

SUMMARY

S.1 Project Synopsis

S.1.1 Location

The Valiano Project (hereafter referred to as “Proposed Project” or “Project”) site is located on approximately 239 acres in an unincorporated portion of San Diego County within the Eden Valley portion of the San Dieguito Community Planning Area near the cities of San Marcos and Escondido. The Project site is located approximately ~~1.72.4 miles driving distance~~ ~~miles~~ west of Interstate I-15 and ~~0.6 mile~~ 1.5 miles driving distance south of State Route 78 (SR-78) at its closest points. Principal site access is from SR-78, Nordahl Road and Country Club Drive, from which a number of smaller surface streets (e.g., Hill Valley Drive, Eden Valley Lane, and Mt. Whitney Road) extend along or near the northern and eastern property boundaries.

S.1.2 Description

The Proposed Project consists of a residential community with 326 single-family dwelling units (du), a resident’s/builder’s option to include ~~Second Dwelling Units~~ Accessory Dwelling Units on 54 lots, and related facilities within a total ~~disturbance~~ grading area of approximately 127 acres. The residential development is divided into five distinct neighborhoods, with a minimum lot size of 5,630 square feet (s.f.) and an overall average lot size of approximately 14,790 s.f. The proposed development also incorporates a number of related amenities and facilities, including park and recreation areas, an on-site wastewater treatment and water reclamation facility (WTWRF) and wet weather storage area, three pump (lift) stations and an existing equestrian complex in the southeastern portion of the site that would be retained. Approximately ~~146~~ 149 acres would be retained as open space, including open space lots and easements as well as biological and agricultural open space easements.

Discretionary actions and permits anticipated for the Proposed Project are detailed on the Discretionary Approval/Permit matrix in Chapter 1.0. Approving agencies include the County of San Diego (County), as well as the: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Wildlife, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (San Diego RWQCB), San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) and Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO). Local attachments to the San Diego County Sanitation District would be required. No detachment is required because the site is not currently within a sewer district. School district authorizations would be required from the Escondido High School District and Escondido Union School District.

S.1.3 Setting

The Proposed Project site is located in a semi-rural area encompassing a mix of urban development, agriculture and open space. ~~Nearby~~ The urban development in the area includes high-density residential uses such as mobile home communities (beginning approximately 1.7 miles driving distance to the north in San Marcos and 1.1 miles driving distance to the east in

Escondido from the Project) and commercial uses such as light industrial, medical center, research centers, and shopping centers to the north (San Marcos beginning approximately 1.5 miles driving distance to the north in San Marcos) and east (Escondido approximately 0.8 mile driving distance to the northeast in Escondido). ~~with nearby areas to the north, west, and south~~ Nearby areas located adjacent to or within a few tenths of a mile of the Project encompass including agricultural uses, low- to moderate density residential development and open space. Local agricultural sites include relatively large areas of avocado orchards adjacent to the northern and southern Project site boundaries; smaller orchards and nurseries to the east, west and southwest (with orchards primarily related to estate residential properties); a minor greenhouse area to the east; and minor (apparent) row/field crop and vineyard cultivation to the east and north, respectively (with these areas also associated with estate residential properties). The nursery operations include uses such as decorative crops (e.g., dollar eucalyptus), ornamental landscaping and fruit trees, as well as lesser amounts of herbaceous crops. Several of the nursery sites encompass open-air container plants, in-ground plantings, and/or enclosed structures, with the latter facilities ostensibly used for temperature-and/or drought-sensitive varieties.

On-site topography is generally characterized by a north-south trending ridge extending through much of the western portion of the property, a large knoll in the southeastern-most area, several larger drainages flanking these upland features, and generally level terrain in other on-site areas. On-site elevations range from approximately 1,013 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) along the ridge top near the northwestern site boundary, to 614 feet AMSL along the southeastern property boundary. Surface drainage from most of the Proposed Project site flows primarily to the east and south, with some variability in direction due to local topography. Associated off-site flows continue generally south before ultimately entering Escondido Creek. The northern-most portion of the site drains north and west through a number of small unnamed drainages, and eventually flows into San Marcos Creek. The site ~~is currently~~ was recently used for commercial agriculture, with extensive areas of ~~active~~ avocado orchards, as well as four minor apiary (bee keeping) sites. Such commercial agricultural operations have occurred more or less continuously on-site since the late 1960s or early 1970s. There is one residence located in the central portion of the site and another residence and an equestrian center located in the southeastern portion of the site.

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

Project design elements that factor into Project impact analyses are detailed in Table 1-3, *Additional Environmental Design Considerations*, of this Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The analysis contained in this EIR shows that the Proposed Project would result in significant impacts related to aesthetics (direct), air quality (direct and cumulative), agricultural resources (direct and cumulative), biological resources (direct), cultural resources (direct), geology and soils (direct), hazards (direct), noise (direct), paleontological resources (direct), utilities (direct and cumulative), and transportation/traffic (direct and cumulative).

The nature of the impacts, the recommended mitigation measures, and the effectiveness of the mitigation in reducing the associated impacts, are identified in Table S-1, *Summary of Significant Effects*.

S.3 Areas of Controversy

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) was distributed on June 20, 2013 for a 30-day public review and comment period. Public comments were received on the NOP for this EIR and reflect concern or controversy over a number of environmental issues. (Refer to Appendix A for the NOP and NOP comment letters.) Environmental issues were raised in 17 letters commenting on the NOP, as listed below:

- State of California's Office of Planning and Research (State Clearinghouse)
- Native American Heritage Commission
- Pala Tribal Historic Preservation Office
- San Pasqual Band of Diegueno Mission Indians of California
- USACE
- State of California Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Caltrans
- City of Escondido
- Vallecitos Water District (VWD)
- LAFCO
- Valley Center Community Planning Group
- San Dieguito Planning Group
- Friends of Eden Valley for Responsible Development
- San Diego County Archaeological Society, Inc.
- Elfin Forest Harmony Grove Town Council
- The Escondido Creek Conservancy
- San Diego Audubon Society

In addition a public scoping meeting was held on July 10, 2013 at the Elfin Forest-Harmony Grove Fire Department, located at 20223 Elfin Forest Road. A number of comment forms were collected from that meeting, as well as subsequent comments via electronic-mail or facsimile. These forms, e-mails and faxes are also included in Appendix A.

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

- Visual impacts, including dark sky/light pollution
- Cultural Resources
- Noise associated with traffic
- Air quality and greenhouse gases, odor
- Traffic: direct and cumulative impacts
- Land use density
- Biological resources
- Community character
- Geology and liquefaction
- Water quality and hydrology
- Groundwater
- Hazards associated with the wastewater reclamation facility

- Growth inducing impacts
- Agricultural resources
- Water availability
- Wastewater treatment
- Recreation
- School impacts
- Utility districts, annexation for sewer
- Public services and utilities (fire, police, water, sewer)
- Fire hazards

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

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

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

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

S.5 Project Alternatives

Chapter 4.0 of this EIR considers the no project alternative and four modified project alternatives, as well as an alternative that evaluates other off-site and combined on-/off-site sewer options. The No Project/No Development Alternative evaluates the environmental effects of maintaining the property in its current condition in the long-term. The General Plan Density Alternative would result in development of land uses as detailed in the 2011 General Plan and also takes into consideration avoidance of RPO steep slopes, wetlands, and wetland buffers. The Reduced Grading Alternative would reduce grading on the site by approximately 166,000 cubic yards (cy). The Biologically Enhanced Alternative was proposed to provide increased connectivity for local

wildlife movement. The Septic Option Alternative would reduce air quality, hazard and community character impacts related to WTWRF operations. The Off-site and Combined On-/Off-site sewer Options aAlternative includes three potential off-site options for the provision of sewer service, in lieu of the proposed on-site WTWRF and related facilities, along with an option to provide combined on- and off-site wastewater treatment.

Based on impact comparison between the Proposed Project and evaluated alternatives (summarized in Table S-2, *Comparison of Environmental Effects of the Proposed Project with Project Alternatives*), an environmentally superior alternative has been identified. The discussion below starts with the environmentally superior alternative and continues with summaries of remaining alternatives in order of increasing impact. Full analysis of impact comparisons is provided in Chapter 4.0.

S.5.1 Septic Option Alternative

S.5.1.1 Description

This alternative would result in the construction of 58 single-family residences distributed across the Project site. The Septic Option Alternative was originally based on the assumption that "... each house could have five bedrooms and each lot could be at least five acres in size to accommodate septic systems." Pursuant to the *Final County Local Agency Management Program (LAMP) for Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems* (County 2015b), however, this assumption has been changed to allow minimum two-acre lots (with the number of potential bedrooms per house to remain unchanged). Specifically, the referenced LAMP, which post-dates the Proposed Project NOP, identifies an allowable density of two acres per single-family dwelling in areas with an average annual precipitation level of between 15 and 20 inches. Under this alternative, it was assumed that each house could have five bedrooms and each lot could be at least five acres in size to accommodate septic systems. The Septic Option Alternative would eliminate the need for the WTWRF and associated pump stations, as well as sewer lines, although potable water lines and related facilities would be required to serve the houses developed under this alternative. In addition, access roads/driveways would be required throughout the development to gain access to the houses. This alternative would eliminate the parks included in the Proposed Project, although steep slope and biological easements would be placed over approximately 185 acres of the Project site. This alternative would require approximately 144,700 cy of cut to fill, with approximately 34,700 cy of excess needing to be exported from the Project site during construction. Existing agricultural and equestrian activities on the site would continue under this alternative.

Based on the previously described LAMP, related amendments to the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances (Division 8 of Title 6), and comments received during the EIR public review process, the Septic Option Alternative has been expanded to include consideration of both conventional and alternative on-site wastewater treatment system (OWTS) designs. Specifically, a conventional OWTS design includes a septic tank and a subsurface disposal system for dispersal of the septic tank effluent, and while some treatment occurs in the septic tank, the majority of the treatment occurs in the unsaturated soil below the disposal field (with associated requirements related to soil/groundwater depths, percolation rates, etc.). An alternative OWTS includes advanced (in addition to primary) treatment in the septic tank and is typically used to overcome

site-specific constraints related to high groundwater or shallow soils (with the additional septic tank treatment largely replacing treatment in the soil provided under conventional systems as noted).

The potential use of either a conventional or alternative OWTS design was evaluated for the Project site, based on factors including geologic and soil conditions, slopes, and percolation/absorption values (Geocon 2015). This analysis notes that on-site lots "...are expected to be underlain by shallow granitic bedrock with extremely low permeability or compacted rock/soil fill derived from onsite sources..." and identifies "...a higher anticipation of system failure without remedy or alternative solution..." due to "...the lack of absorption qualities of the underlying soil." Based on the described conditions and observations, the study concludes that the Project site could accommodate a maximum of approximately 66 residential units under either OWTS design (Geocon 2015). As previously noted, the Septic Option Alternative includes 58 single-family lots with a minimum area of two acres (and up to five bedrooms per unit), based on the noted Geocon study and site-specific conditions including biological and steep slope constraints. Pursuant to the above discussion, this alternative design would be applicable to the use of either a conventional or alternative OWTS.

S.5.1.2 Environmental Impact Comparison with Proposed Project

The Septic Option Alternative would: (1) avoid significant and unmitigated aesthetics and air quality impacts identified for the Proposed Project; (2) avoid significant but mitigable aesthetic and transportation/traffic impacts identified for the Proposed Project; and (3) avoid or reduce significant but mitigable impacts identified for the Proposed Project related to agricultural resources, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, paleontological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, and geology and soils (although at least one impact category under all of these issue areas would remain significant but mitigable, similar to the Proposed Project).

The Septic Option Alternative would meet Project objectives related to complementing and responding to the unique topography and character of the Project site and surrounding area, and embracing and preserving the equestrian nature of the surrounding area as grading would be substantially reduced and the lots would be large enough to support market rate animals/horses. It would, however, fail to meet the remaining Proposed Project objectives listed above in Subchapter 4.1.

S.5.21 Reduced Grading Alternative

S.5.21.1 Description

The Reduced Grading Alternative would reduce grading in Neighborhoods 2, 4 and 5 by eliminating cul-de-sacs within each of the neighborhoods. Overall development footprint would be reduced from approximately ~~127~~125 acres to approximately 108 acres. The grading quantity would be reduced by approximately ~~166~~158,000 cy, although approximately 106,000 cy of cut would need to be exported from the Project site during construction. In addition, the areas requiring blasting would be reduced. The unit count would be reduced by 6 lots to 320 units and the lot sizes in Neighborhood 3 would be reduced to 5,000 s.f.

Although this alternative would result in reduced grading quantities compared to the Proposed Project, the same potable water, recycled water, and sewage lines, as well as ~~and~~ on-site roads, with the exception of the eliminated cul-de-sacs (and focused off-site road improvements) would be required to serve and gain access to the residential and recreational uses that would be constructed on site under the Reduced Grading Alternative. Similarly, the WTWRF and associated pump stations discussed in Chapter 1.0 would still be required to serve the development under this alternative.

S.5.21.2 Environmental Impact Comparison with Proposed Project

As shown in Table S-2, the Reduced Grading Alternative would be expected to result in impacts generally similar to those described for the Proposed Project, in that this alternative would include potentially significant impacts related to aesthetics, ~~and~~ air quality, ~~as well as~~ agricultural resources, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, paleontological resources, transportation/traffic, hazards and hazardous materials, ~~public services (fire protection)~~ and geology/soils. Several of these impacts may decrease from those identified for the Proposed Project, based on considerations such as a smaller grading footprint and fewer residences. This alternative also would result in slightly increased impacts to some of the environmental issues due to the fact that earthwork would not be balanced on site and would require export of 106,000 cy of soil. All of these modifications would be relatively minor, however, and would not be expected to alter the overall impact levels or associated need for mitigation. The Reduced Grading Alternative would generally meet most of the identified Project objectives, with the exception that, due to smaller lot sizes, no horses would be allowed to be kept in the development, and this alternative would not be recreation oriented, as no parks would be constructed. In addition, this alternative would not provide as large of a variety of lot sizes as the Proposed Project.

S.5.32 Biologically Enhanced Alternative

S.5.32.1 Description

This alternative would reduce the amount of areas to be graded within the Project site by eliminating some residential lots in the vicinity of a local wildlife corridor. Specifically, with the exception of Neighborhood 2, unit counts would be reduced under this alternative (264 versus 326). In addition, the minimum lots sizes in Neighborhoods 1 and 3 would be reduced to 4,640 s.f. and 5,000 s.f., respectively. These changes would create larger areas of open space to provide for wildlife movement throughout the proposed development. The overall development footprint would be reduced from approximately ~~165-125~~ acres to 119 acres.

Although this alternative would result in a slightly reduced grading footprint compared to the Proposed Project, the same potable water and sewage lines and on-site roads with the exception of an eliminated cul-de-sac in Neighborhood 3 would be required to serve and gain access to the residential and recreational uses that would be constructed on site under the Biologically Enhanced Alternative. Similarly, the WTWRF and associated pump stations discussed in Chapter 1.0 would still be required to serve the development under this alternative.

S.5.32.2 Environmental Impact Comparison with Proposed Project

The Biologically Enhanced Alternative would be expected to result in impacts generally similar to those described for the Proposed Project, in that this alternative would include potentially significant impacts related to aesthetics and air quality, as well as agricultural resources, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, paleontological resources, transportation/traffic, hazards and hazardous materials, public services (fire protection) and geology and soils. Several of these impacts may decrease from those identified for the Proposed Project, based on considerations such as a slightly smaller grading footprint and fewer residences. This alternative also would result in slightly increased impacts to some of the environmental issues due to the fact that earthwork would not be balanced on site and would require import of 107,000 cy of soil. All of these modifications would be relatively minor, however, and would not be expected to alter the overall impact levels or associated need for mitigation. The Biologically Enhanced Alternative would generally meet most of the identified Project objectives, with the exception that it would not provide the amenities for the equestrian community; due to smaller lot sizes, no horses would be allowed to be kept in the development.

S.5.43 General Plan Density Alternative

S.5.43.1 Description

This alternative would result in development of residential uses identified in the General Plan. The General Plan currently shows the Project site as having two Land Use Element designations: Semi-Rural Residential (SR-1) and Semi-Rural Residential (SR-2). The SR-1 designation allows for one du per one, two or four gross acres, and the SR-2 designation allows for one du per 2, 4 or 8 gross acres. The maximum density of SR-1 and SR-2 designated lands is based upon the slope of the site; steeper on-site slopes equate to larger lot size requirements. Based on the RPO steep slope and RPO wetland requirements, 118 single-family residences would be developed on the Project site. While there are fewer homes under this alternative, larger lots spread over the entire site would still require an extensive road system and similar infrastructure (e.g., potable water and sewage lines). ~~Although this alternative would be lower in development intensity than the Proposed Project, the same potable water and sewage lines and on-site roads (and focused off-site road improvements) would still be required.~~ Similarly, the WTWRF and associated pump stations would be required to serve the Project site.

S.5.43.2 Environmental Impact Comparison with Proposed Project

As shown in Table S-2, the General Plan Density Alternative would be expected to result in impacts generally similar to those described for the Proposed Project, in that this alternative would include significant or potentially significant impacts related to aesthetics, ~~air quality~~ agricultural resources, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, paleontological resources, transportation/traffic, hazards and hazardous materials, ~~public services (fire protection)~~ and geology and soils. Several of these impacts would be less than those identified for the Proposed Project, however, based on considerations such as less grading and fewer residences. Similarly, ~~several of the identified impacts for biological resources and hazards and hazardous materials~~ would be greater under this alternative than ~~that~~ those identified for the Proposed Project based on

the provision of less dedicated open space ~~under this alternative~~, and the fact that earthwork would not be balanced on site and would require import of substantial amounts of soil. All of these modifications would be relatively minor, however, and would not be expected to alter the overall impact levels or associated need for mitigation. The General Plan Density Alternative would meet Project objectives related to complementing and responding to the unique topography and character of the Project site and surrounding area, ~~and embracing and preserving the equestrian nature of the surrounding area~~ and providing amenities for the equestrian community. This alternative would not meet Project objectives related to providing a variety of lot sizes for varied family make up; providing a range of for sale, market rate, detached housing types to accommodate broad market needs from singles to large families and across age groups; and providing an increased density close to the shopping, employment, and transportation centers of Escondido and San Marcos; ~~and providing amenities for the equestrian community~~.

S.5.4 ~~Septic Option Alternative~~

S.5.4.1 ~~Description~~

~~This alternative would result in the construction of 35 single-family residences distributed across the Project site. Under this alternative, it was assumed that each house could have five bedrooms and each lot could be at least five acres in size to accommodate septic systems. The Septic Option Alternative would eliminate the need for the WTWRF and associated pump stations, as well as sewer lines, although potable water lines would be required to serve the houses developed under this alternative. In addition, driveways would be required throughout the development to gain access to the houses. This alternative would eliminate the parks included in the Proposed Project, although steep slope and biological easements would be placed over approximately 185 acres of the Project site. This alternative would require approximately 98,000 cy of cut to fill, with approximately 71,000 cy of excess needing to be exported from the Project site during construction. Existing agricultural and equestrian activities on the site would continue under this alternative.~~

S.5.4.2 ~~Environmental Impact Comparison with Proposed Project~~

~~The Septic Option Alternative would avoid or reduce most significant impacts associated with the Proposed Project, including: (1) significant and unmitigated aesthetics and air quality impacts; and (2) significant and/or potentially significant impacts related to biological resources, cultural resources, noise, paleontological resources, transportation/traffic, hazards and hazardous materials, public services (fire protection) and geology and soils, all of which would be avoided or reduced to less than significant through identified mitigation measures and/or design features. This alternative would, however, fail to meet all of the Proposed Project objectives.~~

S.5.5 No Project/No Development Alternative

S.5.5.1 *Description*

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, the Project site would remain in its current condition. The native and non-native habitat throughout the site would remain intact. The site

would continue to be used for commercial agriculture, with extensive areas of active avocado orchards, as well as four minor apiary (bee keeping) sites. The two existing residential structure and the equestrian center located in the southeastern portion of the site would also remain. Single-family residences could be developed on the 12 existing individual parcels.

The proposed semi-rural residential community would not be constructed (along with supporting infrastructure such as roadways, WTWRF, sewer pump station, and other utilities). In addition, the biological open space preserves, agricultural easements and HOA-maintained landscaped areas (as well as related amenities such as trails and pathways) would not be created.

S.5.5.2 Environmental Impact Comparison with Proposed Project

As shown in Table S-2, the No Project/No Development Alternative would avoid or reduce most significant impacts associated with the Proposed Project, including: (1) significant and unmitigated aesthetics and air quality impacts; and (2) significant and/or potentially significant impacts related to biological resources, cultural resources, noise, paleontological resources, transportation/traffic, hazards and hazardous materials, public services (fire protection) and geology and soils, all of which would be avoided or reduced to less than significant through identified mitigation measures and/or design features. This alternative would, however, fail to meet all of the Proposed Project objectives.

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

S.5.6.1 Description

The Off-site and Combined On-/Off-site Sewer Options Alternative includes three potential off-site options for the provision of sewer service, in lieu of the proposed on-site WTWRF and related facilities, along with an option to provide combined on-/off-site wastewater treatment. All other aspects of the Off-site Sewer Options Alternative are the same as the Proposed Project. These potential off-site sewer options are summarized below.

Under the all four ~~three identified~~ off-site sewer options, the on-site development would remain the same with the proposed five neighborhoods containing 326 residential units. The WTWRF (approximately 0.4 acre in size) would not be constructed under the three off-site sewer options and the WTWRF site ~~this area~~ would be used as part of the proposed equestrian ~~center~~ staging area and public neighborhood park, similar to the previous use. The pump station facilities may also be constructed on the WTWRF site under the three off-site sewer options (within a much smaller footprint), as discussed below. The wet weather storage area (approximately 1.6 acres in size) in the northern portion of Neighborhood 5 would not be constructed under the connection to VWD facilities off-site sewer option, and this area would remain undeveloped and placed in an HOA landscape easement. The other two off-site options would utilize the proposed wet weather storage area for reclaimed water storage, similar to the Proposed Project. Under the combined on-/off-site sewer option, the WTWRF would be constructed at a smaller scale, with the wet weather storage area and all other sewer-related facilities to be the same as those described for the Proposed Project. This option would also include an on-site pump station and force main to convey solids to the

Harmony Grove Treatment Plant for additional processing, or would use trucks to transport solids to the Harmony Grove plant,

Connection to the City of Escondido Hale Avenue Resource Recovery Facility (HARRF)

This potential option involves the following off-site facilities/activities: (1) installation of approximately 2,700 linear feet of sewer pipeline from an existing City ~~pump-lift~~ station (LS-12) to be abandoned and replaced with a new LS-12 located just east of Country Club Drive and south of an unnamed street south of Eden Valley Lane southerly to an on-site location within Neighborhood 5 just south of the San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E) easement, with these facilities to be located within existing City of Escondido and County streets; (2) installation of a new force main pipeline from Neighborhood 5 to an existing City sewer line, with the new facilities to be located within an existing SDG&E easement; (3) abandonment of an approximately 1,600 linear feet of sewer pipeline located in City easement; (4) installation of approximately 200 linear feet of a new recycled water pipeline from an existing pipeline to the Project site, with the new facilities to be located within City streets; and (5) installation of approximately 1,000 linear feet of a new sewer return pipeline from the Project wet weather storage site to new gravity sewer main in Country Club Drive, with the new facilities to be located within existing County streets.

Trending east from the wet weather storage pond in Neighborhood 5, the sewer line would be installed in Country Club Drive to just north of Harmony Heights Road. From here, a new 6- to 8-inch force main would trend east (perpendicularly to Country Club Drive) approximately 1,600 feet, up and over a small hill, in the SDG&E right-of-way to connect to existing sewer in Kauana Loa Drive. The easement is edged on both sides by semi-rural residential uses (a total of approximately 10 homes). The construction period would require excavation and installation within existing disturbed roadbed and transmission easement, followed by re-cover of the pipeline and removal of any excess soil along the pipeline right-of-way.

Connection to Vallecitos Water District (VWD) Facilities

This potential option would involve the installation of approximately 3,400 feet of new force main from the Project site to an existing VWD pipeline. New lines would be located between a pump station located in the southeastern portion of Neighborhood 5, trending northerly to Mt. Whitney Drive, then west to Project streets. From the north end of the Project, the new lines would trend east along Hill Valley Drive to Hill Valley Road. From the point at which Hill Valley Road trends due west, the lines would be installed using one of two routes, on either side of semi-rural residential (four homes) prior to passing along paved roads through the Casitas del Sol Mobile Home Park (past approximately 70 homes, regardless of route) and connecting to existing VWD sewer line in Barham Drive, just south of SR-78. From Barham Drive, the Project would install approximately 500 linear feet of pipeline under SR-78 from Barham Drive to Rancheros Drive (a frontage road between commercial uses and SR-78) in the City of San Marcos.

This alternative also would require four on-site pump stations and back-up power generators. The on-site pump stations would be located along Project roadways within the development. Two would be sited Neighborhood 3: one (PS 1) on a cul-de-sac in the northeastern portion of the

neighborhood between lots 146 and 147, and one (PS 2) along the street leading to Neighborhood 4 south of Lot 122. PS 3 would be sited at the northern extent of Neighborhood 4. The fourth pump station would be located on the WTWRF in Neighborhood 5.

Connection to the Harmony Grove Treatment Plant

This potential option involves: (1) the installation of an approximately 0.8-mile-long force main from the project site to the Harmony Grove WTWRF, with these facilities to be located within existing City/County streets; and (2) the construction of a new pump station and backup power generator at the Project site.

A new six-inch force main would be installed from Neighborhood 5, southerly within Country Club Drive, to the Harmony Grove WTWRF currently under construction. The construction period would require excavation and installation within existing roadbed followed by re-cover of the pipeline and removal of any excess soil along the pipeline right-of-way. Impacts would be to a linear right-of-way, with construction activities moving along the right-of-way (cut, install, cover) as installation occurs.

The new pump station would be located on the Project site, west of Country Club Drive, slightly downslope.

Combined On-/Off-site Treatment

In addition to the off-site treatment options discussed above, the Project Sewer Study (Atkins 2015a) identifies a second potential design option involving: (1) construction of an on-site treatment facility to provide wastewater treatment and solids thickening; and (2) conveyance of thickened sludge to the Harmony Grove Treatment Plant for additional processing and disposal. This option would include an on-site facility that would be similar to (although at a slightly smaller scale than) the proposed WTWRF, an on-site wet weather storage facility as described for the Proposed Project, and a small on-site pump station and force main (assumed to be similar to the facilities described above for the full connection to the Harmony Grove Treatment Plant). Alternatively, thickened solids could be collected on site and hauled to the Harmony Grove facility. Under this option, the existing laboratory at the Harmony Grove Treatment Plant would also be utilized by the on-site facility (similar to the Proposed Project).

S.5.6.2 Environmental Impact Comparison with Proposed Project

The three off-site sewer options, which would replace the on-site WTWRF, as well as the combined on-/off-site option, would be expected to result in generally similar impacts to those described for the Proposed Project. Specifically, this would include potentially significant and unmitigable impacts related to aesthetics and air quality, as well as significant (or potentially significant) but mitigated impacts for the issues of agricultural resources, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, paleontology, transportation/traffic, hazards and hazardous materials, public services (fire protection) and geology and soils. A number of these impacts may vary slightly from those identified for the Proposed Project; however, these variations would be relatively minor and would not be expected to alter the overall impact levels or associated need for

mitigation. Potential impacts identified for noise and air quality associated with operation of the WTWRF would be eliminated ~~under~~ for the off-site options included under this alternative but would remain for the combined on-/off-site option. In addition, none of the off-site sewer options identified for this alternative would not be growth inducing because they would not eliminate an obstacle to growth. The All of the three off-site sewer options identified under this alternative would meet the identified Project objectives.

S.5.7 Environmentally Superior Alternative

Although the No Project alternatives would result in minimal to substantially reduced environmental impacts, Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the State California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines requires identification of an alternative other than the No Project as the environmentally superior alternative.

Based on the above CEQA requirement, the ~~Reduced Grading Alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative. This is the result of elimination of 19 acres of grading, which would result in 37 percent less grading and an increase in biological open space and agricultural easements, as described above. Overall there would be less impacts to agricultural resources, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, paleontological resources, transportation/traffic, hazards and hazardous materials, public services (fire protection) and geology and soils under this environmentally superior alternative.~~ Septic Alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative. This is the result of eliminating 17 acres of grading (i.e., 108 acres versus 125 acres for the Proposed Project), which would result in 18 percent less cut and fill (i.e., 762,000 cy versus 920,000 cy for the Proposed Project), as well as an increase in biological open space and (potentially) the agricultural easement (as described above in Section 4.4.2). Overall there would be less impacts to agricultural resources, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, paleontological resources, transportation/traffic, hazards and hazardous materials and geology and soils under this environmentally superior alternative.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table S-1 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation (See Chapter 7 for Detailed Measures)	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS			
Project-level Impacts			
Subchapter 2.1, Aesthetics			
2.1.2.1 Potential Conflict with Important Visual Elements or Inconsistency with Applicable Design Guidelines			
AE-13	Temporary visual effects during the Proposed Project construction period related to grading and ongoing development would be substantial until buildout occurs and all vegetation is installed and attains five additional years maturity.	M-AE-31: Mitigation for the view of raw soils during grading requires: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installation of landscaping and rock staining on manufactured slopes to occur as each phase of rough grading is completed. • Decision-makers may approve a project alternative that would reduce its potential temporary visual impacts (reduced landform modification). 	Significant and Unmitigable (temporary)
Subchapter 2.2, Air Quality			
2.2.2.1 Conformance to the RAQS			
AQ-1	The Project is proposing an increase in housing units beyond what was included for the site in the 2009 RAQS; therefore, impacts associated with conformance to regional air quality plans would be potentially significant.	M-AQ-1: If the decision-makers find the Project is consistent with the General Plan and approve the project, the mitigation would be to provide a revised housing forecast to SANDAG for revisions to the population and employment projections used in updating the RAQS and SIP. This would accurately reflect anticipated growth due to the Proposed Project; however, interim impacts would remain significant. The decision-makers may approve a Project alternative that would be consistent with the RAQS and SIP (General Plan density).	Significant and Unmitigable
2.2.2.3 Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase of Criteria Pollutants			
AQ-2	Construction of the Proposed Project and other projects that occur in the general vicinity of the Project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in VOC, NO _x , PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} .	None: The Project's contribution would be considerable by its inconsistency with the RAQS and SIP. Decision-makers may approve a Project alternative that would reduce the Project's contribution to a less than considerable level (General Plan density). Project Design Features have been maximized to keep Project contribution of criteria pollutants to a minimum during construction. No other Project mitigation measures are available.	Significant and Unmitigable

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation (See Chapter 7 for Detailed Measures)	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.2, Air Quality (cont.)			
2.2.2.3 Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase of Criteria Pollutants (cont.)			
AQ-3	Operation of the Proposed Project would result in net increases in criteria pollutants, which would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution in criteria pollutants to the regional air quality.	None: The Proposed Project would implement design measures to reduce emissions of criteria pollutants during operation (Table 1-4); no other Project mitigation measures are available. Decision-makers may approve a project alternative that would reduce the Project's contribution to a less than considerable level.	Significant and Unmitigable
AQ-4	Cumulative growth would not be within the range projected by SANDAG, as the Proposed Project was found to not be consistent with the RAQS and SIP. Growth projected for the Proposed Project would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution.	Same as M-AQ-1 .	Significant and Unmitigable
Subchapter 2.8, Transportation/Traffic			
2.8.3.1 Existing Plus Cumulative Plus Project Impacts			
TR-1a and TR-1b	The Proposed Project would have direct and cumulative impacts along Country Club Drive from Auto Park Way to Hill Valley Drive in the City of Escondido (LOS F).	M-TR-1a and b: The EB approach at the Auto Park Way/ Country Club Drive intersection shall be restriped to provide one left turn lane, one shared left turn/through lane, and one right turn lane. The signal will be modified to change the east/west approach to "split" phasing. The applicant has also proposed a prohibition on street parking (if approved by the City Council). The improvements necessary to reduce the significant direct	Significant and Unmitigable[†]

[†] The addition of sidewalks on the east side of this segment may have limited benefit to capacity of the roadway (pedestrians would have dedicated space for movement). This improvement is being discussed as a possible project design feature.

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation (See Chapter 7 for Detailed Measures)	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.8, Transportation/Traffic (cont.)			
2.8.3.1 Existing Plus Cumulative Plus Project Impacts (cont.)			
TR-1a and TR-1b (cont.)		and cumulative impacts are the responsibility of another jurisdiction (City of Escondido) and it cannot be guaranteed that the City would implement the recommended improvements or that the improvements would be completed in time to avoid the significant Project impacts. Regardless, the Applicant will be required to fund or construct the mitigation measures, subject to approval by the City of Escondido. Decision makers may approve a project alternative that would reduce the Project's direct effect and cumulative contribution to a less than considerable level.	
TR-3	The Proposed Project would have a cumulative impact at the Auto Park Way/Mission Road signalized intersection in the City of Escondido (LOS D during the AM and PM peak periods).	M-TR-3: The current design of this intersection has been accepted in Escondido's General Plan. No mitigation measures are proposed. Decision-makers may approve a project alternative that would reduce the Project's contribution to a less than considerable level.	Significant and Unmitigable
TR-4	The Proposed Project would have a cumulative impact at the Auto Park Way/ Country Club Drive signalized intersection in the City of Escondido (LOS D during the AM peak period).	M-TR-4: M-TR-1a shall be implemented. Decision makers may approve a project alternative that would reduce the Project's contribution to a less than considerable level.	Significant and Unmitigable

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation (See Chapter 7 for Detailed Measures)	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT			
Project-level Impacts			
Subchapter 2.1, Aesthetics			
2.1.2.1 Potential Conflict with Important Visual Elements or Inconsistency with Applicable Design Guidelines			
AE-1	Grading would result in landform modification of steep slopes (1.1 acres) and the height and visibility of some resulting manufactured slopes with lack of vegetation and newly exposed rock would contrast with the adjoining natural hillsides.	<p>M-AE-1: <u>The following mitigation measure addresses initial installation of the landscaping and rock staining on the manufactured slopes to ensure long-term visual continuity and screening of the manufactured slopes. Screening for manufactured slopes shall occur as each phase of rough grading is completed and shall include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>All manufactured slopes within steep slopes shall be vegetated beyond the minimal erosion control vegetation (one one-gallon shrub per 100 s.f.) to provide one one-gallon shrub per each 75 s.f. in areas of exposed soil (i.e., non-rocky areas) and exposed newly cut rocks shall be stained to soften and screen the appearance of the manufactured slopes. Landscaping beyond the minimal erosion control vegetation (one 1-gallon shrub per 100 s.f.) to provide one 1-gallon shrub per each 75 s.f. in areas of exposed soil (i.e., non-rocky areas).</u> • <u>Exposed newly cut rocks shall be stained to soften and screen the appearance of the manufactured slopes.</u> • <u>The HOA for the Proposed Project shall have the responsibility to maintain the installed landscaping along the manufactured slopes.</u> 	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation (See Chapter 7 for Detailed Measures)	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.1, Aesthetics (cont.)			
2.1.2.2 Removal or Substantial Adverse Change of a Valued Feature			
AE-2	There would be an introduction of large retaining/ <u>fire</u> walls with <u>horizontal</u> line elements and rectilinear surface planes in visual contrast with the backdrop of rolling hillsides and steep ridgelines.	<p>M-AE-2: Visual character impacts related to retaining/<u>fire</u> walls <u>that would not be screened by landscaping shown in the Project Landscape Concept Plan as a matter of Project design</u> would be mitigated by the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retaining wWall(s) shall be textured and stained or colored to reduce visibility as shown in the Project Landscape Concept Plan. • Other retaining walls shall be screened by landscaping as shown in the conceptual landscape plans. 	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation (See Chapter 7 for Detailed Measures)	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 3.3, Agricultural Resources			
2.3.2.2 Direct Impacts to On-site Agricultural Resources			
AG-1	The Proposed Project would impact approximately 12.98 13.1 acres of significant on-site agricultural resources, based on the results of the LARA Model analysis.	M-AG-1: <u>Mitigation for on-site direct impacts to 13.1 acres of agricultural resources encompassing candidate soils would require on or offsite preservation of suitable agricultural resources at a 1:1 ratio. Options to implement this mitigation include: (1) providing 13.1 acres of off-site mitigation through the acquisition of agricultural mitigation credits via the County Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easement (PACE) Program; (2) providing a combination of PACE mitigation credits and establishment of on-and/or off-site agricultural easements in appropriate areas encompassing CDC candidate soils and totaling 13.1 acres, or (3) purchasing off-site agricultural lands with easements totaling 13.1 acres that meet the intent of the County Agricultural Guidelines, all to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS.</u> On-site direct agricultural impacts would be mitigated through the acquisition of agricultural easements totaling 13.0 acres, through: (1) the acquisition of agricultural mitigation credits through the County PACE Program; (2) providing a combination of PACE mitigation credits and establishment of off and/or on-site agricultural easements totaling 13.0 acres; or (3) purchasing off-site agricultural lands or easements totaling 13.0 acres that meet the intent of the County Agricultural Guidelines.	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation (See Chapter 7 for Detailed Measures)	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.4, Biological Resources			
2.4.2.1 Special Status Species			
BI-1a	Construction of the Proposed Project would significantly impact <u>53.849.9</u> acres of non-native grassland and <u>20.520.3</u> acres of extensive agriculture (pasture) habitat, which comprise habitat for seven County Group 1 animal species, including Cooper’s hawk, red-shouldered hawk, northern harrier, white-tailed kite, turkey vulture, prairie falcon, and grasshopper sparrow.	M-BI-1a and b: Mitigation for impacts to non-native grassland habitat, grasshopper sparrow and raptors foraging will occur at a mitigation ratio of 1:1 (<u>53.149.1</u> acres ²). Mitigation for impacts to <u>20.520.3</u> acres of extensive agriculture will occur at a ratio of 0.5:1 (<u>10.310.2</u> acres) prior to recordation of the first final map. Mitigation would occur through one or a combination of the following: off-site preservation and management of grassland habitat and/or other like-functioning habitat, or purchase of grassland credits or like-functioning habitat at an approved mitigation bank within the NC Plan PAMA. The mitigation for impacts in the Elfin Forest Harmony Grove Community Plan (EFHGCP) (0.6 acre of mitigation for non-native grassland and 10.3 acres of mitigation for extensive agriculture of the above totals) shall be in conformance with the EFHGCP to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS.	Less than Significant
BI-1b	Construction of the Proposed Project would significantly impact raptor foraging habitat comprising <u>53.849.9</u> acres of non-native grassland and <u>20.520.3</u> acres of extensive agriculture (pasture).	Same as M-BI-1a and b , above.	Less than Significant

² A total of 53.1 acres of grassland mitigation would be provided for impacts to 53.8 acres of non-native grassland. The remaining 0.7 acre would be mitigated through oak woodland mitigation, as impacts to 0.7 acre of non-native grassland occur within the oak root zone as defined by the County and are considered impacts to oak woodland.

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation (See Chapter 7 for Detailed Measures)	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.4, Biological Resources (cont.)			
2.4.2.1 Special Status Species (cont.)			
BI-2	Construction-related noise may significantly impact tree- and/or ground-nesting raptors that may be nesting within 300 feet of the construction area if construction noise at the nest exceeds 60 dB L _{EQ} .	M-BI-2: No grubbing, clearing, or grading within 300 feet of an active raptor nest during the raptor breeding season (February 1 to July 15) will occur unless a pre-grading survey determines raptors are not present or until all nesting (or breeding/nesting behavior) has ceased or until after July 15; or (2) construction noise can be controlled to keep noise levels below 60 dB L _{EQ} or ambient (if ambient is greater than 60 dB L _{EQ}) to the satisfaction of the County and wildlife agencies.	Less than Significant
2.4.2.2 Riparian Habitat and Sensitive Natural Communities			
BI-3a	Construction of the Proposed Project would result in significant direct impacts to 0.17 acre of southern riparian forest.	M-BI-3a: Impacts to 0.17 acre of southern riparian forest will be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio through the purchase of 0.51 acre of wetland credits at the San Luis Rey Mitigation Bank, or other location deemed acceptable by the County and Regulatory Agencies prior to recordation of the first final map.	Less than Significant
BI-3b3a	Construction of the Proposed Project would result in significant direct impacts to 0.04 acre of southern willow scrub.	M-BI-3b3a: Impacts to 0.04 acre of southern willow scrub will be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio through the purchase of 0.12 acre of wetland credits at the San Luis Rey Mitigation Bank, or other location deemed acceptable by the County and Regulatory Agencies prior to recordation of the first final map.	Less than Significant
BI-3e3b	Construction of the Proposed Project would result in significant direct impacts to 0.01 acre of mule fat scrub.	M-BI-3e3b: Impacts to 0.01 acre of mule fat scrub will be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio through the purchase of 0.03 acre of wetland credits at the San Luis Rey Mitigation Bank, or other location deemed acceptable by the County and Regulatory Agencies prior to recordation of the first final map.	Less than Significant
BI-3d3c	Construction of the Proposed Project would result in significant direct impacts to 0.02 acre of herbaceous wetland.	M-BI-3d3c: Impacts to 0.02 acre of herbaceous wetland will be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio through the purchase of 0.06 acre of wetland credits at the San Luis Rey Mitigation Bank, or other location deemed acceptable by the County and Regulatory Agencies prior to recordation of the first final map.	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation (See Chapter 7 for Detailed Measures)	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.4, Biological Resources (cont.)			
2.4.2.2 Riparian Habitat and Sensitive Natural Communities (cont.)			
BI-3e3d	Construction of the Proposed Project would result in significant direct impacts to 0.08 acre of disturbed wetland.	M-BI-3e3d: Impacts to 0.08 acre of disturbed wetland will be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio through the purchase of 0.24 acre of wetland credits at the San Luis Rey Mitigation Bank, or other location deemed acceptable by the County and Regulatory Agencies prior to recordation of the first final map.	Less than Significant
BI-3f3e	Construction of the Proposed Project would result in significant direct impacts to 6.76.2 acres of coast live oak woodland.	M-BI-3f3e: Impacts to 6.76.2 acres of coast live oak woodland and 0.91.0 acre of oak woodland buffer (0.70.8 acre non-native grassland, and 0.20.1 acre of eucalyptus woodland, and 0.1 acre combined impacts to extensive agriculture, southern mixed chaparral, and eucalyptus forest) will be mitigated at a 2:1 ratio for the 2.42.1 acres occurring within the LBZ around biological open space, and at a 3:1 ratio for the remaining 4.34.1 acres of impact and 0.91.0 acre of buffer impact. A 2.42.1 -acre Oak Tree Protection Easement would be recorded over the 2.42.1 acres of coast live oak woodland remaining within the LBZ, which would limit fuel modification to clearing of the understory and prohibit the removal of mature oak trees. Mitigation would occur through <u>one or a combination of the following:</u> the purchase of 20.419.5 acres of oak woodland, oak riparian woodland, or oak riparian forest credits at an approved mitigation bank such as the future Brook Forest Conservation Bank or other location deemed acceptable by the County and Wildlife Agencies prior to recordation of the first final map, <u>and/or off-site acquisition and preservation of land within the NC MSCP PAMA boundaries containing oak woodland, oak riparian woodland, or oak riparian forest.</u> Mitigation for 9.8 acres of oak woodland mitigation shall demonstrate conformance with the EFHGCP to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS.	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation (See Chapter 7 for Detailed Measures)	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.4, Biological Resources (cont.)			
2.4.2.2 Riparian Habitat and Sensitive Natural Communities (cont.)			
BI-3g3f	Construction of the Proposed Project would result in significant direct impacts to 1-00.2 acre of isolated Diegan coastal sage scrub and significant indirect impacts to 0-81.6 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub.	M-BI-3g3f: Direct impacts to 1-00.2 acre of Diegan coastal sage scrub and indirect impacts to 0-81.6 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub will be mitigated at a 2:1 ratio through the purchase of 3.6 acres of coastal sage scrub credits at an approved mitigation bank such as the future Brook Forest Conservation Bank or other location deemed acceptable by the County and Wildlife Agencies; and/or off-site acquisition and preservation of land within the draft NC Plan PAMA containing Diegan coastal sage scrub all prior to recordation of the first final map.	Less than Significant
BI-3h3g	Construction of the Proposed Project would result in significant direct impacts to 3-13.0 acres of granitic southern mixed chaparral.	M-BI-3h3g: Impacts to 3.04 acres of granitic southern mixed chaparral will be mitigated at a 0.5:1 ratio through one or a combination of the following: the purchase of 1-61.5 acres of chaparral credits at an approved mitigation bank such as the future Brook Forest Conservation Bank or other location deemed acceptable by the County and Wildlife Agencies; or off-site acquisition and preservation of land within the draft NC MSCP PAMA boundaries containing southern mixed chaparral, all prior to recordation of the first final map.	Less than Significant
BI-3i3h	Construction of the Proposed Project would result in significant direct impacts to 53-849.9 acres of non-native grassland and 20.520.3 acres of extensive agriculture.	Same as M-BI-1a and b , above.	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation (See Chapter 7 for Detailed Measures)	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.4, Biological Resources (cont.)			
2.4.2.2 Riparian Habitat and Sensitive Natural Communities (cont.)			
BI-4	Implementation of the Proposed Project would impact 0.02 acre of herbaceous wetland WUS and 0.19 acre of non-wetland WUS regulated by the USACE.	M-BI-4: Impacts to 0.02 acre of USACE herbaceous wetland will be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio as described in Mitigation Measure M-BI-3d, above. Impacts to 0.19 acre of non-wetland WUS will be mitigated by purchase of 0.19 credits at the San Luis Rey Mitigation Bank, or other location deemed acceptable by the County and Regulatory Agencies. All mitigation for WUS will occur in consultation with the USACE, prior to recordation of the first final map.	Less than Significant
BI-5	Implementation of the Proposed Project would impact a total of 0.920.76 acre of Waters of the State (CDFW jurisdiction) comprised of 0.660.50 acre of vegetated habitat (0.14 acre of southern riparian forest, 0.390.38 acre of coast live oak woodland, 0.02 acre of southern willow scrub, 0.01 acre of mule fat scrub, 0.02 acre of herbaceous wetland, and 0.08 acre of disturbed wetland) and 0.26 acre of streambed.	M-BI-5: Impacts to 0.660.50 acre of vegetated Waters of the State would be mitigated by the implementation of the above Mitigation Measures M-BI-3a (southern riparian forest), M-BI-3b-3a (southern willow scrub), M-BI-3e-3b (mule fat scrub), M-BI-3d-3c (herbaceous wetland), M-BI-3e-3d (disturbed wetland) and M-BI-3f-3e (coast live oak woodland), prior to recordation of the first final map. Impacts to 0.26 acre of streambed Waters of the State would be mitigated by the implementation of Mitigation Measure M-BI-4, above, plus purchase of an additional 0.07 acre credit at the San Luis Rey Mitigation Bank, or other location deemed acceptable by the County and Regulatory Agencies, prior to recordation of the first final map.	Less than Significant
BI-6	Implementation of the Proposed Project would impact 0.180.01 acre of County RPO wetlands comprised of 0.17 acre of southern riparian forest and 0.01 acre of a single stand of mule fat scrub (allowed by exempt activities).	M-BI-6: Impacts to 0.180.01 acre of County RPO wetlands (0.17 acre of southern riparian forest and 0.01 acre of a single stand of mule fat scrub) would be mitigated by the implementation of Mitigation Measures M-BI-3a and M-BI-3e, above.	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation (See Chapter 7 for Detailed Measures)	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.4, Biological Resources (cont.)			
2.4.2.5 Local Policies, Ordinances, and Adopted Plans			
BI-7	Breeding migratory birds may temporarily or permanently leave their territories to avoid construction and/or extraction operations, which could lead to reduced reproductive success and increased mortality.	M-BI-7: In order to ensure compliance with the MBTA, grading and clearing of vegetation will occur outside of the breeding season of most avian species (February 1 to September 1). All grading permits, improvement plans and the final map(s) will include such statement. Grading or clearing during the breeding season of MBTA-covered species could occur with PDS approval and wildlife agency concurrence if it is determined that no nesting birds (or birds displaying breeding or nesting behavior) are present immediately prior to clearing and grading. A pre-construction survey will be conducted within seven days prior to clearing and grading activities to determine if breeding or nesting avian species occur within impact areas.	Less than Significant
Subchapter 2.5, Cultural Resources			
2.5.2.1 Archaeological Sites			
CR-1	Site CA-SDI-17,506, described in the Cultural Resources Inventory and Assessment (Appendix F) as a large artifact scatter with flaked stone, ground stone, and marine shell, including the presence of subsurface cultural material, was assessed as a significant resource under CEQA; however, it does not meet the requirements for significance under RPO. This site would be subject to direct impacts from Project development.	M-CR-1: A data recovery program would be implemented at the site prior to approval of any grading or improvement plans that would cause the direct impact. The research design and data recovery plan are included as Appendix F of the Cultural Resources Inventory and Assessment. The data recovery program would be implemented prior to any grading and/or improvements and prior to the approval of the first Final Map. All data recovery shall include a Kumeyaay and a Luiseño Native American monitor.	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation (See Chapter 7 for Detailed Measures)	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.5, Cultural Resources (cont.)			
2.5.2.1 Archaeological Sites (cont.)			
CR-2	There is a potential for significant direct impacts related to undiscovered buried archaeological resources on the Proposed Project site.	<p>M-CR-2: A County approved archaeologist shall be contracted to implement a grading monitoring and data recovery program, and a pre-grading survey to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS, to mitigate potential impacts to undiscovered buried archaeological resources on the Proposed Project site. This program shall include both a Kumeyaay and Luiseno Native American monitor to be involved with the grading monitoring program and pre-grading survey. The monitors shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Attend the pre-grading meeting with the contractors to explain and coordinate the requirements of the monitoring program. 2. Re-survey areas of the project site including off-site improvement areas. 3. Define the boundaries of CA-SDI-17,506 and determine whether the site can be avoided. 4. Monitor all areas identified for development including off-site improvements. 5. Ensure that all earthmoving activities are observed and shall be onsite during all grading activities for areas to be monitored. 6. Be present for the original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits and monitoring of previously disturbed deposits, as determined by the Project Archaeologist of the excavations in consultation with the Native American monitors. 	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation (See Chapter 7 for Detailed Measures)	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.5, Cultural Resources (cont.)			
2.5.2.1 Archaeological Sites (cont.)			
CR-2 (cont.)		7. If significant cultural resources are discovered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document cultural resources according to professional archaeological methods. • Divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area of discovery to allow evaluation of potentially significant cultural resources. • Contact the County Archaeologist at the time of the discovery. The County Archaeologist must concur with the evaluation before construction activities will be allowed to resume in the affected area. Discovery of significant cultural resources requires implementation of a Research Design and Data Recovery Program to mitigate impacts (refer to Chapter 7). 8. If human remains are discovered and determined to be of Native American origin, proper consultation protocols are to be followed (refer to Chapter 7). 9. Prepare a report documenting the field and analysis results interpreting the artifacts and research data to the Director of Planning & Development Services. <u>A copy of the report shall be provided to the San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians and any culturally affiliated Tribe who requests a copy.</u> 10. In the event that no cultural resources are discovered, a brief letter to the Director of Planning & Development Services by the consulting archaeologist shall document that the grading monitoring activities have been completed without discovery of resources. 11. These measures shall be implemented through notes on the grading plans.	

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation (See Chapter 7 for Detailed Measures)	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.6, Noise			
2.6.2.1 Transportation Noise Levels			
N-1	Noise levels at the Proposed Project’s residential exterior use areas of Neighborhood 5 adjacent to Country Club Drive may exceed 60 CNEL, and would require exterior use area noise control.	M-N-1: Traffic noise levels at the Proposed Project’s residential exterior use areas facing Country Club Drive shall be mitigated to County Standards by installing a 6-foot high noise control wall along the outer perimeter of the residential use areas of Lots 283 through 289 (less than 60 CNEL) (refer to Table 2.6-1).	Less than Significant
N-2	Noise levels at the Proposed Project’s residential building facades facing Country Club Drive may exceed 60 CNEL; typically, with the windows closed, building shells provide approximately 15 dB CNEL of noise reduction. Thus, it is possible that interior noise levels would exceed the 45 CNEL threshold.	M-N-2: A final exterior-to-interior analysis shall be conducted to demonstrate that interior residential noise levels are below 45 CNEL. This analysis would be submitted with the final building plan submittal for the residential units along Country Club Drive (specifically Lots 283 through 289).	Less than Significant
2.6.2.2 Operational Noise Levels			
N-3	Pending identification of specific locations for HVAC units, the use of air conditioning condensers at the Proposed Project site within 35 feet of a property line may create noise levels in excess of the County’s nighttime allowable hourly limit of 45 dBA L _{EQ} at adjacent residences; impacts to the property lines for on-site residences could occur.	M-N-3: If a residential air conditioning condenser is installed within 35 feet of a property line, a 5.5 foot-high noise control barrier shall be installed between the residential use areas and the condensers to reduce related noise impacts at the property lines to less than 45 dBA L _{EQ} .	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation (See Chapter 7 for Detailed Measures)	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.6, Noise (cont.)			
2.6.2.2 Operational Noise Levels (cont.)			
N-4	The WTWRF equipment and generator may create a combined exterior noise level in excess of the allowed exterior one-hour average noise level of 45 dBA L_{EQ} at residential property lines and noise impacts to surrounding property lines could occur.	<p>M-N-4: The applicant shall incorporate the following noise control measures for the WTWRF and shall demonstrate compliance with the County 45 dBA L_{EQ} property line nighttime limit to the satisfaction of the County PDS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Stationary equipment noise may be controlled by providing an exterior enclosure wall and gate to control offsite noise impacts for all WTWRF equipment, enclosing the WTWRF equipment inside a noise control Concrete Masonry Unit (CMU) structure or specific design enclosures, increasing property line setbacks of WTWRF noise sources where feasible, locating WTWRF noise sources such that noise shielding would be provided from on-site buildings or structures, and, incorporating noise control measures such as acoustical louvers or paneling into the WTWRF design. b. Diesel generator noise may be controlled by enclosing the diesel generator within a custom designed noise control structure (such as a steel enclosure), and placing the diesel generator within a CMU building that includes noise control features. 	Less than Significant
N-5	Without additional noise control, the generators associated with the proposed pump stations may create exterior noise levels in excess of the allowed exterior one-hour average noise level of 45 dBA L_{EQ} at residential property lines. Thus, noise impacts from the proposed pump stations to surrounding property lines could occur.	<p>M-N-5: The applicant shall incorporate noise measures by various methods, including but not limited to: enclosing the diesel generator within a custom designed noise control structure (such as a steel enclosure); placing the pump equipment and diesel generator within a CMU construction building that includes noise control features. A final noise impact analysis for the booster pump station backup power generators shall be prepared by a County-approved noise consultant to demonstrate compliance with the County 45 dBA L_{EQ} property line requirement, completed to the satisfaction of the County PDS.</p>	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation (See Chapter 7 for Detailed Measures)	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.6, Noise (cont.)			
2.6.2.2 Operational Noise Levels (cont.)			
N-6	Without additional noise control, the pump and generator associated with the proposed booster pump station (for water circulation) may create exterior noise levels in excess of the allowed exterior one-hour average noise level of 45 dBA L _{EQ} at residential property lines. Thus, noise impacts from the proposed booster pump to surrounding property lines could occur.	M-N-6: Diesel generator noise may be controlled by the various methods, including but not limited to: enclosing the diesel generator within a custom designed noise control structure (such as a steel enclosure); placing the pump equipment and diesel generator within a CMU construction building that includes noise control features. A final noise impact analysis for the pump station backup power generators shall be prepared by a County-approved noise consultant to demonstrate compliance with the County 45 dBA L _{EQ} property line requirement completed to the satisfaction of the County PDS.	Less than Significant
2.6.2.3 Construction Noise Levels			
N-7	Ripping or any heavy dozer activities, use of a large excavator, or use of a rock drill within 180-feet of an occupied off-site or future on-site residential structure may create significant impacts.	M-N-7: If ripping, drilling, or excavation is required within 180 feet of a residentially occupied off-site or on-site property line, a 12-foot high barrier shall be erected along a length of the property line. This barrier shall be of sufficient length to block the line of sight between the occupied property and any ripping operations within 180 feet of the property.	Less than Significant
N-8	Rock breaking within 300 feet of an occupied off-site or future on-site residential structure may create significant impacts.	M-N-8: If a breaker is required on-site during construction, then it shall not be used within 300 feet of property lines of occupied residences.	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation (See Chapter 7 for Detailed Measures)	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.6, Noise (cont.)			
2.6.2.3 Construction Noise Levels (cont.)			
N-9	Blasting using even small charges within 200 feet of an on-site or off-site residential structure may create a significant vibration impact. Larger blasts at greater distances may also create significant impacts; however, potential impacts from larger blasts could not be evaluated until after the surface material and the required blasting charge type is known.	<p>M-N-9: <u>Prior to and during construction activities, the applicant shall be required to prepare and implement a blast plan to reduce impacts associated with air blast over-pressure generated by Project-related construction activities and to incorporate any required noise reducing measures to comply with County Noise Ordinance regulations. The Project applicant shall conform to the blast plan which would be comprised of the following (but not limited to):</u> No blasting shall occur at less than 600 feet from any off-site structure without specific analysis by the blasting contractor showing less than significant vibration impacts to the structure.</p> <p>Initial planning shall consider livestock within 300 feet of a minor blast or 600 feet of a major blast to be removed prior to the commencement of blasting. All blast planning shall be done by a San Diego County Sheriff approved blaster, with the appropriate San Diego County Sheriff blasting permits, and all other applicable local, state, and federal permits, licenses, and bonding. The blasting contractor shall conduct all notifications, inspections, monitoring, major or minor blasting requirements planning, with seismograph reports as necessary.</p> <p><u>Construction equipment associated with blasting (i.e., drilling, pre and post blasting work) shall comply with the County Noise Ordinance, Sections 36.408, 36.409, and 36.410. The blast plan shall include any necessary noise measures such as (but not limited to) temporary noise barriers and blankets, increased setbacks, limiting construction equipment operations, and any other methods specified within the blasting plan must be implemented to comply with County Noise Ordinance requirements.</u></p>	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation (See Chapter 7 for Detailed Measures)	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.7, Paleontological Resources (cont.)			
2.7.2.1 Paleontological Analysis			
P-1	Proposed Project grading for on-site facilities, including excavation and grading activities, could have a potentially significant impact to paleontological resources within terrace deposits and the Santiago Formation.	<p>M-P-1: A qualified paleontologist shall be at the pre-construction meeting to consult with the grading and excavation contractors concerning excavation schedules, paleontological field techniques, and safety issues. A qualified paleontologist is defined as an individual having an M.S. or Ph.D. in paleontology or a related field (e.g., sedimentary or stratigraphic geology, evolutionary biology, etc.), and who has knowledge of San Diego County paleontology and documented experience in professional paleontological procedures and techniques.</p> <p>A qualified paleontologist or paleontological monitor (under the supervision of the qualified paleontologist) shall be on site on a full-time basis during the original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits of high or moderate paleontological resource sensitivity (i.e., Santiago Formation or Quaternary river terrace deposits) to inspect exposures for contained fossils. A paleontological monitor is defined as an individual with at least one year of experience in field identification and collection of fossil materials. The paleontological monitor shall work under the direct supervision of the qualified paleontologist.</p> <p>The Project Applicant shall: (1) submit a copy of a letter signed by the qualified paleontologist or paleontological monitor which states that the applicant has retained their services and acknowledges agreement to perform and/or be responsible for concurrence with the Project mitigation measures; and (2) authorize the qualified paleontologist to direct, divert, or halt any grading activity, and to perform all other acts required by the provisions listed below. If the qualified paleontologist or paleontological monitor</p>	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation (See Chapter 7 for Detailed Measures)	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.7, Paleontological Resources (cont.)			
2.7.2.1 Paleontological Analysis (cont.)			
P-1 (cont.)		<p>ascertains that the Santiago Formation or river terrace deposits are not fossil bearing, the qualified paleontologist shall have the authority to terminate the monitoring program.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Direct, divert, or halt any grading or excavation activity until such time that the sensitivity of the resource can be determined and the appropriate recovery implemented. 2. Salvage unearthened fossil remains. 3. Record stratigraphic and geologic data to provide a context for the recovered fossil remains. 4. Prepare collected fossil remains for curation. 5. Curate, catalog, and identify all fossil remains to the lowest taxon possible, inventory specimens, assign catalog numbers, and enter the appropriate specimen and locality data into a collection database. 6. Transfer the cataloged fossil remains to an accredited institution (museum or university) in California that maintains paleontological collections for archival storage and/or display. 7. The qualified paleontologist shall prepare a final Paleontological Resources Mitigation Report summarizing the field and laboratory methods used, the stratigraphic units inspected, the types of fossils recovered, and the significance of the curated collection. 	
P-2	Proposed Project grading for off-site facilities could have a potentially significant impact to paleontological resources within terrace deposits.	Same as M-P-1 , above.	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation (See Chapter 7 for Detailed Measures)	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.8, Transportation/Traffic			
2.8.3.1 Existing Plus Cumulative Plus Project Impacts			
<u>TR-1a and TR-1b</u>	<u>The Proposed Project would have direct and cumulative impacts along Country Club Drive from Auto Park Way to Hill Valley Drive in the City of Escondido (LOS F).</u> ^[BD1] ^[LB2]	<u>M-TR-1a and b:</u> The EB approach at the Auto Park Way/ Country Club Drive intersection shall be restriped to provide one left-turn lane, one shared left-turn/through lane, and one right turn lane. The signal will be modified to change the east/west approach to “split” phasing. In addition, Country Club Drive will be widened to provide a paved width of 36 feet consisting of two travel lanes and a 10-foot striped center turn lane starting 220 feet southwest of Auto Park Way for a length of approximately 830 feet. Improvements will include connecting the existing sidewalk along the northern side of this roadway section with a five-foot sidewalk complete with a six inch curb and gutter and providing a four-foot decomposed granite pathway along the south side of this segment with a six inch asphalt berm.	<u>Less than Significant</u>
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
2.9.2.3 Human or Environmental Exposure to Hazardous Materials			
HZ-1	<u>Analytical results for soil samples collected near the AST in the northern area of the site (Neighborhood 1) indicate a historical release of DRO and ORO. Additionally, there was minimal staining observed adjacent to the 200-gallon diesel AST located near the southeastern area (Neighborhood 5) of the Proposed Project site.</u> Construction and occupation of the area of the historical release of DRO and ORO near	<u>M-HZ-1a:</u> Excavation and/or grading activities near the location of the on-site AST in Neighborhood 5 shall be actively monitored by a Registered Environmental Assessor (REA) for the potential presence of hydrocarbon contaminated soils. In the event of encountering contaminated soils, these soils shall be properly tested, managed, and disposed of at a licensed facility in accordance with County DEH requirements. <u>M-HZ-1b:</u> Soils near the on-site AST within Neighborhood 1 shall be assessed to identify the vertical and lateral limits of DRO and ORO contaminated soils. Contaminated soils shall be disposed of at a licensed facility in accordance with County DEH requirements.	<u>Less than Significant</u>

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation (See Chapter 7 for Detailed Measures)	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
	the southeastern area (Neighborhood 5) could be hazardous to public health.		
2.9.2.5 Demolition of Structures that May Contain ACM, LBP, and/or Other Hazardous Materials			
HZ-2	Construction and occupation of the area near the on-site structures (approximately 60 years), ACM and/or LCP could be present and hazardous to public health.	M-HZ-2: Potential impacts related to the possible presence of ACM and/or LCP in the structures on site shall be mitigated by additional assessment in the form of an ACM and LCP survey conducted prior to demolition activities. This survey shall be utilized to confirm the absence or presence of these materials and determine appropriate health and safety requirements for demolition and disposal methods for demolition debris.	Less than Significant
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials (cont.)			
2.9.2.6 Wildland Fire Hazards			
HZ-3a and 3b	Potential conflicts with the FPP could occur, as follows: a) Certain areas offsite (APNs 232 491 01, 232 491 42, and 232 492 02) will require ongoing fuel modification and these areas may not be within control of the Applicant; b) Certain Project areas (for occupation of structures in Neighborhoods 2, 4 and portions of Neighborhood 3 as shown on Figure 7 of the approved FPP) do not currently have fire service meeting the County's required 5-minute travel time.	M-HZ-3a: Prior to approval of the first Final Map, areas needing fuel management outside the Applicant's control shall have City of San Marcos Grant of Easement forms in place, specifically for APNs 232 491 01, 232 491 42, and 232 492 02. M-HZ-3b: Prior to occupancy of any structure that does not meet the five minute travel time according to Figure 7 of the approved FPP, either the Harmony Grove Fire Station must be in operation and providing service, or alternate mitigation measures must be provided to the satisfaction of the County Fire Authority (or RSFFPD, if annexed) and the PDS Director.	Less than Significant
2.9.2.8 Vectors			
HZ-4	The equestrian facility staging area, WTWRF and wet weather storage ponds could have a significant public health and safety impact if they significantly	M-HZ-4: Prior to approval of the first Final Map, a Manure Management and Fly/Vector Control Plan would be prepared according to applicable standards and submitted to the DEH for approval. The Plan would include	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation (See Chapter 7 for Detailed Measures)	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
	increase vector populations to a level that could harm the health of the public.	operational procedures to minimize on-site fly, mosquito and vector production and would be enforced by DEH.	
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.10, Geology and Soils			
2.10.2.3 Liquefaction			
GE-1	Project grading could potentially result in seismically-induced settlement and resulting unstable geologic conditions and associated potential impacts could be significant.	M-GE-1: To mitigate potential impacts from seismically induced settlement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A site-specific geotechnical investigation shall be conducted by a qualified engineer or engineering geologist during Project grading to assess potential impacts related to potential seismically-induced settlement and related effects. • All recommendations provided by the Project engineer/geologist to address potential effects related to seismically-induced settlement shall be implemented as part of the Project design/construction efforts • The Grading Plans shall require compliance prior to completion of rough grading. 	Less than Significant
2.10.2.4 Landslides			
GE-2	The Proposed Project could result in significant impacts from surface slope instability, rockfall and other unstable geologic conditions during a seismic event.	M-GE-2: To mitigate potential impacts from slope instability, rockfall, and other unstable conditions during a seismic event: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A site-specific geotechnical investigation shall be conducted by a qualified engineer or engineering geologist during Project grading to assess potential impacts related to manufactured slope instability (including rock fall hazards). • All recommendations provided by the Project engineer/geologist to address potential effects related to manufactured slope instability shall be implemented as part of the Project design/construction efforts. 	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation (See Chapter 7 for Detailed Measures)	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Grading Plans shall require compliance prior to completion of rough grading. 	
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Project-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.10, Geology and Soils (cont.)			
2.10.2.5 Expansive Soils			
GE-3	A number of mapped on-site soils exhibit moderate or high expansion potential. As a result, the Proposed Project could potentially result in significant impacts from expansive soils.	M-GE-3: To mitigate potential impacts from expansive soils: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A site-specific geotechnical investigation shall be conducted by a qualified engineer or engineering geologist during Project grading to assess potential impacts related to expansive soils. All recommendations provided by the Project engineer/geologist to address potential effects related to expansive soils shall be implemented as part of the Project design/construction efforts. The Grading Plans shall require compliance prior to completion of rough grading. 	Less than Significant
Subchapter 3.1.1, Global Greenhouse Gases			
<u>GHG-1</u>	<u>The Project's total estimated construction and vegetation removal GHG emissions would be 6,123 MT CO₂e and the Project's estimated operational GHG emissions would be 4,493 MT CO₂e. Therefore, the Project would generate greenhouse gas emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment.</u>	<u>M-GHG-1:</u> To ensure that construction-related and operational GHG emissions are offset to zero, the following shall be completed: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>The Applicant or its designee shall provide evidence to the County of San Diego (County) Planning & Development Services (PDS) that they have obtained a one-time purchase of carbon credits sufficient to reduce the contribution of construction-related GHG emissions to zero. Construction emissions include all grading, site preparation, building construction, architectural coatings-related emissions, and the one-time loss of carbon sequestered in existing on-site vegetation.</u> <p><u>Carbon credits shall be purchased through: i) a CARB-approved registry, such as the Climate Action Reserve, the American</u></p>	<u>Less than Significant</u>

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

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation (See Chapter 7 for Detailed Measures)	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		<p><u>Carbon Registry, and the Verified Carbon Standard; ii) through CAPCOA GHG Rx; or, iii) if no registry is in existence as identified above, then any other reputable registry or entity that issues carbon offsets consistent with Cal. Health & Safety Code section 38562(d)(1), to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS. Evidence that offset credits sufficient to offset all GHG emissions from construction shall be provided to PDS to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS.</u></p> <p>2. <u>The Applicant shall provide evidence to County PDS that they have obtained carbon credits for the incremental portion of the Project within the Site Plan in a quantity sufficient to offset, for a 30-year period, the operational GHG emissions from that incremental amount of development to net zero, consistent with the performance standards and requirements set forth below. The amount of carbon offsets required for each implementing Site Plan shall be based on the GHG emissions for each land use within the implementing Site Plan, as identified in the Table 3.1.3-4, <i>Operational GHG Emissions and Off-Site Carbon Offsets Per Land Use</i>. The Project’s operational emissions would be 4,493 MT CO₂e at the time of full buildout.³ Therefore, the Project shall be required to reduce the annual emissions by 4,493 MT CO₂e/year for a 30-year period (project life) or a total of 134,790 MT CO₂e. The “Project life” is 30 years, which is consistent with the methodology used by the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s GHG guidance (SCAQMD 2008). The</u></p>	

³ As stated above, this is a conservative number as it does not take into account CO₂e reductions associated with required Project landscaping and native habitat purchase.

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

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation (See Chapter 7 for Detailed Measures)	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		<p><u>Project Applicant shall include in each implementing Site Plan a tabulation that identifies the overall carbon offsets required to mitigate the entire project’s GHG emissions, the amount of carbon offsets purchased to date, and the remaining carbon offsets required to reduce the project’s emissions to net zero.</u></p> <p><u>Carbon credits shall be purchased through: (i) a CARB-approved registry, such as the Climate Action Reserve, the American Carbon Registry, and the Verified Carbon Standard; (ii) through CAPCOA GHG Rx; or, (iii) if no registry is in existence as identified above, then any other reputable registry or entity that issues carbon offsets consistent with Cal. Health & Safety Code section 38562(d)(1), to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS. Evidence that offset credits sufficient to offset all GHG emissions from construction shall be provided to PDS to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS.</u></p>	
Subchapter 2.11, Utilities			
2.11.2.1 Water Supply			
UT-1	<p>Construction of the R7 Reservoir by Rincon MWD could result direct impacts, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual impacts to neighboring areas if the surrounding grove trees are not tall enough to provide sufficient screening of the water tank; and • Biological resource impacts if construction of the easement access road cannot avoid the non-wetland WUS/streambed. 	<p>M-UT-1: The Applicant will coordinate with Rincon MWD at the time the tank is designed and constructed to ensure that there is adequate mitigation for utility-related impacts. The mitigation is anticipated to include, but may not be limited to planting trees around the tank to provide height screening and if impacts to the WUS/streambed crossings cannot be avoided, Rincon MWD shall obtain permits from the USACE, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and CDFW, with appropriate mitigation.</p>	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation (See Chapter 7 for Detailed Measures)	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (cont.)			
Cumulative-level Impacts			
Subchapter 2.4, Biological Resources			
<i>Cumulative Impacts to Sensitive Wildlife</i>			
BI-8	The Project would contribute to cumulative impacts to sensitive wildlife that use the grassland and pasture, including grasshopper sparrows and raptors.	M-BI-8: Same as M-BI-1a and 1b and M-BI-3h , above.	Less than Significant
Subchapter 2.8, Transportation/Traffic			
2.8.3.1 Existing Plus Cumulative Plus Project Impacts			
<u>TR-1a and TR-1b</u>	The Proposed Project would have direct and cumulative impacts along Country Club Drive from Auto Park Way to Hill Valley Drive in the City of Escondido (LOS F).	M-TR-1a and b: The EB approach at the Auto Park Way/ Country Club Drive intersection shall be restriped to provide one left-turn lane, one shared left-turn/through lane, and one right turn lane. The signal will be modified to change the east/west approach to “split” phasing. In addition, Country Club Drive will be widened to provide a paved width of 36 feet consisting of two travel lanes and a 10-foot striped center turn lane starting 220 feet southwest of Auto Park Way for a length of approximately 830 feet. Improvements will include connecting the existing sidewalk along the northern side of this roadway section with a five-foot sidewalk complete with a six inch curb and gutter and providing a four-foot decomposed granite pathway along the south side of this segment with a six inch asphalt berm.	<u>Less than Significant</u>
TR-2	The Proposed Project would have a cumulative impact on one roadway in the County of San Diego: Country Club Drive from Hill Valley Drive to Kauana Loa Drive Eden Valley Lane (LOS F).	M-TR-2: In order to mitigate the cumulative impact along this portion of Country Club Drive the Applicant shall pay the appropriate TIF amount towards the County TIF Program.	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation (See Chapter 7 for Detailed Measures)	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
Cumulative-level Impacts (cont.)			
Subchapter 2.8, Transportation/Traffic (cont.)			
2.8.3.1 Existing Plus Cumulative Plus Project Impacts (cont.)			
<u>TR-4</u>	The Proposed Project would have a cumulative impact at the Auto Park Way/ Country Club Drive signalized intersection in the City of Escondido (LOS D during the AM peak period).	<u>M-TR-4:</u> M-TR-1a shall be implemented.	<u>Less than Significant</u>

**Table S-2
COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT WITH PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

Environmental Issue	Proposed Project (326 SFR)	Alternatives								
		No Project/ No Development (12 SFR)	General Plan Density (118 SFR)	Reduced Grading (320 SFR)	Off-site and Combined Off-/On-site Sewer Options with the Proposed Residential Project (WTWRF removed ¹)				Biologically Enhanced (264 SFR)	Septic Option (35-58 SFR)
					Connection to the City of Escondido HARRF	Connection to VWD Facilities	Connection to the Harmony Grove Treatment Plant	Combined On-Off-site		
Aesthetics	Short-term direct: SU; Long-term direct: SM	Less; LS	Less; SM	Less; SM	Less; Short-term direct: SU; Long-term direct: SM	Less; Short-term direct: SU; Long-term direct: SM	Less; Short-term direct: SU; Long-term direct: SM	Similar; Short-term direct: SU; Long-term direct: SM	Less; SM	Less; LS
Air Quality	Direct: SM SU; Cumulative (construction): SU	Less; LS	Less; Direct: SM LS; Cumulative (construction): SU LS	Less; Direct: SM; Cumulative (construction): SU	Similar; Direct: SM; Cumulative (construction): SU	Similar; Direct: SM; Cumulative (construction): SU	Similar; Direct: SM; Cumulative (construction): SU	Similar; Direct: SU; Cumulative (construction): SU	Less; Direct: SM; Cumulative (construction): SU	Less; LS
Agricultural Resources	SM	Less; LS	Greater Less; SM	Similar; SM	Similar; SM	Slightly Greater; SM	Similar; SM	Similar; SM	Slightly greater Less; SM	Less; SM
Biological Resources	SM	Less; SM	Greater; SM	Less; SM	Similar; SM	Similar; SM	Similar; SM	Similar; SM	Less; SM	Less; SM
Cultural Resources	SM	Less; SM	Similar; SM	Less; SM	Slightly greater; SM	Slightly greater; SM	Slightly greater; SM	Slightly greater; SM	Less; SM	Less; SM
Noise	SM	Less; LS	Less; SM	Less; SM	Slightly less; SM	Slightly less; SM	Slightly less; SM	Slightly greater; SM	Less; SM	Less; LS SM
Paleontological Resources	SM	Less; LS	Less; SM	Less; SM	Slightly greater; SM	Slightly greater; SM	Slightly greater; SM	Slightly greater; SM	Slightly less Similar; SM	Less; LS SM
Transportation/Traffic	SM	Less; LS	Slightly less; SM	Slightly less; SM	Slightly greater; SM	Slightly greater; SM	Slightly greater; SM	Slightly greater; SM	Slightly less; SM	Less; LS
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	SM	Less; SM	Greater; SM	Slightly less; SM	Similar; SM	Similar; SM	Similar; SM	Slightly greater; SM	Slightly less; SM	Less; SM

**Table S-2 (cont.)
 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT WITH PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

Environmental Issue	Proposed Project (326 SFR)	Alternatives								
		No Project/ No Development (12 SFR)	General Plan Density (118 SFR)	Reduced Grading (320 SFR)	Off-site and Combined Off-/On-site Sewer Options with the Proposed Residential Project (WTWRF removed ¹)				Biologically Enhanced (264 SFR)	Septic Option (35-38 SFR)
					Connection to the City of Escondido HARRF	Connection to VWD Facilities	Connection to the Harmony Grove Treatment Plant	Combined On-Off-site		
Geology and Soils	SM	Less; SM	Less; SM	Less; SM	Slightly greater; SM	Slightly greater; SM	Slightly greater; SM	Slightly greater; SM	Slightly less; SM	Less; SM
Utilities and Service Systems	SM	Same; SM	Same; SM	Same; SM	Same; SM	Same; SM	Same; SM		Same; SM	Same; SM

LS = less than significant; SFR = single-family residences; SM = significant but mitigable; SU = significant and unmitigable

¹ The WTWRF would remain under the Combined On-/Off-site Sewer Option, although the level of on-site treatment would be reduced compared to the Proposed Project.