generators. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce significant on-site operational noise impacts to a level that is less than significant.

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.

Mitigation Measure M-N-7: This mitigation measure specified in the FEIR has been imposed on the project as a condition of approval requiring best engineering practices be used 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 for the RF, the applicant, or its designee, shall prepare an acoustical study(s) of the proposed recycling/green waste collection facility for submittal to the County for review and approval. The acoustical study shall identify all noise-generating sources and associated equipment and calculate noise levels at potentially affected property lines from all identified sources. Where predicted noise levels would exceed those established by the County Noise Ordinance Section 36.404, the acoustical study shall identify mitigation measures shown to be effective in reducing noise levels (e.g., enclosures, barriers, facility orientation, etc.) to be implemented to comply with the property line noise level limits of County Noise Ordinance Section 36.404, and such measures shall be implemented by the applicant or its designee prior to issuance of a building permit. Implementation of this measure also requires best engineering practices to be used, including consideration of the noise rating of selected equipment, equipment orientation and placement within a site, and site design, such as building placement enclosures and the use of terrain to shield adjacent properties from on-site noise generator.

Rationale: Implementation of mitigation measure M-N-7 would reduce the impacts identified as N-10 because best engineering practices would be implemented including consideration of the noise rating of selected equipment, equipment orientation and placement of the generators within a site, and site design of the RF to shield adjacent properties from these on-site noise generators. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce significant on-site operational noise impacts to a level that is less than significant.

Evidence Supporting CEQA Findings:

Substantial evidence to support the finding that Impacts N-4 through N-10 would be reduced to less than significant levels with the implementation of mitigation is found within the administrative record pertaining to this FEIR. Please refer to the following document(s):

- FEIR subchapter 2.8- specifically subchapters 2.8.1, 2.8.2.2, 2.8.4.2, 2.8.5.2, 2.8.6.2
- FEIR Appendix M, Noise Report

3. Direct Impacts (Construction)

The project includes design considerations as incorporated into the Specific Plan, the implementation of which would reduce potentially significant impacts associated with construction noise. As detailed in the FEIR Table 1-3, these measures include requiring all construction equipment to be maintained and equipped with noise-reduction intake and exhaust mufflers and engine shrouds; equipment engine shrouds to be closed during equipment operation; whenever feasible, electrical power to be used to run air compressors and similar power tools; equipment staging areas to be located as far as feasible from occupied residences

or schools; for all construction activity on the project site, noise attenuation techniques to be employed as needed to ensure that noise remains below 75 dB(A) eight-hour L_{eq} at the boundary line of an occupied residential use; and no more than one pile driver to be active on any single construction site or within 500 feet of another active pile driver. However, as discussed in FEIR subchapter 2.8, even with implementation of these design considerations, impacts associated with construction noise would remain significant, and additional mitigation measures would be required.

Impact N-11: As explained in the Noise Technical Report (see Appendix M), construction noise, if allowed along more than one property line of any existing on-site property identified as NAP would be significant.

Mitigation Measure M-N-8: This mitigation measure specified in the FEIR has been imposed on the project as a condition of approval, requiring 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.

Rationale: Notwithstanding the project's inclusion of the aforementioned project design considerations, implementation of mitigation measure M-N-8 would be required to reduce the impact identified as N-11. Implementation of M-N-8 assures that construction noise levels would not exceed County construction noise level limit of 75 dB(A) at the on-site NAPs because construction on multiple sides of the NAP would not be permitted to occur. As these properties are located within the project boundary, there is a possibility that on-site residences that are NAP of the project could have construction occur along more than one property line, which would potentially create a doubling (+3 dB) or even quadrupling (+6 dB) of construction noise levels over those calculated if construction were to occur along two or more sides of a NAP property simultaneously. Therefore, if construction were to occur along more than one side of an on-site NAP property, construction noise levels would exceed 75 dB(A) L_{eq}. Mitigation measure M-N-8 provides restrictions that would limit on-site construction activities from occurring simultaneously on more than one side of an on-site NAP property and reduce these impacts to a level that is less than significant.

Impact N-12: Construction noise associated with potential off-site improvements at the CAL FIRE Miller Station site would exceed noise thresholds at adjacent residential properties resulting in a significant impact.

Mitigation Measures M-N-9: This mitigation measure specified in the FEIR has been imposed on the project as a condition of approval, requires that during construction activities within the off-site Miller Station site, 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.

Rationale: Notwithstanding the project's inclusion of the aforementioned project design considerations, implementation of mitigation measure M-N-9 would be required to reduce the impact identified as N-12. Implementation of mitigation measure M-N-9 requires 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 Miller Station should

construction occur at this location. Implementation of this measure would reduce noise impacts to a level that is less than significant.

Impacts N-13: Rock crushing noise levels at surrounding and on-site property lines could exceed County standards representing a significant impact.

Mitigation Measures M-N-10: This mitigation measure specified in the FEIR has been imposed on the project as a condition of approval, requires that 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 (Noise Ordinance Section 36.409) at modified distances determined by the noise study.

Rationale: Implementation of mitigation measure M-N-10 would reduce the impact identified as N-13. Implementation of mitigation measure M-N-10 requires all rock-crushing activities to be located a minimum distance of 350 feet from the nearest property line where an occupied structure is located. Based on an analysis of rock-crushing activities, noise levels would attenuate to 75 dB(A) L_{eq} or less at distances of 350 feet or more, which is the maximum noise level allowed under the County Noise Ordinance. Therefore, impacts associated with rock-crushing activities would be mitigated with the incorporation of M-N-10. Implementation of this measure would reduce noise impacts to a level that is less than significant.

Impact N-14: Blasting associated with construction may result in a significant impact due to impulsive noise.

Mitigation Measures M-N-11: This mitigation measure specified in the FEIR has been imposed on the project as a condition of approval, requiring that 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. Where potential exceedances of the County Noise Ordinance are identified, the blast-drilling and monitoring plan shall identify mitigation measures shown to be effective in reducing noise and vibration levels (e.g., altering orientation of blast progression, increased delay between charge detonations, presplitting), to be implemented to comply with the noise level limits of County Noise Ordinance Sections 36.409 and 36.410 and the vibration level limits of 1.0 in/sec PPV, and such measures shall be implemented by the applicant or its designee prior to the issuance of the grading permit. Additionally, all project phases involving blasting shall conform to the following requirements:

A. All blasting shall be performed by a blast contractor and blasting personnel licensed to operate in the County.

B. 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.

C. 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.

D. Blasting shall not exceed 1 in/sec PPV at the nearest occupied residence in accordance with County of San Diego Noise Guidelines Section 4.3.

E. 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.

Rationale: Implementation of mitigation measure M-N-11 would reduce the impact identified as N-14. Implementation of mitigation measure M-N-11 would assure that a blast-drilling and monitoring plan would address criteria associated with blasting as approved by the County to assure that each blast is monitored for over-pressure and ground borne vibrations. Implementation of this measure would reduce significant direct and cumulative noise impacts to less than significant.

Evidence Supporting CEQA Findings:

Substantial evidence to support the finding that Impacts N-11 and N-14 would be reduced to less than significant levels with the implementation of mitigation is found within the administrative record pertaining to this FEIR. Please refer to the following document(s):

- FEIR subchapter 2.8- specifically subchapters 2.8.1, 2.8.2.2, 2.8.4.2, 2.8.5.3, 2.8.6.2
- FEIR Appendix M, Noise Report

4. Direct Impacts (Vibration)

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.

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.

Mitigation Measures M-N-12: This mitigation measure specified in the FEIR has been imposed on the project as a condition of approval, requiring prior to beginning construction of any project component within 150 feet of an existing or future occupied residence or medical facility, a vibration monitoring plan shall be submitted to the County Noise Control Officer for review and approval. At a minimum, the vibration monitoring plan shall require data be sent to the County Noise Control Officer or designee on a weekly basis or more frequently as determined by the Noise Control Officer. The data shall include vibration level measurements taken during the previous work period. In the event that the County Noise Control Officer determines there is reasonable probability that future measured vibration levels would exceed allowable limits (vibration levels from blasting or pile driving in excess of 1 in/sec PPV or vibration levels from general construction in excess of 0.004 in/sec RMS), the County Noise Control Officer or designee shall take those steps necessary to ensure that future vibration levels do not exceed such limits, including, but not limited to suspending those further construction activities that would result in excessive vibration levels until either alternative equipment or alternative construction procedures can be used that generate vibration levels that

do not exceed 0.004 RMS at the nearest residential structure. Construction activities not associated with vibration generation could continue.

The vibration monitoring plan shall be prepared and administered by a County-approved noise consultant. In addition to the data described above, the vibration monitoring plan shall at a minimum also include the location of vibration monitors, the vibration instrumentation utilized, a data acquisition and retention plan, and exceedance notification and reporting procedures. A description of these plan components is provided:

Location of Vibration Monitors: The vibration monitoring plan shall include a scaled plan indicating monitoring locations, including the location of measurements to be taken at construction site boundaries and at nearby residential properties.

Vibration Instrumentation: Vibration monitors shall be capable of measuring maximum unweighted RMS and PPV levels triaxially (in three directions) over a frequency range of 1 to 100 hertz. The vibration monitor will be set to automatically record daily events during working hours and to record peak triaxial PPV values in 5-minute interval histogram plots. The method of coupling the geophones to the ground will be described and included in the report. The vibration monitors shall be calibrated within one year of the measurement and the certified laboratory conformance report will be included in the report.

Data Acquisition: The information to be provided in the data reports shall include at a minimum daily histogram plots of PPV vs. time of day for three triaxial directions and maximum peak vector sum PPV and maximum frequency for each direction. The reports will also identify the construction equipment operating during the monitoring period and their locations and distances to all vibration measurement locations.

Exceedance Notification and Reporting Procedures: A description of the notification of exceedance and reporting procedures will be included and the follow-up procedures taken to reduce vibration levels to below the allowable limits.

Rationale: Implementation of mitigation measure M-N-12 would reduce the impacts identified as N-15 and N-16. Implementation of mitigation measure M-N-12 would assure that heavy equipment is operated and blasting occurs at a distance from existing residences that would serve to reduce ground borne vibration impacts to less than significant.

Evidence Supporting CEQA Findings:

Substantial evidence to support the finding that Impacts N-11 and N-14 would be reduced to less than significant levels with the implementation of mitigation is found within the administrative record pertaining to this FEIR. Please refer to the following document(s):

- FEIR subchapter 2.8- specifically subchapters 2.8.1, 2.8.2.3, 2.8.4.3, 2.8.5.4, 2.8.6.3
- FEIR Appendix M, Noise Report

5. Cumulative Impacts

Impact N-19: If construction operations occurred on-site and off-site simultaneously, a significant cumulative impact could result.

Impact N-20: Construction noise would result in impulsive noise events from blasting. If multiple blasting operations occurred simultaneously, a significant cumulative impact could result.

Mitigation Measures: See mitigation measures M-N-1, M-N-2, M-N-11, and M-N-12.

Rationale: Notwithstanding the project's inclusion of the aforementioned project design considerations, implementation of mitigation measures M-N-1, M-N-2, M-N-11, and M-N-12 would be required to reduce the cumulative impacts identified as N-19 and N-20. Implementation of mitigation measures M-N-1, M-N-2, M-N-11, and M-N-12 would reduce cumulatively considerable noise impacts associated with construction and blasting to less than significant by assuring that the project's construction would not combine with other projects' construction to expose any local occupied property to excessive construction noise. However, impacts associated with on- and off-site traffic increase (Impacts N-17 and N-18) would remain significant and unavoidable (See, Section III, below).

Evidence Supporting CEQA Findings:

Substantial evidence to support the finding that Impacts N-19 and N-20 would be reduced to less than significant levels with the implementation of mitigation is found within the administrative record pertaining to this FEIR. Please refer to the following document(s):

- FEIR subchapter 2.8- specifically subchapters 2.8.1, 2.8.3, 2.8.4.4, 2.8.5, 2.8.6.4
- FEIR Appendix M, Noise Report

II. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(2)

Pursuant to Section 15091(a)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, the County finds that, for each of the following significant effects identified in the FEIR, mitigation measures which would avoid or avoids or substantially lessens these significant effects are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. The Impacts and mitigation measures are stated fully in the FEIR. The following are brief descriptions of the Impacts and mitigation measures set forth in the FEIR and explanations of the rationale for this finding for each Impact.

A. Air Quality Impacts

Impact AQ-1 and Impact AQ-5: Implementation of the project would result in a direct and cumulatively considerable increase in emissions conflicting with the current RAQS for the San Diego Air Basin.

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1: This mitigation measure specified in the FEIR has been imposed upon the project as a condition of approval, requiring the County to provide a revised housing forecast to SANDAG to ensure that any revisions to the population and employment projections used by the SDAPCD in updating the RAQS and the SIP will accurately reflect anticipated growth due to the proposed project.

Rationale: Implementation of mitigation measure M-AQ-1 requires the provision of housing information to be forwarded to SANDAG to assist in revising the housing forecast to include the

project. Implementation of the proposed project would conflict with the existing San Diego RAQS and applicable SIP because the density proposed is not consistent with current land use plans and SANDAG housing forecasts. However, until SANDAG updates the anticipated growth so it may be included in the emission estimates of the RAQS and the SIP, direct and cumulative impacts associated with conflicts with the RAQS would remain significant and unavoidable.

Evidence Supporting CEQA Findings:

Substantial evidence to support the finding that for Impacts AQ-1 and AQ-5 mitigation measures which would avoid or avoids or substantially lessens these impacts are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency thereby leaving the impacts significant and unavoidable is found within the administrative record pertaining to this FEIR. Please refer to the following document(s):

- FEIR subchapter 2.8- specifically subchapters 2.2.1, 2..2.2.1, 2.2.2.2, 2.2.5, 2.2.6.1,
- FEIR Appendix D, Air Quality Technical Report

B. Transportation/Traffic Impacts

Impact TR-3: The project traffic would increase intersection delay at the intersection of I-15 SB Ramps and Gopher Canyon Road. Specifically, this intersection operates at an unacceptable level in the existing condition. Additional project-related trips would result in a significant impact and the degradation of the operation of this intersection because it would add over a 2-second delay to a Caltrans intersection operating at LOS F.

Impact TR-4: The project traffic would increase intersection delay at the intersection of I-15 NB Ramps and Gopher Canyon Road. Specifically, this intersection operates at an unacceptable level in the existing condition. Additional project-related trips would result in a significant impact and the degradation of the operation of this intersection because it would add over a 2-second delay to a Caltrans intersection operating at LOS F.

Mitigation Measure M-TR-2: This mitigation measure specified in the FEIR has been imposed upon the project as a condition of approval, requiring that prior to the recordation of Final Map associated with the 363rd EDU of the Lilac Hills Ranch Specific Plan, the applicant or its designee shall, coordinate with Caltrans to install a traffic signal at the I-15 SB Ramps/Gopher Canyon Road intersection.

Mitigation Measure M-TR-3: This mitigation measure specified in the FEIR has been imposed upon the project as a condition of approval, requiring that prior to the recordation of Final Map associated with the 363rd EDU of the Lilac Hills Ranch Specific Plan, the applicant or its designee shall, coordinate with Caltrans to install a traffic signal at the I-15 NB Ramps/Gopher Canyon Road intersection.

Rationale: Notwithstanding the project's inclusion of the aforementioned TDM program, mitigation measure M-TR-2 is required to reduce the significant impact identified as TR-3, and mitigation measure M-TR-3 is required to reduce the significant impact identified as TR-4. Implementation of mitigation measures M-TR-2 and M-TR-3 would reduce the impact to less than significant because traffic signals would provide steady regulation of traffic flow reducing intersection delay and improving intersection operations to acceptable levels. Although these

intersections are under the jurisdiction of Caltrans, Caltrans submitted two comment letters to the County stating that the agency is not opposed to the mitigation to install traffic signals at the I-15 Gopher Canyon Road intersection as long as appropriate assurances are provided to implement the mitigation when warranted. (Letter, Armstrong to Slovick, September 4, 2014; Letter, Armstrong to Slovick, October 22, 2014.) However, the signals are within the jurisdiction and control of another agency, Caltrans, and there is no assurance that Caltrans would approve the implementation of the recommended improvements or that the improvements would will be completed in time to avoid the significant impacts at the Impact TR-3 and TR-4 locations. Therefore, for purposes of this EIR, Mitigation Measures M-TR-2 and M-TR-3 are deemed infeasible, and Impacts TR-3 and TR-4 are considered significant and unavoidable.

Evidence Supporting CEQA Findings:

Substantial evidence to support the finding that for Impacts TR-3 and TR-4, mitigation measures which would avoid or substantially lessen these impacts are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency, thereby leaving the impacts significant and unavoidable, is found within the administrative record pertaining to this FEIR. Please refer to the following document(s):

- FEIR subchapter 2.8- specifically subchapters 2.3.1, 2.3.2.1, 2.3.4.1, 2.3.5.1, 2.3.6.1
- FEIR Appendix E, Traffic Impact Study

Impact TR-20: In the cumulative condition, the project traffic coupled with traffic anticipated from other foreseeable projects would degrade operations at the intersection of Old Highway 395 and SR-76.

Impact TR-21: In the cumulative condition, the project traffic coupled with traffic anticipated from other foreseeable projects would degrade operations at the intersection of Pankey Road and SR-76.

Mitigation Measure: None feasible.

Rationale: Notwithstanding the project's inclusion of the aforementioned TDM program, Impacts TR-20 and TR-21 would remain. While intersection improvements would reduce these project impacts to below a level of significance, such mitigation is infeasible because these intersections are under Caltrans' jurisdiction. 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.

Impact TR-30: In the cumulative condition, the project traffic coupled with traffic anticipated from other foreseeable projects would degrade operations to the I-15 segment between the Riverside County Boundary and Old Highway 395.

Impact TR-31: In the cumulative condition, the project traffic coupled with traffic anticipated from other foreseeable projects would degrade operations to the Interstate 15 segment between Old Highway 395 and SR-76.

Impact TR-32: In the cumulative condition, the project traffic coupled with traffic anticipated from other foreseeable projects would degrade operations to the I-15 segment between SR-76 and Old Highway 395.

Impact TR-33: In the cumulative condition, the project traffic coupled with traffic anticipated from other foreseeable projects would degrade operations to the I-15 segment between Old Highway 395 and Gopher Canyon Road.

Impact TR-34: In the cumulative condition, the project traffic coupled with traffic anticipated from other foreseeable projects would degrade operations to the I-15 segment between Gopher Canyon Road and Road Deer Springs Road.

Impact TR-35: In the cumulative condition, the project traffic coupled with traffic anticipated from other foreseeable projects would degrade operations to the I-15 segment between Deer Springs Road and Centre City Parkway.

Impact TR-36: In the cumulative condition, the project traffic coupled with traffic anticipated from other foreseeable projects would degrade operations to the I-15 segment between Centre City Parkway and El Norte Parkway.

Impact TR-37: In the cumulative condition, the project traffic coupled with traffic anticipated from other foreseeable projects would degrade operations to the I-15 segment between El Norte Parkway and SR-78.

Mitigation Measure: None feasible.

Rationale: Notwithstanding the project's inclusion of the aforementioned TDM, Impacts TR-30 through TR-37 would remain. While roadway improvements would reduce these project impacts to below a level of significance, such mitigation is infeasible because these roadways are under Caltrans jurisdiction. 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. .Therefore, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Evidence Supporting CEQA Findings:

Substantial evidence to support the finding that for Impacts TR-20, TR-21, and TR-30 through TR-37, mitigation measures which would avoid or substantially lessen these impacts are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency, which has no project, fund or program for making the improvements, thereby leaving the impacts significant and unavoidable, is found within the administrative record pertaining to this FEIR. Please refer to the following document(s):

- FEIR subchapter 2.3- specifically subchapters 2.3.1, 2.3.3.1, 2.3.4.1, 2.3.5.1, 2.3.6.1
- FEIR Appendix E, Traffic Impact Study
- Global Response to Comment: I-15 Mitigation Infeasible

III. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3)

Pursuant to Section 15091(a)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines, the County finds that, for each of the following significant effects as identified in the FEIR, specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations make the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the FEIR infeasible:

A. Visual Impacts

Mitigation is Infeasible for Visual Impacts

The project includes design considerations, as detailed in FEIR Table 1-3, including development standards and regulations within Section III of the Specific Plan. This section of the Specific Plan provides design guidelines associated with site planning, architecture, landscape and grading for all residential, commercial, and mixed-use areas, along with roadways and recreational uses. Implementation of the Specific Plan would ensure long-term application and continued conformance with all design guidelines contained therein, as well as the Valley Center and Bonsall Design Guidelines. However, as discussed in FEIR subchapter 2.1, even with implementation of these design considerations, visual impacts associated with the project's change in the visual quality of the area would remain significant, and additional mitigation measures would be required.

Impact V-1: The 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 direct impact.

Impact V-2: The 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 direct impact.

Impact V-4: The composition of the project viewshed would be adversely affected by physical changes introduced by the project along with other foreseeable projects within the cumulative project area. These changes would not be compatible with the existing visual character of the area resulting in a significant cumulative visual impact.

Mitigation Measure M-V-1: This mitigation measure specified in the FEIR has been imposed upon the project as a condition of approval, requiring street trees to be planted at close intervals to assure the overlapping foliage would provide adequate screening of the project site from view along W. Lilac Road.

Rationale: Notwithstanding the project's inclusion of the aforementioned project design considerations, implementation of mitigation measure M-V-1 would be required to reduce the impacts identified as V-1, V-2, and V-4. To address impacts M-V-1 would require street trees to be planted at close intervals to assure the overlapping foliage would provide adequate screening of the project site from views along West Lilac Road. However, Consolidated Fire Code regulations prohibit No additional mitigation measures beyond project design considerations already incorporated into the project are available to reduce or avoid this impact. Therefore, direct and cumulative impacts associated with the change to the visual environment would remain significant and unavoidable because conformance with fire regulations would negate the functional effect of the mitigation measure. A statement of overriding considerations would be required.

Impact V-3: During project construction, the project site would conflict with the surrounding visual characteristics. While this impact is temporary, short-term visual impacts would be significant.

Mitigation Measure M-V-2: This mitigation measure specified in the FEIR has been imposed upon the project as a condition of approval, requiring the commencement of construction of each subsequent phase to be delayed to allow the landscaping for the previous phase to mature.

Rationale: Notwithstanding the project's inclusion of the aforementioned project design considerations, implementation of mitigation measure M-V-2 would be required to reduce the impact identified as V-3. While mitigation measure M-V-2 would serve to reduce the views of raw soil and construction activities during the interim period, it is infeasible because certain infrastructure, such as sewer, roads, grading, storm drains, and traffic improvements must be constructed in their entirety and cannot be stopped at the boundary of each discrete phase due to cost considerations. Additionally, project delays would increase the length of interim visual impacts from the construction of infrastructure in other phases. No additional mitigation measure beyond project design considerations already incorporated into the project is available to reduce or avoid this impact. Therefore, short-term construction-related visual impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. A statement of overriding considerations would be required.

Evidence Supporting CEQA Findings:

Substantial evidence to support the finding that for Impacts V-1, V-2, and V-4, specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations make the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the FEIR infeasible is found within the administrative record pertaining to this FEIR. Please refer to the following document(s):

- FEIR subchapter 2.1- specifically subchapters 2.1.1, 2.1.2.3, 2.1.3, 2.1.5, 2.1.6,
- FEIR Appendix C, Visual Resources Report

Project Alternatives are Infeasible for Mitigating Visual Impacts

As set forth in subchapter 1.1 of the FEIR, the project proponent designed the project around the following objectives:

1. Develop a community within northern San Diego County in close proximity to a major transportation corridor consistent with the County's Community Development Model for a walkable pedestrian-oriented mixed-use community.

2. Provide a range of housing and lifestyle opportunities in a manner that encourages walking and riding bikes, and that provides public services and facilities that are accessible to residents of both the community and the surrounding area.

3. Provide a variety of recreational opportunities including parks for active and passive activities, and trails available to the public that connect the residential neighborhoods to the town and neighborhood centers.

4. Integrate major physical features into the project design, including major drainages, and woodlands creating a hydrologically sensitive community in order to reduce urban runoff.

5. Preserve sensitive natural resources by setting aside land within a planned and integrated preserve area.

6. Accommodate future population growth in San Diego County by providing a range of diverse housing types, including mixed-use and senior housing.

7. Provide a broad range of educational, recreational, and social uses and economically viable commercial opportunities within a walkable distance from the residential uses.

No Project/No Development Alternative

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not introduce any new land use at the project site; therefore, visual resources would not be altered with the implementation of the No Project/No Development Alternative. Views from West Lilac Road and surrounding residences would remain unchanged. The significant and unavoidable visual impacts identified for the project would be avoided. However, none of the project objectives would be achieved. Since the No Project/No Development Alternative does not attain the project's primary objectives, it is rejected because it is infeasible.

Legal Lot Alternative

The Legal Lot Alternative would allow development consistent with existing legal lots in accordance with the existing land use designation of Semi-Rural under the General Plan and the zoning resulting in a total of 49 single-family homes constructed on 2-acre minimum lots. This alternative would not change the visual quality of the project site because the 2-acre minimum lots would be comparable to existing rural residential development. The views into the area would not demonstratively contrast with the existing nature of the surrounding areas and significant and unavoidable visual impacts would be avoided. However, this alternative would not meet the primary project objectives. Specifically, this alternative would not provide a range of public facilities, housing opportunities and commercial services to the neighborhood and community. It would not develop a pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use community consistent with the County's Community Development Model, which is the basis for the project. Additionally, the Legal Lot Alternative would not construct parks, trails or a school site, an on-site WRF or RF and would, therefore, not achieve the principles of a sustainable village. No project objectives would be met. Therefore, the Legal Lot Alternative is rejected because it is infeasible.

General Plan Consistent Alternative

The General Plan Consistent Alternative would allow development in accordance with the General Plan Land Use designation, Semi-Rural. This alternative would be subject to the County's Conservation Subdivision Ordinance, which requires the preservation of 75 percent of the project site designated SR-10 as open space. Compliance with the Conservation Subdivision Ordinance would, thus, require the preservation of 156.75 acres of open space on-site in the area designated SR-10. Overall, this alternative would yield 110 single-family dwelling units in a clustered design to preserve sensitive biological resources. The General Plan Consistent Alternative would result in lot sizes averaging over 2 acres and preserve over 250 acres of open space on-site providing greater visual buffering from vantage points within the viewshed. Overall, visual impacts associated with this alternative would be less than the project due to the reduced density/intensity of development. Although as compared to the project, the General Plan Consistent Alternative would result in reduced visual impacts, this alternative would include only 110 single-family detached residential units and would not create a walkable

mixed-use village; would not provide a range of housing and lifestyle opportunities in a manner that encourages non-automotive mobility; nor would it provide for a variety of housing including housing for seniors. Also, this alternative would not provide educational and neighborhood retail opportunities in close proximity to residential uses Therefore, this alternative would not meet a majority of project objectives. This alternative would consist only of single-family detached residential housing with no on-site public facilities; therefore, it would not meet project objectives associated with developing a walkable community (Objective 1), developing a range of housing types (Objective 6), nor provide a broad range of educational, recreational and social uses (Objective 7). Therefore, the General Plan Consistent Alternative is rejected because it is infeasible.

Reduced Footprint Alternative

This alternative is designed to reduce the development footprint to increase preservation of sensitive biological resources on-site. Development of this alternative would include 1,251 residential dwelling units comprised of 783 single-family detached homes (120 fewer units than the project) along with the 468 senior housing units. This alternative would also have 65,000 fewer square feet of commercial uses compared to the project. Like the project, the resulting pattern and intensity of development proposed by this alternative would contrast with the existing visual resources in and around the project site resulting in significant impacts requiring the implementation of mitigation measures. Because lots adjacent to the northern perimeter near the existing West Lilac Road would be generally the same size as those proposed by the project, mitigation measures would not serve to completely reduce the significant changes to the view of the project site. While the overall severity of visual impacts would be less than the project, due to the change in the visual context of the project site associated with this alternative, visual impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Additionally, this alternative would not meet the project objective of providing mixed-use housing (Objectives 2 and 6) Therefore, the Reduced Footprint Alternative is rejected because it is infeasible.

Reduced Intensity Alternative

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would create a less dense community with a smaller commercial area compared to the project. This alternative's design, including grading for West Lilac Road to County standard 2.2C classification through the northern portion of the project site, would result in a large flat mesa near the site's northern boundary. This mesa would create the need for a long sloping transition from the north (along the toe of slope) toward the south. The resulting slope from the mesa along West Lilac Road would only allow for larger lots to the south of the road. Even with the implementation of mitigation measures, impacts to visual resources under this alternative would remain significant and unavoidable and would be greater than those of the project relative to the viewing location along West Lilac Road due to the increased intensity of development along the northern project boundary than existing. Development of this alternative would include two single-family neighborhoods totaling 881 detached homes on 286.2 acres. No attached single-family, senior housing, mixed-use or group care facilities would occur. It would not provide residents with the opportunity to increase the recycling of waste or provide educational opportunities in close proximity to residential uses. This alternative would not meet project objectives because it would not provide a pedestrian-oriented mixed-use community (Objectives 1 and 6) nor provide a range of housing and lifestyle opportunities in a manner that encourages non-automotive mobility (Objective 2). The alternative would not provide a range of diverse housing (Objective 6) nor provide a broad range of educational, recreational and social uses (Objective 7), Therefore, the Reduced Intensity Alternative is rejected because it is infeasible.

2.2C Alternative

The intent of this alternative is to show how West Lilac Road could be constructed to a 2.2C road classification through the project site with the majority of project features remaining in place, to the greatest extent feasible. This alternative would have 581 fewer residential units than the project, primarily due to the removal of the mixed-use residential and a decrease in the number of single-family attached and detached homes. The amount of commercial space would remain the same. Under the 2.2C Alternative, lots adjacent to the northern perimeter would be smaller than those proposed by the project in this location, and the village square and commercial center would be located along West Lilac Road at the northern project perimeter. Like the project, impacts to visual resources, especially along the West Lilac Road corridor, would be significant requiring implementation of mitigation measures. The lots proposed along the northern boundary of the project site would require landscaping to soften the visual transition into the project site at this location. However, because of the increased intensity of development along the northern project boundary, these measures would not reduce impacts to less than significant. Like the project, these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Under the 2.2C Alternative, lots adjacent to the northern perimeter of the project would be smaller than those proposed by the project in this location, and the village square and commercial center would be located along West Lilac Road at the northern project perimeter. Like the project, the lots proposed along the northern boundary of the project site would require landscaping controls to soften the visual transition into the project site at this location. Like the project, fire regulations would preclude the placement of landscape at the intervals necessary to reduce the impact to a less than significant level. While this alternative would meet the objectives of the project; it would not do so to the same degree as the project, especially with respect to Objective 1. Due to the widening of the roadway traversing the commercial area in Phase 2, this alternative would reduce the total commercial acreage and remove all residential uses from the commercial area. The loss of mixed-use residential would essentially remove the village atmosphere from the commercial area, significantly detracting from Objective 1's focus on developing a pedestrian-oriented mixed-use community. One specific loss would be the inability to have sidewalk cafés and other pedestrian friendly design/uses due to the width, right-of-way restrictions and increased speed of the 2.2C roadway design. The removal of the mixed-use residential uses would detract from the range of housing the project is proposing to construct. Therefore, the 2.2C Alternative is rejected because it is infeasible.

Roadway Design Alternative

The Roadway Design Alternative is based on the project as proposed with the various roadway segments constructed without the proposed design exceptions. As set forth in FEIR subchapter 4.4.8, while this alternative would meet all of the main project objectives, no aspect of this alternative would reduce a significant impact of the project, and, therefore, this alternative is rejected as infeasible.

Mountain Ridge Road Fire Station Alternative

The Mountain Ridge Road Fire Station Alternative was included to analyze impacts of providing a Fire Station in Phase 5 of the proposed project. This alternative would improve Mountain Ridge Road to public road standards, providing access to an on-site Fire Station in Phase 5. Two options for Mountain Ridge Road are included in this alternative. Option 1 would reclassify this road to a standard Rural Residential Collector. Option 2 would reclassify this road to Rural Residential Collector with a road exception that would allow the graded right-of-way to be reduced from 48 feet to 40 feet. This alternative (both options) also removes the gates on