S.1 SUMMARY

Description

The Warner Ranch Project application includes several discretionary actions necessary to implement the 513.5-acre Warner Ranch Specific Plan (proposed project). The applicant proposes an amendment of the County of San Diego's General Plan Land Use Element for increased density and of the Mobility Element for an allowance to permit an unacceptable level of service on a portion of State Route (SR) 76. Development of the site also requires a Rezone, approval of a Specific Plan, and a Vesting Tentative Map to implement the residential subdivision, a Site Plan for establishing design consistency with the Specific Plan, and an Administrative Permit for entry gates.

The proposed project includes 780 residential units consisting of 534 single-family detached, 30 attached, and 216 multi-family townhomes (Figure 1-1). The overall density is 2.33 dwelling units per acre (du/ac). There are approximately 7.7 acres of proposed private community parks and a clubhouse, 14.4 acres of landscape areas, 2.7 miles of public and private trails, and 359 acres of open space. On-site grading would be balanced on-site with approximately 2.3 million cubic yards (CY) of cut and 2.3 million CY of fill.

Specific Plan and Zone Reclassification

The project is proposing preparation of a Specific Plan and the associated Zone Reclassification noted above (Specific Plan Area or SPA, with a proposed density of 2.33 du/ac) and zoning to S88 (1.52 du/ac). The Specific Plan designates nine subareas which would provide varying numbers of residential units along with other project features and facilities.

Vesting Tentative Map

The Vesting Tentative Map would allow development of the property with the following:

- 780 residential units (534 single-family detached, with a minimum lot size of 3,000 square feet) and 246 multifamily and attached townhomes)
- 7.7 acres of private community parks, including a clubhouse
- 14.4 acres of landscaped areas
- 359 acres of preserved open space
- 4.2-acre public park
- 10,000-square-foot on-site fire station

It is expected that issuance of building permits for the housing units would be market driven and would generally be phased along with the necessary public improvements. The key aspect of the phasing plan for the SPA is the provision of water, sewer, and fire protection services to support the land uses. The 10 subareas were defined through allocated dwelling units which have been coordinated with the necessary infrastructure and facility improvements. Required improvements include water storage reservoirs, water and wastewater pipelines, fire station, public and private roadways, drainage improvements, and private and public park facilities. The majority of these facilities would be included in Phase I of the development, along with Residential Unit 1.

Administrative Permit Review

This is a discretionary permit that is used in situations where the public's welfare does not require a public hearing before granting approval for uses or structures that have only minor potential adverse impacts on surrounding areas. It is required for the project as it is proposed to be gated, and will ensure adherence to the County's design, safety, and maintenance requirements.

Deannexations/Annexations

Only a portion of the project site (APN 110-021-09) is within the RMWD (Figure 1-21). In order to receive water and wastewater service from the District, the remainder of the property would need to be annexed (APNs 110-090-01, 17, and 18; 110-021-32; and 110-040-22) into RMWD as well as the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA). All of the annexations would require the approval of the Local Area Formation Commission (LAFCO). The project would be required to comply with all rules and regulations which are in effect when the proposed annexations are formally requested. When this EIR is approved and certified, a hearing at LAFCO would be scheduled to request approval of the proposed annexations.

Location

The proposed Warner Ranch Project is located in the unincorporated area in the northwestern portion of San Diego County, approximately 5 miles east of Interstate 15 (I-15) on Pala Road (SR 76). It is just west of Pala Temecula Road in the Pala Pauma Subregional Planning Area. Approximately 150 acres of the project site are developed, having once been a working horse ranch with an estate, guesthouse, and avocado and citrus groves. These areas include houses, barns, arenas, stables, and other outbuildings in the southwestern and central portions of the site. It is presently accessed by two roads off SR 76.

The property is located along the lower slopes of Mount Olympus between two drainages (Gomez Creek on the west and Pala Creek to the east. The topography is characterized by relatively flat land in the southern portion of the site with moderately to steeply sloped land in the northern, northwestern, and eastern areas. Elevations range from approximately 350 feet to

1,000 feet above mean sea level. The eastern and northern areas support native vegetation, including chaparral and coastal sage scrub, and the drainages support riparian habitats.

Setting

In a regional context, the project site is located in an unincorporated area of northern San Diego County, approximately 45 miles from downtown San Diego, 24 miles east of the Pacific Ocean, 16 miles north of the community of Valley Center and 15 miles east of the community of Fallbrook. The site is located within the San Luis Rey River watershed. The site is also within the coastal subprovince of the Peninsular Ranges Geomorphic Province. Habitat types in this area of San Diego County are dominantly chaparral.

Unique biological features in this area of San Diego County are influenced by proximity to the San Luis Rey River and its tributaries which include extensive riparian woodlands and wetlands supporting rare and endangered species such as least Bell's vireo and the arroyo toad; as well as upland habitats including coastal sage scrub and mafic chaparral. These plant communities support rare bird species such as the California gnatcatcher, coastal cactus wren, and nesting golden eagles, as well as a number of sensitive plant species.

Existing conserved lands in the area include the Mount Olympus Resource Conservation Area (RCA) to the northwest of the site, Mount Gregory RCA to the south, Pala Mountains RCA to the southeast, and the San Luis Rey River to the south. Wilderness Gardens, managed by the County Department of Parks and Recreation, is also to the east. Land within the jurisdiction of the U.S. Forest Service is northeast of the site. The property is within the proposed North County Multiple Species Conservation Plan area, but this plan has not yet been adopted.

The Pala Band of Mission Indians Reservation is along the majority of the eastern, northern, and southern boundaries of the site. SR 76 (Pala Road), primarily a two-lane thoroughfare heading from east from I-15 to Palomar Mountain, abuts the southern site boundary. Pala Temecula Road is along the eastern site boundary, running north from SR 76.

Surrounding land uses include rural residential development, agriculture, commercial uses within Pala Village to the east, lands within the Pala Indian Reservation, as well as the Pala Casino Resort and Spa immediately southeast of the property along SR 76. Several rural residences and vacant land are to the west.

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

Table S-1 provides a summary of impact analysis, mitigation, and level of significance of impact after mitigation for each issue. Chapter 2 of this EIR contains the analyses of all issues found to

have significant impacts. Chapter 2 also includes proposed mitigation for these significant impacts. Significant impacts were found for the issues of aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology/soils, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, hazards/hazardous materials, land use, mineral resources, noise, public services, utilities, and traffic. Direct and cumulative impacts to air quality, direct and cumulative impacts to mineral resources (construction aggregate), and direct and cumulative impacts to traffic remain significant.

S.3 Areas of Controversy

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) was distributed on April 29, 2010, for public review and comment. The NOP and ensuing comment letters are included in Appendix A. Areas of controversy are considered to include the following:

- Aesthetic impacts of grading steep slopes
- Air quality
- Biological resources impacts
- Cultural resources impacts
- Greenhouse gas emissions
- Potential of hazardous materials
- Land use—community character, inconsistency with the General Plan, inconsistency with LAFCO policies on open space and agriculture
- Noise generation
- Public services—police protection
- Traffic on State Route 76
- Utilities—water supply and sewer infrastructure
- Water quality impacts on the San Luis Rey River
- Wildfire—lack of fire and emergency services, and adequacy of evacuation

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

An EIR is an information document, used to inform the decision-makers and the public of the environmental effects of a given project. The EIR includes discussion and inclusion of mitigation measures to reduce environmental impacts. The decision-making body must decide whether or how to mitigate significant impacts. A Statement of Overriding Considerations is a document that explains the overriding social or economic considerations of a project even though some impacts remain significant and unmitigated. The decision to prepare a Statement of Overriding

Considerations would be required for air quality during the 3 years in which construction will overlap occupation, and should the direct and cumulative impacts due to a loss of mineral resources (construction aggregate) and the cumulative impacts of traffic on SR 76 remain significant and unmitigated. The EIR is also to include a reasonable range of alternatives that might reduce significant impacts while still attaining the project's objectives. The Decision-making Body must determine if any of these alternatives could substantially reduce significant impacts and still meet project objectives.

S.5 Project Alternatives

Seven alternatives have been developed over time as the project has evolved with agency meetings and input:

- No Development Alternative
- Estate Lots Alternative
- Reduced Footprint Alternative
- Reduced Density Alternative

These are discussed below in this order, as some of these alternatives evolved from the analysis of prior alternatives. All of these alternatives are analyzed in detail in Chapter 4.0 of this EIR. While some of these would avoid or reduce project impacts, they do not meet most of the project objectives. Table S-2 summarizes the analysis of these alternatives.

No Development Alternative

The No Development Alternative would result in leaving the land in its current state and no development would occur. No changes to the existing visual character of the property would occur. There would be no additional impacts to air quality from traffic, construction or operational activities, and no cumulative impacts to GHG. No impacts to biological resources or cultural resources would occur. No biological resources would be preserved in open space.

The proposed project includes a fire station, a water storage tank, and hydrants. The project would also provide access to adjacent properties for fire-fighting vehicles, as project streets are required to be designed for such vehicles. These amenities would not be done with the No Development Alternative. Under the No Project Alternative the threat of wildfires would still remain.

Five potentially significant impacts due hazardous materials were identified for the project: possible presence of asbestos containing materials and possible presence of lead based paints in on-site structures that would be demolished, occurrence of organochloride pesticides and of arsenic, possible occurrence of hydrocarbons in a small area associated with a diesel above

ground storage tank, and the presence of 10 septic systems to be removed. Any impacts from asbestos or lead-based paint are associated with the demolition of the structures. The structures are assumed to be left as is under this alternative, so no potentially significant impacts would occur. Continued application of herbicides and pesticides are assumed under this alternative. Legally applied pesticides and herbicides are not hazardous materials. Lastly, the septic systems would remain in place and would not be removed.

Use of the 10 septic systems would continue, with no removal necessary. All flow patterns of the mainstem of Gomez Creek and its tributaries would be maintained. Any potential for pollutants to enter the creek associated with project development would not occur. Any transport of pesticides and sediment in stormwater runoff presently occurring in the proposed project area would continue to run to Gomez Creek and ultimately to the San Luis Rey River. Access to the mineral resources (construction aggregate) potentially occurring on site would remain. No noise would be generated by construction grading or operational activities.

No additional population growth would occur under this alternative. No additional housing for the area would occur. The demand for all public services in the area would remain the same. There would be no change to response times from the police and fire departments. No additional students would be generated within the school districts. New park facilities proposed with the project would not occur. No contributions to the Traffic Infrastructure Fund for this property would occur under this alternative.

Estate Lots Alternative

This alternative would require a Conservation Subdivision and would allow 20 lots in a slightly modified footprint compared to the proposed project. Lots would be a minimum of 8 acres to comply with the County's Groundwater Ordinance and would require on-site septic systems. Both emergency vehicles and residents would have three entrances/exits onto SR 76. This alternative would not include the park or fire station.

This alternative would also require less grading and would potentially avoid adverse visual impacts associated with cut slopes. There are no significant agricultural resources on the property. There are four groves, two citrus groves and two avocado groves. The proposed project would remove the two southern groves and retain the two northern groves. The larger lots would have the potential to retain and increase agricultural resources. Given the limited number of proposed lots, emissions generated by development under this alternative have been largely assumed in the General Plan, and impacts to air quality and cumulative impacts to GHG would be reduced from those of the proposed project.

The majority of the reduction is due to fewer impacts to southern cactus scrub and coastal sage scrub, which would also reduce impacts to the cactus wren on site. Overall, impacts to biological resources under this alternative would be less severe compared to the proposed project. Impacts to cultural resources would be the same as for the proposed project. Geologic impacts would essentially be the same under this alternative. Most of the lots in this alternative are within the areas of potential subsidence and liquefaction. The reduction in units may allow for an easier resolution.

In terms of wildfire concerns, the proposed project includes a fire station, a water storage tank, and hydrants. The project would also provide access to adjacent properties for fire-fighting vehicles, as project streets are required to be designed for such vehicles. This alternative does not include a fire station so the existing development in the area as well as new development would still be served by existing emergency services (within a 20-minute response time).

Five potentially significant impacts due hazardous materials were identified—possible presence of asbestos containing materials and possible presence of lead based paints in on-site structures that would be demolished, occurrence of organochloride pesticides and of arsenic in the orchard areas, possible occurrence of hydrocarbons in a small area associated with a diesel above ground storage tank. This alternative proposes 20 individual lots. If the development area is mass graded with infrastructure placement, these potential impacts are the same as for the proposed project, and would be dealt with as described for the proposed project.

All flow patterns of the mainstem of Gomez Creek and its tributaries would be maintained. A project under this alternative would likely have less hardscape and more permeable area within the development envelope. No impacts would occur within the Pala Creek drainage. Each of the 20 lots would likely develop on its own schedule, with permitting of septic systems and erosion and runoff controls determined on an individual basis, as contrasted with the overall hydromodification, stormwater management, and drainage plans of the proposed project.

This alternative would be consistent with the current land use designation and zoning. It would be compatible with the more rural areas of the Pala-Pauma community, but not compatible with the more urbanized areas such as the resort/casino and village. It would not be consistent with the Subregional Plan SSA designation.

At least some of the alluvium on site may be suitable for use in aggregate. This Estate Lots Alternative would impact the same areas of alluvium. Because development under this alternative would be by 20 individual owners and on minimum 8-acre lots, it is unlikely this material could feasibly be extracted and used. The availability of this material would be lost under this alternative; this would be a direct significant unmitigated impact and a cumulative significant unmitigated impact. Impacts to noise would be the same under this alternative as under the proposed project.

Interior and exterior noise impacts generated by traffic along SR 76 would still occur along the site's southwestern boundary. Noise barriers would therefore be required under this alternative, as with the proposed project. Mitigation would still be required for potential impacts to wildlife species if construction activities are anticipated during breeding season.

Development under this alternative would also contribute to population growth in the overall area, but at a much lesser level as it proposes only 20 lots. It would not supply housing generally affordable to the workforce, and would therefore not contribute to the jobs/housing balance. Developer fees would be paid to reduce impacts to school services.

The amount of traffic generated under this alternative would be less than under the proposed project. Under this alternative, approximately 200 trips per day would be predicted. This total of 200 trips per day is in contrast to the approximately 6,327 trips per day projected for the proposed project. Signalization at the entry to the property from SR 76 would not be warranted under this alternative. Improvements to SR 76 along the property frontage proposed by the project would not be constructed under this alternative. Contributions to the Transportation Impact Fund would be less under this alternative than for the proposed project. Under this alternative, the water supply system would be constructed, but each lot would require a separate septic system.

Reduced Footprint Alternative

This alternative would have a smaller footprint than the proposed project and would consist of 350 two-story single-family residential units, a one-story commercial-retail building (23,000 square feet in size), fire station, public park, and a community center. The park, fire station, and commercial area would be along the project's frontage. The setback from Gomez Creek would be increased and the western exit from the project site would be eliminated. Circulation would be modified in the western "lobe" to promote pedestrian traffic. Three at-will exits would be provided onto SR 76 with roads meeting public standards with right-turn only exits, and emergency vehicles would have access at these intersections. Cul-de-sacs would be limited to 800 feet in length.

The visual impacts would likely be greater than those under the proposed project, because development would be more visible. However, views would be similar to the existing commercial development associated with the Pala Casino Resort and Spa. Temporary or short-term air quality impacts associated with the grading phase of construction would be reduced in comparison to the proposed project, as the development footprint is smaller under this alternative. Impacts to biological resources would decrease under this alternative. Impacts to cultural resources could potentially decrease because less land would be disturbed. Most of the

lots located in this alternative are within the areas of potential subsidence and liquefaction. Land use impacts would likely increase with the inclusion of the commercial element.

Impacts associated with risk of wildfire and potential exposure to hazardous materials would generally be comparable to those of the proposed project.

Implementation of this alternative would still require a GPA, Rezone, and SPA. Although the footprint would decrease, land use impacts would remain the same as with the proposed project. This Reduced Footprint Alternative, although smaller, would still impact the same areas of alluvium, the potential mineral resource of aggregate. Impacts to noise would be approximately the same under this alternative as under the proposed project.

Development under this alternative would also contribute to population growth in the overall area. It would supply some housing generally affordable to the workforce, although less than the proposed project. It would contribute to the jobs/housing balance. Impacts to public services would remain the same under this alternative

The amount of traffic generated under this alternative would be less than under the proposed project. Under this alternative, approximately 5,760 trips per day would be projected for residential uses, plus 50 trips per day for the fire station. This is slightly less than 6,327 trips per day projected for the proposed project. The water supply system, sewage disposal system, and fire station would all be constructed under this alternative.

Reduced Density Alternative

This alternative would also occupy the same footprint as the proposed project, but the density would be reduced to 1.2 du/acre, allowing 290 single-family units (37 percent fewer units). Neighborhoods would have more central parks and be more pedestrian-oriented. Cul-de-sacs would be limited to 800 linear feet. Three at-will exits would be provided onto SR 76 with roads meeting public standards with right-turn only exits, and emergency vehicles would have access at these intersections. The fire station and park would still be included along the project's frontage.

As this alternative would occupy the same footprint as the proposed project, impacts to aesthetics and agriculture would be the same. Air quality impacts would be reduced to required levels though the implementation of design and regulatory measures Impacts to biological resources would be the same as the proposed project.

Impacts to cultural resources would be the same as for the proposed project, as would potential effects from subsidence or settling, and liquefaction. Potentially significant impacts due hazardous materials would be the same. All flow patterns of the mainstem of Gomez Creek and its tributaries

would be maintained. A project under this alternative would likely have approximately the same amounts of hardscape and permeable area within the development envelope. Implementation of this alternative would still require a GPA, Rezone, and SPA. Although the footprint would decrease, land use impacts would remain the same as with the proposed.

This Reduced Density Alternative would impact the same areas of alluvium, the potential mineral resource of construction aggregate. Impacts to noise would be approximately the same under this alternative as under the proposed project. Development under this alternative would also contribute to population growth in the overall area, but to a lesser degree because fewer dwelling units would be constructed. It would contribute to the jobs/housing balance.

Impacts to public services would decrease under this alternative. The amount of traffic generated under this alternative would be less than under the proposed project, generating approximately 3,000 trips as compared to the 6,327 of the proposed project.

Overall, the severity of traffic impacts would be less under this alternative because fewer daily trips and traffic would be generated compared to the project.

The water supply system, sewage disposal system, and fire station would all be constructed under this alternative, as with the proposed project.

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
Significant and Unavoidable Impacts			
2.2 Air Quality			
Project-Level Impacts			
2.2.3.1 Conformance with the Regional Air Quality Strategy			
AQ-1	The proposed project would contribute to local population growth, employment growth, and associated VMT on local roadways, the proposed project is not considered accounted for in the SIP and RAQS, and the proposed project would conflict with or obstruct the implementation with local air quality plans.	**M-AQ-1** The County shall provide a revised housing forecast to SANDAG to ensure that any revisions to the population and employment projections used by SDAPCD in updating the RAQS and the SIP will accurately reflect anticipated growth due to the proposed project.	Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
Cumulative-Level Impacts			
2.2.4.2 Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase of Criteria Pollutants (Operation)			
AQ-CUM-2	The proposed project operations represents a substantial increase in projected traffic over current conditions and results in a cumulatively considerable contribution to O_3 precursors, NO_x, CO, SO_X, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions after full occupancy of the proposed project and during the combined construction and operation phasing. In addition, the project is inconsistent with the growth projections used in preparation of the SDAPCD RAQS and SIP.	Implement mitigation measures **M-AQ-1**, **M-AQ-2**, and **M-AQ-3.**	Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
2.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
Cumulative-Level Impacts			
2.6.3 Generate Greenhouse Gas Emissions, either Directly or Indirectly, That May Have a Significant Impact on the Environment			
GHG-CUM-1	The project's mitigated GHG emissions would be cumulatively considerable based on the County's efficiency ratio thresholds.	**M-GHG-1** The applicant will install solar panels on rooftop spaces (a photovoltaic solar system) on site as appropriate to produce approximately 4,756,002 kilowatt-hours (kWh) of electricity per year on average. (Under current technology, this equates to up to 9,605 solar panels or an average of 12 solar panels on each single-family home, 2,858 solar panels on the multi-family units, 78 solar panels on the clubhouse, and 40 solar panels on the fire station, with each solar panel having an estimated rating of 285 watts.) The actual capacity and/or conversion efficiency of the photovoltaic panels may alter the actual number of roofs or non-residential roof space requirements to meet the annual 4,756,002 kWh requirement at project buildout. With each building permit, the estimated rating of the solar panel to be installed will be provided to the County of San Diego to determine the overall remaining kilowatt-hours of electricity that are needed to comply with this measure. **M-GHG-2** The project will plumb for electric vehicle charging stations at all the residential units and include electric vehicle charging stations for 3 percent of the total off- street common area parking spaces required. A cabinet, box, or enclosure connected to a conduit linking the parking spaces with the electrical service will be provided for the installation of electric vehicle supply equipment to provide electric vehicle charging stations at those common areas. **M-GHG-3** The project will include outdoor electric outlets for all homes to facilitate use of electrical lawn and garden equipment.	Impacts would be less than significant.

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

<table>
<tr><th>Impact No.</th><th>Impact</th><th>Mitigation</th><th>Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>
M-GHG-4 Develop and provide to all homeowners an informative brochure to educate homeowners regarding water conservation measures, recycling, location of the electric vehicle charging stations and conduits, location of outdoor electric outlets to promote using electrical lawn and garden equipment, and location of nearby resources such as dining and entertainment venues, small commercial centers, and civic uses to reduce vehicle miles traveled.

M-GHG-5 Carbon Offsets – Construction Emissions: To ensure the project would result in less than significant construction-related GHG emissions, the project applicant shall complete the following:

Prior to issuance of the first grading permit, the applicant 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 in the amount of 18,144 MT CO_2E (note: this number reflects the additional construction-related GHG impacts after applying all other mitigation and reductions), which would reduce the entire contribution of construction-related GHG emissions to a level less than significant (see Table M-GHG-5). Construction emissions include all grading, site preparation, building construction, and architectural coatings related emissions.

Table M-GHG-5
Expected Construction CO_2E Emissions Summary
<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Bio-CO_2</th><th>NBio-CO_2</th><th>Total CO_2</th><th>CH_4</th><th>N_2O</th><th>CO_2E (MT)</th></tr>
<tr><td>Total</td><td>0.00</td><td>9,349.30</td><td>9,349.30</td><td>1.71</td><td>0.00</td><td>9,385.17</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">Blasting Emissions (Metric Tons)</td><td>8,758.74</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">Total (Blasting + Cumulative Construction Total)</td><td>18,143.91</td></tr>
</table>
Source: Appendix O.
</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		M-GHG-6 Carbon Offsets – Operational Emissions: To ensure the project would result in less than significant operational-related GHG emissions, the project applicant shall complete one of the following two options. (Note: the project's operational emissions would be 10,902 MT CO_2E in the year 2025 at the time of full buildout; see Table M-GHG-6). Therefore, to achieve an efficiency ratio of 3.6 MT CO_2E/year/service population and maintain a less than significant level of GHG emissions, the project may only generate up to 8,489 MT CO_2E annually. Therefore, the project will need to reduce the annual emissions by 2,413 MT CO_2E until the year 2050. Executive Order (EO) S-3-05 established the goals that GHG emissions should be reduced to 2000 levels by 2010, to 1990 levels by 2020, and to 80% below 1990 levels by 2050. Therefore, the project needs to mitigate GHG emissions to the year 2050. At this time, there are no regulations pertaining to GHG emission goals post 2050. It should be noted: as new federal, state and local regulations are adopted or increases in technology occur (for example, solar), this could reduce the amount of carbon credits needed to maintain a level of less than significant. (1) Prior to the recordation of the first final map, the applicant shall provide evidence to County PDS that they have obtained carbon credits in the amount of 2,413 MT CO_2E per year multiplied by the number of years from the commencement of the operational aspects of the project (conservatively calculated for this purpose from the date of the first Final Map approval) until the year 2050. Evidence shall consist of documentation from a County-approved third party that the carbon credits have been obtained and meet the requirements stated herein. The amount of GHG credits may be reduced at the time of first final map issuance if the applicant can demonstrate with substantial evidence that changes in state regulation or law, or other increased building efficiencies have reduced the total MT CO_2E emitted by the project. This will require approval from the County Director of PDS.	

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

<table>
<tr><th>Impact No.</th><th>Impact</th><th>Mitigation</th><th>Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>
(2) Prior to recordation of each Final Map, the applicant shall obtain the amount of carbon offset credits required for each Final Map based upon the uses contained within that Final Map. Each Final Map shall include as an attachment a tracking table that identifies any previous offsets purchased, and the amount remaining.

The amount of GHG credits may be reduced at the time of each final map issuance if the applicant can demonstrate with substantial evidence that changes in state regulation or law, or other increased building efficiencies have reduced the total MT CO_2E emitted by the project. This will be included in the tabulation and will require approval from the County Director of PDS.

Evidence shall consist of documentation from a County-approved third-party verifier that the carbon credits have been obtained and meet the requirements stated herein. The amount of GHG credits may be reduced at the time of each final map issuance if the applicant can demonstrate with substantial evidence that changes in state regulation or law, or other increased building efficiencies have reduced the total MT CO_2E emitted by the project. This will require approval from the County Director of PDS.

Table M-GHG-6
Year 2025 GHG Emissions and Carbon Offsets per Land Use (metric tons)
<table>
<tr><th>CO_2E Generator (Unmitigated)</th><th>Single-Family CO_2E Emissions</th><th>Multifamily CO_2E Emissions</th><th>Fire Station CO_2E Emissions</th><th>Park CO_2E Emissions</th></tr>
<tr><td>Area (project)</td><td>813.679</td><td>374.841</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Electricity single family</td><td>1,247.559</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>
</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness

Table M-GHG-6
Year 2025 GHG Emissions and Carbon Offsets per Land Use (metric tons)

CO_2E Generator (Unmitigated)	Single-Family CO_2E Emissions	Multifamily CO_2E Emissions	Fire Station CO_2E Emissions	Park CO_2E Emissions
Electricity multifamily		349.667		
Electricity commercial			126.253	
Electricity park				25.982
Natural gas single family	792.817			
Natural gas multifamily		182.144		
Natural gas commercial			7.839	
Mobile (emissions including LCFS)	7,068.935	2,605.181	229.713	
Mobile (LCFS corrections)	706.894	260.518	22.971	
Waste	284.809	51.478	0.883	
Water	271.619	125.135	17.789	
Total	**11,186.31**	**3,948.96**	**405.45**	**25.98**

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

<table>
<tr><th>Impact No.</th><th>Impact</th><th>Mitigation</th><th>Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>
Table M-GHG-6
Year 2025 GHG Emissions and Carbon Offsets per Land Use
(metric tons)
<table>
<tr><th>CO_2E Mitigation and Reductions</th><th>CO_2E Reduction</th><th>CO_2E Reduction</th><th>CO_2E Reduction</th><th>CO_2E Reduction</th></tr>
<tr><td>Area – mitigation measures</td><td>−426.224</td><td>−196.350</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Energy – electricity – single family</td><td>−67.715</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Energy – electricity – multifamily</td><td></td><td>−15.629</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Energy – electricity – RPS</td><td>−268.225</td><td>−75.178</td><td>−27.144</td><td>−5.586</td></tr>
<tr><td>Energy – natural gas – single family</td><td>−40.689</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Energy – natural gas – multifamily</td><td></td><td>−5.415</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>9,605 solar panels (285 W)</td><td>−1076.396</td><td>−464.073</td><td>−6.495</td><td>−12.665</td></tr>
<tr><td>Mobile – LCFS reduce emissions by 10%</td><td>−706.894</td><td>−260.518</td><td>−22.971</td><td></td></tr>
</table>
</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

<table>
<tr><th>Impact No.</th><th>Impact</th><th>Mitigation</th><th>Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>
Table M-GHG-6
Year 2025 GHG Emissions and Carbon Offsets per Land Use
(metric tons)
<table>
<tr><th>CO_2E Mitigation and Reductions</th><th>CO_2E Reduction</th><th>CO_2E Reduction</th><th>CO_2E Reduction</th><th>CO_2E Reduction</th></tr>
<tr><td>Mobile – Pavley II plus tire pressure</td><td>−174.603</td><td>−64.348</td><td>−5.674</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Mobile – 4.4% VMT reduction</td><td></td><td>−479.345</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Waste – install recycling bins</td><td>−71.202</td><td>−12.870</td><td>−0.111</td><td>−0.111</td></tr>
<tr><td>Water – install low flow water fixtures</td><td>−58.449</td><td>−26.928</td><td>−3.585</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Water – RPS</td><td>−58.40</td><td>−26.904</td><td>−3.825</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Mitigation and Reductions Total</td><td>−2,948.79</td><td>−1,627.56</td><td>−69.80</td><td>−18.36</td></tr>
<tr><td>Total with Mitigation and Reductions</td><td>8,237.52</td><td>2,321.41</td><td>335.64</td><td>7.62</td></tr>
<tr><td>Percent of Emissions and Carbon Offset</td><td>75.56%</td><td>21.29%</td><td>3.08%</td><td>0.07%</td></tr>
</table>
</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

<table>
<tr><th>Impact No.</th><th>Impact</th><th>Mitigation</th><th>Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>
Table M-GHG-6
Year 2025 GHG Emissions and Carbon Offsets per Land Use
(metric tons)
<table>
<tr><th>CO_2E Mitigation and Reductions</th><th>CO_2E Reduction</th><th>CO_2E Reduction</th><th>CO_2E Reduction</th><th>CO_2E Reduction</th></tr>
<tr><td>Carbon Offset Needed (Total 2,413.37)</td><td>1,823.51</td><td>513.88</td><td>74.30</td><td>1.69</td></tr>
<tr><td>Number of Units</td><td>534</td><td>246</td><td>1</td><td>1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Carbon Offset per Unit or Use</td><td>3.41</td><td>2.09</td><td>74.30</td><td>1.69</td></tr>
</table>
Source: Appendix O.
</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">2.8 Land Use</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Project-Level Impacts</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">2.8.3 Conflict with any Applicable Land Use Plans, Policies, or Ordinances Adopted for Avoiding or Mitigating Environmental Effects</td></tr>
<tr><td>LU-1</td><td>The proposed project would result in impacts on the environment that are related to the project's location away from an established or planned village, as defined by the County's General Plan.</td><td>Refer to M-AE-1 through M-AE-5; M-AQ-1 through M-AQ-3; M-GHG-1 through M-GHG-4; M-N-1 through M-N-5; M-TR-1 through M-TR-6; M-UT-1 and M-UT-2.</td><td>Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">2.8 Mineral Resources</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Direct and Cumulative-Level Impacts</td></tr>
<tr><td>MR-1 and MR-CUM-1</td><td>MRZ-2 materials would be lost to future mining efforts once project</td><td>M-MR-1 The alluvium on site should be used in project construction, particularly for slab underlayment and for utility trench construction, if</td><td>Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.</td></tr>
</table>

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
	development is complete. This would be a direct impact of the project and would contribute to a cumulative impact.	feasible. It is estimated these uses would involve approximately 17,000 tons of material.	
2.11 Transportation and Traffic			
Direct Impacts			
2.11.2.1 Roadway Segments			
TR-4	SR 76 from S. Mission Road to Gird Road	**M-TR-2** Implementation of the Caltrans SR 76 East Project, which will widen SR 76 from two lanes to four lanes between S. Mission Road and I-15.	Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
TR-5	SR 76 from Gird Road to Old Highway 395	Implement **M-TR-2.**	Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
TR-6	SR 76 crossing of I-15, between the freeway ramps.	Implement **M-TR-2.**	Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
Cumulative-Level Impacts			
2.11.3.1 Roadway Segments			
TR-11	SR 76 From E. Vista Way to N. River Road	There are no feasible mitigation measures identified; see Section 2.11 for infeasible mitigation identified and rationale for why it is infeasible.	Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
TR-12	SR 76 From N. River Road to Camino Del Rey	There are no feasible mitigation measures identified; see Section 2.11 for infeasible mitigation identified and rationale for why it is infeasible.	Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
TR-13	SR 76 Between Camino Del Rey and S. Mission Road	There are no feasible mitigation measures identified; see Section 2.11 for infeasible mitigation identified and rationale for why it is infeasible.	Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
TR-14	SR 76 S. Mission Road to Gird Road	Implement **M-TR-2.**	Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
TR-15	SR 76 Gird Road to Old Highway 395	Implement **M-TR-2.**	Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
TR-16	SR 76 Old Highway 395 to the I-15 southbound ramp	Implement **M-TR-2.**	Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
TR-17	SR 76 Between the I-15 ramps	Implement **M-TR-2.**	Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
TR-18	SR 76 between I-15 NB ramp to Pankey Road	There are no feasible mitigation measures identified; see Section 2.11 for infeasible mitigation identified and rationale for why it is infeasible.	Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
TR-21	SR 76 Couser Canyon Road and W. Pala Mission Road	**M-TR-6** Design and construct improvements at the intersection of SR 76 with Cole Grade Road to the satisfaction of Caltrans (either a signal or roundabout as determined through a review under the I.C.E. Policy).	Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
TR-22	SR 76 W. Pala Mission Road to E. Pala Mission Road	Implement **M-TR-6.**	Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
TR-23	SR 76 E. Pala Mission Road to Lilac Road	Implement **M-TR-6.**	Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
TR-24	SR 76 Lilac Road to Adams Drive	Implement **M-TR-6.**	Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
TR-25	SR 76 Adams Drive to Cole Grade Road	Implement **M-TR-6.**	Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
2.11.3.2 Intersections			
TR-26	SR 76/E. Vista Way	There are no feasible mitigation measures identified; see Section 2.11 for infeasible mitigation identified and rationale for why it is infeasible.	Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
TR-27	SR 76/N. River Road	There are no feasible mitigation measures identified; see Section 2.11 for infeasible mitigation identified and rationale for why it is infeasible.	Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
TR-28	SR 76/Camino Del Rey	There are no feasible mitigation measures identified; see Section 2.11 for infeasible mitigation identified and rationale for why it is infeasible.	Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
TR-29	SR 76/S. Mission Road	Implement **M-TR-2.**	Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
TR-30	SR 76/Gird Road	Implement **M-TR-2.**	Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
TR-31	SR 76/Old Highway 395	Implement **M-TR-2.**	Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
TR-36	SR 76/E. Pala Mission Road	Implement **M-TR-6.**	Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
TR-37	SR 76/Lilac Road	Implement **M-TR-6.**	Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
Less Than Significant Impacts (With Mitigation)			
2.1 Aesthetics			
Project-Level Impacts			
2.1.2.1 Effects on Landmarks, Historic Resources, Trees, and Rock Outcroppings			
AE-1	The appearance of the project within the landscape would detract from the natural elements in the landscape to the west of the site. Views of the dense single and multifamily development and the 10,000 sf two-story fire station would contrast with the visual character of the natural views of the San Luis Rey River and the Monserate, Palomar, and Pala Mountains (including Mt. Olympus) and views of rural agriculture west of the project. This would be considered significant.	**M-AE-1** • Project grading shall be designed to retain the natural landform and reflect the existing topographic features of the site to the extent feasible. Continuous straight manufactured cut or fill slopes with hard edges and/or no transition areas at the top or toe of slope shall be avoided. Grading techniques, such as the blending of graded slope contours into the natural topography or use of varying slope gradients with smooth cuts, shall be utilized, as appropriate and approved as part of the Grading Plans. • To maintain the natural setting of the site, approximately 70 percent of the site will be dedicated in protective open space easements. Grading shall be prohibited within the dedicated open space lots, with the exception of minor grading required for trail improvements and/or for purposes of access to/maintenance of project utilities.	Impacts would be less than significant.

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
AE-2	The manufactured cut and fill slopes could adversely change the existing visual character of the hillsides and image of the project site. This would be considered a significant impact.	**M-AE-2** • The maximum slope ratio allowed for manufactured fill slopes shall be 2:1; the maximum slope ratio allowed for manufactured cut slopes shall be 1.5:1. Slope ratios for all manufactured slopes shall be consistent with recommendations of the landscape architect and as identified by the geotechnical engineer in the Geotechnical Report prepared for the proposed project. All slope ratios shall also be subject to approval as part of the Grading Plans. • Where the construction of manufactured slopes requires cutting into native rock, the slope and texture of the cut face shall be varied and subject to site specific special measures for installing enhanced visual blending submitted and approved by the Director of PDS. If rock catchment netting or fencing is installed on manufactured slopes of greater than 30 feet in height, it shall be included in the study with measures such as painting to reflect the color of the surrounding rock to reduce its visibility. The measures recommended in the approved study shall be made part of the major use permit for the project.	Impacts would be less than significant.
AE-3	The proposed water tank may be visible from certain off-site vantage points to the south/southeast across the valley and change the existing visual character of the hillsides and image of the project site. The tank could potentially have significant impacts to the area's visual quality.	**M-AE-3** • Upon completion of construction of the on-site water tank, the exterior surface shall be painted, to reduce to visibility of the water tank. The color shall be earthtoned in color (e.g., muted tan or green) in order to blend the structure into the surrounding natural setting.	Impacts would be less than significant.
2.1.2.3 Effects on Focal and/or Panoramic Views			
AE-4	The perimeter walls would have the potential to change the existing visual character and image of the project site, thus resulting in a significant impact.	**M-AE-4** • As part of the construction phase, all walls (including sound walls) shall be constructed consistent with the wall type and height shown in the Wall and Fence Plan (part of the Landscape Plan; Figure 1-18). All walls constructed along the development perimeter facing SR 76 shall be earth-toned in color and textured to reduce their visual appearance.	Impacts would be less than significant.

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		The walls shall not exceed 9 feet in height. • Upon completion of their construction, landscape screening shall be provided along the exterior of the perimeter walls along the façade facing SR 76, consistent with that shown on the final Landscape Plan adopted by the County, to reduce their visibility and to create visual interest. A combination of shrubs, trees, and/or vines shall be utilized consistent with that shown on the Landscape Plan to ensure adequate screening is achieved, to enhance the visual setting, and to blend the walls into the existing visual environment. • All landscaping shall be installed consistent with County landscaping design and irrigation requirements, Maintenance of all project landscaping shall be the responsibility of the Homeowners Association and maintained in perpetuity for the life of the project. • As part of the construction phase, all sound walls shall be constructed of materials similar to that used for the perimeter wall proposed along the southern boundary of the development footprint, adjacent to State Route 76, to visually blend them into the adjoining perimeter wall. All sound walls shall be constructed consistent with that shown on the Wall and Fence Plan (part of the Landscape Plan) as adopted by the County.	
AE-5	Components of the proposed project design would have the potential to substantially obstruct, interrupt, or detract from a valued focal and/or panoramic vista from a public road or a scenic vista or highway.	**M-AE-5** Implement mitigation measures M-AE-1 to M-AE-4.	Impacts would be less than significant.
		2.1.3 Cumulative-Level Impacts	
AE-5	As the proposed project would contribute to a change in the overall visual character of the area through development of the site as proposed, in	**M-AE-CUM-1** • Implement mitigation measures (**M-AE-1** to **M-AE-4**), in combination with design measures (**PDF-AE-1** to **PDF-AE-8**).	Impacts would be less than significant.

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
	combination with the proposed improvements to SR 76, the proposed project would have the potential to contribute to cumulative impacts with regard to aesthetics.		
2.2 Air Quality			
Project-Level Impacts			
2.2.3.2 Conformance to Federal and State Ambient Air Quality Standards			
AQ-2	For 2016 when emissions from blasting could occur, daily construction emissions of NO_x would exceed the daily threshold of 250 pounds per day, even with the incorporation of project design features.	**M-AQ-2** Prior to the start of construction activities, the project applicant, or his designee, shall ensure the following are incorporated into construction plans: • All heavy diesel construction equipment is classified as Tier III at a minimum. This will also satisfy health risk impacts related to diesel particulates under T-BACT guidelines. • Equipment during building construction meet Tier IV guidelines at a minimum. This will also satisfy health risk impacts related to diesel particulates under T-BACT guidelines. • Only low VOC paints shall be utilized (150 g/L or less).	Impacts would be less than significant.
AQ-3	Daily operational emissions would exceed the thresholds for NO_x, CO, SO_X, PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, and VOC due to area sources.	**M-AQ-3** Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall ensure that project plans show the provision of only natural gas hearths.	Impacts would be less than significant.
AQ-4	Daily combined construction and operational emissions are expected to exceed SDAPCD thresholds and violate federal and state ambient air quality standards.	Implement mitigation measures **M-AQ-2** and **M-AQ-3.**	Impacts would be less than significant.

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
Cumulative-Level Impacts			
2.2.4.2 Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase of Criteria Pollutants (Operation)			
AQ-CUM-1	The proposed project that has a significant direct impact on air quality with regard to emissions of NO_x and therefore would also have a significant cumulatively considerable net increase.	Implement **M-AQ-2.**	Impacts would be less than significant.
2.3 Biological Resources			
Project-Level Impacts			
2.3.3.1 Special-Status Species			
BI-1	The proposed project has the potential to impact arroyo toad on 18.3 acres of suitable aestivation habitat within 1,000 meters (1 kilometer) of occupied habitat on the San Luis Rey River, if arroyo toad were to migrate across SR 76 to the site in the future and occupy potentially suitable arroyo toad habitat in Gomez Creek.	**M-BI-1** The Biological Easement (see COA BIO No. 1) will conserve 359 acres. **M-BI-2** The RMP (see COA BIO No. 2) provides for long-term management of the proposed open space preserve. **M-BI-3** The construction monitoring (see COA BIO No. 3) includes toad surveys and toad exclusionary measures, if needed. **M-BI-4** ESA permitting and consultation will be done if toad is detected within the construction limits.	Impacts would be less than significant.
BI-2	The proposed project has the potential to impact southwestern willow flycatcher and least Bell's vireo on 0.1 acre of wetland scrub, woodland or forest, if these riparian obligate breeding species occur on site in proximity to the development in the future.	Implement **M-BI-1** and **M-BI-2.** **M-BI-5** The restoration or avoidance requirements (See COA BIO No. 4, above) would result in restoration of 0.3 acres of southern coast live oak riparian forest or avoidance of impacts**.**	Impacts would be less than significant.
BI-3	The proposed project has the potential to impact California gnatcatcher on approximately 35.9 acres of suitable	Implement **M-BI-1** and **M-BI-2.** **M-BI-6** The construction monitoring (See COA BIO No. 5) includes	Impacts would be less than significant.

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
	coastal sage scrub (including disturbed coastal sage scrub) and southern cactus scrub if this species occurs on site in the future.	California gnatcatcher surveys and avoidance measures.	
BI-4	The proposed project would directly impact one cactus wren location and 2.7 acres of occupied southern cactus scrub.	Implement **M-BI-1** and **M-BI-2.** **M-BI-7** The revegetation requirements (See COA BIO No. 17, above) would result in on-site creation/revegetation of 3.5 acres of southern cactus scrub, the purchase of mitigation credit, or off-site conservation and management. The applicant is required to implement mitigation that will result in equal or greater benefit to the species, as determined by PDS review of specific mitigation alternatives. **M-BI-8** The construction monitoring (See COA Bio No. 6) includes cactus wren surveys and avoidance measures.	Impacts would be less than significant.
BI-5	The proposed project would directly impact 108.0 acres of occupied habitat for Southern California rufous-crowned sparrow (County Group I species).	Implement **M-BI-1** and **M-BI-2.**	Impacts would be less than significant.
BI-6	The proposed project would directly impact approximately 103.1 acres of foraging habitat for golden eagle, white-tailed kite, turkey vulture and northern harrier (County Group I species).	Implement **M-BI-1** and **M-BI-2.**	Impacts would be less than significant.
BI-7	The proposed project has the potential to directly impact two-striped garter snake, yellow warbler, and other riparian County Group I species.	Implement **M-BI-1** and **M-BI-5.**	Impacts would be less than significant.
BI-8	The proposed project would directly impact occupied habitat for Coastal western whiptail, northern red-diamond rattlesnake, Blainville's horned lizard,	Implement **M-BI-1** and **M-BI-2.**	Impacts would be less than significant.

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
	orange-throated whiptail, Northwestern San Diego pocket mouse and San Diego desert woodrat (County Group II species).		
BI-9	The proposed project could result in potential indirect impacts to special-status plant species and vegetation on a short-term basis due to construction activity.	**M-BI-9 Biological Monitoring** (see COA BIO No. 7 through No. 10, above), which will ensure all work is limited to the development boundary through temporary fencing of disturbance areas in accordance with the approved plans and a biological monitor will be on site during pre-construction and construction activities in order to monitor the clearing/grubbing activities and minimize indirect impacts to adjacent open space areas, including jurisdictional waters.	Impacts would be less than significant.
BI-10	Potential long-term indirect impacts to special-status plant species and vegetation could include trampling by humans and pets traveling off-trail, invasion by exotic plants and animals, exposure to urban pollutants (fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides, and other hazardous materials), soil erosion, fire, hydrological changes (e.g., surface and groundwater level and quality), and collection.	**M-BI-10 RMP, Limited Building Zone Easement, Open Space Signage and Fencing/Wall, Easement Avoidance** (see COA BIO No. 2 and No. 11 through No. 15, above), which provide for long-term resource management and monitoring and require that a limited building zone easement be dedicated to the County to minimize impacts adjacent to open space areas; open space easements be clearly marked with signs and fencing, as needed; and that signage and fencing be installed prior to completion of grading, including jurisdictional waters.	Impacts would be less than significant.
BI-11	The proposed project could result in potential indirect impacts to special-status wildlife species on a short-term basis due to construction activity.	Implement **M-BI-9.**	Impacts would be less than significant.
BI-12	Potential long-term indirect impacts to special-status wildlife species could include trampling of wildlife or necessary habitat by humans and pets traveling off-trail, domestic pets (e.g.,	Implement **M-BI-10.**	Impacts would be less than significant.

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
	cats and dogs) impacting prey (e.g., ground squirrel, rabbits, other rodents), invasion by exotic plants and animals, exposure to urban pollutants (fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides, and other hazardous materials), soil erosion, fire, hydrological changes (e.g., surface and groundwater level and quality), collection, killing (red-diamond rattlesnake), disruption of wildlife movement patterns, collisions with vehicles, and loss of foraging habitat.		
BI-13	There are potential short-term indirect impacts to nesting raptors.	Implement **M-BI-9.**	Impacts would be less than significant.
BI-14	Potential long-term indirect impacts to roosting and nesting habitat for raptors would be a significant impact.	Implement **M-BI-10.**	Impacts would be less than significant.
BI-15	The proposed off-site waterline and sewer line could result in short-term, indirect impacts associated with noise and increased human presence if the construction occurred during the nesting season for nesting birds, including California gnatcatcher, least Bell's vireo, and southwestern willow flycatcher.	**M-BI-11** See COA BIO No. 16, which requires pre-construction surveys in suitable nesting habitat if installation of the waterline or sewer line occurs between February 15 and August 31.	Impacts would be less than significant.
2.3.3.2 Sensitive Habitat and Jurisdictional Waters			
BI-16	The proposed project would result in direct permanent loss of 105.0 acres of the following special-status upland vegetation communities: Diegan	Implement **M-BI-1, M-BI-2, and M-BI-7.**	Impacts would be less than significant.

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
	coastal sage scrub (including disturbed), granitic southern mixed chaparral, non-native grassland, and extensive agriculture (pasture land).		
BI-16a	The proposed project would result in direct permanent loss of 2.7 acres of southern cactus scrub.	Implement **M-BI-1** and **M-BI-7.**	Impacts would be less than significant.
BI-16b	The proposed project has the potential to result in the loss of 33.2 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub.	Implement **M-BI-1** and **M-BI-2.**	Impacts would be less than significant.
BI-16c	The proposed project has the potential to result in the loss of 2.3 acres of granitic southern mixed chaparral.	Implement **M-BI-1** and **M-BI-2.**	Impacts would be less than significant.
BI-16d	The proposed project has the potential to result in the loss of 20.3 acres of non-native grassland.	Implement **M-BI-1** and **M-BI-2.**	Impacts would be less than significant.
BI-16e	The proposed project has the potential to result in the loss of 50.1 acres of extensive agricultural land.	Implement **M-BI-1** and **M-BI-2.**	Impacts would be less than significant.
BI-17	The proposed project would result in direct permanent loss of 0.13 acre of the following special-status wetland/jurisdictional communities: Southern coast live oak riparian forest and non-wetland drainages	Implement **M-BI-1, M-BI-2,** and **M-BI-5.** **M-BI-12** See COA BIO No. 19, above, which requires impacts to waters of the U.S. and state comply with state and federal regulations and obtain the appropriate agency permits.	Impacts would be less than significant.
BI-17a	The proposed project has the potential to result in the permanent loss of 0.1 acre of Southern coast live oak riparian forest	Implement **M-BI-1, M-BI-2, M-BI-5,** and **M-BI-12.**	Impacts would be less than significant.

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
BI-17b	The proposed project has the potential to result in the permanent loss of 0.03 acre of non-wetland drainages.	Implement **M-BI-1, M-BI-2,** and **M-BI-12.**	Impacts would be less than significant.
BI-18	The proposed project would result in indirect short-term impacts to jurisdictional waters, including wetlands, within on-site open space and adjacent native habitat areas during construction.	Implement **M-BI-9.**	Impacts would be less than significant.
BI-19	The proposed project would result in indirect long-term impacts to jurisdictional waters, including wetlands, within on-site open space and adjacent native habitat areas following project.	Implement **M-BI-10.**	Impacts would be less than significant.
BI-20	The proposed project would result in indirect short-term impacts to special-status vegetation communities within on-site open space and adjacent native habitat areas during construction.	Implement **M-BI-9.**	Impacts would be less than significant.
BI-21	The proposed project would result in indirect long-term impacts to special-status vegetation communities within on-site open space and adjacent native habitat areas following project construction.	Implement **M-BI-10.**	Impacts would be less than significant.
2.3.3.5 Impacts to Nesting Birds			
BI-22	The 20 percent increase in traffic may result in increased mortality of wildlife and adversely affect wildlife connectivity along Gomez Creek.	**M-BI-13** See COA BIO No. 22, above, which requires installation of a traffic signal light at the main entrance to the project, installation of wire game management directive fencing to preclude wildlife from crossing at-grade across SR 76, and a wildlife camera monitoring program to provide a means to implement adaptive management of these measures.	Impacts would be less than significant.

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
BI-23	If mass grading occurs during the period of March 15 through August 31, bird nesting could be adversely affected.	**M-BI-14** See COA BIO No. 21, above, which requires pre-construction surveys in suitable nesting habitat if any grading occurs between March 15 and August 31. Active nests shall be given appropriate buffers.	Impacts would be less than significant.
2.4 Cultural Resources			
Project-Level Impacts			
CR-1	Potential direct impacts to archaeological deposits beneath the existing structure at P-37-027238 (the Main House)	**M-CR-1** To mitigate for potential direct impacts to archaeological deposits beneath the existing structure at P-37-027238 (the Main House), the applicant shall implement the following program. **ANY PERMIT:** **M-CR-1.1 Demolition Monitoring** Intent: In order to mitigate for potential impacts to the significant component (1870s era adobe wall and possible subsurface resources) of the historic Main House (P-37-027238), a demolition monitoring program (including controlled excavations) shall be implemented pursuant to the County of San Diego (County) *Guidelines for Determining Significance, Report Format and Content Requirements: Cultural Resources* and the California Environmental Quality Act. Description of Requirement: A County-approved Principal Investigator, known as the "Project Archaeologist," shall be contracted to perform demolition monitoring and controlled excavations of the historic Main House (P-37-027238). The demolition monitoring program shall include but is not limited to the following: a. The Project Archaeologist shall perform the demolition monitoring duties and controlled excavations during the demolition of the historic Main House (P-37-027238). The contract or letter of acceptance provided to the County shall include an agreement that the demolition monitoring will be completed, and a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Project Archaeologist and the County of San Diego shall be executed. The contract or letter of acceptance shall	Impacts would be less than significant.

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		include a cost estimate for the monitoring work and reporting. b. The cost of the monitoring shall be added to the grading bonds or bonded separately. Documentation: The applicant shall provide a copy of the Demolition Monitoring Contract or letter of acceptance, cost estimate, and MOU to the *[PDS, PCC]*. Additionally, the cost of the monitoring work shall be added to the grading bond cost estimate. Timing: Prior to approval of any grading and or improvement plans and issuance of any grading or construction permits. Monitoring: The *[PDS, PCC]* shall review the contract or letter of acceptance, MOU, and cost estimate or separate bonds for compliance with this condition. The cost estimate should be forwarded to *[PDS, LDR]*, for inclusion in the grading bond cost estimate, and grading bonds and the grading monitoring requirement shall be made a condition of the issuance of the grading or construction permit. The following notes shall be placed on the grading/improvement plans: ***M-CR-1.2Demolition Monitoring*** Intent: In order to comply with the County *Guidelines for Significance, Report Format and Content Requirements: Cultural Resources* and the California Environmental Quality Act, a demolition monitoring program for the historic Main House (P-37-027238) shall be implemented. Description of Requirement: The County-approved Project Archaeologist and *[PDS, PCC]*, shall attend the pre-construction/demolition meeting with the contractors to explain and coordinate the requirements of the demolition monitoring and controlled excavation program. The Project Archaeologist shall monitor the demolition of the historic Main House (P-37-027238). The demolition monitoring program shall comply with the County *Guidelines for Determining Significance, Report Format and Content Requirements: Cultural Resources*. Documentation: The applicant shall have the contracted Project Archaeologist attend the pre-construction/demolition meeting to explain the	

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		demolition monitoring requirements. Timing: Prior to the pre-grading/demolition meeting, and prior to any clearing, grubbing, trenching, grading, or any land disturbances, this condition shall be completed. Monitoring: The *[DPW, PDCI]* shall invite the *[PDS, PCC]* to the pre-grading/demolition meeting to coordinate the demolition monitoring requirements of this condition. The *[PDS, PCC]* shall attend the pre-construction/demolition meeting and confirm the attendance of the approved Project Archaeologist. ***M-CR-1.3Demolition Monitoring*** Intent: In order to comply with the County *Guidelines for Determining Significance, Report Format and Content Requirements: Cultural Resources*, and the California Environmental Quality Act, a demolition monitoring program for the historic Main House (P-37-027238) shall be implemented. Description of Requirement: The Project Archaeologist shall monitor the demolition of the historic Main House (P-37-027238). The demolition monitoring program shall comply with the following requirements: a. During the demolition of the historic Main House (P-37-027238), the Project Archaeologist shall be on site full time. The frequency and location of the inspections will be determined by the Project Archaeologist. b. In the event that the interior 1870s-era adobe wall or other cultural resource is identified, the Project Archaeologist shall have the authority to divert or temporarily halt demolition operations to allow evaluation of the potentially significant cultural resource. At the time of discovery, the Project Archaeologist shall contact the PDS Staff Archaeologist. The Project Archaeologist, in consultation with the PDS Staff Archaeologist, shall determine the significance of the discovered resource(s). Demolition activities will be allowed to resume in the affected area only after the PDS Staff Archaeologist has	

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		concurred with the evaluation. c. In the event that any portion of the 1870s-era adobe is identified, a preservation plan shall be prepared. The preservation plan shall include: • Reasonable efforts to preserve (through avoidance) the 1870s-era adobe in situ. • If preservation is not feasible, then a research design and data recovery program shall be implemented as identified in item d. d. A research design and data recovery program (controlled excavation) of the historic Main House (P-37-027238) shall be prepared and shall include but not be limited to the following: • If preservation in situ is not feasible, the wall may be dismantled and moved to another location on site. • All building components, including the concrete slab foundation, shall be removed without disturbing the ground surface and/or as directed by the Project Archaeologist. Once the ground surface is exposed, the Project Archaeologist shall map all visible features and artifacts. • A controlled excavation program to expose features and recover artifacts shall be conducted in conformance with professional standards if historic features or deposits are identified. • All recovered materials shall be cataloged and analyzed and appropriate special studies conducted. Documentation: The applicant shall implement the demolition monitoring program pursuant to this condition. Timing: The following actions shall occur throughout the duration of the demolition of the historic Main House (P-37-027238). Monitoring: The [DPW, PDCI] shall make sure that the Project Archaeologist is on site performing the monitoring duties of this condition. The [DPW, PDCI] shall contact the [PDS, PCC] if the Project Archaeologist or applicant fails to comply with this condition.	

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		M-CR-1.4Demolition Monitoring **ROUGH GRADING** Intent: In order to comply with the County *Guidelines for Determining Significance, Report Format and Content Requirements: Cultural Resources*, and the California Environmental Quality Act, a demolition monitoring program shall be implemented. Description of Requirement: The Project Archaeologist shall prepare one of the following reports upon completion of the demolition activities for the historic Main House (P-37-027238) that require monitoring: a. If no cultural resources are encountered during demolition, then a final negative monitoring report shall be submitted substantiating that demolition activities are completed and no cultural resources were encountered. Demolition monitoring logs showing the date and time that the monitor was on site must be included in the negative monitoring report. b. If cultural resources were encountered during demolition, the Project Archaeologist shall provide a demolition monitoring report stating that the demolition monitoring activities have been completed and that resources have been encountered. The report shall detail all cultural artifacts, features, and deposits discovered during monitoring and the anticipated schedule for completion of the disposition of artifacts (curation, repatriation) phase of the monitoring. Documentation: The applicant shall submit the demolition monitoring report to the *[PDS, PCC]* for review and approval. Once approved, a final copy of the report shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center. Timing: Upon completion of all demolition activities, and prior to rough grading final inspection (Grading Ordinance Section 87.421.a.2), the report shall be completed. Monitoring: The *[PDS, PCC]* shall review the report or monitoring memo for compliance with the project Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program, and inform *[DPW, PDCI]* that the requirement is completed.	

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
CR-2	Potential impacts to unknown cultural resources due to the cultural sensitivity of the area due to ground-disturbing activities on- and off-site.	**M-CR-2** Due to the cultural sensitivity of the project area, monitoring of the project area shall be conducted by a qualified archaeologist and a Luiseño Native American monitor during ground-disturbing activities, including off-site improvements, to ensure that if buried features (e.g., human remains, hearths, historic deposits) are present, they will be handled in a timely and proper manner. **ANY PERMIT*:*** ***M-CR-2.1 Archaeological Grading Monitoring*** Intent: In order to mitigate for potential impacts to undiscovered buried archaeological resources on the Warner Ranch project site, including off-site improvements, a grading monitoring program and potential data recovery program shall be implemented pursuant to the County *Guidelines for Determining Significance*, *Report Format and Content Requirements: Cultural Resources* and the California Environmental Quality Act. Description of Requirement: A County-approved principal investigator, known as the Project Archaeologist, shall be contracted to perform cultural resource grading monitoring and a potential data recovery program during all grading, clearing, grubbing, trenching, and construction activities. The grading monitoring program shall include the following: a. The Project Archaeologist shall perform the monitoring duties before, during, and after construction pursuant to the most current version of the County *Guidelines for Determining Significance, Report Format and Content Requirements: Cultural Resources*. The contract or letter of acceptance provided to the County shall include an agreement that the grading monitoring will be completed, and a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Project Archaeologist and the County shall be executed. The contract or letter of acceptance shall include a cost estimate for the monitoring work and reporting. b. The Project Archaeologist shall provide evidence that a Luiseño Native American has been contracted to perform Native American grading monitoring for the project.	Impacts would be less than significant.

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		c. The cost of the monitoring shall be added to the grading bonds or bonded separately. Documentation: The applicant shall provide a copy of the grading monitoring contract or letter of acceptance, cost estimate, and MOU to the *[PDS, PCC]*. Additionally, the cost of the monitoring work shall be added to the grading bond cost estimate. Timing: Prior to approval of any grading and or improvement plans and issuance of any grading or construction permits. Monitoring: The *[PDS, PCC]* shall review the contract or letter of acceptance, MOU, and cost estimate or separate bonds for compliance with this condition. The cost estimate shall be forwarded to *[PDS, LDR]*, for inclusion in the grading bond cost estimate, and grading bonds and the grading monitoring requirement shall be made a condition of the issuance of the grading or construction permit. ***M-CR-2.2Cultural Resources Report*** **OCCUPANCY** Intent: In order to ensure that the grading monitoring and demolition monitoring occurred during the demolition of the Main House (P-37-027238) and the grading phase of the project, a final report shall be prepared. Description of Requirement: A final grading monitoring and data recovery report that documents the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the archaeological monitoring program shall be prepared. The report shall include the following items: a. DPR site forms b. Daily monitoring logs c. Evidence that all cultural materials have been curated, which shall include but not be limited to the following: • Evidence that all prehistoric archaeological materials collected during the survey, testing, demolition monitoring and controlled excavations, and grading monitoring program have been	

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		submitted to a San Diego curation facility or a culturally affiliated Native American Tribal curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR 79, and therefore would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records, including title, shall be transferred to the San Diego curation facility or culturally affiliated Native American Tribal curation facility and shall be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the curation facility stating that the prehistoric archaeological materials have been received and that all fees have been paid. or • Evidence that all prehistoric materials collected during the survey, testing, demolition monitoring and controlled excavations, and grading monitoring program have been repatriated to a Native American group of appropriate Tribal affinity. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the Native American Tribe to whom the cultural resources have been repatriated confirming that the archaeological materials have been received. Historic materials shall be curated at a San Diego curation facility and shall not be curated at a Tribal curation facility or repatriated. The collections and associated records, including title, shall be transferred to the San Diego curation facility and shall be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the curation facility stating that the historic materials have been received and that all fees have been paid. d. If no cultural resources are discovered, a negative monitoring report must be submitted stating that the grading monitoring activities have been completed. Grading monitoring logs must be submitted with the negative monitoring report.	

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		Documentation: The Project Archaeologist shall prepare the final report and submit it to the *[PDS, PCC]* for approval. Once approved, a final copy of the report shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) and the culturally affiliated Tribe. Timing: Prior to any occupancy, final grading release, or use of the premises in reliance of this permit, the final report shall be prepared. Monitoring: The *[PDS, PCC]* shall review the final report for compliance with this condition and the report format guidelines. Upon acceptance of the report, *[PDS, PCC]* shall inform *[PDS, LDR]* and *[DPW, PDCI]*, that the requirement is complete and the bond amount can be relinquished. If the monitoring was bonded separately, then *[PDS, PCC]* shall inform *[PDS or DPW FISCAL]* to release the bond back to the applicant. The following notes shall be placed on the Grading/Improvement Plans: ***M-CR-2.3Archaeological Monitoring*** **PRECONSTRUCTION MEETING** Intent: In order to comply with the *County of San Diego Guidelines for Significance, Report Format and Content Requirements: for Cultural Resources,* a cultural resource grading monitoring program shall be implemented. Description of Requirement: The County-approved Project Archaeologist, Luiseño Native American monitor, and *[PDS, PCC]* shall attend the pre-construction meeting with the contractors to explain and coordinate the requirements of the grading monitoring program. The Project Archaeologist and Luiseño Native American monitor shall monitor original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits in all areas identified for development including off-site improvements. The grading monitoring program shall comply with the County *Guidelines for Determining Significance, Report Format and Content Requirements: for Cultural Resources***.** Documentation: The applicant shall have the contracted Project Archaeologist and Luiseño Native American monitor attend the pre-construction meeting to explain the monitoring requirements.	

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		Timing: Prior to the pre-construction conference, and prior to any clearing, grubbing, trenching, grading, or any land disturbances this condition shall be completed. Monitoring: The *[DPW, PDCI]* shall invite the *[PDS, PCC]* to the pre-construction conference to coordinate the cultural resource monitoring requirements of this condition. The *[PDS, PCC]* shall attend the pre-construction conference and confirm the attendance of the approved Project Archaeologist. ***M-CR-2.4Archaeological Monitoring*** **DURING CONTRUCTION** Intent: In order to comply with the County *Guidelines for Determining Significance, Report Format and Content Requirements: Cultural Resources*, a Cultural Resource Grading Monitoring Program shall be implemented. Description of Requirement: The Project Archaeologist and Luiseño Native American monitor shall monitor all areas identified for development including off-site improvements. The grading monitoring program shall comply with the following requirements during earth-disturbing activities: a. During the original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits, the Project Archaeologist and Luiseño Native American monitor shall be on site as determined necessary by the Project Archaeologist. Inspections will vary based on the rate of excavation, the materials excavated, and the presence and abundance of artifacts and features. The frequency and location of inspections will be determined by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Luiseño Native American monitor. Monitoring of cutting of previously disturbed deposits will be determined by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Luiseño Native American monitor. b. In the event that previously unidentified, potentially significant cultural resources are discovered, the Project Archaeologist or the Luiseño Native American monitor shall have the authority to divert	

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		or temporarily halt ground-disturbing operations in the area of discovery to allow evaluation of potentially significant cultural resources. At the time of discovery, the Project Archaeologist shall contact the PDS Staff Archaeologist. The Project Archaeologist, in consultation with the PDS Staff Archaeologist and the Luiseño Native American monitor, shall determine the significance of the discovered resources. Construction activities will be allowed to resume in the affected area only after the PDS Staff Archaeologist has concurred with the evaluation. For significant cultural resources, a research design and data recovery program to mitigate impacts shall be prepared by the Project Archaeologist and approved by the PDS Staff Archaeologist, then carried out using professional archaeological methods. The research design and data recovery program shall include (1) reasonable efforts to preserve (through avoidance) "unique" cultural resources or Sacred Sites pursuant to CEQA Section 21083.2(g), as the preferred option; (2) the capping of identified Sacred Sites or unique cultural resources and placement of development over the cap, if avoidance is infeasible; and (3) data recovery for non-unique cultural resources. Isolates and clearly non-significant deposits will be minimally documented in the field and the monitored grading can proceed. c. If any human remains are discovered, the property owner or their representative shall contact the County Coroner and the PDS Staff Archaeologist. Upon identification of human remains, no further disturbance shall occur in the area of the find until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Most Likely Descendant, as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission, shall be contacted by the property owner or their representative in order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains. The immediate vicinity where the Native	

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		American human remains are located is not to be damaged or disturbed by further development activity until consultation with the Most Likely Descendant regarding their recommendations, as required by California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5097.98, has been conducted. The guidelines in PRC Section 5097.98, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, and Health & Safety Code Section 7050.5 shall be followed. Upon conclusion of the proper treatment and disposition of the remains, the property owner or their representative shall advise the PDS Staff Archaeologist of the outcome. d. Monthly status reports shall be submitted to the Director of PDS starting from the date of the notice to proceed to termination of implementation of the grading monitoring program. The reports shall briefly summarize all activities during the period and the status of progress on overall plan implementation. Upon completion of the implementation phase, a final report shall be submitted describing the plan compliance procedures and site conditions before and after construction. Documentation: The applicant shall implement the grading monitoring program pursuant to this condition. Timing: The following actions shall occur throughout the duration of the grading construction. Monitoring: The *[DPW, PDCI]* shall make sure that the Project Archaeologist is on site performing the monitoring duties of this condition. The *[DPW, PDCI]* shall contact the *[PDS, PCC]* if the Project Archaeologist or applicant fails to comply with this condition. ***M-CR-2.5Archaeological Monitoring*** **ROUGH GRADING** Intent: In order to comply with the County *Guidelines for Determining Significance, Report Format and Content Requirements: Cultural Resources*, a grading monitoring program shall be implemented.	

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		Description of Requirement: The Project Archaeologist shall prepare one of the following reports upon completion of the grading activities that require monitoring: a. If no archaeological resources are encountered during grading or demolition monitoring, then a final negative monitoring report shall be submitted substantiating that grading activities are completed and no cultural resources were encountered. Grading monitoring logs showing the date and time that the monitor was on site must be included in the negative monitoring report. b. If archaeological resources were encountered during grading or demolition monitoring, the Project Archaeologist shall provide a grading monitoring report stating that the field grading monitoring activities have been completed and that resources have been encountered. The report shall detail all cultural artifacts and deposits discovered during monitoring and the anticipated time schedule for completion of the curation phase of the monitoring. Documentation: The applicant shall submit the grading and demolition monitoring report to the *[PDS, PCC]* for review and approval. Once approved, a final copy of the report shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center and the culturally affiliated Tribe. Timing: Upon completion of all grading activities, and prior to rough grading final inspection (Grading Ordinance Section 87.421.a.2), the report shall be completed. Monitoring: The *[PDS, PCC]* shall review the report or field monitoring memo for compliance with the project Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program, and inform *[DPW, PDCI]* that the requirement is completed. ***M-CR-2.6Archaeological Monitoring*** **FINAL GRADING RELEASE** Intent: In order to comply with the County *Guidelines for Determining Significance, Report Format and Content Requirements: Cultural Resources*, a grading monitoring program shall be implemented.	

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		Description of Requirement: The Project Archaeologist shall prepare a final report that documents the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the grading and demolition monitoring program if cultural resources were encountered during grading. The report shall include the following, if applicable: a. Department of Parks and Recreation Primary and Archaeological Site forms b. Daily monitoring logs c. Evidence that all cultural materials have been curated, including but not limited to the following: • Prehistoric archaeological materials collected during the survey, testing, demolition monitoring and controlled excavations, and grading monitoring program shall be submitted and curated at a San Diego curation facility or a culturally affiliated Native American Tribal curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR 79, and therefore would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records, including title, shall be transferred to the San Diego curation facility or culturally affiliated Native American Tribal curation facility and shall be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the curation facility stating that the prehistoric archaeological materials have been received and that all fees have been paid. or • Evidence that all prehistoric materials collected during the survey, testing, demolition monitoring and controlled excavations, and grading monitoring program have been repatriated to a Native American group of appropriate tribal affinity. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the Native	

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		American tribe to whom the cultural resources have been repatriated confirming that the archaeological materials have been received. Historic materials shall be curated at a San Diego curation facility and shall not be curated at a Tribal curation facility or repatriated. The collections and associated records, including title, shall be transferred to the San Diego curation facility and shall be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the curation facility stating that the historic materials have been received and that all fees have been paid. d. If no cultural resources are discovered, a negative monitoring report must be submitted stating that the grading monitoring activities have been completed. Grading monitoring logs must be submitted with the negative monitoring report. Documentation: The Project Archaeologist shall prepare the final report and submit it to the *[PDS, PCC]* for approval. Once approved, a final copy of the report shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) and the culturally affiliated Tribe. Timing: Prior to any occupancy, final grading release, or use of the premises in reliance of this permit, the final report shall be prepared. Monitoring: The *[PDS, PCC]* shall review the final report for compliance this condition and the report format guidelines. Upon acceptance of the report, *[PDS, PCC]* shall inform *[PDS, LDR]* and *[DPW, PDCI]* that the requirement is complete and the bond amount can be relinquished. If the monitoring was bonded separately, then *[PDS, PCC]* shall inform *[PDS or DPW FISCAL]* to release the bond back to the applicant.	
CR-3	Impacts to CA-SDI-746	**M-CR-3** In order to avoid indirect impacts to CA-SDI-746, which is located off site on a parcel adjacent to the Warner Ranch project area, permanent fencing will be maintained along the project boundary in this area and temporary fencing during grading will be required, as follows.	Impacts would be less than significant.

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		The following notes shall be placed on the grading/improvement plans: ***M-CR-3.1Temporary Fencing*** **PRE-CONSTRUCTION MEETING** Intent: In order to prevent inadvertent disturbance to CA-SDI-746, temporary construction fencing shall be installed. Description of Requirement: Prior to the commencement of any grading and or clearing in association with this grading plan, temporary orange construction fencing shall be placed in all locations of the project where proposed grading or clearing is within 100 feet of CA-SDI-746. The placement of the temporary fencing shall be approved by the PDS, Permit Compliance Section. Upon approval, the temporary fencing shall remain in place until the conclusion of grading activities, after which the temporary fencing shall be removed. Documentation: The applicant shall have a California-licensed surveyor, in consultation with the Project Archaeologist, install and certify the installation of the temporary fencing. The applicant shall submit photos of the fencing along with the certification letter to the *[PDS, PCC]* for approval. Timing: Prior to the pre-construction meeting and prior to any clearing, grubbing, trenching, grading, or any land disturbances the temporary fencing shall be installed, and shall remain for the duration of the grading and clearing. Monitoring: The *[PDS, PCC]* shall either attend the pre-construction meeting and approve the installation of the temporary fencing, or review the certification and pictures provided by the applicant's surveyor. **PERMANENT FENCING** Because permanent fencing is required for biological resources, see the biological permanent fencing mitigation measure M-BI-10 (see COA BIO No. 11).	

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
CR-4	Impacts to CA-SDI-12208H	**M-CR-4** In order to avoid impacts to CA-SDI-12208H, the site will be left in open space, and temporary fencing will be in place during construction. Because the site is within biological open space, see biological temporary fencing mitigation measure M-BI-9 (see COA BIO No. 10).	Impacts would be less than significant.
CR-5	Impacts to CA-SDI-4502	**M-CR-5** Although site CA-SDI-4502 was determined to have limited significance, which was exhausted through testing, recordation, and curation, in order to fully exhaust the information, the bedrock milling will be incorporated into landscaped areas for educational purposes as follows: The following notes shall be placed on the grading/improvement plans: ***M-CR-5.1 Relocation of Bedrock Milling Features*** **PRE-CONSTRUCTION GRADING** **AND/OR IMPROVEMENTS** Intent: In order to meet the intent of the County *Guidelines for Determining Significance, Report Format and Content Requirements: Cultural Resources* and the California Environmental Quality Act, the bedrock milling of site CA-SDI-4502 shall be incorporated into the open space or landscape areas of the Warner Ranch project. Description of Requirement: The bedrock milling of site CA-SDI-4502 shall be relocated to the on-site open space or landscape areas of the Warner Ranch project. Documentation: The applicant shall: a. Provide a letter from the Project Archaeologist that the bedrock milling associated with site CA-SDI-4502 has been relocated. The letter shall identify the location on site to which the bedrock milling was moved. b. The Project Archaeologist shall prepare updated DPR site record forms identifying the new location of the bedrock milling. Evidence in the form of a letter from the South Coastal	Impacts would be less than significant.

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		Information Center that the DPR forms have been submitted to the South Coastal Information Center shall be submitted to the *[PDS, PCC]*. Timing: This condition shall be completed prior to any clearing, grubbing, trenching, grading, or any land disturbances. Monitoring: The *[PDS, PCC]* shall review the letter from the Project Archaeologist and the South Coastal Information Center for compliance with this condition.	
2.5 Geology and Soils			
Project-Level Impacts			
2.5.2.3 Liquefaction			
GE-1	Liquefaction associated with seismic events could result in damage to infrastructure and buildings, and thereby to human health and safety.	**M-GE-1** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, a final Geotechnical Report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil or Geotechnical Engineer. The report shall include any additional field efforts, including but not limited to borings and sampling, and associated laboratory testing, to determine if liquefaction, subsidence/settlement, and rock fall are concerns for this project. The report shall specify foundation designs which are adequate to preclude substantial damage to the proposed structures due to liquefaction or subsidence/settlement. The report shall also state the condition of the graded and natural surfaces in proximity to development, and what actions were taken to remediate rock fall if actions were necessary. The report shall be submitted with the building plans, and all recommendations of the report shall be incorporated into the design of the buildings. Measures developed in that report shall be based on site-specific conditions and will include site-specific measures required to mitigate against potential geologic hazards. Measures developed for concerns about liquefaction and subsidence/settlement would be similar, and overlap. Those measures would likely include, but not be limited to, the following: • Deposits of concern shall be over-excavated and recompacted.	Impacts would be less than significant.

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		• Deposits of concern shall be replaced with engineered fill. • Fill shall be surcharged (temporary over loading with fill) to facilitate settlement. • Densification of deposits of concern shall be done in-place, potentially including but not limited to any combination of placement of vibra-stone columns, use of wick and blanket drains, compaction grouting, and dynamic compaction. • Subdrains shall be incorporated.	
		2.5.2.4 Landslides and Subsidence	
GE-2	Subsidence and/or settlement associated with compressible soils could result in damage to infrastructure and buildings, and thereby to human health and safety.	**M-GE-2** Completion of a Geotechnical Report and implementation of the recommendations described in the report, as specified in mitigation measure M-GE-1 would also mitigate potential impacts from subsidence and/or settlement associated with compressible soils. This Geotechnical Report shall address potential subsidence and settlement issues associated with compressible soils.	Impacts would be less than significant.
GE-3	Rock fall associated with exposed slopes that could result in damage to infrastructure and buildings, and thereby to human health and safety.	**M-GE-3** Clearing, grubbing, and grading of the project site provides additional opportunities to observe site conditions, including rock fall potential, and to remediate potential situations during development. Mitigation for potential rock fall requires that the suspected boulders located within the proposed development footprint be removed during grading. If potentially hazardous boulders are identified within the proposed fuel modification zones, they shall either be removed or broken in place. The removal of boulders shall be completed prior to completion of rough grading for each phase of the affected areas of the proposed project with evidence provided to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Development Services. Alternate methods for addressing the rock fall hazard such as installation of rock catchment fencing or containment areas may be proposed, but such methods would be subject to review and approval by the County and may involve additional environmental review.	Impacts would be less than significant.

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
2.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
Project-Level Impacts			
2.7.2.1 Wildfire			
HZ-1	Wildfire protection	**M-HZ-1** Prior to issuance of the first building permit a temporary fire station with adequate accommodations for firefighting personnel and equipment to protect the initial phases of the proposed project. Prior to the issuance of the 391st building permit, a permanent station building, as described in the project description of this EIR, shall be constructed. The operation and maintenance costs associated with the proposed station will be addressed prior to approval of the first building permit for the project as follows: The project will form an appropriate financing district to generate annual funding for operation and maintenance costs for the fire station until the annual property taxes from the proposed project will generate additional revenues to SDCFA to support the fire station's staff and equipment. Upon approval of the proposed project and the establishment of higher property values, the annual property taxes will generate additional revenues to SDCFA to support district-wide operation and maintenance of this fire station. In the event, additional operation and maintenance funds are required above and beyond SDCFA's share of increased property tax revenues generated by the project, the financing mechanism will provide the difference in funding needed to operate the fire station based upon standard operational parameters needed to service the project residents.	Impacts would be less than significant.
2.7.2.2 Hazardous Materials			
HZ-2	Possible occurrence of lead-based paints (LBP).	**M-HZ-2** For potential lead-based-paint-containing materials: Prior to issuance of a building permit that includes demolition of on-site structures and prior to commencement of demolition or renovation activities, a survey shall be performed by a California Department of Health Services-certified lead inspector/risk assessor to determine the presence or absence of lead-based paint located in buildings or structures whose age of	Impacts would be less than significant.

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		construction indicates the possible inclusion of lead-based paint containing materials. All lead containing materials scheduled for demolition must comply with applicable regulations for demolition methods and dust suppression. Lead containing materials shall be managed in accordance with applicable regulations including, at a minimum, the hazardous waste disposal requirements (Title 22 California Code of Regulations Division 4.5); the worker health and safety requirements (Title 8 California Code of Regulations Section 1532.1); and the State Lead Accreditation, Certification, and Work Practice Requirements (Title 17 Division 1, Chapter 8).	
HZ-3	Possible occurrence of asbestos-containing materials (ACM).	**M-HZ-3** For potential asbestos-containing materials: Prior to issuance of a building permit that includes demolition of on-site structures and prior to commencement of demolition or renovation activities, a facility survey shall be performed to determine the presence or absence of asbestos-containing materials in buildings or structures whose age of construction indicates the possible inclusion of asbestos-containing materials. Suspect materials that will be disturbed by the demolition or renovation activities shall be sampled and analyzed for asbestos content, or assumed to be asbestos-containing. The survey shall be conducted by a person certified by the California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal/OSHA) pursuant to regulations implementing subdivision (b) of Section 9021.5 of the Labor Code, and shall have taken and passed an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)-approved Building Inspector Course. Should regulated asbestos-containing materials be found, it shall be handled in compliance with the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District Rule 361.145 – Standard for Demolition and Renovation. Evidence of completion of the facility survey shall consist of a signed, stamped statement from the person certified to complete the facility survey indicating that the survey has been completed and that either regulated asbestos is present or absent. If present, the letter shall describe the procedures that will be taken to remediate the hazard.	Impacts would be less than significant.

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
HZ-4	Occurrence of organochloride pesticides at one point in the western orchard and of arsenic at one point in the eastern orchard.	**M-HZ-4** "The investigation and any remedial actions related to pesticide contamination focuses on the elimination of human or environmental exposure. A complicated issue relative to pesticide-contaminated sites is the definition of hazardous waste. Even though the concentrations in soil may exceed the Title 22 levels for a hazardous waste, legally applied pesticides, and the resulting residues in soil, are not regulated as hazardous waste unless transported off the subject property (California H&SC Section 25117)" (County of San Diego 2007a). For potential contamination in the soil in the historical agricultural areas: Prior to approval of a grading permit and following the cessation of orchard production, the orchard area containing the dieldrin concentration in excess of the screening level and the orchard area containing the arsenic concentration above background level shall be delineated. The project applicant shall provide evidence that all site contamination has been remediated under the oversight of an appropriately licensed environmental professional to the satisfaction of the County Department of Environmental Health Voluntary Assistance Program or other applicable oversight agency such as the State Department of Toxic Substances Control or the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Evidence of satisfaction of the above condition shall include a concurrence letter from the Department of Environmental Health Voluntary Assistance Program (or other applicable oversight agency) indicating that site remediation has been carried out in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements.	Impacts would be less than significant.
HZ-5	On-site septic systems that would be removed.	**M-HZ-5** For existing septic systems: Prior to approval of a grading permit, the project contractor shall obtain a permit and approval from the County Department of Environmental Health to remove the on-site septic systems.	Impacts would be less than significant.
HZ-6	Possible occurrence of hydrocarbons in a small area associated with the existing 1,500-gallon diesel AST. This is based on one sample taken during 2005.	**M-HZ-6** For possible soil contamination with hydrocarbons associated with the diesel aboveground storage tank (AST): Prior to approval of a grading permit, the amount of soil reported contaminated in 2005 with hydrocarbons associated with the diesel AST	Impacts would be less than significant.

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		shall be sampled and tested. If hydrocarbon levels exceed screening levels, the affected soil mass shall be quantified vertically and horizontally and a remediation procedure shall be prepared based on these results.	
2.10 Noise			
Project-Level Impacts			
2.10.2.1 Noise Sensitive Land Uses			
N-1	Noise generated from traffic along SR 76 will expose the proposed western residential lots to sound levels greater than the County's 60 dBA CNEL exterior noise standard. The lots affected are Lots 201 and 206, Lots 176-180 and Lots 204-205, and Lots 202-203.	**M-N-1** Noise barriers will be built to reduce exterior noise impacts to residential lots along SR 76, on the western portion of the site. Lots 221-225 and Lots 321-333 require 6-foot barriers. Lots 319 and 320 require 7-foot barriers. Lots 219, 220 and 213 require 8-foot barriers (with a 6-foot barrier on the side yard of Lot 213). Lots 214-218 require 9-foot barriers. The barriers are to be constructed of non-gapping material consisting of masonry, half-inch-thick glass, earthen berm, or any combination of these materials. The location and required heights of the barriers is shown in Figure 2.10-7.	Impacts would be less than significant.
N-2	Noise generated from traffic along SR 76 has the potential to expose proposed sensitive uses to interior noise levels exceeding the 45 dBA CNEL threshold. The lots affected are single-family lots 145-148, 178-230, 313-338 and 392-404, and multi-family lots 267-270 and 278-284 and 606 (fire station).	**M-N-2** An interior noise assessment is necessary to finalize noise requirements based on precise grading plans and actual building design specifications, which would mitigate exterior noise levels to an interior level of 45 dBA CNEL. The affected lots that will require an interior noise assessment are single-family lots 145-148, 178-230, 313-338 and 392-404. Multifamily lots 267-270 and 278-284 and 606 will require an interior noise assessment as well. The interior noise assessment reports should be conducted prior to issuance of building permits. Interior noise levels of 45 dBA CNEL can be obtained with conventional building construction methods by providing a window condition requiring a means of mechanical ventilation (air conditioning) and providing upgraded windows at all affected lots.	Impacts would be less than significant.
2.10.2.2 Construction Noise			
N-3	In the event that rock drills are staged within 225 feet of any occupied noise sensitive land use, the County's 75dBA standard would be exceeded.	**M-N-3** In the event that rock drills are staged within 225 feet of any occupied noise sensitive land use, a specific mitigation plan shall be developed by a County-certified acoustical engineer to reduce impacts to below the County's 75 dBA standard. A temporary noise barrier may be required which could range from 8 to 12 feet in height. The noise barrier	Impacts would be less than significant.

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		would need to be of solid non-gapping material to adequately reduce construction noise levels. The mitigation plan may also place restrictions on the usage of the equipment (amount of time used and/or the location in respect to the property line).	
N-4	Rock drills that will be utilized can produce impulsive noise, reaching noise levels of 87-91 dBA at a distance of 50 feet and a maximum impulsive noise level of 94 dBA when the two rock drills are combined. . This maximum estimated noise level exceeds the threshold of 82 dBA as identified in the County's Noise Ordinance, Section 36.410: Sound Level Limitations on Impulsive Noise.	**M-N-4** To reduce the maximum noise level of 94 dBA (cumulative noise level from both rock drills) to 82 dBA the rock drills would need to be located 200 feet from the nearest occupied residential property line or only operate 25 percent of the hourly or daily duration (15 minutes of any hour) when located within that distance. In the event that the rock drills are staged within 200 feet of any occupied noise sensitive land use, it is recommended that a specific mitigation plan based upon the location of the construction equipment, topography and construction schedule be identified by a County certified acoustical engineer. If impacts are anticipated, a mitigation plan should be developed that may include a temporary noise barrier along any property line where the impacts could occur. The mitigation plan would determine the height and location of a temporary barrier, if one is necessary. The height of this noise barrier can range from 8 to 12 feet in height. The proposed noise barrier will need to be of solid non-gapping material to adequately reduce construction noise levels below the County's threshold. The mitigation plan can also limit the usage of the equipment (amount of time used and/or the location in respect to the property line).	Impacts would be less than significant.
N-5	Construction noise in sensitive habitat areas during nesting and breeding season will expose sensitive wildlife species to noise levels in excess of 60 dBA Leq.	**M-N-5** If clearing, grubbing, and grading activities are proposed during the period of February 1 to August 31 of any year, the biological monitor will determine if there are sensitive bird nests within the projected 60 dBA L_{eq} construction noise contour. If nests are present under these circumstances, a County approved acoustical consultant will establish a baseline noise level in the occupied habitat without construction. If the construction noise levels at the nest sites during breeding season are anticipated to exceed 60 dBA L_{eq} or the ambient condition (whichever is higher), noise attenuation measures will be implemented. These measures include, but are not limited to, utilizing	Impacts would be less than significant.

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		noise barriers and noise reducing features on construction equipment as necessary to maintain construction noise at acceptable levels at nest sites.	
2.11 Transportation and Traffic			
Direct Impacts			
2.11.2.1 Roadway Segments			
TR-1	SR 76 from west of E. Vista Way to N. River Road	**M-TR-1** Implementation of the Caltrans SR 76 Middle Project, which widened SR 76 from two lanes to four lanes between Melrose Drive on the west to S. Mission Road.	Impacts would be less than significant.
TR-2	SR 76 from N. River Road to Camino Del Rey	Implement **M-TR-1.**	Impacts would be less than significant.
TR-3	SR 76 from Camino Del Rey to S. Mission Road	Implement **M-TR-1.**	Impacts would be less than significant.
2.11.2.2 Intersections			
TR-7	SR 76 intersection with E. Vista Way	Implement **M-TR-1.**	Impacts would be less than significant.
TR-8	SR 76 intersection at the I-15 southbound ramps	**M-TR-3** Implementation of the Caltrans SR 76 East Project to reconfigure the SR 76/ I-15 interchange.	Impacts would be less than significant.
TR-9	SR 76 intersection at the I-15 northbound ramps	Implement **M-TR-3.**	Impacts would be less than significant.
TR-10	SR 76 intersection with project entry	**M-TR-4** Improve the project frontage and channelized/signalize the main public entrance intersection on SR 76 so that there are dual left turns for eastbound to northbound movements and a deceleration lane for westbound to northbound traffic.	Impacts would be less than significant.

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
Cumulative-Level Impacts			
2.11.3.1 Roadway Segments			
TR-19	SR 76 Horse Ranch Creek Road and Rice Canyon Road	**M-TR-5** Prior to issuance of any building permit for new structures within the project, the applicant, or its designee, shall pay all applicable fees to the TIF Program, which should be updated to include the changes to the Land Use and Mobility Elements proposed by the project.	Impacts would be less than significant.
TR-20	SR 76 Rice Canyon Road and Couser Canyon Road	Implement **M-TR-5.**	Impacts would be less than significant.
TR-21	SR 76 Couser Canyon Road and W. Pala Mission Road	**M-TR-6** Design and construct improvements at the intersection of SR 76 with Cole Grade Road to the satisfaction of Caltrans (either a signal or roundabout as determined through a review under the I.C.E. Policy).	Impact would remain significant and unavoidable.
2.11.3.2 Intersections			
TR-32	SR 76/I-15 southbound ramps	**M-TR-7** Although the interchange is now improved; developer has agreed to make a fair-share contribution of up to 12.3 percent (see Table 8-3) of the unfunded cost of approximately $10M based upon Caltrans formula for calculating fair share as set forth in the Caltrans Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Studies.	Impacts would be less than significant.
TR-33	SR 76/I-15 northbound ramps	Implement **M-TR-7.**	Impacts would be less than significant.
TR-34	SR 76/Rice Canyon Road	Implement **M-TR-5.**	Impacts would be less than significant.
TR-35	SR 76/Couser Canyon Road	Implement **M-TR-5.**	Impacts would be less than significant.
TR-38	SR 76/Cole Grade Road	Implement **M-TR-6.**	Impacts would be less than significant.

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
2.12 Utilities and Service Systems			
Project-Level Impacts			
2.12.2.1 Wastewater			
UT-1	The project has not yet been annexed into the RMWD.	**M-UT-1** The project shall be annexed into RMWD prior to approval of grading or improvement plans. The project developer must pay all service fees related to wastewater service as determined by RMWD.	Impacts would be less than significant.
2.12.2.3 Water Supply			
UT-2	The project has not yet been annexed into the RMWD.	**M-UT-2** The project shall be annexed into RMWD prior to approval of grading or improvement plans. The project developer must pay all service fees related to water service as determined by RMWD.	Impacts would be less than significant.

Table S-2
Summary of Analysis for Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Issue Areas	Proposed Project	Alternatives to the Proposed Project			
		No Development	*Estate Lot*	*Reduced Footprint*	*Reduced Density*
2.1 Aesthetics	LTS	▼	▼	▲	—
2.2 Air Quality	SU	▼	▼	▼	▼
2.3 Biological Resources	LTS	▼	▼	▼	—
2.4 Cultural Resources	LTS	▼	▼	▼	—
2.5 Geology and Soils	LTS	▼	—	—	—
2.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions	LTS	▼	▼	▼	▼
2.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials	LTS	—	▲	—	—
2.8 Land Use	LTS	▼	▼	—	—
2.9 Mineral Resources	SU	▼	▲	—	—
2.10 Noise	LTS	▼	—	—	—
2.11 Transportation and Traffic	SU	▼	▼	▼	▼
2.12 Utilities and Service Systems	LTS	▼	▼	▼	—
3.1 Agricultural Resources	NS	▼	▼	—	—
3.2 Hydrology and Water Quality	NS	▼	▲	—	▼
3.3 Population and Housing	NS	▼	▲	▼	▼
3.4 Recreation	NS	▼	▲	—	—
3.5 Energy	NS	▼	—	—	—
3.6 Public Services	NS	▼	▼	▼	▼

▲ = Alternative is likely to result in greater impacts to issue when compared to proposed project.
— = Alternative is likely to result in similar impacts to issue when compared to proposed project.
▼ = Alternative is likely to result in reduced impacts to issue when compared to proposed project.
NS = Not a potentially significant impact.
LTS = Less than Significant with mitigation measures.
SU = Potentially significant and unavoidable impact.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK