SUMMARY

This chapter is a summary of the Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Soitec Solar Development Project (Proposed Project) prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

As required by CEQA, this Program EIR: (1) assesses the potentially significant direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental effects of the Proposed Project; (2) identifies potential feasible means of avoiding or substantially lessening significant adverse impacts; and (3) evaluates a range of reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Project, including the required No Project Alternative. The County is the "lead agency" for the proposed project evaluated in this Program EIR, and has the principal responsibility for certifying the EIR and approving the proposed project. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, this EIR consists of an evaluation of the effects of the entire Proposed Project. This Program EIR will be used by the County to evaluate the environmental implications of adopting the proposed project, amendments to the Zoning Ordinance.

S.1 Project Synopsis

S.1.1 Project Description

Tierra del Sol Solar LLC, Rugged Solar LLC, LanWest Solar LLC, LanEast Solar LLC, and Soitec Solar Development LLC (the applicants) propose to develop, finance, construct, and operate four renewable energy solar farm projects in southeastern San Diego County. For purposes of this Program EIR, the four solar farm projects are collectively referred to as the Proposed Project. Currently, the applicants are seeking project-level approvals for only the Tierra del Sol and Rugged solar farms, which are analyzed at a project level of detail in this Program EIR. The LanEast and LanWest solar farms are analyzed at a programmatic level, because sufficient project-level data has not been developed at this time.

The Proposed Project encompasses a total of approximately 1,490 acres within the Mountain Empire Subregional Plan area in unincorporated San Diego County. The four individual solar farms comprising the Proposed Project would utilize concentrator photovoltaic (CPV) electric generation system technology to produce solar energy at the utility-scale. Together, these four solar farms comprise the whole of the action as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Proposed Project would produce up to 168.5 megawatts (MW) of solar energy and would be located on approximately 1,490 acres in southeastern San Diego County.

Table S-1, Overview of the Proposed Project, lists the individual solar farms analyzed in this document. For each solar farm listed, the acreage and approximate number of associated CPV trackers is provided.

Table S-1
Overview of the Proposed Project

Name	Acres	CPV[2] trackers, Approximate Number	Estimated Electrical Generation Capacity (MW[3])
Tierra del Sol	420	2,657	60
Rugged	765	3,588	80
LanEast	233	900	22
LanWest	55	264	6.5
Tierra del Sol Gen-Tie	17[1]	N/A	N/A
Total	**1,490**	**7,409**	**168.5**

Notes:
1 Includes access roads, pull sites, and staging areas anticipated to be required.
2 CPV – Concentrator Photovoltaic (CPV) Electric Generation Systems
3 MW – Megawatt

The following provides an overview of each of the four proposed solar farms that comprise the Proposed Project.

Tierra del Sol

The Tierra del Sol solar farm would produce up to 60 megawatts (MW) alternating current (AC) generating capacity and would consist of approximately 2,657 trackers utilizing dual axis tracking systems ("trackers") located on 420 acres in the community of Tierra del Sol. In addition to the trackers and direct current (DC) to AC conversion equipment (i.e., inverter and transformer units), Tierra del Sol would include the following primary components:

- A 1,000-volt DC underground collection system and a 34.5-kilovolt (kV) overhead and underground collection system linking the trackers to the on-site project substation.
- A 4-acre operation and maintenance (O&M) site, including a 60-foot by 125-foot (7,500-square-foot) O&M building. The O&M building would be used for storage, employee operations, and maintenance of equipment.
- A 3-acre on-site private collector substation site encompassing a fenced pad area of approximately 7,500 square feet and a maximum height of 35 feet to house approximately 3,750 square feet of equipment, including 450 square feet of metal-clad switchgear.
- A dual circuit 138 kV overhead/underground transmission line (gen-tie) would connect the project substation to the Rebuilt Boulevard Substation.

Tierra del Sol solar farm would be constructed in two main phases as follows:

- Phase I is a 45 MW CPV electric generation project located on approximately 330 acres.
- Phase II is a 15 MW CPV electric generation project located on approximately 90 acres.

The Tierra del Sol substation and gen-tie, as well as San Diego Gas and Electric's (SDG&E's) interconnection facilities, would be sized to accommodate both Phase I and Phase II. The Tierra del Sol solar farm would be located entirely on private lands within unincorporated San Diego County; most of the gen-tie would be located on private lands except for an approximately 0.5-mile portion of the underground gen-tie that would be located within County right-of-way (ROW). Upon completion, Tierra del Sol would be monitored both on site at the 4-acre O&M annex and off site through a supervisory control and data acquisition (SCADA) system.

Primary access to the Tierra del Sol site would be provided via two points of ingress/egress along Tierra del Sol Road. The main entrance would be located where Tierra del Sol Road splits off along the northern boundary of the Tierra del Sol solar farm site. The secondary entrance would be located along the project site's western limits adjacent to Tierra del Sol Road. Two additional points of emergency egress/ingress would be provided at the project's southwestern point and northeastern point to facilitate U.S. Customs and Border Patrol access and to provide an alternate fire access point, respectively.

Power from the on-site private substation would be delivered to the 138 kV bus at SDG&E's Rebuilt Boulevard Substation via an approximate 6-mile dual circuit 138 kV transmission line within a 125-foot private ROW when aboveground and a 60-foot easement when underground. The Tierra del Sol gen-tie line would consist of an approximately 1-mile underground alignment. The underground alignment would first lead northward from the on-site substation along the County ROW within Tierra del Sol Road for approximately 0.6 mile. The underground alignment would then be routed to the east via a 90-degree turn that would consist of an approximately 0.3-mile segment. A transition pole would be constructed at this location where the gen-tie line would transition from an underground alignment to an overhead alignment that would extend northward and end just east of Jewel Valley Road for approximately 3.5 miles, where the gen-tie line would then transition back to an underground alignment for the remain 1.5 miles and end at the interconnection point at the Rebuilt Boulevard Substation.

Rugged

The Rugged solar farm would produce up to 80 MW of AC generating capacity and would consist of approximately 3,588 trackers on 765 acres in the unincorporated community of Boulevard, California. Trackers on the Rugged solar farm are grouped into four different subareas on the project site: the northwest subarea, central subarea, southern subarea, and eastern subarea. In addition to the CPV trackers and inverter transformer units, Rugged includes the following primary components:

- A collection system linking the trackers to the on-site project substation consisting of (1) 1,000-volt (V) DC underground conductors leading to (2) 34.5 kV underground and overhead AC conductors.

- A 60-foot by 125-foot (7,500-squarefoot) O&M building. The O&M building would be used for storage, employee operations, and maintenance of equipment.
- A 2-acre on-site private collector substation site with a fenced pad area of approximately 6,000 square feet and maximum height of 35 feet. The on-site substation would include a 450-square-foot control house.

Upon completion, Rugged would be monitored on site at the O&M annex and off site through a SCADA system.

Primary access to the Rugged site would be from Ribbonwood Road and McCain Valley Road. One roadway would be constructed off site from McCain Valley Road leading to the central subarea if Rough Acres Ranch Road is not constructed per Rough Acres Ranch Major Use Permit (MUP) 3300-09-019. Access to the northwest subarea would be provided via Ribbonwood Road. The central subarea would also include an access road leading south crossing Tule Creek to provide access to the southern subarea. The eastern building block would be accessible via an access road leading from McCain Valley Road crossing beneath the Sunrise Powerlink.

Power from the on-site substation would be delivered to the 69 kV bus at SDG&E's proposed Rebuilt Boulevard Substation via the Tule Wind Energy project (MUP 3300-09-019) gen-tie alignment (Tule gen-tie) as adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 8, 2012. The 138 kV gen-tie for the Tule Wind Energy project includes a 69 kV undersling line, which will be used to service the Rugged solar farm. The Tule gen-tie will run south along the east side of McCain Valley Road and SDG&E's Sunrise Powerlink and across Interstate 8 (I-8), after which it will cross McCain Valley Road and run parallel to Old Highway 80 along the north side until it crosses Old Highway 80 at the proposed new SDG&E Boulevard East Substation. Both the Rebuilt Boulevard Substation and Tule gen-tie were subject to prior environmental analysis; construction of these facilities would be completed prior to operation of the Rugged solar farm (Iberdrola Renewables 2013). Rugged Solar LLC and Tule Wind LLC have a joint-use agreement in place for use of the gen-tie line, associated transmission towers, and access road.

LanEast and LanWest

For purposes of this Program EIR, the LanEast solar farm and LanWest solar farm are analyzed at a program level of environmental review because neither project has been fully developed to a project-level of detail at this time. Although the specific details of LanEast and LanWest are not yet known, solar farm facilities are assumed to be similar to those proposed for the Tierra del Sol and Rugged solar farms discussed above.

The proposed LanEast solar farm is anticipated to provide up to 22 MW of AC generating capacity and would consist of approximately 900 trackers. In addition to trackers, a collector

substation, and an on-site O&M annex, a gen-tie would be required to connect the on-site collector substation to SDG&E's Rebuilt Boulevard Substation located approximately 0.75 mile southwest of the project boundary. LanEast would interconnect with the Tule gen-tie 69 kV undersling line at the on-site collector substation.

The proposed LanWest solar farm is anticipated to provide up to 6.5 MW of AC generating capacity and would consist of approximately 264 trackers. In addition to the trackers and inverter transformer units, power generated at the LanWest site would be delivered to SDG&E's Rebuilt Boulevard Substation by means of a dedicated underground 12.5 kV distribution line. The Rebuilt Boulevard Substation is located approximately 1,000 feet from the southwest corner of the site, across Old Highway 80.

S.1.2 Project Objectives

Specific objectives for the Proposed Project are as follows:

1. Assist in achieving the state's Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) and greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) reduction objectives by developing and constructing California RPS-qualified solar generation, approved under Senate Bill (SB) X1 2, which established renewable energy targets of 20% total electricity sold to retail customers by the end of 2013, 25% by the end of 2016, and 33% of total electricity sold to retail customers by 2020.
2. Create utility-scale solar energy in-basin to improve reliability for the San Diego region by providing a source of local generation.
3. Locate solar power plant facilities as near as possible to existing or planned electrical transmission facilities, including colocating with existing transmission facilities when feasible.
4. Site solar power plant facilities in areas within the County of San Diego (County) that have excellent solar attributes, including but not limited to high direct normal irradiance (DNI), in order to maximize productivity.
5. No net additional emission of GHGs, including GHG emissions from employee transportation, consistent with the methodology employed by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) pursuant to Division 25.5 (commencing with Section 38500) of the Health and Safety Code.
6. Invest a minimum of $100 million of economic development to support the local economy through the creation of high-wage, highly skilled construction and permanent jobs that pay prevailing and living wages.
7. Develop up to 168.5 MW of renewable solar energy systems that reduce consumption of non-renewable resources and reduce GHG and other long-term air pollutant emissions while minimizing impacts to natural resources.

S.1.3 Project Location

The Proposed Project encompasses a total of approximately 1,490 acres within the Mountain Empire Subregional Plan area in unincorporated San Diego County. The Mountain Empire Subregional Plan area contains five subregional group areas. The Proposed Project site is located in the Boulevard Subregional Plan area. The following describes the locations of each solar farm project in greater detail.

Tierra del Sol

The 420-acre Tierra del Sol solar farm site is located south of I-8 within private lands located adjacent to the U.S.–Mexico border in eastern San Diego County. The Tierra del Sol site is situated south of Tierra del Sol Road and immediately north of the U.S.–Mexico border. The approximately 6-mile, dual circuit138 kV gen-tie line would travel from the Tierra del Sol site to the SDG&E Rebuilt Boulevard Substation. The site includes the following Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs): 658-090-31-00, 658-090-54-00, 658-090-55-00, 658-120-03-00, and 658-120-02-00.

Rugged

The 765-acre Rugged solar farm site is located north of I-8 to the east of Ribbonwood Road and primarily west of McCain Valley Road and includes the following APNs: 611-060-04, 611-090-02, 611-090-04, 611-091-03, 611-091-07 (portion), 611-100-07, 612-030-01, and 612-030-19, and a property (APN 611-110-01) located adjacent to and east of McCain Valley Road. The Rugged solar farm includes two separate sites. A majority of the site is located west of McCain Valley Road and includes the central, northwest, and southern subarea. A smaller portion of the site is east of McCain Valley Road and comprises the eastern subarea. The Rugged solar farm would tie into the Tule Wind Energy project gen-tie line, which connects the site to the Rebuilt Boulevard Substation.

LanEast and LanWest

The 233-acre LanEast solar farm site is bordered by I-8 to the north and Old Highway 80 to the south. McCain Valley Road intersects the site. The LanEast site includes the following APNs: 613-030-37 and 612-091-18 (portion).

The LanWest solar farm site is approximately 55 acres and is located immediately west of the LanEast site, south of I-8 and north of Old Highway 80. The LanWest site includes the following APN: 612-091-18 (portion).

S.1.4 Environmental Setting

The entire Proposed Project area is generally a semi-arid environment that supports a wide range of habitats and biological communities. These habitats and communities include scrub, chaparral, and woodland. Additionally, these habitats and communities vary greatly depending on the ecoregion, soils and substrate, elevation, and topography. Topography within the Proposed Project area varies from flat to steeply sloping terrains. Regional access to the Proposed Project area is provided by I-8 running east and west through the Proposed Project area.

The surrounding Boulevard Subregional Plan area, which includes the communities of Boulevard and Tierra del Sol can be characterized as a predominantly rural landscape featuring large-lot ranches and single-family homes with a mixture of small-scale agriculture, recreational opportunities, and undeveloped lands. The Boulevard community has been known as a rural area that primarily consists of single-family homes scattered amongst the mountainous landscape; however, recent developments have resulted in a variable physical setting that includes both rural and major infrastructure elements, including the Kumeyaay Wind Farm and Sunrise Powerlink.The Tierra del Sol community is generally characterized by a diversity of land uses consisting of ranching operations, single-family homes, energy infrastructure, telecommunications equipment, and the U.S.–Mexico international border.

South of I-8, major infrastructure elements of the landscape include the Sunrise Powerlink, which consists of a 500 kV electric transmission line supported by 150-foot tall steel lattice structures and the Southwest Powerlink, which also consists of a 500 kV electric transmission line supported by 150-foot tall steel lattice structures (four of which are located on the Tierra del Sol site), as well as several large, vertical, and metallic communication towers located at the White Star Communication Facility, and the linear rust colored U.S.–Mexico international border fence (located immediately south of the Tierra del Sol site). In addition, the Golden Acorn Casino and Travel Center is located south of I-8 near the Tecate Divide on reservation lands of the Campo Kumeyaay Nation, and the existing Boulevard Border Patrol Station and the adjacent Lux Motel are located south of the interstate near the Ribbonwood Road exit.

North of I-8, the setting consists of a mixture of large-lot rural residences and undeveloped lands with mountainous terrain consisting of steep slopes, prominent ridgelines, and rock outcroppings within County, state park, tribal, and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) lands. Prominent components that contribute to the physical setting north of I-8 within the vicinity of the Proposed Project include scattered single-family residential development, the McCain Valley Conservation Camp and the Sunrise Powerlink, which consists of a 500 kV electric transmission line supported by 150-foot tall steel lattice structures, as well as open grassland and mature oaks

Other prominent man-made features in the area include the 25-wind turbine Kumeyaay Wind Farm located atop the Tecate Divide. The recently constructed 29,000-square-foot Boulevard Border Patrol Station also contributes to the built environment within the Proposed Project area.

The Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Proposed Project was published on December 6, 2012. While the baseline for the project is normally established by the physical condition that exists when the NOP is published, the CEQA Guidelines and applicable case law recognize that the lead agency has the discretion to determine how the existing physical conditions without the project can most realistically be measured and can depart from using existing physical conditions on the date of NOP. Where physical environmental conditions vary over time or are expected to change, the use of environmental baselines that differ from the date of the NOP may be appropriate when conducting the environmental analysis. For example, the California Supreme Court recently noted that "an existing conditions analysis may take account of environmental conditions that will exist when the project begins operations; the agency is not strictly limited to those prevailing during the period of EIR preparation. An agency may, where appropriate, adjust its existing conditions baseline to account for a major change in environmental conditions that is expected to occur before project implementation. In so adjusting its existing conditions baseline, an agency exercises its discretion on how best to define such a baseline under the circumstance of rapidly changing environmental conditions." (Neighbors for Smart Rail v. Exposition Metro Line Construction Authority (2013) 57 Cal. 4th 439, 452.)

The Proposed Project area is experiencing major changes in environmental conditions that are expected to occur before implementation of the Proposed Project. All relevant discretionary approvals and environmental review has been completed for the SDG&E East County Substation Project (ECO Substation), which includes the Rebuilt Boulevard Substation and the 138 kV ECO Transmission Line between the ECO Substation and the Rebuilt Boulevard Substation. In addition, all relevant discretionary approvals and environmental review has been completed for the Tule Wind project, which includes 67 wind turbines that will produce up to 186 MW of electricity, a collector substation/O&M facility on Rough Acres Ranch, and a 3.8 mile-long 138kV gen-tie (Tule gen-tie) that would connect the on-site collector substation to the Rebuilt Boulevard Substation. The ECO Transmission Line, Rebuilt Boulevard Substation, and Tule Wind project, including the Tule gen-tie, are all anticipated to be fully constructed before any portion of the Proposed Project commences operation. In fact, the Proposed Project cannot begin operation until after the ECO Transmission Line and Rebuilt Boulevard Substation are operation, and the Rugged solar farm cannot begin operation until the Tule gen-tie is constructed. Accordingly, these projects as approved are included in the baseline used to analyze the impacts associated with the operation of the Proposed Project, along with existing physical conditions in existence as of December 6, 2012.

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

Table S-2 summarizes the results of the environmental analysis completed for the project in Chapter 2.0. Mitigation measures have been identified to reduce environmental impacts associated with aesthetics, air quality, biology, cultural resources, and noise and are included in Table S-2. The mitigation measures would reduce potentially significant impacts, but not below a significant level for aesthetics and air quality. Additional "infeasible" mitigation measures were considered in attempting to reduce impacts to below a level of significance. A detailed analysis of significant environmental effects, mitigation measures and infeasible mitigation measures is discussed in Chapter 2.0 of this Program EIR.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
Significant and Unavoidable Impacts			
2.1 Aesthetics			
Project-Level Impacts			
2.1.3.1 Scenic Vistas			
AE-LE-LW-1	Views from Interstate-8 and Old Highway 80	**M-AE-PP-1:** The applicant shall install landscape screens as specified in Appendix 2.1-4, Landscape Screening Design for the Soitec Solar Development Program EIR. Features of the solar facility to be screened include the 50-foot-wide fire buffer with 6-foot-tall perimeter fence, concentrator photovoltaic (CPV) solar panels, and other associated features that exceed the height of the fencing installed around the perimeter of the solar facility. The applicant shall also be responsible for continued maintenance of the landscape screens, including installation and maintenance of a drip irrigation system and implementation of and consistency with plant installation and maintenance standards identified in the Landscape Screening Design report. Periodic monitoring and reporting to observe and assess the maintenance regime and implementation of appropriate measures to promote plant survival, growth, overall health, and vigor shall also be required. If necessary, adaptive measures shall be implemented in the subsequent spring season to address project deficiencies as they relate to the desired landscape screening effect. Additional details regarding recommended plants and materials for landscape screens, project-specific designs, irrigation systems, water demand calculations, and maintenance and monitoring activities are included in the Landscape Screening Design Report.	Significant and Unavoidable.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
AE-PP-1	Views from Interstate-8 and Old Highway 80	See M-AE-PP-1 (landscape screening)	Significant and Unavoidable.
		2.1.3.2 Visual Character or Quality	
AE-TDS-1	Alteration of visual landscape	See M-AE-PP-1 (landscape screening)	Significant and Unavoidable.
AE-TDS-2	Alteration of visual landscape	No Feasible Mitigation	Significant and Unavoidable.
AE-R-1	Alteration of visual landscape	See M-AE-PP-1 (landscape screening)	Significant and Unavoidable.
AE-LE-LW-2	Alteration of visual landscape	See M-AE-PP-1 (landscape screening)	Significant and Unavoidable.
AE-PP-2	Alteration of visual landscape	See M-AE-PP-1 (landscape screening)	Significant and Unavoidable.
		2.1.3.3 Light or Glare	
AE-TDS-3	Glare impacts to adjacent residents	See M-AE-PP-1 (landscape screening)	Significant and Unavoidable.
AE-TDS-4	Glare impacts to motorists on Tierra del Sol Road	See M-AE-PP-1 (landscape screening)	Significant and Unavoidable.
AE-R-2	Glare impacts to adjacent residents	See M-AE-PP-1 (landscape screening)	Significant and Unavoidable.
AE-R-3	Glare impacts to motorists on Ribbonwood Road and McCain Valley Road.	See M-AE-PP-1 (landscape screening)	Significant and Unavoidable.
AE-LE-LW-3	Glare impacts to residents and motorists.	See M-AE-PP-1 (landscape screening)	Significant and Unavoidable.
AE-PP-3	Glare impacts to residents and motorists.	See M-AE-PP-1 (landscape screening)	Significant and Unavoidable.
		Cumulative-Level Impacts	
		2.1.4.1 Scenic Vistas	
AE-CUM-PP-1	Views from Interstate-8 and Old Highway 80	See M-AE-PP-1 (landscape screening)	Significant and Unavoidable.
		2.1.4.2 Visual Character or Quality	
AE-CUM-PP-2	Alteration of visual landscape	See M-AE-PP-1 (landscape screening)	Significant and Unavoidable.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
2.2 Air Quality			
Project-Level Impacts			
2.2.3.2 Conformance to Federal and State Ambient Air Quality Standards			
AQ-PP-1	Short-term Construction Emissions (NO_x)	**M-AQ-PP-1:** The applicant shall implement the following measures to reduce NOx emissions during construction of the Proposed Project: • All equipment with engines meeting the requirements above shall be properly maintained and the engines tuned to the engine manufacturer's specifications. • Construction equipment will employ electric motors when feasible. • No mobile or portable construction equipment over 50 horsepower shall use engines certified as meeting CARB or EPA Tier 1 standards. All engines shall comply preferably with Tier 3 standards, but no less than Tier 2 at a minimum.	Significant and Unavoidable.
AQ-PP-2	Short-term Construction Emissions (PM_{10})	No Feasible Mitigation.	Significant and Unavoidable
Cumulative-Level Impacts			
2.2.4.1 Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase of Criteria Pollutants (Construction)			
AQ-CUM-1	Short-term Construction Emissions (NO_x)	**M-AQ-LE-1:** During site grading activities for the LanEast site, grading will be limited to no more than 5 acres per day. **M-AQ-LW-1:** During site grading activities for the LanWest site, grading will be limited to no more than 5 acres per day. **M-AQ-LE-2:** Prior to issuance of Major Use Permits for the LanEast solar farm, a site-specific air quality technical report will be prepared and approved by the County, which will verify compliance with County and San Diego Air Pollution Control District standards during construction and operation of the solar farm. The site-specific technical report will be prepared in accordance with County report format and content requirements, and the report will be completed and approved by the County prior to certification of the project-level CEQA document. Project design features PDF-AQ-1 through PDF-AQ-3 as delineated in the Tierra del Sol solar farm and Rugged solar farm technical reports and as listed in Table 1-10 of Section 1.0, Project Description, will be	Cumulatively Considerable and Unavoidable.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		incorporated into the LanEast technical report, and will be implemented during construction and operation of these projects. PDF-AQ-1 requires implementation of dust control measures during construction activities; PDF-AQ-2 requires a worker ridesharing program to be implemented to reduce single passenger trips from construction worker trips by 30%; and PDF-AQ-3 requires dust control measures during project operation. **M-AQ-LW-2:** Prior to issuance of Major Use Permits for the LanWest solar farm, a site-specific air quality technical report will be prepared and approved by the County, which will verify compliance with County and San Diego Air Pollution Control District standards during construction and operation of the solar farm. The site-specific technical report will be prepared in accordance with County report format and content requirements, and the report will be completed and approved by the County prior to certification of the project-level CEQA document. Project design features PDF-AQ-1 through PDF-AQ-3 as delineated in the Tierra del Sol solar farm and Rugged solar farm technical reports and as listed in Table 1-10 of Section 1.0, Project Description, will be incorporated into the LanWest technical report, and will be implemented during construction and operation of these projects. PDF-AQ-1 requires implementation of dust control measures during construction activities; PDF-AQ-2 requires a worker ridesharing program to be implemented to reduce single passenger trips from construction worker trips by 30%; and PDF-AQ-3 requires dust control measures during project operation. See **M-AQ-PP-1** (Equipment Restrictions) above.	
2.3 Biological Resources			
None			
2.4 Cultural Resources			
None			
2.5 Land Use and Planning			
Project-Level Impacts			
LU-LE-1	Conflict with General Plan Policies (COS 11.1 and 11.3)	No Feasible Mitigation.	Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
LU-LW-1	Conflict with General Plan Policies (COS 11.1 and 11.3)	No Feasible Mitigation.	Significant and Unavoidable
LU-PP-1	Conflict with General Plan Policies (COS 11.1 and 11.3)	No Feasible Mitigation.	Significant and Unavoidable
Cumulative-Level Impacts			
None			
2.6 Noise			
None			
Significant Impacts Mitigated To A Level Of Less Than Significant			
Impact No.	**Impact**	**Mitigation**	**Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness**
2.1 Aesthetics			
None			
2.2 Air Quality			
Project-Level Impacts			
2.2.3.2 Conformance to Federal and State Ambient Air Quality Standards			
AQ-LE-1	Short -Term Construction Emissions (fugitive dust)	See **M-AQ-LE-1** (grading limitation) above	Less than Significant.
AQ-LE-2	Short-Term Construction Emissions (PM_{10} and NO_x)	See **M-AQ-LE-2** (Preparation of Site Specific Technical Report) above	Less than Significant.
AQ-LE-3	Long-Term Operational Emissions	See **M-AQ-LE-2** (Preparation of Site Specific Technical Report) above	Less than Significant.
AQ-LW-1	Short-Term Construction Emissions (fugitive dust)	See **M-AQ-LW-1**(grading limitation) above	Less than Significant.
AQ-LW-2	Short-Term Construction Emissions (PM_{10} and NO_x)	See **M-AQ-LW-2** (Preparation of Site Specific Technical Report) above	Less than Significant.
AQ-LW-3	Long-Term Operational Emissions	See **M-AQ-LW-2** (Preparation of Site Specific Technical Report) above	Less than Significant.
Cumulative-Level Impacts			
None			

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
2.3 Biological Resources			
Project-Level Impacts			
2.3.3.1 Candidate, Sensitive, or Special-Status Species			
BI-TDS-1	Short-Term Direct Special-Status Plants, County List A and B	**M-BI-PP-2:** To prevent inadvertent disturbance to areas outside the limits of grading, all grading shall be monitored by a biologist. A County-approved "Project Biologist" shall be contracted to perform biological monitoring during all grading, clearing, grubbing, trenching, and construction activities. The following shall be completed: 1. The Project Biologist shall perform the monitoring duties before, occasionally during, and after construction pursuant to the most current version of the County of San Diego *Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements: Biological Resources*, and this permit. The contract provided to the County shall include an agreement that this will be completed, and a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the biological consulting company and the County of San Diego shall be executed. The contract shall include a cost estimate for the monitoring work and reporting. In addition to performing monitoring duties pursuant to the most current version of the County of San Diego Report Format and Content Requirements, Biological Resources, the Project Biologist also will perform the following duties: a. Attend the preconstruction meeting with the contractor and other key construction personnel prior to clearing, grubbing, or grading to reduce conflict between the timing and location of construction activities and other mitigation requirements (e.g., seasonal surveys for nesting birds); b. Conduct meetings with the contractor and other key construction personnel describing the importance of restricting work to designated areas prior to clearing, grubbing, or grading; c. Discuss procedures for minimizing harm to or harassment of wildlife encountered during construction with the contractor and other key construction personnel prior to clearing, grubbing, or grading;	Less than Significant.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		d. Review and/or designate the construction area in the field with the contractor in accordance with the final grading plan prior to clearing, grubbing, or grading; e. Conduct a field review of the staking to be set by the surveyor, designating the limits of all construction activity prior to clearing, grubbing, or grading; f. Be present during initial vegetation clearing, grubbing, and grading; g. Flush special-status species (i.e., avian or other mobile species) from occupied habitat areas immediately prior to brush-clearing and earth-moving activities; h. To address hydrology impacts, the Project Biologist shall verify that grading plans include a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP; see M-BI-PP-3 for required best management practices (BMPs)). The cost of the monitoring shall be added to the grading bonds that will be posted with the Department of Public Works (DPW), or bond separately with the PDS. Documentation: The applicant shall provide a copy of the biological monitoring contract, cost estimate, and MOU to PDS. Additionally, the cost amount 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: PDS shall review the contract, MOU, and cost estimate or separate bonds for compliance with this condition. The cost estimate should be forwarded to the project manager for inclusion in the grading bond cost estimate and grading bonds. DPW shall add the cost of the monitoring to the grading bond costs. **M-BI-PP-3:** The SWPPP shall include, at a minimum, the BMPs listed as follows. The combined implementation of these requirements shall protect adjacent habitats and special-status species during construction to the maximum extent practicable. At a	

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		minimum, the following measures and/or restrictions shall be incorporated into the SWPPP and noted on construction plans, where appropriate, to avoid impacts on special-status species and sensitive vegetation communities during construction. The Project Biologist shall verify implementation of the following design requirements: 1. No planting or seeding of invasive plant species on the most recent version of the California Invasive Plant Council (Cal-IPC) California Invasive Plant Inventory for the project region will be permitted. 2. When construction operations are completed, any excess materials or debris will be removed from the work area. 3. Fully covered trash receptacles that are animal-proof and weatherproof will be installed and used by the operator to contain all food, food scraps, food wrappers, beverage containers, and other miscellaneous trash. Prohibit littering and remove trash from construction areas daily. All food-related trash and garbage shall be removed from the construction sites on a daily basis. 4. Pets on or adjacent to construction sites will not be permitted by the operator. 5. Enforce speed limits in and around all construction areas. Vehicles shall not exceed 15 miles per hour on unpaved roads and the right-of-way accessing the construction site or 10 miles per hour during the night. **M-BI-PP-4:** To ensure that the biological monitoring occurred during the grading phase of the project, the Project Biologist shall prepare a final biological monitoring report. The report shall substantiate the supervision of the grading activities and confirm that grading or construction activities did not impact any areas outside of the designated construction zone or any other sensitive biological resources. The report shall conform to the County of San Diego *Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements: Biological Resources*, and include the following items:	

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		1. Photos of the temporary fencing that was installed during the trenching, grading, or clearing activities 2. Monitoring logs showing the date and time that the Project Biologist was on site 3. Photos of the site after the grading and clearing activities 4. Documentation: The Project Biologist shall prepare the final report and submit it to PDS for review and approval. Timing: Prior to any occupancy, final grading release, or use of the premises in reliance of this permit, the final report shall be approved. Monitoring: PDS shall review the final report for compliance with this condition and the report format guidelines. Upon approval of the report, PDS shall inform DPW that the requirement is complete and the bond amount can be relinquished. If the monitoring was bonded separately, then PDS shall inform DPW to release the bond back to the applicant.	
BI-TDS-2	Long-Term Direct Special-Status Plants, County List A and B	**M-BI-PP-1:** The applicant will preserve in permanent open space an acreage of native habitats equivalent to or greater than the acreage of project impacts; the native habitats shall be generally consistent with the assemblage of vegetation communities impacted by the project. This will mitigate for project impacts to upland scrub and chaparral communities (acreages to be preserved per County mitigation ratios as shown in Table 2.3-18) as well as habitat loss of special-status plant and wildlife species (additional acreage to be preserved to equal the total acreage of project impacts, at a minimum). The off-site open space conservation area shall be evaluated to determine if the off-site area provides similar or greater biological function and value when compared with the identified significant impacts. This assessment shall include vegetation community mapping and an assessment of associated flora and fauna to the extent necessary to determine if the off-site conservation area provides commensurate biological function and value for each significantly impacted biological resource (vegetation communities, special-status plant species, and special-status wildlife species). The off-site open space conservation area may be composed of more than one set of contiguous parcels. Mitigation for the loss of special-status plant species shall be a	Less than Significant.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		minimum of 2:1 mitigation to impact ratio for Jacumba milk-vetch and Tecate tarplant and 1:1 mitigation to impact ratio for sticky geraea and desert beauty unless otherwise negotiated to a different ratio with the Wildlife Agencies. The assessment of the number of individuals of these species supported within the impact and mitigation areas shall be conducted in comparable survey years to appropriately account for potential annual variation in the number of individuals. Preservation of off-site open space shall be provided through one of the following options: Option 1: If purchasing Mitigation Credit from the mitigation bank, the evidence of purchase shall include the following information to be provided by the mitigation bank: a. A copy of the purchase contract referencing the project name and numbers for which the habitat credits were purchased. b. If not stated explicitly in the purchase contract, a separate letter must be provided identifying the entity responsible for the long-term management and monitoring of the preserved land. c. To ensure the land will be protected in perpetuity, evidence must be provided that a dedicated conservation easement or similar land constraint has been placed over the mitigation land. d. An accounting of the status of the mitigation bank must be provided that shall include the total amount of credits available at the bank, the amount required by this project, and the amount remaining after utilization by this project. Option 2: If mitigation credit is not purchased in a mitigation bank, then the applicant shall provide for the conservation of habitat of the same amount and type of land located in San Diego County indicated as follows: a. Prior to purchasing the land for the proposed mitigation, the location should be pre-approved by the County Department of Planning and Development	

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		Services (PDS). b. A Resource Management Plan (RMP) shall be prepared and approved pursuant to the County of San Diego *Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements: Biological Resources* to the satisfaction of the director of PDS. If the off-site mitigation is proposed to be managed by Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), the RMP shall also be prepared and approved to the satisfaction of the director of DPR. c. An open space easement over the land shall be dedicated to the County of San Diego or like agency to the satisfaction of the director of PDS. The land shall be protected in perpetuity. d. The purchase and dedication of the land and selection of the resource manager and establishment of an endowment to ensure funding of annual ongoing basic stewardship costs shall be complete prior to approval of the RMP. In lieu of providing a private habitat manager, the applicant may contract with a federal, state, or local government agency with the primary mission of resource management to take fee title and manage the mitigation land). Evidence of satisfaction must include a copy of the contract with the agency, and a written statement from the agency that (1) the land contains the specified acreage and the specified habitat, or like functioning habitat, and (2) the land will be managed by the agency for conservation of natural resources in perpetuity. Documentation: The applicant shall purchase the off-site mitigation credits and provide evidence to PDS for review and approval. If the off-site mitigation is proposed to be owned or managed by DPR, the applicant must provide evidence to PDS that DPR agrees to this proposal. It is recommended that the applicant submit the mitigation proposal to PDS for a pre-approval. If an RMP is going to be submitted in lieu of purchasing credits, then the RMP shall be prepared, and an application for the RMP shall be submitted to PDS. Timing: Prior to issuance of a grading permit the mitigation shall occur.	

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		Monitoring: PDS shall review the mitigation purchase for compliance with this condition. Upon request from the applicant, PDS can pre-approve the location and type of mitigation only. The credits shall be purchased before the requirement can be completed. If the applicant chooses option 2, then PDS shall accept an application for an RMP, and PDS and DPR shall review the RMP submittal for compliance with this condition and the RMP Guidelines. The applicant is currently assessing 2,619 acres of open space located just west of the project area to mitigate for the loss of sensitive vegetation communities and habitat that will be impacted as a result of the Proposed Project. A description of the mitigation site, including a list of vegetation communities and the potential for sensitive plant and wildlife species to occur, is included in Appendix 2.3-6.	
BI-TDS-3	Short-Term Direct Special-Status Wildlife, County Group 1	**M-BI-PP-2:** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (restrictions on construction vehicle speed limits) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a biological monitoring report) **M-BI-PP-11:** Cover and/or provide escape routes for wildlife from excavated areas and monitor these areas daily. All steep trenches, holes, and excavations during construction shall be covered at night with backfill, plywood, metal plates, or other means, and the edges covered with soils and plastic sheeting such that small wildlife cannot access them. Soil piles will be covered at night to prevent wildlife from burrowing in. The edges of the sheeting will be weighed down by sandbags. These areas may also be fenced to prevent wildlife from gaining access. Exposed trenches, holes, and excavations shall be inspected daily (i.e., each morning) by a qualified biologist to monitor for wildlife entrapment. Excavations shall provide an earthen ramp to allow for a wildlife escape route.	Less than Significant.
BI-TDS-4	Short-Term Direct Special-Status Wildlife, County Group 1 or CDFW Special Concern, active nests or	**M-BI-PP-10:** To avoid impacts to nesting birds the applicant shall: 1. Submit to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) a Nesting Bird Management, Monitoring,	Less than Significant.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
	young of nesting	and Reporting Plan (NBMMRP) for review and approval prior to commencement project activities during the breeding season (February 1 to August 31, and as early as January 1 for some raptors). The NBMMRP should include the following: a. Nest survey protocols describing the nest survey methodologies b. A management plan describing the methods to be used to avoid nesting birds and their nests, eggs, and chicks c. A monitoring and reporting plan detailing the information to be collected for incorporation into a regular Nest Monitoring Log (NML) with sufficient details to enable USFSW and CDFW to monitor the applicant's compliance with Fish and Game Code Sections 3503, 3503.5, 3511, and 3513 d. A schedule for the submittal (usually weekly) of the NML. e. Standard buffer widths deemed adequate to avoid or minimize significant project-related edge effects (disturbance) on nesting birds and their nests, eggs, and chicks f. A detailed explanation of how the buffer widths were determined g. All measures the applicant will implement to preclude birds from utilizing project-related structures (i.e., construction equipment, facilities, or materials) for nesting. And 2. Conduct preconstruction nesting bird surveys within 72 hours of construction-related activities and implement appropriate avoidance measures for identified nesting birds. To determine the presence of nesting birds that the project activities may affect, surveys should be conducted beyond the project area—300 feet for passerine birds and 500 feet for raptors. The survey	

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		protocols should include a detailed description of methodologies utilized by CDFW-approved avian biologists to search for nests and describe avian behaviors that indicate active nests. The protocols should include but are not limited to the size of the project area being surveyed, method of search, and behavior that indicates active nests. Each nest identified in the project area should be included in the NML. The NMLs should be updated daily and submitted to the CDFW weekly. Since the purpose of the NMLs is to allow the CDFW to track compliance, the NMLs should include information necessary to allow comparison between nests protected by standard buffer widths recommended for the project (300 feet for passerine birds, 500 feet for raptors) and nests whose standard buffer width was reduced by encroachment of project-related activities. The NMLs should provide a summary of each nest identified, including the species, status of the nest, buffer information, and fledge or failure data. The NMLs will allow for tracking the success and failure of the buffers and will provide data on the adequacy of the buffers for certain species. The applicant(s) will rely on its avian biologists to determine the appropriate standard buffer widths for nests within the project area to employ based on the sensitivity levels of specific species or guilds of avian species. The determination of the standard buffer widths should be site- and species-/guild-specific and data-driven and not based on generalized assumptions regarding all nesting birds. The determination of the buffer widths should consider the following factors: 1. Nesting chronologies 2. Geographic location 3. Existing ambient conditions (human activity within line of sight—cars, bikes, pedestrians, dogs, noise) 4. Type and extent of disturbance (e.g., noise levels and quality—punctuated, continual, ground vibrations—blasting-related vibrations proximate to tern colonies are known to make the ground-nesting birds flush the nests) 5. Visibility of disturbance 6. Duration and timing of disturbance	

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		7. Influence of other environmental factors 8. Species' site-specific level of habituation to the disturbance. Application of the standard buffer widths should avoid the potential for project-related nest abandonment and failure of fledging, and minimize any disturbance to the nesting behavior. If project activities cause or contribute to a bird being flushed from a nest, the buffer must be widened.	
BI-TDS-5	Long-Term Direct Special-Status Wildlife, County Group 1 or CDFW Special Concern, removal of suitable habitat	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.
BI-TDS-6	Short-Term Direct Special-Status Wildlife, County Group 2	**M-BI-PP-2:** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (restrictions on construction vehicle speed limits) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a biological monitoring report) **M-BI-PP-11:** (monitoring excavated areas and soil piles)	Less than Significant.
BI-TDS-7	Short-Term Direct Special-Status Wildlife, County Group 2, active nests or young of nesting	**M-BI-PP-10:** (preconstruction surveys for nesting birds and setbacks)	Less than Significant.
BI-TDS-8	Long-Term Direct Special-Status Wildlife, County Group 2	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.
BI-TDS-9	Long-Term Direct Special-Status Wildlife, foraging habitat for raptors	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.
BI-TDS-10	Long-Term Direct Special-Status Wildlife, Core wildlife areas	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.
BI-TDS-11	Short-Term Indirect	**M-BI-PP-2:** (biological monitoring)	Less than Significant.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
	Special-Status Plants, County List A and B	**M-BI-PP-3:** (preparation and implementation of a SWPPP) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a biological monitoring report) **M-BI-PP-5:**The applicant shall develop a Fugitive Dust Control Plan in compliance with San Diego County Air Pollution Control District Regulations to reduce particulate matter less than 10 microns (PM_{10}) and fine particulate matter less than 2.5 microns ($PM_{2.5}$) emissions during construction. The Fugitive Dust Control Plan shall include: 1. Name(s), address(es), and phone number(s) of person(s) responsible for the preparation, submission, and implementation of the plan. 2. Description and location of operation(s). 3. Listing of all fugitive dust emissions sources included in the operation. 4. The following dust control measures shall be implemented: a. The road leading to the operations and maintenance facility shall be paved as early as practical during construction. b. All other on-site unpaved roads shall be effectively stabilized using soil stabilizers that can be determined to be as efficient, or more efficient for fugitive dust control than California Air Resources Board–approved soil stabilizers, and shall not increase any other environmental impacts including loss of vegetation. c. All material excavated or graded shall be sufficiently watered to prevent excessive dust. Watering will occur as needed with complete coverage of disturbed areas. The excavated soil piles shall be watered hourly for the duration of construction or covered with temporary coverings. d. Construction activities that occur on unpaved	

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		surfaces will be discontinued during windy conditions when winds exceed 25 miles per hour and when those activities cause visible dust plumes. All grading activities shall be suspended when wind speeds are greater than 30 miles per hour. e. Track-out shall not extend 25 feet or more from an active operation, and track-out shall be removed at the conclusion of each workday. f. All haul trucks hauling soil, sand, or other loose materials shall be covered (e.g., with tarps or other enclosures that would reduce fugitive dust emissions). g. Soil loads should be kept below 18 inches of the freeboard of the truck. h. Drop heights should be minimized when loaders dump soil into trucks. i. Traffic speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 25 miles per hour. j. Disturbed areas should be minimized. k. Disturbed areas should be revegetated as soon as possible after disturbance.	
BI-TDS-12	Long-Term Indirect Special-Status Plants, County List A and B	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-PP-5:** (implementation of a Fugitive Dust Control Plan **M-BI-PP-6:** Prior to installation of any landscaping, plant palettes shall be reviewed by the Project Biologist to minimize the effects that proposed landscape plants could have on biological resources outside of the project footprint due to potential naturalization of landscape plants in the undeveloped lands. Landscape plants will not include invasive plant species on the most recent version of the Cal-IPC California Invasive Plant Inventory for the project region. Landscape plans will include a plant palette composed of native species that do not require high irrigation rates. **M-BI-PP-7:** Operation and maintenance personnel will	Less than Significant.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		be prohibited from: 1. Harming, harassing, or feeding wildlife and/or collecting special-status plant or wildlife species 2. Traveling (either on foot or in a vehicle) outside of the project footprint in undisturbed portions of the project area 3. Bringing pets on the project area 4. Littering on the project area. **M-BI-PP-8:**To minimize the potential exposure of the project area to fire hazards, all features of the Project's Fire Protection Plan (see Appendices 3.1.4-5 and 3.1.4-6) shall be implemented in conjunction with development of the Tierra del Sol solar farm. **M-BI-PP-9:** Weed control treatments shall include any legally permitted chemical, manual, and mechanical methods applied with the authorization of the San Diego County agriculture commissioner. The application of herbicides shall be in compliance with all state and federal laws and regulations under the prescription of a pest control advisor (PCA) and implemented by a licensed applicator. Where manual and/or mechanical methods are used, disposal of the plant debris shall follow the regulations set by the San Diego County agriculture commissioner. The timing of the weed control treatment shall be determined for each plant species in consultation with the PCA, the San Diego County agriculture commissioner, and Cal-IPC with the goal of controlling populations before they start producing seeds.	
BI-TDS-13	Short-Term Indirect Special-Status Wildlife, Detected or Potentially Occurring	**M-BI-PP-2:** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (restrictions on construction vehicle speed limits and preparation and implementation of a SWPPP) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a biological monitoring report) **M-BI-PP-5:** (implementation of a Fugitive Dust Control Plan) **M-BI-PP-11**: (monitoring excavated areas and soil	Less than Significant.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		piles) **M-BI-PP-12:** Minimize night construction lighting adjacent to native habitats. Lighting of construction areas at night shall be the minimum necessary for personnel safety and shall be low illumination, selectively placed, and directed/shielded appropriately to minimize lighting in adjacent native habitats.	
BI-TDS-14	Long-Term Indirect Special-Status Wildlife, Detected or Potentially Occurring	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-PP-5:** (implementation of a Fugitive Dust Control Plan) **M-BI-PP-6:** (biological review of landscape plans) **M-BI-PP-7:** (restrictions on operation and maintenance personnel activity) **M-BI-PP-8:** (implementation of a Fire Protection Plan)	Less than Significant.
BI-TDS-15	Long-Term Indirect Special-Status Wildlife, Potential Electrocution and/or Collision with Overhead Transmission Lines	**M-BI-TDS-1:** Provide evidence to the Director of PDS that all transmission towers and lines are designed to conform to Avian Power Line Interaction Committee (APLIC) standards. The Tierra del Sol project shall implement recommendations by the APLIC (2006), which will protect raptors and other birds from electrocution. These measures are sufficient to protect even the largest birds that may perch or roost on transmission lines or towers from electrocution. Specifically, these measures will include guidance on proper pole and cross member dimensions, phasing, and insulator design and dimensions to preclude wire-to-wire contact with a goal of providing 150 centimeters (59 inches) of separation between energized conductors and energized hardware and ground wire. In addition, bird diverters or other means to make lines more visible to birds will be installed to help avoid collisions.	Less than Significant.
BI-TDS-16	Short-Term Indirect Special-Status Wildlife, Nesting Success of Tree-Nesting Raptors, Construction-related	**M-BI-PP-10:** (preconstruction surveys for nesting birds and setbacks)	Less than Significant.
BI-TDS-17	Long-Term Indirect Special-Status Wildlife, Nesting	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
	Success of Tree-Nesting Raptors, Loss of Suitable Nesting Habitat		
BI-R-1	Short-Term Direct Special-Status Plants, County List A and B	**M-BI-PP-2:** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (no planting or seeding of invasive plant species) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a biological monitoring report)	Less than Significant.
BI-R-2	Long-Term Direct Special-Status Plants, County List A and B	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.
BI-R-3	Long-Term Direct Special-Status Plants, County List A and B	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.
BI-R-4	Short-Term Direct Special-Status Wildlife, County Group 1	**M-BI-PP-2:** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (restrictions on construction vehicle speed limits) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a biological monitoring report) **M-BI-PP-11:** (monitoring excavated areas and soil piles)	Less than Significant.
BI-R-5	Short-Term Direct Special-Status Wildlife, County Group 1 or CDFW Species of Special Concern or active nests or young of nesting	**M-BI-PP-10:** (preconstruction surveys for nesting birds and setbacks)	Less than Significant.
BI-R-6	Long-Term Direct Special-Status Wildlife, County Group 1 or CDFW Species of Special Concern Removal of suitable habitat of County Group 1 wildlife	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
	species		
BI-R-7	Short-Term Direct Special-Status Wildlife, County Group 2	**M-BI-PP-2:** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (restrictions on construction vehicle speed limits) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a biological monitoring report) **M-BI-PP-11:** (monitoring excavated areas and soil piles)	Less than Significant.
BI-R-8	Short-Term Direct Special-Status Wildlife, County Group 2 or active nests or young of nesting	**M-BI-PP-10:** (preconstruction surveys for nesting birds and setbacks)	Less than Significant.
BI-R-9	Long-Term Direct Special-Status Wildlife, Group 2 Loss of suitable habitat	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.
BI-R-10	Long-Term Direct Special-Status Wildlife, Loss of foraging habitat for raptors	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.
BI-R-11	Long-Term Direct Special-Status Wildlife, Core Wildlife Area	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.
BI-R-12	Short-Term Indirect Special-Status Plants, County List A and B	**M-BI-PP-2:** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (preparation and implementation of a SWPPP) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a biological monitoring report) **M-BI-PP-5:** (implementation of a Fugitive Dust Control Plan)	Less than Significant.
BI-R-13	Long-Term Indirect Special-Status Plants, County List A and B	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-PP-5:** (implementation of a Fugitive Dust Control Plan	Less than Significant.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		M-BI-PP-6: (biological review of landscape plans) **M-BI-PP-7:** (restrictions on operation and maintenance personnel activity) **M-BI-PP-8:** (implementation of a Fire Protection Plan) **M-BI-PP-9:** (regulated herbicide application)	
BI-R-14	Short-Term Indirect Special-Status Wildlife, Detected or Potentially Occurring	**M-BI-PP-2:** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (restrictions on construction vehicle speed limits and preparation and implementation of a SWPPP) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a biological monitoring report) **M-BI-PP-5:** (implementation of a Fugitive Dust Control Plan) **M-BI-PP-11:** (monitoring excavated areas and soil piles) **M-BI-PP-12:** (minimize night lighting)	Less than Significant.
BI-R-15	Long-Term Indirect Special-Status Wildlife, Detected or Potentially Occurring	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-PP-5:** (implementation of a Fugitive Dust Control Plan) **M-BI-PP-6:** (biological review of landscape plans) **M-BI-PP-7:** (restrictions on operation and maintenance personnel activity) **M-BI-PP-8:** (implementation of a Fire Protection Plan)	Less than Significant.
BI-R-16	Short-Term Indirect Special-Status Wildlife, Nesting Success of Tree-Nesting Raptors, Construction-related	**M-BI-PP-10:** (preconstruction surveys for nesting birds and setbacks)	Less than Significant.
BI-R-17	Long-Term Direct Special-Status Wildlife, Nesting	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
	Success of Tree-Nesting Raptors, Loss of Suitable Nesting Habitat		
BI-LE-1	Short-Term Direct Special-Status Plants, County List A and B	**M-BI-PP-2:** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (no planting or seeding of invasive plant species) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a biological monitoring report)	Less than Significant.
BI-LE-2	Long-Term Direct Special-Status Plants, County List A and B	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.
BI-LE-3	Short-Term Direct Special-Status Wildlife, County Group 1	**M-BI-PP-2:** (Biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (restrictions on construction vehicle speed limits) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a Biological monitoring report) **M-BI-PP-11:** (monitoring excavated areas and soil piles)	Less than Significant.
BI-LE-4	Long-Term Direct Special-Status Wildlife, County Group 1, Removal of suitable habitat	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.
BI-LE-5	Short-Term Direct Special-Status Plants, County Group C and D	**M-BI-PP-2:** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (preparation and implementation of a SWPPP) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a biological monitoring report)	Less than Significant.
BI-LE-6	Long-Term Direct Special-Status Plants, County Group C and D	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.
BI-LE-7	Short-Term Direct Special-Status	**M-BI-PP-2:** (biological monitoring)	Less than Significant.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
	Wildlife, County Group 2	**M-BI-PP-3:** (restrictions on construction vehicle speed limits) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a biological monitoring report) **M-BI-PP-11:** (monitoring excavated areas and soil piles)	
BI-LE-8	Long-Term Direct Special-Status Wildlife, County Group 2, Removal of suitable habitat	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.
BI-LE-9	Long-Term Direct Special-Status Wildlife, Loss of foraging habitat for raptors	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.
BI-LE-10	Short-Term Indirect Special-Status Plants	**M-BI-PP-2:** (Biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (preparation and implementation of a SWPPP) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a Biological monitoring report) **M-BI-PP-5:** (implementation of a Fugitive Dust Control Plan)	Less than Significant.
BI-LE-11	Long-Term Indirect Special-Status Plants	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-PP-5:** (implementation of a Fugitive Dust Control Plan **M-BI-PP-6:** (Biological review of landscape plans) **M-BI-PP-7:** (restrictions on operation and maintenance personnel activity) **M-BI-PP-8:** (implementation of a Fire Protection Plan) **M-BI-PP-9:** (regulated herbicide application)	Less than Significant.
BI-LE-12	Short-Term Indirect Special-Status Wildlife, Detected or	**M-BI-PP-2:** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (restrictions on construction vehicle speed	Less than Significant.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
	Potentially Occurring	limits and preparation and implementation of a SWPPP) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a biological monitoring report) **M-BI-PP-5:** (implementation of a Fugitive Dust Control Plan) **M-BI-PP-11:** (monitoring excavated areas and soil piles) **M-BI-PP-12:** (minimize night lighting)	
BI-LE-13	Long-Term Indirect Special-Status Wildlife, Detected or Potentially Occurring	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-PP-5:** (implementation of a Fugitive Dust Control Plan) **M-BI-PP-6:** (biological review of landscape plans) **M-BI-PP-7:** (restrictions on operation and maintenance personnel activity) **M-BI-PP -8:** (implementation of a Fire Protection Plan)	Less than Significant.
BI-LE-14	Short-Term Indirect Special-Status Wildlife, Nesting Success of Tree-Nesting Raptors, Construction-related	**M-BI-PP-10:** (preconstruction surveys for nesting birds and setbacks)	Less than Significant.
BI-LE-15	Long-Term Direct Special-Status Wildlife, Impacts to active nests or young of nesting sensitive bird species	**M-BI-PP-10:** (preconstruction surveys for nesting birds and setbacks)	Less than Significant.
BI-LW-1	Short-Term Direct Special-Status Plants	**M-BI-PP-2:** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (no planting or seeding of invasive plant species) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a biological monitoring report)	Less than Significant.
BI-LW-2	Long-Term Direct Special-Status	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
	Plants		
BI-LW-3	Short-Term Direct Special-Status Wildlife, County Group 1	**M-BI-PP-2:** (Biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (restrictions on construction vehicle speed limits) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a Biological monitoring report) **M-BI-PP-11:** (monitoring excavated areas and soil piles)	Less than Significant.
BI-LW-4	Long-Term Direct Special-Status Wildlife, County Group 1, Removal of suitable habitat	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.
BI-LW-5	Short-Term Direct Special-Status Plants, County Group C and D	**M-BI-PP-2:** (Biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (preparation and implementation of a SWPPP) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a Biological monitoring report	Less than Significant.
BI-LW-6	Long-Term Direct Special-Status Plants, County Group C and D	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.
BI-LW-7	Short-Term Direct Special-Status Wildlife, County Group 2	**M-BI-PP-2:** (Biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (restrictions on construction vehicle speed limits) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a Biological monitoring report) **M-BI-PP-11:** (monitoring excavated areas and soil piles)	Less than Significant.
BI-LW-8	Long-Term Direct Special-Status Wildlife, County Group 2, Removal of suitable habitat	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
BI-LW-9	Long-Term Direct Special-Status Wildlife, Loss of foraging habitat for raptors	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.
BI-LW-10	Short-Term Indirect Special-Status Plants	**M-BI-PP-2:** (Biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (preparation and implementation of a SWPPP) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a Biological monitoring report) **M-BI-PP-5:** (implementation of a Fugitive Dust Control Plan)	Less than Significant.
BI-LW-11	Long-Term Indirect Special-Status Plants	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-PP-5:** (implementation of a Fugitive Dust Control Plan **M-BI-PP-6:** (Biological review of landscape plans) **M-BI-PP-7:** (restrictions on operation and maintenance personnel activity) **M-BI-PP-8:** (implementation of a Fire Protection Plan) **M-BI-PP-9:** (regulated herbicide application)	Less than Significant.
BI-LW-12	Short-Term Indirect Special-Status Wildlife, Detected or Potentially Occurring	**M-BI-PP-2:** (Biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (restrictions on construction vehicle speed limits and preparation and implementation of a SWPPP) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a biological monitoring report) **M-BI-PP-5:** (implementation of a Fugitive Dust Control Plan) **M-BI-PP-11:** (monitoring excavated areas and soil piles) **M-BI-PP-12:** (minimize night lighting)	Less than Significant.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
BI-LW-13	Long-Term Indirect Special-Status Wildlife, Detected or Potentially Occurring	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-PP-5:** (implementation of a Fugitive Dust Control Plan) **M-BI-PP-6:** (biological review of landscape plans) **M-BI-PP-7:** (restrictions on operation and maintenance personnel activity) **M-BI-PP-8:** (implementation of a Fire Protection Plan)	Less than Significant.
BI-LW-14	Long-Term Direct Special-Status Wildlife, Nesting Success of Tree-Nesting Raptors, Loss of Suitable Nesting Habitat	**M-BI-PP-10:** (preconstruction surveys for nesting birds and setbacks)	Less than Significant.
BI-LW-15	Short-Term Indirect Special-Status Wildlife Impacts to active nests or young of nesting special-status bird species	**M-BI-PP-10:** (preconstruction surveys for nesting birds and setbacks)	Less than Significant.
2.3.3.2 Riparian Habitat or Sensitive Natural community			
BI-TDS-18	Short-Term Indirect Special-Status Upland Vegetation Communities	**M-BI-PP-2:** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (preparation and implementation of a SWPPP) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a biological monitoring report)	Less than Significant.
BI-TDS-19	Long-Term Indirect Special-Status Upland Vegetation Communities	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.
BI-TDS-20	Short-Term Indirect Groundwater-Dependent Vegetation	**M-BI-PP-14**: The groundwater monitoring program will establish the current status and health of the existing oak woodland and document oak conditions up to a 5-year post-construction time frame. The goal is to determine if the project's use of groundwater is impacting area oak trees/woodlands. If water levels in Wells RM-1, RM-3 and RSD-1 do not drop more than 3 feet below baseline during the first year construction period, monitoring will cease at that	Less than Significant.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		time because impacts would be expected to be less than significant. 1. The baseline data would be collected over the course of approximately 1 year prior to project-related groundwater extraction. Potentially affected native trees within the study area will be evaluated for overall physical condition and attributes. The trees shall be inventoried by an International Society of Aboriculture (ISA) Certified Arborist or Registered Professional Forester with specific experience evaluating native oak species, in particular coast live oaks. The baseline monitoring evaluations will include the following: 2. Establishment of 28 pseudo-randomized 0.2-acre plots around oak groupings and scattered individual trees. Sample plots would include the range of existing habitat conditions, including elevation, slope and aspect, proximity to roads, and other land uses. If an oak woodland monitoring site is less than 0.1 acre, the entire site will be evaluated. 3. Tagging of trees and recording species, tag number, trunk diameter at breast height (dbh) (inches), height (feet) and dominance (i.e., whether the tree is under the canopy of another tree or forms the uppermost canopy). Slope, aspect, and elevation of each tree location, existing understory species (including proportion of natives to exotics), presence of debris and litter, and soil type, depth, and parent material will be noted for each tree or plot. 4. Placement of tensiometers (or similar) to measure soil moisture levels a. Soil moisture levels will be recorded quarterly at depths up to 48 inches. 5. Assessment of tree status, including documentation of: a. Trunk diameter at breast height (dbh), measured at 4.5 feet above ground (according to standard practices) b. Number of stems	

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		c. Overall tree height (based on ocular estimates) d. Tree crown spread (measurement in each cardinal direction, based on ocular estimate) e. Overall tree health condition (Good, Fair, Poor, Dead) f. Overall tree structural condition (Good, Fair, Poor, Dead) g. Pest presence (Type, Extent – minimal, moderate, high) h. Disease presence (Type, Extent – minimal, moderate, high) 6. Other specific comments. 7. Assessment of acorn production, seedling establishment, and sapling tree densities and conditions 8. The data collection procedure will include full data collection at each plot so that consistency is maintained among sampling plots. a. Creation of oak tree database using GIS or similar application. 9. Ongoing monitoring will be carried out quarterly during the 1-year project construction period. If the Certified Arborist or Registered Professional Forester observes an impact to the oak woodland after this period, monitoring will continue in years 2 through 5 following initiation of project-related groundwater extraction. Monitoring will include the following components: 10. Monitoring inspections will include re-evaluation of the baseline data as well as collection of soil moisture data from pre-placed tensiometers. 11. Monitoring will include re-evaluating the trees to determine if changes are occurring that may indicate ground water drawdown is having a deleterious effect	

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		on oak woodlands or individual trees. The following information will be recorded during each monitoring visit and the data will be compared to previous monitoring results: • Trunk diameter at breast height (dbh), measured at 4.5 feet above ground (according to standard practices) • Number of stems • Overall tree height (based on ocular estimates) • Tree crown spread (measurement in each cardinal direction, based on ocular estimate) • Overall tree health condition (Good, Fair, Poor, Dead) • Overall tree structural condition (Good, Fair, Poor, Dead) • Pest presence (Type, Extent – minimal, moderate, high) • Disease presence (Type, Extent – minimal, moderate, high) • Other specific comments. In particular, monitoring evaluations will focus on examining crowns for discoloration, loss of vigor, foliage curling, and/or pest presence; and trunks and root crowns for beetle/borer symptoms, bleeding cankers, or seeping areas (indicative of fungal infections). These and similar signs may indicate that a tree or a grouping of trees is experiencing stress, which can be corroborated by tensiometer readings. Trees under stress are more susceptible to disease and insect attacks. The following mitigation criteria will be established to protect groundwater resources and groundwater-dependent habitat in the project area: If the groundwater levels at off-site wells located within 0.5 mile of Well B (RM-1, RM-3, or RSD-1) drops 10 feet below the baseline water levels, groundwater pumping at Well B will cease until the water level at the well that experienced the threshold exceedance has increased above the threshold and remained there for at least 30 continuous days. Additionally, written permission from the County PDS must be obtained before production may be resumed.	

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		If the groundwater levels in the vicinity of the groundwater dependent habitat (RM-1 or RM-3) drops below 10 feet of the pre-pumping static water level and there is evidence of deteriorating oak tree health as determined by the Certified Arborist or Registered Professional Forester, there may be a temporary or permanent cessation of pumping at Well B. If evidence of deterioration persists after the 5-year period, mitigation will consist of off-site wetland/ oak woodland credits at a 3:1 ratio. If an impact to the oak woodland habitat is observed by the monitoring Certified Arborist or Registered Professional Forester over the duration of the project construction period, routine monitoring of the oak woodland will continue for a maximum up to 5 years following initiation of project-related groundwater extraction. The monitoring Certified Arborist or Registered Professional Forester will base mitigation recommendations on the type and extent of tree issues observed. If groundwater drawdown is determined to be the cause of tree stress, resulting in the presence of secondary pests (insects and/or disease), halting groundwater extraction may be recommended. If less than 3 feet of drawdown is observed at monitoring wells RM-1 and RM-3 at the end of project construction and no deleterious health effects are observed in the oak woodland habitat, monitoring can cease at the end of the first year of project operation as long as the wells operate only as intended under the project's conditions of approval. For the 1-year construction period, 18 acre-feet (AF) of water is proposed to be pumped from on-site supply Well B. For subsequent years, 6 acre-feet per year (AFY) will be pumped from Well B for operation and maintenance of the project. The groundwater storage within 0.5-mile radius study area surrounding Well B is estimated at 387 AF. The average annual recharge for the study area within 0.5-mile radius of Well B is estimated at 27 AFY. Thus, average annual recharge within the 0.5-mile radius study area is sufficient to meet project construction and operational water demands.	

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		A groundwater monitoring report will be completed by a Certified Hydrogeologist registered in the State of California and submitted to the County PDS each month, no later than 28 days following the end of the monitoring month. The report will include the following information: Water level hydrographs and tabulated water level data for each monitoring well Tabulated groundwater production volumes from each production well Documentation of groundwater drawdown at off-site monitoring wells RM-1 and RM-3 Documentation of any threshold-included curtailment of groundwater production • Appendix documenting groundwater dependent habitat monitoring as described above. If the baseline water levels at the off-site monitoring wells RM-1, RM-3, and RSD-1 are exceeded by 5 feet, the County PDS will be notified via letter and electronic mail within five working days of the exceedance. Additionally, if water level thresholds at the off-site wells are exceeded by 10 feet, pumping of Well B shall cease and the County PDS notified via letter and electronic mail within five working days. In addition to the monthly groundwater monitoring reports, annual reports will also be submitted to the County PDS summarizing groundwater-dependent habitat monitoring efforts and any mitigation recommendations implemented in the field during the monitoring year. The monitoring year will coincide with the calendar year. The annual reports will document tree health and mortality, tensiometer readings, water level readings, well production, and success of mitigation efforts (if any were necessary). Annual reports will be completed prior to the end of January in the next calendar year.	

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
BI-TDS-21	Short-Term Indirect Special-Status Upland Vegetation Communities	**M-BI-PP-2:** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (preparation and implementation of a SWPPP) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a biological monitoring report) **M-BI-PP-5:** (implementation of a Fugitive Dust Control Plan)	Less than Significant.
BI-TDS-22	Long-Term Indirect Special-Status Upland Vegetation Communities	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-PP-5:** (implementation of a Fugitive Dust Control Plan **M-BI-PP-6:** (biological review of landscape plans) **M-BI-PP-7:** (restrictions on operation and maintenance personnel activity) **M-BI-PP-8:** (implementation of a Fire Protection Plan) **M-BI-PP-9 :** (regulated herbicide application)	Less than Significant.
BI-R-18	Short-Term Direct Special-Status Upland Vegetation Communities	**M-BI-PP-2:** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (preparation and implementation of a SWPPP) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a biological monitoring report)	Less than Significant.
BI-R-19	Long-Term Direct Special-Status Upland Vegetation Communities	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.
BI-R-20	Short-Term Direct Jurisdictional Wetlands and Waters	**M-BI-PP-2:** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (restrictions on construction vehicle speed limits) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a biological monitoring report)	Less than Significant.
BI-R-21	Long-Term Direct Jurisdictional Wetlands and Waters	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-PP-13:** To comply with the state and federal regulations for impacts to "waters of the United	Less than Significant.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		States and state," the following agency permits are required, or verification that they are not required shall be obtained. 1. The following permit and agreement shall be obtained, or provide evidence from the respective resource agency satisfactory to the director of PDS that such an agreement or permit is not required: a. A Clean Water Act, Section 401/404 permit issued by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) for all project-related disturbances of waters of the United States and/or associated wetlands. b. A Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement issued by the CDFW for all project-related disturbances of any streambed. 2. Documentation: The applicant shall consult each agency to determine if a permit or agreement is required. Upon completion of the agency review of this project, the applicant shall provide a copy of the permit(s)/agreement(s), or evidence from each agency that such an agreement or permit is not required to PDS for compliance. 3. Timing: Prior to approval of any grading and or improvement plans and issuance of any Grading or Construction Permits. 4. Monitoring: PDS shall review the permits/agreement for compliance with this condition. Copies of these permits should be implemented on the grading plans. **MM-BI-R-1:** Option 1: A Revegetation Plan for 0.30 acre of mitigation is required for impacts to alkali meadow and disturbed alkali meadow (ACOE/RWQCB/CDFW/County jurisdictional wetland). ACOE, RWQCB, and/or CDFW staff may require additional mitigation for non-Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) jurisdictional waters/riparian habitat impacted by the project. The Revegetation Plan shall conform to the most current version of the County of San Diego Report Format and Content Requirements for Revegetation Plans. In order to ensure project completion and success of the Revegetation Plan, a surety shall be provided and an agreement shall be executed with the County of San Diego consisting of a letter of credit,	

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		bond, or cash for 100% of the estimated costs associated with the implementation of the Revegetation Plan and a 10% cash deposit of the cost of all improvements (no less than $3,000; no more than $30,000). The surety shall be released upon completion of the Revegetation Plan provided the installed vegetation is in a healthy condition and meets the plan's success criteria. An RMP shall be prepared and approved pursuant to the County of San Diego *Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements: Biological Resources* to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS. If the off-site mitigation is proposed to be owned and/or managed by DPR, the RMP shall also be approved by the Director of DPR. Option 2: If purchasing Mitigation Credit, the mitigation bank shall be approved by the CDFW. The following evidence of purchase shall include the following information to be provided by the mitigation bank: 1. A copy of the purchase contract referencing the project name and numbers for which the habitat credits were purchased. 2. If not stated explicitly in the purchase contract, a separate letter must be provided identifying the entity responsible for the long-term management and monitoring of the preserved land. 3. To ensure the land will be protected in perpetuity, evidence must be provided that a dedicated conservation easement or similar land constraint has been placed over the mitigation land. 4. An accounting of the status of the mitigation bank. This shall include the total amount of credits available at the bank, the amount required by this project and the amount remaining after utilization by this project. Documentation: The applicant shall purchase the off-site mitigation credits and provide the evidence to the PDS for review and approval. If the off-site mitigation is proposed to be owned or managed by DPR, the applicant must provide evidence to the PDS that DPR agrees to this proposal. It is recommended that the applicant submit the mitigation proposal to the PDS, for a pre-approval. If an RMP is going to be submitted in-lieu of purchasing credits, then the RMP shall be prepared, and an application for the RMP shall be	

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		submitted to the PDS. Timing: Prior to the approval of the map and prior to the approval of any plan and issuance of any permit, the mitigation shall be completed. Monitoring: The PDS shall review the mitigation purchase for compliance with this condition. Upon request from the applicant, PDS can preapprove the location and type of mitigation only. The credits shall be purchased before the requirement can be completed. If the applicant chooses option 2, then the PDS shall accept an application for an RMP, and PDS shall review the RMP submittal for compliance with this condition and the RMP Guidelines.	
BI-R-22	Short-Term Indirect Jurisdictional Wetlands and Waters	**M-BI-PP-2:** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (preparation and implementation of a SWPPP) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a biological monitoring report) **M-BI-PP-5:** (implementation of a Fugitive Dust Control Plan)	Less than Significant.
BI-R-23	Long-Term Indirect Jurisdictional Wetlands and Waters	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-PP-5:** (implementation of a Fugitive Dust Control Plan **M-BI-PP-6:** (biological review of landscape plans) **M-BI-PP-7:** (restrictions on operation and maintenance personnel activity) **M-BI-PP-8:** (implementation of a Fire Protection Plan) **M-BI-PP-9:** (regulated herbicide application)	Less than Significant.
BI-R-24	Short-Term Indirect Groundwater-Dependent Vegetation	**M-BI-PP-14**: (groundwater monitoring and mitigation plan)	Less than Significant.
BI-R-25	Short-Term Indirect Special-Status Upland Vegetation Communities	**M-BI-PP-2:** (biological monitoring) **MBI-PP-3:** (preparation and implementation of a SWPPP)	Less than Significant.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		M-BI-PP-4: (preparation of a biological monitoring report) **M-BI-PP-5:** (implementation of a Fugitive Dust Control Plan)	
BI-R-26	Long-Term Indirect Special-Status Upland Vegetation Communities	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-PP-5:** (implementation of a Fugitive Dust Control Plan **M-BI-PP-6:** (biological review of landscape plans) **M-BI-PP-7:** (restrictions on operation and maintenance personnel activity) **M-BI-PP-8:** (implementation of a Fire Protection Plan) **M-BI-PP-9 :** (regulated herbicide application)	Less than Significant.
BI-R-27	Long-Term Direct Jurisdictional Wetlands and Waters	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-PP-13:** (federal and state permits) **M-BI-R-1:** (3:1 wetland mitigation)	Less than Significant.
BI-LE-16	Short-Term Direct Special-Status Upland Vegetation Communities	**M-BI-PP-2:** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (preparation and implementation of a SWPPP) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a biological monitoring report)	Less than Significant.
BI-LE-17	Long-Term Direct Special-Status Upland Vegetation Communities	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.
BI-LE-18	Short-Term Direct Jurisdictional Wetlands and Waters	**M-BI-PP-2:** (Biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (restrictions on construction vehicle speed limits) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a Biological monitoring report)	Less than Significant.
BI-LE-19	Long-Term Direct Jurisdictional Wetlands and Waters	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-PP-13:** (federal and state permits)	Less than Significant.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
BI-LE-20	Short-Term Indirect Jurisdictional Wetlands and Waters	**M-BI-PP-2:** (Biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (preparation and implementation of a SWPPP) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a Biological monitoring report) **M-BI-PP-5:** (implementation of a Fugitive Dust Control Plan)	Less than Significant.
BI-LE-21	Long-Term Indirect Jurisdictional Wetlands and Waters	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-PP-5:** (implementation of a Fugitive Dust Control Plan **M-BI-PP-6:** (Biological review of landscape plans) **M-BI-PP-7:** (restrictions on operation and maintenance personnel activity) **M-BI-PP-8:** (implementation of a Fire Protection Plan) **M-BI-PP-9:** (regulated herbicide application)	Less than Significant.
BI-LE-22	Short-Term Indirect Special-Status Upland Vegetation Communities	**M-BI-PP-2:** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (preparation and implementation of a SWPPP) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a biological monitoring report) **M-BI-PP-5:** (implementation of a Fugitive Dust Control Plan)	Less than Significant.
BI-LE-23	Long-Term Indirect Special-Status Upland Vegetation Communities	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-PP-5:** (implementation of a Fugitive Dust Control Plan **M-BI-PP-6:** (biological review of landscape plans) **M-BI-PP-7:** (restrictions on operation and maintenance personnel activity) **M-BI-PP-8:** (implementation of a Fire Protection Plan) **M-BI-PP-9:** (regulated herbicide application)	Less than Significant.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
BI-LE-24	Long-Term Direct Jurisdictional Wetlands and Waters	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-PP-13:** (federal and state permits)	Less than Significant.
BI-LW-16	Short-Term Direct Special-Status Upland Vegetation Communities	**M-BI-PP-2:** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (preparation and implementation of a SWPPP) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a biological monitoring report)	Less than Significant.
BI-LW-17	Long-Term Direct Special-Status Upland Vegetation Communities	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.
BI-LW-18	Short-Term Direct Jurisdictional Wetlands and Waters	**M-BI-PP-2:** (Biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (restrictions on construction vehicle speed limits) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a Biological monitoring report)	Less than Significant.
BI-LW-19	Long-Term Direct Jurisdictional Wetlands and Waters	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-PP-13:** (federal and state permits)	Less than Significant.
BI-LW-20	Short-Term Indirect Jurisdictional Wetlands and Waters	**M-BI-PP-2:** (Biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (preparation and implementation of a SWPPP) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a Biological monitoring report) **M-BI-PP-5:** (implementation of a Fugitive Dust Control Plan)	Less than Significant.
BI-LW-21	Long-Term Indirect Jurisdictional Wetlands and Waters	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-PP-5:** (implementation of a Fugitive Dust Control Plan **M-BI-PP-6:** (Biological review of landscape plans) **M-BI-PP-7:** (restrictions on operation and maintenance personnel activity)	Less than Significant.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		M-BI-PP-8: (implementation of a Fire Protection Plan) **M-BI-PP-9:** (regulated herbicide application)	
BI-LW-22	Short-Term Indirect Special-Status Upland Vegetation Communities	**M-BI-PP-2:** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (preparation and implementation of a SWPPP) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a biological monitoring report) **M-BI-PP-5:** (implementation of a Fugitive Dust Control Plan)	Less than Significant.
BI-LW-23	Long-Term Indirect Special-Status Upland Vegetation Communities	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-PP-5:** (implementation of a Fugitive Dust Control Plan **M-BI-PP-6:** (biological review of landscape plans) **M-BI-PP-7:** (restrictions on operation and maintenance personnel activity) **M-BI-PP-8:** (implementation of a Fire Protection Plan) **M-BI-PP-9:** (regulated herbicide application)	Less than Significant.
BI-LW-24	Long-Term Direct Jurisdictional Wetlands and Waters	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-PP-13:** (federal and state permits)	Less than Significant.
		2.3.3.3 Jurisdictional Wetlands and Waterways	
BI-R-27	Long-Term Direct Jurisdictional Wetlands and Waters	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-PP-13:** (federal and state permits) **M-BI-R-1:** (3:1 wetland mitigation)	Less than Significant.
BI-LE-25	Long-Term Direct Jurisdictional Wetlands and Waters	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-PP-13:** (federal and state permits)	Less than Significant.
BI-LW-25	Long-Term Direct Jurisdictional Wetlands and Waters	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-PP-13:** (federal and state permits)	Less than Significant.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
2.3.3.4 Wildlife Movement and Nursery Sites			
BI-TDS-23	Short-Term Direct Foraging and Breeding Habitat	**M-BI-PP-2:** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (preparation and implementation of a SWPPP) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a biological monitoring report)	Less than Significant.
BI-TDS-24	Long-Term Direct Foraging and Breeding Habitat	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.
BI-TDS-25	Short-Term Indirect Foraging and Breeding Habitat Groundwater-Dependent Vegetation	**M-BI-PP-14:** (groundwater monitoring and mitigation plan)	Less than Significant.
BI-TDS-26	Long-Term Direct Wildlife Movement	**M-BI-PP-1**: (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.
BI-R-28	Short-Term Direct Foraging and Breeding Habitat	**M-BI-PP-2:** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (preparation and implementation of a SWPPP) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a biological monitoring report)	Less than Significant.
BI-R-29	Long-Term Direct Foraging and Breeding Habitat	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.
BI-R-30	Short-Term Indirect Foraging and Breeding Habitat Groundwater-Dependent Vegetation	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.
BI-R-31	Long-Term Direct Wildlife Movement	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.
BI-LE-26	Short-Term Direct Foraging and Breeding Habitat	**M-BI-PP-2:** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (preparation and implementation of a SWPPP) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a biological monitoring report)	Less than Significant.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
BI-LE-27	Long-Term Direct Wildlife Movement, Wildlife access	**M-BI-LE-1:** A wildlife movement corridor shall be established along Walker Creek to allow for continued movement across the LanEast solar farm site. The corridor shall be established consistent with County standards (minimum 1,000 feet wide with a 400-foot wide pinch point for no more than 500 feet in length), and shall include an appropriate RPO wetland buffer.	Less than Significant.
BI-LE-28	Long-Term Indirect Wildlife Movement, Noise and/or nighttime lighting	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.
BI-LE-29	Short- and Long-Term Indirect Wildlife Movement, Barrier to movement	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-PP-5:** (implementation of a Fugitive Dust Control Plan) **M-BI-PP-6:** (biological review of landscape plans) **M-BI-PP-7:** (restrictions on operation and maintenance personnel activity) **M-BI-PP-8:** (implementation of a Fire Protection Plan) **M-BI-LE-1:** (wildlife corridor)	Less than Significant.
BI-LE-30	Short- and Long-Term Indirect Wildlife Movement, Visual continuity	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-LE-1:** (wildlife corridor)	Less than Significant.
BI-LW-26	Short-Term Direct Foraging and Breeding Habitat	**M-BI-PP-2:** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-PP-3:** (preparation and implementation of a SWPPP) **M-BI-PP-4:** (preparation of a biological monitoring report)	Less than Significant.
BI-LW-27	Long-Term Direct Wildlife Movement, Wildlife access	**M-BI-LW-1:** A wildlife movement corridor shall be established along Walker Creek to allow for continued movement across the LanWest solar farm site. The corridor shall be established consistent with County standards (minimum 1,000 feet wide with a 400-foot wide pinch point for no more than 500 feet in length), and shall include an appropriate RPO wetland buffer.	Less than Significant.
BI-LW-28	Long-Term Indirect Wildlife Movement, Noise and/or nighttime lighting	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
BI-LW-29	Short- and Long-Term Indirect Wildlife Movement, Barrier to movement	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-PP-5:** (implementation of a Fugitive Dust Control Plan) **M-BI-PP-6:** (biological review of landscape plans) **M-BI-PP-7:** (restrictions on operation and maintenance personnel activity) **M-BI-PP-8:** (implementation of a Fire Protection Plan) **M-BI-LW-1:** (wildlife corridor)	Less than Significant.
BI-LW-30	Short- and Long-Term Indirect Wildlife Movement, Visual continuity	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-LW-1:** (wildlife corridor)	Less than Significant.
2.3.3.5 Local Policies, Ordinances, and Adopted Plans			
BI-TDS-27	Short-Term Direct Migratory Bird Treaty Act	**M-BI-PP-10:** (preconstruction surveys for nesting birds and setbacks)	Less than Significant.
BI-R-32	Short-Term Direct Migratory Bird Treaty Act	**M-BI-PP-10:** (preconstruction surveys for nesting birds and setbacks)	Less than Significant.
BI-LE-31	Long-Term Direct Jurisdictional Wetlands and Waters	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-PP-13:** (federal and state permits)	Less than Significant.
BI-LE-32	Short-Term Direct Migratory Bird Treaty Act	**M-BI-PP-10:** (preconstruction surveys for nesting birds and setbacks)	Less than Significant.
BI-LE-33	Long-Term Direct Special-Status Wildlife, Loss of foraging habitat for golden eagles	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.
BI-LW-31	Long-Term Direct Jurisdictional Wetlands and Waters	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-PP-13:** (federal and state permits)	Less than Significant.
BI-LW-32	Short-Term Direct Migratory Bird Treaty Act	**M-BI-PP-10:** (preconstruction surveys for nesting birds and setbacks)	Less than Significant.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
BI-LW-33	Long-Term Direct Special-Status Wildlife, Loss of foraging habitat for golden eagles	**M-BI-PP-1:** (habitat preservation)	Less than Significant.
Cumulative-Level Impacts			
None.			
2.4 Cultural Resources			
Project-Level Impacts			
2.3.4.1 Historical Resources and Archaeological Resources			
CR-TDS-1	Discovery of Unknown Archaeological/Cultural Deposits	**M-CR-PP-1:**ARCHAEOLOGICAL GRADING MONITORING: [PDS, PCC] [DPW, ESU] [GP, IP, UO] [PDS, FEE X 2] INTENT: In order to mitigate for potential impacts to undiscovered buried archaeological resources on the project site, a grading monitoring program and potential data recovery program shall be implemented pursuant to the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Cultural Resources and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT: A County Approved Principal Investigator (PI) 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 of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Requirements for Cultural Resources, and this permit. 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 of San Diego shall be executed. The contract or Letter of Acceptance shall include a cost estimate for the monitoring work and reporting.	Less than Significant

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		b. The Project Archeologist shall provide evidence that a Kumeyaay Native American has also been contracted to perform Native American Grading Monitoring for the project. c. d. The cost of the monitoring shall be added to the grading bonds or bonded separately. e. DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall provide a copy of the Grading Monitoring Contract or Letter of Acceptance from the Project Archaeologist, cost estimate, and MOU to the [PDS, PCC]. Additionally, the cost amount 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. OCCUPANCY: (Prior to any occupancy, final grading release, or use of the premises in reliance of this permit). CULTURAL RESOURCES REPORT [PDS, FEE X2] INTENT: In order to ensure that the Grading Monitoring occurred during 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:	

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		i. DPR Primary and Archaeological Site forms. ii. Daily Monitoring Logs i. Evidence that all cultural materials have been curated that includes but is not limited to the following: i. The applicant shall provide evidence that all prehistoric archaeological materials collected during the survey, testing, and grading monitoring program have been submitted to a San Diego curation facility or a culturally affiliated Native American Tribal curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79, and, therefore, would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/ researchers for further study. The collections and associated records, 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 identifying that the archaeological materials have been received. ii. Historic materials shall be curated at a San Diego curation facility and shall not be 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.	

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		v. 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 applicant's 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). 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. <u>Grading Plan Notes</u> PRE-CONSTRUCTION MEETING: (Prior to Preconstruction Meeting, and prior to any clearing, grubbing, trenching, grading, or any land disturbances.) CULT#GR-X ARCHAELOGICAL MONITORING [PDS, FEE X2] INTENT: In order to comply with the County of San Diego Guidelines for Significance – Cultural Resources, a Cultural Resource Grading Monitoring Program shall be implemented. DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT: The County approved Project Archaeologist, 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	

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		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 of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Cultural Resources. DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall have the contracted Project Archeologist and Native American attend the preconstruction meeting to explain the monitoring requirements. TIMING: Prior to the Pre-construction 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 preconstruction conference to coordinate the Cultural Resource Monitoring requirements of this condition. The [PDS, PCC] shall attend the preconstruction conference and confirm the attendance of the approved Project Archaeologist. DURING CONTRUCTION: (The following actions shall occur throughout the duration of the grading construction). **CULT#GR-X ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING [PDS, FEE X2]** INTENT: In order to comply with the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Cultural Resources, a Cultural Resource Grading Monitoring Program shall be implemented. DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT: The Project Archaeologist and 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 following requirements during earth-disturbing activities:	

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		a. During the original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits, the Project Archaeologist and Native American Monitor shall be onsite 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 Native American Monitor. Monitoring of cutting of previously disturbed deposits will be determined by the Project. b. In the event that previously unidentified potentially significant cultural resources are discovered, the Project Archaeologist, in consultation with the Native American monitor, shall have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance 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 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 Staff Archaeologist, then carried out using professional archaeological methods. The Research Design and Data Recovery Program shall include (1) avoidance of Traditional Cultural Properties, (2) reasonable efforts to preserve (avoidance) "unique" cultural resources pursuant to CEQA Section 21083.2(g) or for Sacred Sites as the preferred option (3) the capping of identified Sacred Sites or unique cultural resources and placement of development over the cap, if avoidance is infeasible, and (4) data recovery for non-unique cultural resources. Traditional Cultural Properties shall be avoided. 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	

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Most Likely Descendant (MLD), 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 American human remains are located is not to be damaged or disturbed by further development activity until consultation with the MLD regarding their recommendations as required by Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 has been conducted. Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, CEQA Section 15064.5 and Health & Safety Code Section 7050.5 shall be followed. 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 Archeologist is on-site performing the Monitoring duties of this condition. The [DPW, PDCI] shall contact the [PDS, PCC] if the Project Archeologist or applicant fails to comply with this condition. ROUGH GRADING: (Prior to rough grading approval and issuance of any building permit). **CULT#GR-X ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING [PDS, FEE]** INTENT: In order to comply with the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Cultural Resources, a Grading Monitoring Program shall be implemented. 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, then submit a final Negative Monitoring	

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		Report 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, 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 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 grading activities, and prior to Rough Grading final Inspection (Grading Ordinance SEC 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 MMRP, and inform [DPW, PDCI] that the requirement is completed. FINAL GRADING RELEASE: (Prior to any occupancy, final grading release, or use of the premises in reliance of this permit). **CULT#GR-X ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING [PDS, FEE]** INTENT: In order to comply with the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Cultural Resources, a Grading Monitoring Program shall be implemented. DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT: The Project Archaeologist shall prepare a final report that	

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		documents the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the Grading 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 that includes but is not limited to the following: i. Evidence that all prehistoric archaeological materials collected during the survey, testing, and grading monitoring program have been submitted to a San Diego curation facility or a culturally affiliated Native American Tribal curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79, and, therefore, would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records, 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, 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 identifying that the archaeological materials have been received. ii. Historic materials shall be curated at a San Diego curation facility and shall not be 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	

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		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 applicant's 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). 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-TDS-2	Indirect Impacts to Known Archaeological/ Cultural Deposits in Unevaluated Sites	**M-CR-PP-2:** TEMPORARY FENCING: [PDS, PCC] [DPW, PDCI] [PC] [PDS, FEE]. INTENT: In order to prevent inadvertent disturbance to archaeological sites within the avoidance areas and to the unimpacted potions of sites outside of the Major Use Permit boundaries, 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 to protect from inadvertent disturbance archaeological sites within the avoidance areas and to the unimpacted potions of sites outside of the Major Use Permit boundaries during all earth disturbing activities. Temporary fencing shall include but is not limited to the following:	Less than Significant.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		a. Temporary fencing is required in all locations of the project where proposed grading or clearing is within 100 feet of any archaeological site within avoidance areas or the unimpacted potions of sites outside of the Major Use Permit boundaries. b. The placement of such fencing shall be approved by the PDS, Permit Compliance Section. Upon approval, the fencing shall remain in place until the conclusion of grading activities after which the fencing shall be removed. DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall have a California licensed surveyor install and certify the installation of the temporary fencing in consultation with the Project Archaeologist. The applicant shall submit photos of the fencing along with the certification letter to the [PDS, PCC] for approval. TIMING: Prior to Preconstruction Meeting, and prior to any clearing, grubbing, trenching, grading, or any land disturbances the fencing shall be installed, and shall remain for the duration of the grading and clearing. MONITORING: The [PDS, PCC] shall either attend the Preconstruction Meeting and approve the installation of the temporary fencing, or review the certification and pictures provided by the applicant's surveyor."	
CR-R-1	Discovery of Unknown Archaeological/Cultural Deposits	**See M-CR-PP-1 (Archaeological Monitoring)**	
CR-LE-1	Discovery of Unknown Archaeological/Cultural Deposits Impacts to Known Archaeological/Cultural Deposits	**See M-CR-PP-1 (Archaeological Monitoring** **M-CR-PP-3:** ARCHAEOLOGICAL TREATMENT PLAN: [PDS, PCC] [BP, GP, CP, UO] [DPLU, FEE] INTENT: In order to mitigate impacts to significant cultural resources pursuant to CEQA and the County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance, a Cultural Treatment Plan for cultural sites CA-SDI-5933/6892/6903, CA-SDI-6893/16823, CA-SDI-6900/16827, CA-SDI-6901, CA-SDI-6902/16785, CA-SDI-6904/19881, CA-SDI-16786, CA-SDI-16824, CA-SDI-16826, CA-SDI-18921, CA-SDI-19278, CA-SDI-19901, CA-SDI-19902, CA-SDI-20370, P-37-032131, P-37-031313, LE-01, LE-02, LE-03, LE-09, LE-10, LE-	

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		12, LE-13, LW-02, LW-03, and LW-04 shall be prepared. DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT: A Cultural Treatment Plan shall be prepared and submitted for approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning & Development Services. The Cultural Treatment Plan shall include the testing of sites not previously tested. Based on the results of the Testing Program, a Data Recovery Program pursuant to the County Guidelines for Cultural Resources may be required. Any resources determined to be RPO significant shall be avoided. All artifacts shall be under the control of the Project Archaeologist until curation. DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall submit an Archaeological Treatment Plan for approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Development Services for cultural sites CA-SDI-5933/6892/6903, CA-SDI-6893/16823, CA-SDI-6900/16827, CA-SDI-6901, CA-SDI-6902/16785, CA-SDI-6904/19881, CA-SDI-16786, CA-SDI-16824, CA-SDI-16826, CA-SDI-18921, CA-SDI-19278, CA-SDI-19901, CA-SDI-19902, CA-SDI-20370, P-37-032131, P-37-031313, LE-01, LE-02, LE-03, LE-09, LE-10, LE-12, LE-13, LW-02, LW-03, and LW-04CA-SDI-6897, CA-SDI-16786, CA-SDI-16827, CA-SDI-19278, CA-SDI-16856, CA-SDI-19872, CA-SDI-20116 and CA-SDI-20392. The Cultural Treatment Plan shall be prepared by the Project Archaeologist. TIMING: Prior to approval of any plan or issuance of any permit, and prior to use of the premises in reliance on this permit, the archaeological Treatment Plan shall be prepared and submitted to the County of San Diego for review and approval. MONITORING: The [PDS, PCC] shall review the Archaeological Treatment Plan for compliance with this condition. Upon acceptance of the documentation, [PDS, PCC] shall inform [PDS, LDR] that the requirement is complete.	
CR-LW-1	Discovery of Unknown Archaeological/Cultural Deposits	**See M-CR-PP-1 (Archaeological Monitoring)** **See M-CR-PP-3 (Archaeological Work Plan)**	

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
	Impacts to Known Archaeological/Cultural Deposits		
2.4.3.2 Human Remains			
None			
Cumulative-Level Impacts			
None			
2.5 Land Use			
None			
2.6 Noise			
Project-Level Impacts			
2.6.3.1 Operational Noise			
N-TDS-1	Long-Term Operational Equipment Noise (Inverters)	**M-N-TDS-1:** Enclose Inverters in Noise Attenuating Structures: To ensure noise from inverters would comply with the County Noise Ordinance, the following would be implemented: • Locate non-enclosed inverters a minimum of 800 feet or greater from the nearest property line, or enclose inverters within 800 feet of property lines in cement blocks or other type of structure capable of achieving a minimum 10 dB attenuation. Inverters located within 130 feet of a residential property line require an enclosure capable of achieving a minimum of 15 dB attenuation. • Direct all switch station doorways and exterior ventilation ducts away from adjacent property lines. • Prior to the approval of building plans, a noise analysis shall be prepared that demonstrates that the inverters comply with the County Noise Ordinance.	Less than Significant.
N-TDS-2	Temporary Gen-Tie Maintenance Noise	**M-N-TDS-1:** Tierra del Sol Gen-Tie Line Maintenance Protocol: To ensure noise from maintenance activities along the gen-tie line will comply with the County noise standards, the following shall be implemented throughout the use of the gen-tie line: • Brush clearance along the gen-tie route shall be accomplished using non-motorized equipment and hand tools when performing work within 4,500 feet of a noise sensitive land use. • For equipment maintenance or replacement associated with the gen-tie facilities, the number of simultaneously operating trucks or other support equipment shall be limited to the minimum practicable number to accomplish the task, with a maximum of	Less than Significant.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		two trucks to be operating simultaneously once in position. • As part of an operations and maintenance program, prepare a Helicopter Noise Control Plan that addresses the use of helicopters for annual line inspection, and for delivery of repair parts or materials to limited access portions of the gen-tie line. The plan shall demonstrate compliance with the County Noise Ordinance for the impacts caused by helicopter noise on properties with an occupied residence, and with property lines within 3,000 feet of proposed helicopter use locations. Components of the plan may include the following. o Affected property owners shall be notified prior to the use of helicopters for repair/maintenance activity within 3,000 feet of their property boundaries. o Helicopter operations for line inspection and repair materials delivery shall be restricted to an altitude not less than 400 feet above ground level within 1,125 feet of a noise sensitive land use, unless a helicopter quieter than a Bell 407 or Kman Kmax is proposed to be used. o The area for take-off and landing of helicopters associated with line inspection or repair operations shall not be located within 3,000 feet of a property line with an occupied residence.	
N-R-1	Long-Term Operational Equipment Noise (Inverters)	**M-N-R-1:** Enclose Inverters in Noise Attenuating Structures: To ensure noise from inverters would comply with the County Noise Ordinance, the following would be implemented: • Locate non-enclosed inverters a minimum of 800 feet or greater from the nearest property line, or enclose inverters within 800 feet of property lines in cement blocks or other type of structure capable of achieving a minimum 10 dB attenuation. • Direct all switch station doorways and exterior ventilation ducts away from adjacent property lines. • Prior to the approval of building plans, a noise analysis shall be prepared that demonstrates that the inverters comply with the County Noise Ordinance. The O&M building at the Rugged solar farm shall be located no closer than 1,250 feet from the property line.	Less than Significant.
N-LE-1	Long-Term Operational	**M-N-LE-1:** Site-Specific Noise Technical Report: To ensure compliance with all applicable County laws,	Less than Significant.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
	Equipment Noise	regulations, and policies, each solar farm will prepare a site-specific noise technical report that will include project specifications, applicable noise calculations, project design features and mitigation measures applicable to the LanEast and LanWest solar farms. The Noise Technical Report will address both operational and construction related noise sources, as well as noise from the use of generators during an emergency. The technical report will calculate specific anticipated noise and vibration levels from operations and construction-related activities in accordance with County standards and provide specific mitigation when noise levels are expected to exceed County standards.	
N-LW-1	Long-Term Operational Equipment Noise	See **M-N-LE-1** (Site-Specific Noise Technical Report) above.	Less than Significant.
		2.6.3.2 Construction Noise	
N-TDS-3	Short-Term Gen-Tie Construction Noise	**M-N-TDS-3:** Construction Management Plan: Prior to construction, the applicant shall prepare a construction management plan which establishes construction restrictions in order to achieve compliance with the County's 8-hour average 75 dB standard at the property lines, or edge of construction easement, for occupied residences along the gen-tie route. The Plan shall demonstrate compliance with the County Noise ordinance for the impacts caused by gen-tie construction activities within 100 feet of the affected property boundary. Components of the plan may include the following. • Affected property owners shall be notified prior to construction activity within 100 feet of their property boundaries. • In order to comply with the County Noise Ordinance (Section 36.409 – Construction Equipment), the duration of heavy equipment for construction shall comply with the following limitations, for the specified distance between heavy equipment operations and property line of (or edge of construction easement within the) occupied parcel: o Within 50 feet – no more than 4 hours per 8-hour period o Within 75 feet – no more than 6 hours per 8-hour period o Within 100 feet or greater - no use restriction	Less than Significant.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		• All construction equipment operations associated with the gen-tie route shall incorporate all recommended noise reducing measures; such as, but not limited to; limiting construction equipment operations, installation of temporary noise barriers, etc.; and implementation of these recommendations within the Construction Management Plan shall demonstrate compliance with County Code Noise Ordinance, Sections 36.408 and 36.409.	

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
N-TDS-4	Short-Term Construction Blasting Noise and Vibrations	**M-N-TDS-4:** Blasting Plan: If blasting is required during construction of the gen-tie line, the applicant shall obtain a blasting permit from the County and shall prepare a blasting plan prior to start of construction that will reduce impacts associated with construction-related noise and vibrations related to blasting. The blasting plan will be site-specific, based on general and exact locations of required blasting and the results of a project-specific geotechnical investigation. The blasting plan will include a description of the planned blasting methods, an inventory of receptors potentially affected by the planned blasting, and calculations to determine the area affected by the planned blasting. Noise calculations in the blasting plan will account for blasting activities and all supplemental construction equipment. The final blasting plan and pre-blast survey shall meet the requirements provided below. • Blasting associated with gen-tie transmission line construction shall be prohibited within 430 feet of the boundary of any occupied parcels zoned for agricultural use. Alternate non-impulsive methods (i.e., chemical fracturing of the rock) shall be used, as necessary, to facilitate pole installation when bedrock is encountered within this blast prohibition radius. • Blasting associated with gen-tie transmission line construction shall be prohibited within 1,700 feet of existing structures. Alternate non-explosive methods (i.e., chemical fracturing of the rock) shall be used, as necessary, to facilitate pole installation when bedrock is encountered within this blast prohibition radius. • The blasting plan will include a schedule to demonstrate, where feasible, construction blasting to occur infrequently enough that it will not exceed the County's impulsive noise standard because blasting would not occur for more than 25% (15 minutes) during a 1-hour period due to the short time duration of a blast. Where this is not possible, other construction blasting would be coordinated with impacted building occupants to occur in their absence, or at other acceptable times, to avoid nuisance or annoyance complaints. • To ensure that potentially impacted residents are informed, the applicant will provide notice by mail to all property owners within 1,700 feet of the project at least 1 week prior to the start of construction activities.	Less than Significant.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		• Blasting would be completed between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. to be compliant with County Noise Ordinance. • All blasting associated activities (specifically drilling operations) shall incorporate all recommended noise reducing measures such as; but not limited to; limiting drilling operations, installation of temporary noise barriers, etc. that demonstrate compliance with the County Code Noise Ordinance, Sections 36.408, 36.409, and 36.410.	
N-TDS-5	Short-Term Construction Helicopter Noise	**M-N-TDS-5:** Construction Helicopter Noise Control Plan: Prior to construction, the applicant will prepare a Helicopter Noise Control Plan that indicates where helicopters would be used and the frequency and duration for such use during construction. The plan shall demonstrate compliance with the County Noise ordinance for the impacts caused by helicopter noise on properties with an occupied residence, and with property lines within 1,600 feet of proposed helicopter use locations. Components of the plan may include the following. • Affected property owners shall be notified prior to the use of helicopters for construction activity within 1,600 feet of their property boundaries. • In order to comply with the County Noise Ordinance (Section 36.409, Construction Equipment), the duration of helicopter use for construction shall comply with the following limitations, for the specified distance between helicopter operations and property line of occupied parcel: ○ Within 400 feet – no more than 1 hour per 8-hour period ○ Within 600 feet – no more than 5 hours per 8-hour period ○ Within 800 feet or greater – no use restriction	Less than Significant.
N-LE-2	Short-Term Construction Noise	See **M-N-LE-1** (Site-Specific Noise Technical Report) above.	Less than Significant.
N-LE-3	Short-Term Construction Vibrations	See **M-N-LE-1** (Site-Specific Noise Technical Report) above.	Less than Significant.
N-LW-2	Short-Term Construction Noise	See **M-N-LW-1** (Site-Specific Noise Technical Report) above.	Less than Significant.
N-LW-3	Short-Term Construction Vibrations	See **M-N-LW-1** (Site-Specific Noise Technical Report) above.	Less than Significant.

Table S-2
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
2.6.3.3 Vibration			
N-TDS-6	Short-Term Construction Blasting Vibrations (within 1,700 feet)	See **M-N-TDS-4** (blasting plan) above.	Less than Significant.
N-LE-4	Short-Term Pile Driver Vibrations (within 35 feet)	See **M-N-LE-1** (Site-Specific Noise Technical Report) above.	Less than Significant.
N-LW-2	Short-Term Construction Noise	See **M-N-LW-1** (Site-Specific Noise Technical Report) above.	Less than Significant.
N-LW-3	Short-Term Construction Vibrations	See **M-N-LW-1** (Site-Specific Noise Technical Report) above.	Less than Significant.
N-LW-4	Short-Term Pile Driver Vibrations (within 35 feet)	See **M-N-LW-1** (Site-Specific Noise Technical Report) above.	Less than Significant.
2.6.3.4 Corona Noise			
None			
Cumulative-Level Impacts			
None			

S.3 Areas of Controversy

CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(b)(2) requires that a Program EIR identify areas of controversy, including issues raised by other agencies and the public. Areas of known controversy associated with the Proposed Project that are relevant to the Program EIR are as follows:

- Development of solar farm facilities that could affect scenic vistas, visual resources, agricultural lands, cultural resources, special-status species and wildland fires
- Low frequency noise
- Hazards from exposure to electric and magnetic fields (EMFs)
- Adequacy of setbacks
- Amendments to the Boulevard Subregional Plan.

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

The County Board of Supervisors (BOS) serves as the decision-making body for the Proposed Project. Issues to be resolved by the BOS include: (i) whether or how to mitigate the significant effects of the Proposed Project, (ii) whether to reject or approve one of the alternatives to the Proposed Project and other environmental findings, and (iii) whether to reject or approve the Proposed Project.

The BOS will decide if the significant and unmitigated effects associated with aesthetics and air quality can be reduced. Mitigation measures would reduce direct and cumulative impacts associated with the Proposed Project, but not to a level below significant. Other mitigation measures, as described in Chapter 2.0, would reduce impacts to less than significant; however, they were determined to be infeasible. For example, one infeasible mitigation measure for the Tierra del Sol solar farm aesthetic impacts would include the installation of vegetation screens along the northern and western project boundary to screen views of the Tierra del Sol site from offsite viewers and to replicate the existing vegetation pattern in the surrounding landscape. Installation of vegetation screens would conflict with requirements presented in the Fire Protection Plan (see Appendix 2.8-5) and therefore, this mitigation measure is deemed as infeasible. However, it is ultimately the decision of the BOS to determine if mitigation measures, such as these, are feasible or infeasible. In determining how to mitigate significant effects, the BOS may decide that some infeasible mitigation measures, such as the one previously described would still meet project objectives and would otherwise be feasible to reduce significant impacts to a level less than significant. The BOS will adopt detailed findings on the feasibility of mitigation measures to substantially lessen or avoid the significant effects on the environment. The BOS will also decide whether to adopt feasible mitigation measures.

In addition to mitigation measures, the BOS will decide whether or not to adopt the Proposed Project or any of the Proposed Project alternatives that would reduce significant impacts while still meeting the objectives. Regarding those alternatives that would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in this EIR, the BOS must either adopt the alternative or find it to be infeasible. The BOS may also want to consider whether to adopt specific components or a combination of the Proposed Project and Proposed Project alternatives.

Because this Program EIR has identified adverse environmental effects that are unavoidable, the BOS must also determine if the adverse environmental effects are considered acceptable with consideration of economic, social, technological, and other relevant benefits of the Proposed Project. The BOS would prepare a statement of overriding considerations as described in CEQA Section 15093 to reflect the ultimate balancing of competing public objectives if the BOS decides to approve the Proposed Project, Proposed Project alternatives, or components of either, which have the potential to cause one or more significant effects on the environment.

S.5 Project Alternatives

CEQA requires in Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines that an EIR describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Project or to the Proposed Project location that would feasibly attain most of the Proposed Project objectives but would avoid or lessen any significant environmental impacts. An EIR should evaluate the environmental impacts of the alternatives compared to the Proposed Project. Chapter 4.0 of this Program EIR describes and evaluates alternatives and is intended to implement the requirements set forth in the CEQA Guidelines. This chapter also identifies the Environmentally Superior Project Alternative as required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2).

S.5.1 Reduced Proposed Project Alternatives

S.5.1.1 Reduced Proposed Project Alternative (Alternative 1)

The Reduced Proposed Project Alternative would reduce the amount of development within the Proposed Project as a whole, including the Tierra del Sol, Rugged, LanEast, and LanWest sites, by increasing the setbacks from the property lines on highly visible edges of the project sites.

Under this alternative, the Tierra del Sol project would remove up to six rows of trackers from the northwestern edge of the project site and nine rows of trackers from the northern edge of the project site to increase the setback by approximately 500 feet from the public ROW (Tierra del Sol Road) (see Figure 4-1, Tierra del Sol Reduced Project Alternative). There would be no trackers removed along the eastern or southern edge of the project because those portions of the project cannot be viewed from the public road. The total number of trackers developed on site would be reduced by approximately 640 trackers (25%), resulting in approximately 2,020 trackers total developed on site. The project would retain a 50-foot fuel modification zone along the edge of the trackers; however, native vegetation would remain in place within the additional 500-foot area of setback. Vegetative screening would not be implemented under this alternative since the large area of native vegetation would remain to screen views of the fence and tracker bases. Under this alternative, the total disturbed acreage on Tierra del Sol would be reduced by approximately 75 acres. The gen-tie location would remain the same for this alternative.

Under this alternative, development on the Rugged site would be reduced by removing trackers from approximately half of the eastern subarea (Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 611-110-01), eliminating trackers from the western subarea (APNs 611-060-04 and 611-090-02), and removing trackers from the southern edge of the central subarea (APNs 612-030-19 and 612-030-01) (see Figure 4-2, Rugged Reduced Project Alternative). There would be no trackers removed from the northeastern subarea (APN 611-100-07) because these trackers are minimally visible from public ROWs. Under this alternative, approximately 950 trackers

(26% of the total trackers) would be removed from the project site. The total disturbed acreage would be reduced by approximately 130 acres.

The LanEast and LanWest solar farms would similarly be reduced by removing rows of CPV trackers at the northern and southern property lines to increase the setbacks from I-8 and Old Highway 80. Since LanEast and LanWest are analyzed at a programmatic level, the extent of setbacks and reduction in trackers cannot be specifically determined at this time, but would be anticipated to be reduced by approximately 25% of the total number of trackers on each solar farm site. However, the setbacks would need to comply with the County Fire Authority to allow for adequate fuel modification buffer areas. The amount of ground disturbance on the LanEast and LanWest sites would also be reduced by approximately 25%.

The Reduced Proposed Project Alternative (Alternative 1) would generally result in similar or slightly reduced impacts to the environmental resource areas considered within this EIR compared to the Proposed Project. This alternative would reduce impacts related to aesthetics and air quality, although not to less than significant levels, and therefore, significant and unmitigable impacts would still remain. This alternative would also reduce impacts related to biological and cultural resources, and noise. This alternative would meet all project objectives, although not to the degree that the Proposed Project would. For example, Alternative 1 would result in approximately 17,580 fewer homes[1] served as compared to the Proposed Project, and therefore, it would not achieve project objectives 1, 6, and 7 to the degree that the Proposed Project would.

S.5.1.2 No LanEast and LanWest Alternative (Alternative 2)

The No LanEast and LanWest Alternative would include the reduced Tierra del Sol and Rugged solar farms as described above and would remove the LanEast and LanWest solar farms from the Proposed Project. The Tierra del Sol gen-tie would be the same as the Proposed Project under this alternative.

This alternative would reduce impacts related to aesthetics, especially those associated with LanEast and LanWest being highly visible from I-8 and Old Highway 80, and air quality. However, aesthetic and air quality impacts from the Tierra del Sol and Rugged sites are not anticipated to be reduced to a level below significance, and therefore, significant and unmitigable

[1] The number of homes not served by the Reduced Proposed Project Alternative compared to the Proposed Project was calculated based on the following equation:

L*Y/X = HNS (homes not served) where L = number of trackers less than the Proposed Project; Y = annual kilowatt hour (kWh) production per tracker (assumed approximately 64,260 kWh per 1,000 Volt tracker); and X = average annual kWh of energy used per home in California (estimated at 6,876 kWh (U.S. Energy Information Administration 2013, Table 5A).

impacts would still remain. Significant and unmitigable impacts to land use from the LanEast and LanWest sites would be avoided and overall impacts related to land use would be reduced to less than significant under this alternative. This alternative would generally meet all project objectives, although not to the degree that the Proposed Project would. For example, using the calculation formula described in Section S.5.1.1, Alternative 2 would result in approximately 25,736 fewer homes served as compared to the Proposed Project, and therefore, it would not achieve project objectives 1, 6, and 7 to the degree that the Proposed Project would.

S.5.1.3 Reduced Proposed Project and Underground Tierra del Sol Gen-tie Alternative (Alternative 3)

The Reduced Proposed Project and Underground Tierra del Sol Gen-tie Alternative would include the reduced Tierra del Sol, Rugged, LanEast, and LanWest solar farms described under Alternative 1, reducing the amount of ground disturbance on each of the sites and increasing setbacks from public ROWs. This alternative would also include an entirely underground gen-tie line for all 6 miles of the gen-tie route, as compared to the Proposed Project which includes 3.5 miles of overhead gen-tie. The gen-tie would be constructed within a 50- to 100-foot-wide easement along the same alignment as the Proposed Project.

The reduction in the number of trackers constructed at each of the four solar farm sites would reduce aesthetic and air quality impacts, but not to a level less than significant. Impacts to biological and cultural resources and from noise would also be reduced due to the reduction in the number of trackers constructed at each of the four sites and increased setbacks. Impacts to land use would remain significant and unmitigable. However, undergounding the Tierra del Sol gen-tie may possibly increase impacts related to air quality, biological resources, and cultural resources, from the additional excavation and trenching activities needed. Therefore, this Alternative is anticipated to result in overall similar impacts than the Proposed Project. This alternative would generally meet all project objectives, although not to the degree that the Proposed Project would. For example, Alternative 3 would result in approximately 17,580 fewer homes served as compared to the Proposed Project, and therefore, it would not achieve project objectives 1, 6, and 7 to the degree that the Proposed Project would.

S.5.1.4 Reduced Tierra del Sol and Rugged Solar Farms, No LanEast and LanWest, and Underground Tierra del Sol Gen-Tie Alternative (Alternative 4)

Alternative 4 would include the reduced Tierra del Sol and Rugged solar farms as described above under Alternative 1, would remove the LanEast and LanWest solar farms, as described under Alternative 2, from the Proposed Project, and would construct the Tierra del Sol gen-

tie entirely underground for all six miles of the gen-tie route, as described above under Alternative 3.

The Reduced Tierra del Sol and Rugged Solar Farms, No LanEast and LanWest, and Underground Tierra del Sol Gen-Tie alternative (Alternative 4) would reduce impacts related to aesthetics, especially impacts associated with LanEast and LanWest being highly visible from I-8 and Old Highway 80 and aesthetic impacts associated with the overhead gen-tie. However, aesthetic impacts would not be reduced to a level below significance since the Tierra del Sol and Rugged solar farms would still result in significant unmitigable impacts related to visual character and quality. Short-term construction related air quality impacts would also remain significant and unmitigable under this alternative due to the construction overlap of Tierra del Sol and Rugged. Land use impacts would be reduced to less than significant. Potential impacts related to biological resources and noise are also anticipated to be substantially reduced by this alternative. This alternative would generally meet all project objectives, although not to the degree that the Proposed Project would. For example, Alternative 4 would result in approximately 25,736 fewer homes served as compared to the Proposed Project, and therefore, it would not achieve project objectives 1, 6, and 7 to the degree that the Proposed Project would.

S.5.2 Alternative Locations

S.5.2.1 Relocate Tierra del Sol to Los Robles Alternative (Alternative 5)

The Relocate Tierra del Sol to Los Robles Alternative would eliminate the development of a solar farm on the Tierra del Sol site and would instead involve the development of a solar farm on the Los Robles site. This alternative would eliminate development of the Tierra del Sol gen-tie. The Los Robles site is located approximately 1 mile south of I-8 and approximately 0.5 miles southwest of the community of Boulevard; it is northeast of the Tierra del Sol site, and southwest of the LanEast and LanWest sites (see Figure 4-3, Los Robles Alternative Project Site). The Los Robles site consists of two subareas: a larger western portion (approximately 945 acres) located on the east side of Tierra del Sol Road, and an eastern portion (approximately 517 acres) located on the east side of Jewel Valley Road. Together these two subareas comprise approximately 1,460 acres. The two subareas are separated by a distance of approximately 0.25 mile.

The Los Robles site generally consists of flat to gently rolling terrain primarily covered by chaparral and non-native grassland. The site is designated Rural Lands and zoned S92, General Rural. The site has several wells located on the property which are currently producing and would likely have an on-site supply of local groundwater. Any use of this groundwater would require a groundwater investigation in compliance with County regulations to determine groundwater conditions and availability of this resource for the project.

There would be two primary access points to the Los Robles site: Tierra del Sol Road and Jewel Valley Road, both of which parallel the northwestern project boundary. The Los Robles site would be developed with the same number of trackers (2,657) as proposed on the Tierra del Sol site, and therefore, a similar amount of ground disturbance is anticipated as for the Tierra del Sol site (420 acres). The same CPV solar generation technology would be used on the Los Robles site as the Tierra del Sol site and construction and operation of the trackers and associated facilities, including an on-site operations and maintenance (O&M) annex and collector substation, would be the same. The Los Robles site would include an underground gen-tie within 50- to 100-foot easements connecting the on-site private substation to SDG&E's Rebuilt Boulevard Substation, which is located approximately 0.5 mile northeast of the project boundary.

The overall size of this alternative site could allow for this portion of the project to be designed in a way that potentially avoids project edges adjacent to public ROWs, steep slopes, and environmentally sensitive areas such as Resource Protection Ordinance wetlands or oak root zones.

All other components of the Proposed Project would remain the same, including the Rugged, LanEast, and LanWest solar farms. Potential impacts related to the Rugged, LanEast, and LanWest solar farms would therefore be the same as the Proposed Project. The following comparison is focused on the impacts associated with the relocation of the Tierra del Sol solar farm to the Los Robles site, as well as the elimination of the Tierra del Sol gen-tie, compared to the Proposed Project.

Alternative 5 would generally result in similar impacts to the environmental resource areas considered within this EIR compared to the Proposed Project. While significant and unmitigable aesthetic impacts associated with the Tierra del Sol gen-tie would be avoided, other significant and unmitigable impacts related to aesthetics would remain. Inclusion of the LanEast and LanWest solar farms in this alternative would also result in significant and unmitigable impacts related to land use, similar to the Proposed Project. However, under this alternative, short-term construction emissions would be reduced to less than significant since the construction schedules of the Los Robles solar farm would not overlap with the construction schedule of the Rugged solar farm. This alternative may also result in reduced biological and cultural impacts due to construction of a shorter gen-tie line and reduced noise impacts at adjacent property boundaries due to the larger area of the site that would allow for increased setbacks. This alternative would meet all project objectives to the same extent as the Proposed Project, and would achieve project objective 3 to a greater extent by locating the Tierra del Sol solar farm even closer to the Rebuilt Boulevard Substation. The applicant has site control of the Los Robles site and implementation of a solar farm at this site would not require any components that would be infeasible to construct.

S.5.2.2 Relocate LanEast and LanWest to Los Robles Alternative (Alternative 6)

The Relocate LanEast and LanWest to Los Robles Alternative would eliminate the development of solar farms on the LanEast and LanWest sites and would instead involve the development of a 1,164-tracker solar farm on the Los Robles site; the Los Robles site is described in more detail above in Section 4.4.1.1.

Since the Los Robles site would be developed with the same number of trackers (1,164) as proposed on the LanEast and LanWest sites, ground disturbance on the Los Robles site would total approximately 288 acres, the same as the ground disturbance associated with the LanEast and LanWest solar farms. The same CPV solar generation technology would be used on the Los Robles site, and construction and operation of the trackers and associated facilities, including an on-site O&M annex and collector substation, would be the same. The Los Robles solar farm would tie in to the Tierra del Sol gen-tie at the on-site substation and would be contained within the same underground 60-foot easement that would connect the on-site private substation to SDG&E's Rebuilt Boulevard Substation, which is located approximately 0.5 mile northeast of the project boundary. All other components of the Proposed Project would remain the same, including the Tierra del Sol and Rugged solar farms. Potential impacts related to the Rugged and Tierra del Sol solar farms would therefore be the same as the Proposed Project. The following comparison is focused on the impacts associated with the relocation of the LanEast and LanWest solar farms to the Los Robles site compared to the Proposed Project.

Alternative 6 would generally result in similar overall impacts to the environmental resource areas considered within this Program EIR compared to the Proposed Project. Relocation of the LanEast and LanWest solar farms to a location that is less visually prominent from I-8 and Old Highway 80 might reduce significant and unmitigable impacts associated with the Proposed Project to less than significant under this alternative. However, significant and unmitigable impacts related to visual character and quality and glare, as well as aesthetic impacts associated with the gen-tie, would remain. Elimination of the LanEast and LanWest solar farms under this alternative would also reduce significant and unmitigable impacts related to land use to less than significant. However, under this alternative, short-term construction emissions would remain significant and unmitigable since the construction schedules for Tierra del Sol and Rugged solar farms would continue to overlap. This alternative would result in similar biological and cultural impacts as the Proposed Project and slightly reduced noise impacts at adjacent property boundaries due to the larger area of the site that would allow for increased setbacks. This alternative would meet all project objectives. The applicant has site control of the Los Robles site, and implementation of a solar farm at this site would not require any components that would be infeasible to construct.

S.5.2.3 Relocate Tierra del Sol, LanEast and LanWest to Los Robles Alternative (Alternative 7)

This alternative would replace the development of solar farms on the Tierra del Sol, LanEast, and LanWest sites, as well as the Tierra del Sol gen-tie, by instead developing a solar farm on the Los Robles site; the Los Robles site is described in more detail above in Section 4.4.1.1.

The Los Robles site would be developed with the same number of trackers (3,821) as proposed on the three sites, and therefore, the total number of trackers developed under this alternative would be the same as for the Proposed Project. Ground disturbance on the Los Robles site would total approximately 708 acres, the same as the ground disturbance associated with the Tierra del Sol, LanEast, and LanWest solar farms. The same CPV solar generation technology would be used and construction and operation of the trackers and associated facilities, including an on-site O&M annex and collector substation would be the same. The Los Robles site would include an approximately 0.5 to 2 mile underground gen-tie within a 60-foot easement connecting the on-site private substation to SDG&E's Rebuilt Boulevard Substation, which is located approximately 0.5 mile northeast of the project boundary.

The Rugged solar farm would remain the same as the Proposed Project. Potential impacts related to the Rugged solar farm would therefore be the same as the Proposed Project. The following comparison is focused on the impacts associated with the relocation of the Tierra del Sol, LanEast, and LanWest solar farms to the Los Robles site, as well as the elimination of the Tierra del Sol gen-tie, compared to the Proposed Project.

Alternative 7 would generally result in similar overall impacts to the environmental resource areas considered within this EIR compared to the Proposed Project. Under this alternative, short-term air quality impacts associated with construction emissions would be reduced to less than significant since the construction schedules of the Los Robles solar farm would not overlap with the construction schedule of the Rugged solar farm. Elimination of the LanEast and LanWest solar farms under this alternative would also reduce significant and unmitigable impacts related to land use to less than significant.

This alternative may result in reduced biological and cultural impacts due to construction of a shorter gen-tie line and greater flexibility in project design and reduced noise impacts at adjacent property boundaries due to the larger area of the site that would allow for increased setbacks. Reduced noise impacts would also be realized from the elimination of helicopter noise that would result from construction and maintenance activities of the overhead portion of the Tierra del Sol gen-tie. Overall, potential impacts associated with aesthetics under this alternative are expected to remain significant and unmitigable. This alternative would meet all project objectives to the same extent as the Proposed Project, and would achieve project objective 3 to a

greater extent by locating the Tierra del Sol solar farm even closer to the Rebuilt Boulevard Substation. The applicant has site control of the Los Robles site and implementation of a solar farm at this site would not require any components that would be infeasible to construct.

S.5.2.4 Relocate Tierra del Sol, LanEast and LanWest to Los Robles and Maximize Los Robles Alternative (Alternative 8)

The Relocate Tierra del Sol, LanEast, and LanWest to Los Robles and Maximize Los Robles Alternative (Maximize Los Robles Alternative) would eliminate the development of solar farms on the Tierra del Sol, LanEast, and LanWest sites, as well as the Tierra del Sol gen-tie, and would instead involve the development of a solar farm on the Los Robles site; the Los Robles site is described in more detail above in Section 4.4.1.1.

In addition to the relocation of all 3,821 trackers proposed on the Tierra del Sol, LanEast, and LanWest sites to the Los Robles site, this alternative would also include the development of 1,006 additional trackers on the Los Robles site for a total of 4,827 trackers on this site, which would generate approximately 112 MW of renewable solar energy. The total number of trackers for the entire project, including Rugged, would be increased to 8,415, which would generate a total of approximately 192 MW of renewable solar energy.

Ground disturbance on the Los Robles site would be greater than the total ground disturbance associated with the Tierra del Sol, LanEast and LanWest solar farms due to the development of the additional trackers to maximize solar power generation on the site. The Los Robles site is approximately 1,460 acres in total; however, under this alternative site disturbance would not exceed 1,000 acres. Sufficient acreage would remain to design the site to avoid visually prominent areas, steep slopes, and environmentally sensitive areas such as Resource Protection Ordinance wetlands or oak root zones.

The same CPV solar generation technology would be used on the Los Robles site as the Tierra del Sol, LanEast, and LanWest sites, and construction and operation of the trackers and associated facilities, including an on-site O&M annex and collector substation, would be the same. The Los Robles site would include an approximately 0.5-mile to 2-mile underground gen-tie within a 50- to 100-foot easement connecting the on-site private substation to SDG&E's Rebuilt Boulevard Substation, which is located approximately 0.5 mile northeast of the project boundary.

The Rugged solar farm would remain the same as the Proposed Project. Potential impacts related to the Rugged solar farm would therefore be the same as the Proposed Project. The following comparison is focused on the impacts associated with the relocation of the Tierra del Sol, LanEast, and LanWest solar farms to the Los Robles site, as well as the elimination

of the Tierra del Sol gen-tie and the increased number of trackers on the Los Robles site, compared to the Proposed Project.

The Maximize Los Robles Alternative would generally result in similar impacts to the environmental resource areas considered within this EIR compared to the Proposed Project. Although Alternative 8 would result in a slightly increased construction effort and increased ground disturbance from the installation of more trackers, thereby increasing overall emissions (related to both air quality and GHGs), biological and cultural resource impacts, traffic and water demand, this alternative would also reduce impacts associated with Proposed Project. Aesthetic impacts, and in particular impacts related to scenic vistas, as well as impacts related to land use conflicts, would be reduced by relocating the LanEast and LanWest solar farms to a location that is less visually prominent from I-8 and Old Highway 80. Short-term construction emissions would also be reduced to less than significant since the construction schedules of the Los Robles solar farm would not overlap with the construction schedule of the Rugged solar farm. And finally, impacts associated with construction and operation of the gen-tie would be greatly reduced since the Los Robles solar farm would be located closer to the Boulevard substation (reducing the gen-tie length by approximately two-thirds or more). This alternative would meet all project objectives to the same extent as the Proposed Project with the exception of project objectives 3 and 7. This alternative would achieve project objective 3 to a greater extent by locating the Tierra del Sol solar farm even closer to the Rebuilt Boulevard Substation, and would exceed project objective 7 by developing more than 168.5 MW of renewable solar energy systems. The applicant has site control of the Los Robles site, and implementation of a solar farm at this site would not require any components that would be infeasible to construct.

S.5.3 No Project Alternative

S.5.3.1 No Project Alternative (Alternative 9)

CEQA requires an evaluation of the No Project Alternative so that decision makers can compare the impacts of approving the Proposed Project with the impacts of not approving the Proposed Project. According to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6(e) (14 CCR 15000 et seq.), the No Project Alternative must include the assumption that conditions at the time of the Notice of Preparation (NOP) (i.e., baseline environmental conditions) would not be changed since the Proposed Project would not be installed. The No Project Alternative must also describe the events or actions that would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the Proposed Project were not approved.

The No Project Alternative assumes that the Proposed Project, including the Tierra del Sol, Rugged, LanEast, and LanWest solar farms, and Tierra del Sol gen-tie components would not be developed and the existing conditions at these sites would remain. Because no solar farm

development would occur on the Proposed Project sites, this alternative would not meet any of the Proposed Project objectives.

The No Project Alternative would result in reduced impacts to the environmental resource areas considered within this EIR compared to the Proposed Project. However, this alternative would not meet any of the project objectives.

S.5.4 Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(b), indicate that a list of reasonable alternatives must be developed and considered by the lead agency. Elimination of potential environmental impacts of the proposed project should be considered when developing potential alternatives. As evaluated in Chapter 2 of this EIR, the significant impacts of the proposed project are: Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Land Use, and Noise.

As shown in Table S-3, the No Project Alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed project, based on the minimization or avoidance of most of the proposed project's significant environmental impacts. However, the No Project Alternative does not meet most of the basic project objectives. Additionally, CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6(c)) require that, if the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

The Reduced Project Alternatives, including Alternatives 1 through 4, would generally reduce impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, and noise by allowing for greater setbacks and reducing ground disturbance. Alternatives 2 and 4 would reduce significant and unmitigable impacts related to aesthetics (scenic vistas) and land use to less than significant. However, none of the Alternatives 1 through 4 would reduce impacts related to aesthetics or air quality to less than significant, and Alternatives 1 and 3 would also not reduce impacts related to land use to less than significant. Impacts related to biological resources, cultural resources, and noise would be reduced to less than significant with incorporation of mitigation, similar to the Proposed Project. In addition, Alternatives 3 and 4 would result in additional impacts related to air quality, biological resources, and cultural resources from undergrounding the gen-tie. Therefore, none of the Reduced Project Alternatives would entirely eliminate significant and unmitigable impacts.

Alternatives 5, 7, and 8 would reduce significant and unmitigable aesthetics impacts related to the overhead gen-tie to less than significant as well as reduce significant and unmitigable air quality impacts related to the overlap of the Tierra del Sol and Rugged solar farms construction schedules to less than significant. These alternatives would also reduce biological and cultural resource impacts and noise impacts related to construction of the

Tierra del Sol gen-tie. Alternatives 6 through 8 would reduce aesthetic and land use impacts by moving the LanEast and LanWest solar farms to a location further from I-8 and Old Highway 80, thereby reducing scenic vista and glare impacts. Therefore, Alternatives 7 and 8 are the only alternatives that reduce aesthetic (scenic vista impacts only), air quality, and land use impacts to less than significant. Aesthetic impacts related to visual character and quality and glare would remain significant and unmitigable, the same as for all other alternatives and the Proposed Project. Alternative 8 would result in increased impacts to biological and cultural resources associated with greater levels of ground disturbance; therefore, Alternative 7 is the only alternative that would reduce significant and unmitigable impacts to aesthetics (scenic vistas), air quality, and land use without also increasing impacts to other resource areas.

Therefore, the Relocate Tierra del Sol, LanEast and LanWest Alternative (Alternative 7) is the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative may result in reduced biological and cultural impacts due to construction of a shorter gen-tie line and greater flexibility in project design and reduced noise impacts at adjacent property boundaries due to the larger area of the site that would allow for increased setbacks. Reduced noise impacts would also be realized from the elimination of helicopter noise that would result from construction and maintenance activities of the overhead portion of the Tierra del Sol gen-tie. Overall, potential impacts associated with aesthetics under this alternative are expected to remain significant and unmitigable; however, impacts associated with air quality and land use are anticipated to be reduced to less than significant. This alternative would meet all project objectives to the same extent as the Proposed Project, and would achieve project objective 3 to a greater extent by locating the Tierra del Sol solar farm even closer to the Rebuilt Boulevard Substation. The applicant has site control of the Los Robles site and implementation of a solar farm at this site would not require any components that would be infeasible to construct.

Table S-3
Summary of Analysis for Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Issue Areas	*Proposed Project*	Alternatives to the Proposed Project								
		Reduced Proposed Project	*No LanEast and LanWest*	*Reduced TDS and Underground Gen-Tie*	*No LanEast and LanWest and Underground Gen-Tie*	*Relocate TDS to Los Robles*	*Relocate LanEast and LanWest to Los Robles*	*Relocate TDS, LanEast and LanWest to Los Robles*	*Maximize Los Robles*	*No Project*
2.1 Aesthetics	SU	▼	▼	▼	▼	—	▼	▼	▼	▼

Table S-3
Summary of Analysis for Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Issue Areas	*Proposed Project*	Alternatives to the Proposed Project								
		Reduced Proposed Project	*No LanEast and LanWest*	*Reduced TDS and Underground Gen-Tie*	*No LanEast and LanWest and Underground Gen-Tie*	*Relocate TDS to Los Robles*	*Relocate LanEast and LanWest to Los Robles*	*Relocate TDS, LanEast and LanWest to Los Robles*	*Maximize Los Robles*	*No Project*
2.2 Air Quality	SU	▼	▼	—	—	▼	—	▼	▲	▼
2.3 Biological Resources	LTS	▼	▼	▲	—	—	—	▼	▲	▼
2.4 Cultural Resources	LTS	▼	▼	—	—	▼	—	▼	▲	▼
2.5 Land Use	NS	—	▼	—	▼	—	▼	▼	▼	▼
2.6 Noise	LTS	▼	▼	—	—	▼	▼	▼	▲	▼
3.1.1 Agriculture and Forestry Resources	NS	—	—	—	—	▼	—	▼	▼	—
3.1.2 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity	NS	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
3.1.3 Greenhouse Gas Emissions	LTS	▼	▼	—	—	▼	—	▼	▲	▲
3.1.4 Hazards and Hazardous Materials	NS	—	▼	—	▼	—	—	▼	—	▼
3.1.5 Hydrology and Water Quality	NS	▼	▼	▼	▼	▼	—	▼	—	▼
3.1.6 Paleontological Resources	LTS	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
3.1.7 Public Services	NS	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	▼
3.1.8 Transportation and Traffic	NS	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
3.1.9 Utilities	NS	▼	▼	▼	▼	▼	—	▼	—	▼
3.2.1 Parks and Recreation	LTS	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
3.2.2 Mineral Resources	LTS	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
3.2.3 Population and Housing	LTS	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	▼

▲ 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