

**Reader's Guide to the Final EIR
For the Palomar Community College North Education Center
Public Review and Comment Period**

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was circulated for public review from August 29th to October 12th, 2007 (a 45-day review period). A total of ten comment letters were received by the Palomar Community College District within the review period; three additional letters were received outside of the review period. The Responses to Comments document is included with the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR). The EIR is available for review at the Palomar Community College San Marcos Campus, located at 1140 West Mission Road, San Marcos, California 92069.

REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR

Based on comments received during the public review period, minor revisions were made to the text of the Draft EIR. Revisions were made to the Executive Summary, Chapters 1.0 and 5.0, and Sections 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1.4, 4.1.6 and 4.1.7 of the Draft EIR. These changes include revisions and updates to mitigation measures, based on comments received from the Wildlife Agencies, other State and local agencies and organizations, and comments from the public. No new project impacts were identified with regard to the comments received.

Language was added to the Executive Summary and Project Description for clarification purposes and to address signage, initial facilities planned, signage for the Native Area, undergrounding of utility lines, and offsite improvements. Additional discussion was added to Section 2.1 to clarify building height limits and to delete reference to construction of a sound wall for noise impacts.

Language was also revised in Section 2.2 for clarification purposes and to address the results of an Intersecting Lane Vehicle (ILV) analysis, prepared as a result of comments received from Caltrans. The Existing plus Project and Horizon Year 2030 analysis was revised to address comments from Caltrans regarding traffic volumes. Mitigation measures were also revised as appropriate to require signal warrant analysis. Per the direction of Caltrans and the County, the traffic analysis was revised to utilize a different approach for calculating the trip generation rate. A trip generation study was conducted for the project using data collected at the Escondido Education Center, also operated by the Palomar Community College District. Based on this data, a trip generation rate of 0.55 trips per student was used, rather than SANDAG's standard rate of 1.2 trips per student. In addition, the traffic analysis was revised to reflect construction of the facilities in two phases. Phase I ranges from project opening to 40 percent of project buildout; Phase II is the project at full buildout. The results of the increase in traffic, due to the new trip generation rate, were analyzed in the revised traffic report.

Mitigation measures for impacts to biological resources (Section 3.1) were revised based on comments received from the Wildlife Agencies. Mitigation measures were revised to include the requirement for preparation of a Management and Monitoring Plan (MMRP) and a wetland creation/restoration/enhancement plan, as appropriate, and mitigation was revised to specify that all mitigation habitat purchased must be placed within a dedicated biological open space easement. Mitigation for impacts to coyote brush scrub was revised to require that mitigation be provided at a ratio of 2:1, rather than 1.5. In addition, the Thresholds of Significance were revised for consistency with the Biological Technical Report, and minor

language was added to the discussion of indirect impacts relative to landscaping materials, signage for the Native Area, and temporary fencing during construction. In addition, acreage calculations for impacts to wetland habitat were revised to reflect minor design changes to the alignment of Horse Ranch Creek Road, based on discussions with the owners of the adjacent proposed Campus Park project. No new impacts to sensitive habitat were identified with this design change.

Mitigation measures for cultural impacts (Section 3.2) were amended per comments received from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to specify that a Native American Monitor be present during monitoring activities, and to address the discovery of unknown human remains. Mitigation Measure CR-1 was also revised to delete the requirement to cap Loci A associated with CA-SDI-682. Impacts to Loci A would occur as a result of grading required for the Meadowood project, not from improvements required at Horse Ranch Creek Road/SR 76 with the proposed project.

Section 3.3 was revised to address internal trip capture. A reference was added to Tables 3.3-13 and 3.3-14 to identify the data source. Discussion was also added to Sections 4.1.4 and 4.1.7 to address issues pertaining to the potential for wildfire and the provision of fire protection services.

Table 5-1 was added to Chapter 5.0 to provide a summary of how the proposed alternatives reduce or increase potential impacts as compared to the proposed project. A statement was added to indicate that the No Project/No Build Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

Other minor changes were made in various chapters throughout the document to clarify wording or to correct typographical errors. Of the technical studies prepared for the Draft EIR, minor changes were made to the traffic, biological, and cultural analyses, based on revisions made to the Draft EIR in response to public comments.

All technical reports and related documents are available for review at the Palomar Community College District, located at 1140 West Mission Road, San Marcos, California 92069.

INTRODUCTION TO THE FINAL EIR

This document is a Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR), which identifies and analyzes the potential environmental impacts that could result from implementation of the proposed Palomar Community College North Education Center project. In accordance with the *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines* Section 15002, an EIR is the public document used by the approving agency to analyze significant environmental effects of a proposed project, to identify the project alternatives, and to disclose possible ways to reduce or avoid the possible environmental damage. The EIR itself does not control the way in which a project can be developed or constructed; rather, the agency must respond to the information contained in the EIR by one or more of the seven methods outlined in Section 15002(h) of the *CEQA Guidelines*, which include:

1. Changing the proposed project;
2. Imposing conditions on the approval of the project;
3. Adopting plans or ordinances to control a broader class of projects to avoid the adverse changes;

4. Choosing an alternative way to meet the same need;
5. Disapproving the project;
6. Finding that changes in, or alterations to, the project are not feasible;
7. Finding that the unavoidable significant environmental damage is acceptable, as provided in Section 15093 of the *CEQA Guidelines*.

Responses to Comments

The Responses to Comments include all comments received on environmental issues raised during the public review process for the Draft EIR and the District's responses to each comment. The Responses to Comments are located in the beginning of the Final EIR. Each comment received is assigned a comment number, and its corresponding response is assigned the same number. On each page, each response is located in the column adjacent to the comment to which it responds.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.