Protection Plan and provide for additional fire services to serve the project site. This alternative would only meet four of the eight project objectives.

Analysis of the Reduced Intensity Alternative

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would create less dense community with a smaller commercial area compared to the project. Development of this alternative would include two single-family neighborhoods totaling 881 detached homes. This alternative would include a 5.6-acre commercial area adjacent to a village square with 75,000 square feet of commercial uses. No attached single-family, senior housing, mixed-use or group care facilities would occur. This alternative would also include 103.6 acres of biological open space, 2 parks, and 65 acres of common areas/agriculture. A WRF would be constructed to serve the on-site residents, similar to the project. Also, under this alternative, an on-site fire station or renovation to a nearby station would be required as

for the project. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would reflect the alignment of West Lilac Road through the project site; however, it would be constructed consistent with the General Plan Circulation Element road standard 2.2C. All other internal roadways would be private and would be constructed to the same standard as proposed by the project. No gates would be included. Like the project, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would require a General Plan Amendment, Rezone, and approval of a Specific Plan.

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would not reduce the significant and unavoidable visual quality impacts associated with the project. Because this alternative would place smaller lots adjacent to the northern project perimeter, visual impacts to views along the existing West Lilac Road would be greater under this alternative than for the project. Significant and unavoidable cumulative traffic impacts would be reduced under this alternative. Due to the reduced intensity of development and fewer ADT, operational air quality, traffic, and noise impacts would be less under this alternative as compared to the project. Because of the similar development footprint and grading required, impacts related to agricultural, biological, and cultural resources would be similar for both this alternative and the project. Impacts relative to hazards also would be similar for this alternative and the project. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would meet would meet six of eight project objectives.

Analysis of the 2.2C Alternative

The 2.2C Alternative combines both Phases 1 and 2 of the Reduced Intensity Alternative with Phases 3, 4, and 5 of the project. The intent of this alternative is to show how West Lilac Road could be constructed to Road 2.2C standard through the project site with the majority of project features remaining in place, to the extent feasible. Overall, development of this alternative would include 792 single-family detached homes, 468 senior housing units, 105 single-family attached units, and a total of 15.3 acres/85,000 square feet of commercial uses. This alternative would also include: a WRF, RF/trailhead, 5.5 acres of detention basins, a 12.0-acre school site; 2 acres of private recreation; 6.5 acres for a group care facility; 10.7 acres of institutional uses; 103.6 acres of biological open space; 2 parks, and 45 acres of common areas/agriculture. The 2.2C Alternative would reflect the alignment of West Lilac Road through the project site as consistent with General Plan Circulation Element road standard 2.2C. All other internal roadways would be constructed to the same standard as proposed by the project. Development of this alternative also would require a new fire station either co-located on the CAL FIRE Miller Station site or within the project site. Like the project, the 2.2C Alternative would require a General Plan Amendment, Rezone, and approval of a Specific Plan.

The 2.2C Alternative would not reduce the significant and unavoidable visual quality impacts associated with the project. Because this alternative would place smaller lots adjacent to the northern project perimeter, visual impacts to views along the existing West Lilac Road would be greater under this alternative than for the project. Significant and unavoidable cumulative traffic impacts would be reduced. Due to the slightly reduced intensity of development and fewer ADT, operational air quality, traffic, and noise impacts would be less under this alternative as compared to the project. Impacts related to agricultural, biological and cultural resources, and hazards would be similar for both this alternative and the project. The 2.2C Alternative would meet all the objectives of the project. However, it would not do so to the same degree.

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.1 Aesthetics	**Impact V-1**: The proposed project would change the composition of the visual environment in terms of dominance, scale, diversity, and continuity, as viewed from West Lilac Road resulting in a significant impact.	**M-V-1:** Street trees shall be planted at close intervals to assure the overlapping foliage would provide adequate screening of the project site from view along West Lilac Road. However, impacts associated with the change to the visual environment would remain significant and unavoidable.	Significant and Unavoidable
	Impact V-2: The proposed project would change the composition of the visual environment in terms of dominance, scale, diversity, and continuity, as viewed from surrounding residential areas resulting in a significant impact.	See **M-V-1.** However, impacts associated with the change to the visual environment would remain significant and unavoidable.	Significant and Unavoidable
	Impact V-3: During project construction, the site would conflict with the surrounding visual characteristics. While this impact is temporary, short-term visual impacts would be significant.	**M-V-2**: The commencement of construction of each subsequent phase will be lengthened to accommodate mature growth of landscaping of the previous phase. However, impacts associated with temporary construction related visual would remain significant and unavoidable.	Significant and Unavoidable
	Impact V-4: The composition of the project viewshed would be adversely affected by physical changes introduced by the project along with projects within the cumulative project area. These changes would not be compatible with the existing visual character of the area resulting in significant cumulative visual impacts.	See **M-V-1.** However, impacts associated with the cumulative change to the visual environment would remain significant and unavoidable.	Significant and Unavoidable
2.2 Air Quality	**Impact AQ-1**: Implementation of the project would conflict with and exceed the assumptions used to develop the current RAQS.	**M-AQ-1:** The County shall provide a revised housing forecast to SANDAG to ensure that any revisions to the population and employment projects used in updating the RAQS and the SIP will accurately reflect anticipated growth due to the proposed project. However, impacts associated with conflicts with the RAQS would remain significant and unavoidable.	Significant and Unavoidable

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.2 Air Quality (cont.)	**Impact AQ-2**: Construction emissions are projected to exceed the applicable SLTs for PM10 and NOx.	**M-AQ-2**: The following dust control measures will be implemented: • A "trackout" gravel bed shall be installed at every access point used during construction or at every location off-road equipment transitions to paved surfaces. The gravel bed shall be 25 feet long and the width of the access point/roadway. • Chemical stabilizers shall be applied annually to all unpaved storage/maintenance yards, parking areas, and unpaved roads. • Speeds will be limited to 15 miles an hour or less and shall be randomly verified by radar enforcement.	
		M-AQ-3: The following measure shall be implemented to reduce NOX emission levels during blasting days: All construction activity shall be halted during any blasting operation and only equipment required as part of the blasting operations, e.g., drill rig or equipment used to excavate and remove material, shall operate on the same day as blasting occurs during the construction of Phase 4, given the exceedance of NOx during this phase.	
		M-AQ-4: Any permit conditions for crushing equipment shall be followed. Material shall be pre-watered prior to loading into the crusher as required to comply with permit and opacity emission limits. The crusher's emissions opacity shall be monitored once every 30 days of operation and an opacity limit of 20 percent as average over a six-minute period shall be maintained. Water shall be applied to crushed material to prevent dust plumes.	
		M-AQ-5: The following measure shall will be implemented to reduce PM10 and PM2..5 emissions levels during blasting: Blasting activities shall adhere to permitting requirements by the California Division of Industrial Safety or the best management practices for control of fugitive dust from construction and demolition for blasting, such as wet drilling and wetting the surface area prior to blasting.	Less than Significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.2 Air Quality (cont.)	**Impact AQ-3:** Operational emissions are projected to exceed the applicable SLTs for ROG, CO, and PM_{10}.	**M-AQ-6:** The project applicant/phase developer shall develop a Green Cleaning Product education program consisting of: 1) Provision of educational materials in rental offices, leasing spaces and/or on websites, on low ROG/VOC consumer products for planned households and institutional consumers; 2) Educational materials shall be provided for detergents; cleaning compounds; polishes; floor finishes; cosmetics; personal care products; home, lawn and garden products; disinfectants; sanitizers; aerosol paints; automotive specialty products; low ROG/VOC paints and architectural coatings; and low emission landscape equipment. 3) Educational materials will include information on the importance of recycling and purchasing recycled material. **M-AQ-7:** Promote and encourage ride share and alternate forms of transportation.	Less than Significant
	Impact AQ-4: The phasing of project construction would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants as a result of operational and construction impacts occurring simultaneously.	See **M-AQ-2 through M-AQ-5**.	Less than Significant
	Impact AQ-5: Implementation of the project would result in a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions conflicting with the current RAQS.	See **M-AQ-1**. However, impacts associated with cumulative conflict with the RAQS would remain significant and unavoidable.	Significant and Unavoidable
	Impact AQ-6: Operational and construction impacts associated with the project's phasing of construction, in combination with the emissions from other proposed projects or reasonably foreseeable future projects, would be cumulatively significant.	See **M-AQ-2 through M-AQ-7**.	Less than Significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.3 Transportation/ Traffic	**Existing Plus Project (Traffic Scenario B)** *Intersections* **Impact TR-1***:* I-15 SB Ramps/Gopher Canyon Road (Caltrans)	**M-TR-1**: To reduce Impact TR-1, prior to the recordation of Final Map associated with the 1st EDU of Phase 4 (if construction follows the proposed Phasing Plan) or the 363rd EDU of the Lilac Hills Ranch Specific Plan, the applicant shall install traffic signals at I-15 SB Ramps/Gopher Canyon Road.	Less than Significant
	Impact TR-2: I-15 NB Ramps/Gopher Canyon Road (Caltrans)	**M-TR-2:** To reduce Impact TR-2, prior to the recordation of Final Map associated with the 1st EDU of Phase 4 (if construction follows the proposed Phasing Plan) or the 363rd EDU of the Lilac Hills Ranch Specific Plan, the applicant shall install traffic signals at I-15 NB Ramps/Gopher Canyon Road intersection.	Less than Significant
	Existing Plus Project (Traffic Scenario C) *Roadway Segments* **Impact TR-3:** West Lilac Road from Old Highway 395 to Main Street	**M-TR-3:** To reduce Impact TR-3, prior to the recordation of Final Map associated with the 929th EDU of the Lilac Hills Ranch Specific Plan the applicant shall improve West Lilac Road between Old Highway 395 and Main Street to meet the General Plan Mobility Element classification of 2.2C, subject to exceptions as approved by the County.	Less than Significant
	Impact TR-4: Gopher Canyon Road from E. Vista Way to I-15 **Impact TR-5:** E. Vista Way from Gopher Canyon Road to Osborne Street	Mitigation to reduce Impacts TR-4 and TR-5 would require widening of these roads to four-lane highways consistent with County Road Standards 4.1A and 4.1B. Straightening and widening these road segments could encroach into agricultural lands and existing agricultural operations and would have significant impacts to oak woodlands and wetlands which are located along these roads. Therefore, these improvements would not be feasible and Impacts TR-4 and 5 would remain significant and unavoidable.	Significant and Unavoidable
	Intersections **Impact TR-6:** Old Highway 395/West Lilac Road	**M-TR-4**: To reduce Impact TR-6, prior to the recordation of Final Map associated with the 585th EDU of the Lilac Hills Ranch Specific Plan, the applicant shall install traffic signals at Old Highway 395/West Lilac Road intersection.	Less than Significant
	Existing Plus Project (Traffic Scenario D) *Intersections* **Impact TR-7**: Old Highway 395/Circle R Drive	**M-TR-5**: To reduce Impact TR-7, prior to the recordation of Final Map with the 121st EDU (Phases 4 and 5), or 1,132 total EDU, shall install traffic signals at Old Highway 395/Circle R Drive intersection.	Less than Significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.3 Transportation/ Traffic (cont.)	**Existing Plus Project (Traffic Scenario E, Build-out)** *Roadway Segments* **Impact TR-8**: E. Vista Way, between SR-76 and Gopher Canyon Road	Mitigation of Impacts TR-8 would require widening of roads to four-lane highways consistent with County Road Standards 4.1A. Widening the roadway could encroach on agricultural lands and existing agricultural operations and would have significant impacts to wetlands that extend along the length of the road. Therefore, this improvement would not be feasible and Impact TR-8 would remain significant and unavoidable.	Significant and Unavoidable
	Existing Plus Cumulative Projects Plus Project *Roadway Segments* **Impact TR-9**: Camino Del Rey between Old River Road and West Lilac Road **Impact TR-10**: Gopher Canyon Road between E. Vista Way and I-15 SB Ramps – LOS F, and the cumulative projects plus the proposed project would add more than 100 daily trips. **Impact TR-11**: E. Vista Way, between SR-76 and Gopher Canyon Road **Impact TR-12**: E. Vista Way, between Gopher Canyon Road and Osborne Street **Impact TR-15**: Cole Grade Road, between Fruitvale Road and Valley Center Road	**M-TR-6**: To reduce Impacts TR-9 though TR-12, prior to issuance of any building permit for new structures within the Lilac Hills Ranch Specific Plan, cumulative impacts to roadways shall be mitigated through payment to the TIF Program. These identified roadway segments would operate at an acceptable LOS once upgraded as identified in the TIF program. Therefore, payment of TIF fees reduces impacts to less than significant.	Less than Significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.3 Transportation/ Traffic (cont.)	**Impact TR-13**: Pankey Road, between Pala Mesa Drive and SR-76	**M-TR-7:** The following mitigation measures would mitigate the significant cumulative traffic impacts to Impacts TR-12 and TR-13: a) Pay the TIF after the TIF has been updated to include Pankey Road from Pala Mesa Drive to SR-76 and Lilac Road from Old Castle Road to Anthony Road and to account for the changes in the Land Use and Mobility Elements proposed by the project; or b) Construct, or agree to construct Pankey Road from Pala Mesa Drive to SR-76 to a 4.2B classification and Lilac Road from Old Castle Road to Anthony Road to a 2.1C classification. If the TIF is not updated to include Pankey Road from Pala Mesa Drive to SR-76, an alternative mitigation measure for Impact TR-13 would be to construct Pankey Road from Pala Mesa Drive to SR-76 to a 4.2B classification. However, the Pankey Road segment is already required to be improved by the Campus Park and Meadowood projects, which have been conditioned to construct the roadway to its current classification of 2.1A Community Collector. Furthermore, the proposed project contributes approximately 5 percent of the total trips to the cumulative traffic condition. This small amount is not roughly proportional to the mitigation of improving the roadway to a 4.B classification over the length of Pankey Road. Mitigation measures must be roughly proportional to the environmental impacts caused by the project. Therefore, because the project's contribution to the cumulative traffic condition is not roughly proportional to the improvements required to mitigate the impact, conditioning this project to construct the road improvements is not feasible, and the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.	Significant and Unavoidable

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.3 Transportation/ Traffic (cont.)	**Impact TR-14:** Lilac Road, between Old Castle Road and Anthony Road	**See M-TR-7** If the TIF is not updated to include Lilac Road from Old Castle Road to Anthony Road, an alternative mitigation measure for Impact TR-14 would be as follows. To mitigate the project's contribution to the cumulative impact to this roadway segment, the project would construct intermittent left turn lanes at major access locations along Lilac Road. These improvements would allow the roadway to operate at LOS D or better. The alternative mitigation measure mitigates the project's contribution to the cumulative impact along this roadway segment. Impact TR-14 (Lilac Road from Old Castle Road to Anthony Road) would be mitigated to less than significant.	Less Than Significant
	Intersections **Impact TR-16:** E. Vista Way/Gopher Canyon Road **Impact TR-17:** SR-76/Old River Road/E. Vista Way **Impact TR-18:** SR-76/Olive Hill Road/Camino Del Rey **Impact TR-20:** SR-76/Pankey **Impact TR-22:** Old Highway 395/West Lilac Road **Impact TR-26:** I-15 SB Ramps/Gopher Canyon Road **Impact TR-27:** I-15 NB Ramps/Gopher Canyon Road	See **M-TR-6.**	Less than Significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.3 Transportation/ Traffic (cont.)	**Impact TR-21:** Old Highway 395/E. Dulin Road **Impact TR-28**: Miller Road/Valley Center Road	**M-TR-8:** The following mitigation measures would mitigate the significant cumulative traffic impacts to Impacts TR-19 and TR-26: a) Pay the TIF after the TIF has been updated to include Old Highway 395/East Dulin Road and Miller Road/Valley Center Road and to account for the changes in the Land Use and Mobility Elements proposed by the project; or b) Construct, or agree to construct traffic signals at these intersections. The project would pay into the TIF Program if it has been updated to mitigate local and regional cumulative impacts. In the alternative, the project would construction traffic signals once signal warrants are met, as described above. The alternative mitigation measure mitigates the project's contribution to the cumulative impact at these two intersections. Impacts TR-20 and TR-27 (Old Highway 395/E. Dulin Road and Miller Road/Valley Center Road, respectively) would be mitigated to less than significant.	Less than Significant
	Caltrans' Facilities **Impact TR-19:** Old Highway 395/ SR-76 **Impact TR-23**: I-15 SB Ramps/Old Highway 395 **Impact TR-24:** I-15 NB Ramps/Old Highway 395	County staff coordinated with Caltrans, and Caltrans confirmed that it has no project, fund, or program to make the necessary improvements to which the applicant can make a fair-share contribution. Therefore, because improvements necessary to reduce significant cumulative impacts are the responsibility of another jurisdiction, and no program is available to which the applicant could contribute, mitigation is infeasible. No other feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce the significant cumulative impacts at these three intersections. The impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.	Significant and Unavoidable

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.3 Transportation/ Traffic (cont.)	*Freeway Segments* **Impact TR-29**: I-15, between Riverside County Boundary and Old Highway 395 **Impact TR-30:** I-15, between Old Highway 395 and SR-76 **Impact TR-31:** I-15, between SR-76 and Old Highway 395 **Impact TR-32:** I-15, between Old Highway 395 and Gopher Canyon Road **Impact TR-33:** I-15, between Gopher Canyon Road and Deer Springs Road **Impact TR-34:** I-15, between Deer Springs Road and Centre City Parkway **Impact TR-35:** I-15, between Centre City Parkway and El Norte Parkway **Impact TR-36:** I-15, between El Norte Parkway and SR-78	No feasible mitigation measures are currently available to reduce the significant cumulative impacts identified as TR-28 and TR-35. The project has coordinated with Caltrans, and Caltrans has no project, fund or program to which the applicant can make a fair-share contribution. Therefore, because funding sources have not been identified for planned improvements that would reduce these impacts no feasible mitigation measures are available at this time and the cumulative freeway impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.	Significant and Unavoidable

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.4 Agricultural Resources	**Impact AG-1:** The project would result in a significant adjacency issue associated with the on-site Park (P-10) also identified as AA 6.	**M-AG-1:** A 50-foot-wide agricultural buffer planted with two rows of the appropriate tree crop (e.g., citrus, avocado) shall be provided along AAs 3 through 10 and 13 creating adequate buffer between off-site agricultural activities and on-site uses.	Less than Significant
	Impact AG-2: The project would result in a significant adjacency issue associated with the Institutional site.	**M-AG-2:** A 6-foot-high fence shall be maintained along AAs 3 through 10 and 13 in order to prevent intrusion by people and domesticated pets.	Less than Significant
	Impact AG-3: The project would result in a significant adjacency issue associated with the age restricted area within Phase 4 also identified as AA 8.	**M-AG-3:** A Limited Building Zone, prohibiting habitable structures as well as any structure which could attract residents, visitors, or children shall be implemented at AAs 3, 4, 6 through 10, and 13 to prevent residents from congregating within areas in proximity to off-site agricultural operations.	Less than Significant
	Impact AG-4: The project would result in a significant adjacency issue associated with AA 3.	See **M-AG-1, M-AG-2**, and **M-AG-3**	Less than Significant
	Impact AG-5: The project would result in a significant adjacency issue associated with AA 4.	See **M-AG-1, M-AG-2,** and **M-AG-3**	Less than Significant
	Impact AG-6: The project would result in a significant adjacency issue associated with AA 5.	See **M-AG-1, M-AG-2,** and **M-AG-3**	Less than Significant
	Impact AG-7: The project would result in a significant adjacency issue associated with AA 7.	See **M-AG-1, M-AG-2,** and **M-AG-3**	Less than Significant
	Impact AG-8: The project would result in a significant adjacency issue associated with AA 9.	See **M-AG-1, M-AG-2,** and **M-AG-31.**	Less than Significant
	Impact AG-9: The project would result in a significant adjacency issue associated with AA 10.	See **M-AG-1, M-AG-2,** and **M-AG-3**	Less than Significant
	Impact AG-10: The project would result in a significant adjacency issue associated with AA 13.	See **M-AG-1, M-AG-2**, and **M-AG-3**	Less than Significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.4 Agricultural Resources (cont.)	**Impact AG-11:** The project would result in a significant adjacency issue associated with interim on-site agricultural activities.	**M-AG-4:** The applicant/HOA shall exercise control over interim agricultural operations on-site through specific terms of agricultural leases. Through the execution of agricultural leases, the applicant/HOA will prohibit aerial pesticide spraying and will take all precautions to minimize other impacts (both to and from future residents) including noise and dust generation, trespassing, and vandalism. All storage and use of hazardous materials and pesticides within these agricultural areas shall comply with all State Law and the County Agricultural, Weights and Measures Regulations.	Less than Significant
	Impact AG-12: The project would result in a significant on and off-site adjacency issue associated with storage of hazardous materials.	See **M-AG-1, M-AG-2,** and **M-AG-3**	Less than Significant
	Impact AG-13: The project would result in a significant adjacency issue associated with non-native pests or domestic pets.	See **M-AG-1, M-AG-2,** and **M-AG-3**	Less than Significant
	Impact AG-14: The project would result in a significant adjacency issue associated with the spread of pathogens and disease.	See **M-AG-1, M-AG-2,** and **M-AG-3**	Less than Significant
	Impact AG-15: The project would result in a significant cumulative impacts associated with potential loss of agricultural production.	See **M-AG-1, M-AG-2, M-AG-3,** and **M-AG-4**	Less than Significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.5 Biological Resources	**Impact BIO-1**: The project would impact more than 5 percent of the raptor foraging habitat onsite, and therefore the project raptor foraging impact would be significant.	**M-BIO-1a:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit for Phase 1, the following shall be provided either on-site within the open space easement; off-site within a draft PAMA of the draft North County MSCP in Valley Center or adjacent communities; or through a mitigation bank, subject to the approval of the County and appropriate wildlife agencies: 1. Impacts to 9.8 acres of coastal sage scrub (including disturbed) shall be mitigated at a 2:1 ratio with 19.6 acres. 2. Impacts to 0.1 acre of disturbed coastal/valley freshwater marsh shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 0.3 acre. 3. Impacts to 0.5 acre of southern coast live oak riparian woodland shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 1.5 acres. 4. Impacts to 0.5 acre of southern mixed chaparral shall be mitigated at a 0.5 to 1 ratio with 0.3 acre. 5. Impacts to 0.5 acre of southern willow riparian woodland shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 1.5 acres.	Less than Significant
		M-BIO-1b: Prior to issuance of a grading permit for Phase 2, the following shall be provided either on-site within the open space easement; off-site within a draft PAMA of the draft North County MSCP in Valley Center or adjacent communities; or through a mitigation bank, subject to the approval of the County and appropriate wildlife agencies: 1. Impacts to 6.8 acres of coastal sage scrub (including disturbed) shall be mitigated at a 2:1 ratio with 13.36 acres. 2. Impacts to 0.2 acre of southern coast live oak riparian woodland shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 0.6 acre. 3. Impacts to 0.3 acre of open water shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 0.9 acre.	

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.5 Biological Resources (cont.)		**M-BIO-1c:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit for Phase 3, the following shall be provided either on-site within the open space easement; off-site within a draft PAMA of the draft North County MSCP in Valley Center or adjacent communities; or through a mitigation bank, subject to the approval of the County and appropriate wildlife agencies: 1. Impacts to 0.3 acre of coast live oak woodland shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 0.9 acre. 2. Impacts to 3.0 acres of coastal sage scrub (including disturbed) shall be mitigated at a 2:1 ratio with 6.0 acres. 3. Impacts to 0.8 acre of southern coast live oak riparian woodland (including disturbed) shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 2.4 acres. 4. Impacts to 53.8 acres of southern mixed chaparral (including disturbed) shall be mitigated at a 0.5 to 1 ratio with 26.9 acres. 5. Impacts to 0.3 acre of southern willow scrub (including disturbed) shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 0.9 acre. 6. Impacts to 0.1 acre of mule fat scrub (including disturbed) shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 0.3 acre.	
		M-BIO-1d: Prior to issuance of a grading permit for Phase 4, the following shall be provided either on-site within the open space easement; off-site within a draft PAMA of the draft North County MSCP in Valley Center or adjacent communities; or through a mitigation bank, subject to the approval of the County and appropriate wildlife agencies: 1. Impacts to 0.1 acre of southern coast live oak riparian woodland shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 0.3 acre. 2. Impacts to 0.1 acre of disturbed southern willow scrub shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 0.3 acre. 3. Impacts to 0.1 acre of disturbed wetland shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 0.3 acre.	

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.5 Biological Resources (cont.)		**M-BIO-1e**: Prior to issuance of a grading permit for Phase 5, the following shall be provided either on-site within the open space easement; off-site within a draft PAMA of the draft North County MSCP in Valley Center or adjacent communities; or through a mitigation bank, subject to the approval of the County and appropriate wildlife agencies: 1. Impacts to 0.2 acre of southern willow scrub shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 0.6 acre. 2. Impacts to 0.2 acre of open water shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 0.6 acre.	
		M-BIO-1f: Prior to issuance of a grading permit for off-site improvements, the following shall be provided either on-site within the open space easement; off-site within a draft PAMA of the draft North County MSCP in Valley Center or adjacent communities; or through a mitigation bank, subject to the approval of the County and appropriate wildlife agencies: 1. Impacts to 0.1 acres of coastal sage scrub (including disturbed) shall be mitigated at a 2:1 ratio with 0.2 acre.	

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.5 Biological Resources (cont.)	**Impact BIO-2**: The project would have direct impacts to riparian habitat and sensitive natural communities, consisting of the following: coast live oak woodland (0.3 acre), coastal sage scrub (17.0 acres), disturbed coastal sage scrub (2.6 acres), disturbed coastal/valley freshwater marsh (0.1 acre), southern coast live oak riparian woodland (1.1 acres), disturbed southern coast live oak riparian woodland (0.5 acre), southern mixed chaparral (49.4 acres), disturbed southern mixed chaparral (4.9 acres), southern willow riparian woodland (0.5 acre), southern willow scrub (0.3 acre), disturbed southern willow scrub (0.3 acre), open water (0.5 acre), and disturbed wetland (0.01 acre). Off-site impacts include coastal sage scrub (0.1 acre). As the project construction would occur in five phases, the impacts would occur in phases (see Table 2.7-4 of the EIR). These impacts to riparian habitat and sensitive natural communities would be considered significant.	**M-BIO-2:** A Resource Management Plan shall be prepared by a qualified biologist prior to the issuance of grading permits to address any restoration, enhancement, and maintenance of open space. The report shall address the location of the mitigation sites within the project site and off-site, site preparation, irrigation system requirements, plant palettes, installation procedure, and describe the maintenance and monitoring program for both the establishment mitigation areas and the enhancement mitigation areas. The proposed open space easement shall be owned by a conservancy, the County or other similar, experienced entity subject to approval by the County. Maintenance responsibilities shall be provided by an entity approved by the County and funding shall be provided through an 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. The management goals for the on-site biological open space shall include the following: 1. Preserve and manage the open space lands to the benefit of the flora, fauna, and native ecosystem functions reflected in the natural communities occurring within the RMP land. 2. Manage the land for the benefit of sensitive plant and wildlife species and existing natural communities, without substantive efforts to alter or restrict the natural course of habitat development and dynamics. 3. Reduce, control, and where feasible, eradicate non-native, invasive flora and/or fauna known to be detrimental to native species and/or the local ecosystem. 4. Maintain the character and function of certain agricultural areas within the wetland buffer and open space area.	Less than Significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.5 Biological Resources (cont.)		The Resource Manager shall be responsible for interpreting the results of site monitoring to determine the ongoing success of the RMP. If it is necessary to modify the plan between regularly scheduled updates, plan changes shall be submitted to the County and agencies for approval as required.	
	Impact BIO-3: The project would impact jurisdictional waters, including 4.22 acres (2.92 acres of non-wetland waters and 1.30 acres of wetlands) of ACOE jurisdictional area, 6.55 acres (3.1 acres of streambed and 3.45 acres of wetlands) of CDFG/RWQCB jurisdictional area, and 2.23 acres of County wetlands located on-site. These direct impacts to riparian habitat would be significant.	**M-BIO-3:** Prior to the issuance of grading permits, wetland impacts shall be mitigated at a ratio of 3:1, consisting of on-site preservation, enhancement, and/or creation of wetlands. Mitigation of wetlands shall include a 1:1 creation component to ensure no net loss of wetlands. Non-wetland waters and streambed shall be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio consisting of preservation/enhancement. Mitigation measures for impacts to ACOE, CDFG/RWQCB, and County RPO wetlands are listed as follows: 1. ACOE jurisdiction: On-site permanent impacts to 2.9 acres on-site non-wetland waters of the US shall be mitigated with the preservation/enhancement of 2.9 acres. Permanent impacts to 1.30 acres of wetlands on-site shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 3.9 acres of ACOE jurisdictional wetlands enhancement/preservation/creation (1:1 creation component). 2. CDFG/RWQCB jurisdiction: On-site permanent impacts to 3.1 acres on-site streambed shall be mitigated with the preservation/enhancement of 3.1 acres of streambed. Permanent impacts to 3.45 acres of state wetlands on-site shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 10.35 acres of CDFG/RWQCB jurisdictional state wetlands enhancement/ preservation/ creation (1:1 creation component). 3. County RPO jurisdiction: Permanent impacts to 2.23 acres of RPO wetlands on-site shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with 6.69 acres of RPO wetlands enhancement/ preservation/ creation (1:1 creation component).	Less than Significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.5 Biological Resources (cont.)		Impacts to jurisdictional resources are not additive; therefore, mitigation for impacts to CDFG/RWQCB jurisdictional area fulfills the mitigation requirements for impacts to ACOE jurisdictional and County wetlands. Ultimately, the jurisdictional waters/wetland mitigation shall proceed in accordance with the permit and certification requirements of the ACOE, CDFG/RWQCB, and County.	
		M-BIO-4: A Revegetation Plan shall be prepared by a qualified biologist to address the mitigation identified in M-BIO-3 and the wildlife agency permits. The ACOE, CDFG/RWQCB, and County shall review and approve the Revegetation Plan prior to the issuance of wetland permits and grading permits. Success criteria shall be the following, at a minimum: 1. 80 percent transplant/container plant survival in year 1; 2. 100 percent transplant/container plant survival in year 2 with 50 percent native cover, 50 percent diversity and 50 percent density; 3. 100 percent transplant/container plant survival in year 3 with 60 percent native cover, 60 percent diversity and 60 percent density; 4. 100 percent transplant/container plant survival in year 4; with 75 percent native cover, 70 percent diversity and 70 percent density; 5. 100 percent transplant/container plant survival in year 5 with 80 percent native cover, 70 percent diversity and 70 percent density; 6. The wetland revegetation areas must sustain themselves for a minimum of one year (meeting the fifth-year performance standards) in the absence of significant maintenance measures; and 7. The cover of non-native annuals and herbs, as identified by the project biologist, will be no more than 10 percent by the end of the five-year monitoring period. No invasive exotic perennials on the Cal-IPC lists A and B will be permitted on the revegetation sites by the end of the five-year monitoring period.	

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.5 Biological Resources (cont.)		8. If the success criteria/performance standards are not achieved at the end of each year of monitoring or by the end of the fifth year, the owner/project proponent will consult with the County of San Diego to develop appropriate remedial measures. Remedial measures may involve actions such as replanting areas, continued weed control, or finding alternative revegetation sites.	
2.6 Cultural Resources	**Impact CR-1**: Although, site CA-SDI-20436 does not meet the threshold of significance under RPO, it is a significant resource under CEQA. Because the site is not within the dedicated open space easement, there is a potential for significant direct and indirect impacts.	**M-CR-1:** Prior to approval of a Final Map, the applicant shall implement the data recovery program prepared by Mary Robbins-Wade (2013) for site CA SDI-20436. The data recovery program shall be implemented prior to the commencement of any grading and/or improvements. All data recovery shall include a Luiseño Native American monitor.	Less than Significant
	Impact CR-2: Unknown CEQA and/or RPO-significant archaeological resources could be buried within the project site. Such previously undiscovered cultural sites could be disturbed during on-site grading activities. Impacts to any unknown cultural resources are potentially significant.	**M-CR-2:** Prior to approval of grading or improvement plans for any phase of the project, or associated with improvements to the Miller Fire Station site, the applicant shall implement a grading monitoring and data recovery program to mitigate potential impacts to undiscovered buried archaeological resources on the project site, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Development Services. This program shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following actions: a. Provide evidence to the Department of Planning and Development Services that a County approved archaeologist has been contracted to implement a grading monitoring and data recovery program to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Development Services. A letter from the Principal Investigator shall be submitted to the Director of Planning and Development Services. The letter shall include the following guidelines: (1) The project archaeologist shall contract with a Luiseño Native American monitor to be involved with the grading monitoring program as outlined in the County of San Diego Report Format and Content Guidelines (2007).	Less than Significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.6 Cultural Resources (cont.)		(2) The County certified archaeologist/historian and Luiseño Native American monitor shall attend the pre-grading meeting with the contractors to explain and coordinate the requirements of the monitoring program as outlined in the County of San Diego Report Format and Content Guidelines (2007). (3) The project archaeologist shall monitor all areas identified for development including off-site improvements. (4) During the original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits, the archaeological monitor(s) and Luiseño Native American monitor(s) shall be onsite as determined by the Project Archaeologist of the excavations. Inspections will vary based on the rate of excavation, the materials excavated, and the presence and abundance of artifacts and features. The frequency and location of inspections will be determined by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Luiseño Native American monitor. Monitoring of cutting of previously disturbed deposits will be determined by the Principal Investigator. (5) Isolates and clearly non-significant deposits will be minimally documented in the field and the monitored grading can proceed.	

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.6 Cultural Resources (cont.)		(6) In the event that previously unidentified potentially significant cultural resources are discovered, the archaeological monitor(s) shall have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area of the discovery to allow evaluation of potentially significant cultural resources. The Principal Investigator shall contact the County Archaeologist at the time of the discovery. The Principal Investigator, in consultation with the County staff archaeologist, shall determine the significance of the discovered resources. The County Archaeologist must concur with the evaluation before construction activities will be allowed to resume in the affected area. For significant cultural resources, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program to mitigate impacts shall be prepared by the consulting archaeologist and approved by the County Archaeologist, then carried out using professional archaeological methods. (9) If any human bones are discovered, the Principal Investigator shall contact the County Coroner. In the event that the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Most Likely Descendant, as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission, shall be contacted by the Principal Investigator in order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains. (10) Before construction activities are allowed to resume in the affected area, the artifacts shall be recovered and features recorded using professional archaeological methods. The Principal Investigator shall determine the amount of material to be recovered for an adequate artifact sample for analysis.	

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.6 Cultural Resources (cont.)		(11) In the event that previously unidentified cultural resources are discovered, all cultural material collected during the grading monitoring program shall be processed and curated at a San Diego facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79, and therefore would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within San Diego County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the curation facility identifying that archaeological materials have been received and that all fees have been paid. Or Alternatively, cultural material collected may be repatriated to the appropriate Luiseño tribe. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the tribe that archaeological materials have been received. (12) Monthly status reports shall be submitted to the Director of Planning and Development Services starting from the date of the notice to proceed to termination of implementation of the grading monitoring program. The reports shall briefly summarize all activities during the period and the status of progress on overall plan implementation. Upon completion of the implementation phase, a final report shall be submitted describing the plan compliance procedures and site conditions before and after construction. (13) In the event that previously unidentified cultural resources are discovered, a report documenting the field and analysis results and interpreting the artifacts and research data within the research context shall be completed and submitted to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Development Services prior to the issuance of any building permits. The report shall include Department of Parks and Recreation Primary and Archaeological Site forms.	

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.6 Cultural Resources (cont.)		(14) In the event that no cultural resources are discovered, a brief letter to that effect shall be sent to the Director of Planning and Development Services by the consulting archaeologist that the grading monitoring activities have been completed. b. Provide evidence to the Director of Public Works that the following notes have been placed on the Grading Plan: (1) The County certified archaeologist/historian and Luiseño Native American monitor shall attend the pre-construction meeting with the contractors to explain and coordinate the requirements of the monitoring program. (2) The project archaeologist shall monitor all areas identified for development including off-site improvements. (3) During the original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits, the archaeological monitor(s) and Luiseño Native American monitor(s) shall be onsite as determined by the Principal Investigator of the excavations. Inspections will vary based on the rate of excavation, the materials excavated, and the presence and abundance of artifacts and features. The frequency and location of inspections will be determined by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Luiseño Native American monitor. Monitoring of cutting of previously disturbed deposits will be determined by the Principal Investigator.	

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.6 Cultural Resources (cont.)		(4) In the event that previously unidentified potentially significant cultural resources are discovered, the archaeological monitor(s) shall have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area of the discovery to allow evaluation of potentially significant cultural resources. The Principal Investigator shall contact the County Archaeologist at the time of the discovery. The Principal Investigator, in consultation with the County staff archaeologist, shall determine the significance of the discovered resources. The County Archaeologist must concur with the evaluation before construction activities will be allowed to resume in the affected area. For significant cultural resources, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program to mitigate impacts shall be prepared by the Principal Investigator and approved by the County Archaeologist, then carried out using professional archaeological methods. (5) The archaeological monitor(s) and Luiseño Native American monitor shall monitor all areas identified for development. (6) If any human bones are discovered, the Principal Investigator shall contact the County Coroner. In the event that the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Most Likely Descendant, as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission, shall be contacted by the Principal Investigator order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains. (7) The Principal Investigator shall submit monthly status reports to the Director of Planning and Development Services starting from the date of the notice to proceed to termination of implementation of the grading monitoring program. The reports shall briefly summarize all activities during the period and the status of progress on overall plan implementation. Upon completion of the implementation phase, a final report shall be submitted describing the plan compliance procedures and site conditions before and after construction.	

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.6 Cultural Resources (cont.)		(8) Prior to rough grading inspection sign-off, provide evidence that the field grading monitoring activities have been completed to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Development Services. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the Project Investigator. (9) Prior to Final Grading Release, submit to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Development Services, a final report that documents the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the Archaeological Monitoring Program. The report shall also include the following: (a) Department of Parks and Recreation Primary and Archaeological Site forms. (b) Evidence that all cultural material collected during the grading monitoring program has been curated at a San Diego facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79, and therefore would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/ researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within San Diego County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the curation facility identifying that archaeological materials have been received and that all fees have been paid. Alternatively, cultural material collected will be repatriated to the appropriate Luiseño band(s), per the project's pre-excavation agreement. Or In the event that no cultural resources are discovered, a brief letter to that effect shall be sent to the Director of Planning and Development Services by the Principal Investigator that the grading monitoring activities have been completed.	

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.6 Cultural Resources (cont.)	**Impact CR-3:** The improvements proposed within and adjacent to CA-SDI-5072 could result in significant impacts if any trenching required for off-site improvements in this area would affect native soils.	**M-CR-3:** Prior to approval of off-site improvement plans, if it is determined that trenching for signalization cannot be accommodated within the existing fill layer above native soils within CA-SDI-5072, a capping plan shall be developed and implemented to preserve site deposits beneath the roadway improvements. The capping plan shall be similar to that implemented for construction of I-15 and associated facilities in the area of this site and consist of the following: a. Any brushing and grubbing required shall be completed by hand; b. The soil cap shall be at least 12 inches thick and shall consist of documented fill soil that is free of any cultural material; c. Fill material shall be placed by end-dumping using rubber-tired vehicles prior to any other grading operations; d. All work in the vicinity of CA-SDI-5072 shall be monitored by an archaeologist and a Native American (Luiseño) monitor; e. There shall be no storage or staging of equipment or vehicles within the boundaries of the archaeological site, except in areas that are already paved; f. There shall be no encroachment into the archaeological site by workers or vehicles except in areas that are already paved or capped.	Less than Significant
	Impact CR-4: Ground-disturbing activity associated with potential improvements to the Miller Fire Station site could result in disturbance of previously undiscovered cultural sites. Impacts to any unknown cultural resources are potentially significant.	See **M-CR-2.**	Less than Significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.7 Hazards/ Hazardous Materials	**Impact HZ-1:** The project would result in a potentially significant adverse impact associated with wildland fires, due to the fact that within several areas of the project site, fuel modification zones would be less than 100-feet in width, as required by County Fire Code.	**M-HZ-1:** For areas within the project site where buildings or structures do not meet the standard 100-foot setback for fuel management, one of the following measures shall be met: A. Prior to approval of the first Final Map, a recorded easement on adjacent property shall be obtained in order to meet FMZ standards off-site. B. If an agreement and recorded easement on adjacent property cannot be obtained, alternative measures as detailed in the FPP would be required to achieve the same level of protection shall be identified prior to approval of a final map. The specific measures shall be incorporated into the site plan and/or use permit plot plan for the area and shall be subject to the approval of the DSFPD: 1. Additional ignition-resistant construction methods and other non-combustible features, such as parking lots, sidewalks, concrete patios, decorative rock, natural boulders on-site, and similar landscape features; and/or 2. Fire-barrier walls. Either measure A or B above shall be met prior to issuance of a Final Map.	Less than Significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.8 Noise	**Traffic-generated Noise (Direct)** **Impact N-1:** Traffic generated noise at identified exterior receivers would be significant**.**	**M-N-1:** Prior to approval of the master tentative map, or subsequent implementing tentative map, as appropriate, the project applicant shall dedicate "noise protection easements" on the master tentative map and each subsequent implementing tentative map for all lots located within the 60 CNEL contour, as shown on Figures 2.9-2a and 2.9-2b. • The noise protection easements shall contain a restriction requiring compliance with the standards for the subject land use as stated in Tables N-1 and N-2 of the County General Plan Noise Element (Tables 7 and 8 of Appendix M). Thus, the Noise easement shall contain the following language. o For single-family lots: The noise level at exterior use areas associated with single-family detached dwelling units, shall contain at least the following minimum net lot area: ▪ for lots less than 4,000 square feet in area, the exterior area shall include 400 square feet, ▪ for lots between 4,000 square feet to 10 acres in area, the exterior area shall include 10 percent of the lot area; ▪ for lots over 10 acres in area, the exterior area shall include 1 acre. • Noise levels with the single-family residential exterior use areas shall not exceed 60 CNEL. o For residential lots other than single family lots: The noise level at exterior use areas is defined as areas which are provided for private or group usable open space purposes (as defined in Table N-2 of the County General Plan Noise Element). • Noise levels with the exterior use areas for all other residential lots shall not exceed 65 CNEL. o For non-residential noise sensitive land uses, the exterior area is the public use provided.	Less than Significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.8 Noise (cont.)		• The exterior noise level standard for shall be 65 CNEL and the interior noise level standard shall be 50 dB(A) L_{eq} (one hour average). o Exterior noise standards do not apply for land uses where no exterior use area is proposed or necessary. o For all other land uses the exterior noise level standard shall not exceed the limit defined as "Acceptable" in Table N-1 of the County General Plan Noise Element or the equivalent one-hour noise standard. • The lots with the noise protection easements shall be identified on all final maps.	
		M-N-2: Prior to approval of any building permit for properties located within in noise protection easements, the building permit applicant shall demonstrate that interior noise levels due to exterior noise sources would not exceed the applicable standards detailed below for the subject land use (see Figures 2.9-2a and 2.9-2b). In these cases, it is anticipated that the typical method of compliance would be to provide the homes with air conditioning or equivalent forced air circulation to allow occupancy with closed windows, which, for most residential construction, would provide sufficient exterior-to-interior noise reduction. • An acoustical study shall be prepared to demonstrate and verify that interior noise levels are below 45 CNEL within all residential structures, and below 50 CNEL schools, churches, medical/dental facilities (i.e., hospitals, laboratories, nursing homes) child care facilities, government facilities, and commercial uses (office and retail).	
	Impact N-2: Interior noise levels of second floor receivers adjacent to the roadways could exceed allowable interior noise levels and would result in a significant impact.	See **M-N-1**.	Less than Significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.8 Noise (cont.)	**Impact N-3:** Traffic generated noise at off-site receivers adjacent to Covey Land and future Lilac Hills Ranch Road would increase significantly over existing conditions and would result in a significant impact.	See **M-N-1**. However, impacts associated with traffic related noise increase would remain significant and unavoidable.	Significant and Unavoidable
	Stationary and Construction Noise (Direct) *Operational Impacts* **Impact N-4:** Noise at exterior receivers due to the location of HVACS would result in a significant impact.	**M-N-3:** Best engineering practices shall be used and consider in the placement of noise generating equipment and shielding when installing stationary noise sources associated with HVAC systems and standby generators. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant, or its designee, shall prepare an acoustical study(s) of proposed mechanical equipment including generators, which will identify all noise-generating equipment, predict noise levels at property lines from all identified equipment, and recommended mitigation to be implemented (e.g., enclosures, barriers, site orientation), as necessary, to comply with the County Noise Ordinance Section 36.404.	Less than Significant
		M-N-4: Best engineering practices shall be used in the placement of noise generating equipment when developing site plans for commercial land uses containing loading docks, delivery areas, and parking lots such that noise levels at the property line comply with County standards. Development plans shall be accompanied by an acoustical analysis demonstrating compliance with County standards for approval prior to issuance of building permits. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant, or its designee, shall prepare an acoustical study(s) of proposed commercial land use site plans, which shall identify all noise-generating areas and associated equipment, predict noise levels at property lines from all identified areas, and recommended mitigation to be implemented (e.g., enclosures, barriers, site orientation, reduction of parking stalls), as necessary, to comply with the County Noise Ordinance Section 36.404.	

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.8 Noise (cont.)		**M-N-5:** Best engineering practices shall be used and considered in the placement and design of dog parks, such that noise levels at surrounding property lines comply with County standards for the applicable zone. Development plans shall be accompanied by an acoustical analysis demonstrating compliance with County standards for approval prior to issuance of building permits. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant, or its designee, shall prepare an acoustical study(s) of proposed dog parks, which shall predict noise levels at potentially affected property lines from all sources, and recommended mitigation to be implemented (e.g., barriers, site location, etc.), as necessary, to comply with the County Noise Ordinance Section 36.404.	
		M-N-6: Best engineering practices shall be used and considered in the placement of noise generating equipment when developing site plans for the WRF such that noise levels at the property line comply with County standards. Development plans shall be accompanied by an acoustical analysis demonstrating compliance with County standards for approval prior to issuance of building permits. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant, or its designee, shall prepare an acoustical study(s) of proposed WRF, which shall identify all noise-generating sources and associated equipment, predict noise levels at potentially affected property lines from all identified sources, and recommended mitigation to be implemented (e.g., enclosures, barriers, site orientation, etc.), as necessary, to comply with the County Noise Ordinance Section 36.404.	

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.8 Noise (cont.)		**M-N-7:** Best engineering practices shall be used and considered in the placement of noise generating equipment when developing site plans for the recycling and green waste collection facility such that noise levels at the property line comply with County standards. Development plans shall be accompanied by an acoustical analysis demonstrating compliance with County standards for approval prior to issuance of building permits. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant, or its designee, shall prepare an acoustical study(s) of proposed recycling/green waste collection facility, which shall identify all noise-generating sources and associated equipment, predict noise levels at potentially affected property lines from all identified sources, and recommended mitigation to be implemented (e.g., enclosures, barriers, site orientation, etc.), as necessary, to comply with the County Noise Ordinance Section 36.404.	
	Impact N-5: Noise at exterior receivers due to the location of non-emergency generators would result in a significant impact.	See **M-N-4 through M-N-7**.	Less than Significant
	Impact N-6: Noise at exterior receivers due to the location of parking lots would result in a significant impact.	See **M-N-4 through M-N-7**.	Less than Significant
	Impact N-7: Noise at exterior receivers due to the location of loading docks would result in a significant impact.	See **M-N-4 through M-N-7**.	Less than Significant
	Impact N-8: Noise levels due to dog park activities would be a significant noise impact.	See **M-N-4 through M-N-7**.	Less than Significant
	Impact N-9: The project includes the construction and operation of a WRF the location of which would result in a significant impact at exterior noise receiver locations.	See **M-N-4 through M-N-7**.	Less than Significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.8 Noise (cont.)	**Impact N-10:** The project includes the construction and operation of a RF the location of which would result in a significant impact at exterior noise receiver locations.	See **M-N-4 through M-N-7**.	Less than Significant
	Construction Impacts **Impact N-11:** Construction noise if allowed along more than one property line of any existing on-site property identified as NAP would be significant.	**M-N-8:** During all phases of project-related construction activities, the project applicant or designated contractor shall ensure that construction does not occur along more than one property line of any single existing on-site property that is identified as NAP on the implementing map. **M-N-9:** Prior to and during project-related construction activities for the expansion of the CAL FIRE Miller Station, the project applicant(s) and primary contractor(s) shall erect a temporary 12-foot-high noise barrier sufficient to block the line of sight from the adjacent properties to the construction activities along the eastern and western property lines of CAL FIRE Miller Station. The noise barrier shall be constructed of material with a minimum weight of two pounds per square foot with no gaps or perforations. Noise barriers may be constructed of, but are not limited to, 5/8-inch plywood, 5/8-inch oriented strand board, or hay bales. **M-N-10:** Prior to and during all project-related rock crushing activities, the project applicant(s) and primary contractor(s) of all project phases involving rock crushing shall ensure that all rock crushing activities are located a minimum distance of 350 feet from the nearest property line where an occupied structure is located and shall comply with County noise standards pursuant to County Noise Ordinance, Section 36.409. The 350-foot setback distance may be reduced if a noise study is conducted for rock processing activities and such activities noise levels are within acceptable County limits at modified distances determined by the noise study.	Less than Significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.8 Noise (cont.)		**M-N-11:** Prior to approval of the grading permit for any implementing tentative map, the project applicant or the designated contractor shall have a blast and monitoring plan prepared with an estimate of noise and vibration levels of each blast at NSLU within 1,000 feet of each blast. Additionally, all project phases involving blasting shall conform to the following requirements: • All blasting shall be performed by a blast contractor and blasting personnel licensed to operate in the County. • Each blast shall be monitored and recorded with an air blast over-pressure monitor and groundborne vibration accelerometer approved by the County that is located outside the closest residence to the blast. • A blasting plan, including estimates of the air blast over-pressure level and groundborne vibration at the residence closest to the blast, shall be submitted to the County for review prior to the first blast. Blasting shall not commence until the County has approved the blast plan. • Blasting shall not exceed 0.1 in/sec PPV at the nearest occupied residence in accordance with County of San Diego Noise Guidelines Section 4.3. Blasting shall not be conducted within 1,000 feet of on- or off-site sensitive receptors unless the Blasting Study concludes that a distance less than 1,000 feet would not exceed County construction and impulsive noise standards.	
	Impact N-12: Construction noise associated with the off-site Cal Fire Miller Station (if selected as the fire option, see subchapter 2.7) property would exceed noise thresholds at adjacent residential properties resulting in a significant impact.	See **M-N-8 through N-11**.	Less than Significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.8 Noise (cont.)	**Impact N-13:** Rock crushing noise levels at surrounding and onsite property lines could exceed County standards representing a significant impact.	See **M-N-8 through N-11**.	Less than Significant
	Impact N-14: Blasting associated with construction may result in a significant impact due to impulsive noise.	See **M-N-8 through N-11**.	Less than Significant
	Vibration (Direct) **Impact N-15:** During project grading, there would be impacts associated with the exposure of a NSLU to groundborne vibration levels associated with heavy equipment. This would result in a significant impact.	**M-N-12:** Prior to and during all phases of construction activities, the project applicant shall not allow heavy equipment to be operated within 100 feet of any inhabited residence.	Less than Significant
	Impact N-16: During project grading and blasting operations, there would be impacts associated with the exposure of a NSLU to groundborne vibration levels associated with blasting. This would result in a significant impact.	See **M- N-12**.	Less than Significant
	Cumulative Impacts **Impact N-17:** Traffic generated noise at off-site receivers adjacent to Covey Land and future Lilac Hills Ranch Road would increase significantly over existing conditions and would result in a significant cumulative impact.	See **M-N-1, 2, 11, and 12.** However, impacts associated with cumulative traffic related noise increase would remain significant and unavoidable.	Significant and Unavoidable
	Impact N-18: The project would place NSLUs in areas where the projected cumulative noise levels from road traffic could exceed the County's exterior noise limits. This is a significant cumulative impact.	See **M-N-1, 2, 11,** and **12.**	Less than Significant

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

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.8 Noise (cont.)	**Impact N-19:** Construction noise would result in noise events construction activity, including grading. If multiple construction operations occurred simultaneously, a significant cumulative impact would result.	See **M-N-1, 2, 11,** and **12.**	Less than Significant
	Impact N-20: Construction noise would result in impulsive noise events from blasting. If multiple blasting operations occurred simultaneously, a significant cumulative impact would result.	See **M-N-1, 2, 11,** and **12.**	Less than Significant