

Attachment D – Environmental Findings and Documentation

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

TO: Recorder/County Clerk
Attn: James Scott
1600 Pacific Highway, M.S. A33
San Diego, CA 92101

FROM: County of San Diego
Planning & Development Services, M.S. O650
Attn: Project Planning Section Secretary
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 110
San Diego, CA 92123

Office of Planning and Research
P.O. Box 3044
Sacramento, CA 95812

SUBJECT: FILING OF NOTICE OF DETERMINATION IN COMPLIANCE WITH PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 21108 OR 21152

Project Name and Number(s): 2015 General Plan Clean-Up General Plan Amendment & Rezone; GPA 14-001; REZ 14-001

State Clearinghouse No.: 2002111067

Project Location: The project includes General Plan text changes that apply to the entire unincorporated County of San Diego and Land Use Map, zoning, Mobility Element Network, and community/subregional plan changes that apply to specific areas.

Project Applicant: County of San Diego, 5510 Overland Ave., Suite 310, San Diego, CA 92123, (858) 694-3084

Project Description: This General Plan Clean-Up includes changes to the Land Use Map (and some associated zoning and Regional Category Map changes, when necessary for consistency), General Plan text, Implementation Plan, Mobility Element Network, and community/subregional plans.

Agency Approving Project: County of San Diego

County Contact Person: Kevin Johnston Phone: (858) 694-3084

Date Form Completed: November 18, 2015

This is to advise that the County of San Diego Board of Supervisors has approved the above described project on November 18, 2015, Item #, and has made the following determinations:

1. The project will will not have a significant effect on the environment.
2. An Environmental Impact Report was prepared and certified for this project pursuant to the provisions of the CEQA.
 A Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration was adopted for this project pursuant to the provisions of the CEQA.
 An Addendum to a previously certified Environmental Impact Report was prepared and considered for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
3. (New) mitigation measures were were not made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. A Mitigation reporting or monitoring plan was was not adopted for this project.

The following determinations are only required for projects with Environmental Impact Reports (in reference to the EIR that the project relies on for 15162 Findings):

5. A Statement of Overriding Considerations was was not adopted for this project.
6. Findings were were not made pursuant to the provisions of State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091.

Project status under Fish and Wildlife Code Section 711.4 (Department of Fish and Wildlife Fees):

- Certificate of Fee Exemption (attached)
 Proof of Payment of Fees (attached)

Fish and Wildlife Code Section 711.4 compliance for the subject project is covered by a previous payment of fees associated with the environmental review conducted for County of San Diego General Plan Update Program EIR (SCH 2002111067)

The Environmental Impact Report with any comments and responses and record of project approval may be examined at the County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services, Project Processing Counter, 5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 110, San Diego, California.

Date received for filing and posting at OPR: _____

Signature: _____ Telephone: (858) 694-3084

Name (Print): Kevin Johnston Title: Land Use/Environmental Planner

This notice must be filed with the Recorder/County Clerk within five working days after project approval by the decision-making body. The Recorder/County Clerk must post this notice within 24 hours of receipt and for a period of not less than 30 days. At the termination of the posting period, the Recorder/County Clerk must return this notice to the Department address listed above along with evidence of the posting period. The originating Department must then retain the returned notice for a period of not less than twelve months. Reference: CEQA Guidelines Section 15075 or 15094.

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
 DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND LAND USE
 5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B
 San Diego, CA 92123
 858-694-2960

MISCELLANEOUS RECEIPT

FEE CODE	DESCRIPTION	FEES	PAYMENTS
			\$47.00

TOTAL FEES:
 TOTAL PMTS:
 BALANCE:
 RECEIVED:
 CHANGE:

State of California—The Resources Agency
 DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
2010 ENVIRONMENTAL FILING FEE CASH RECEIPT

RECEIPT# **399113**
 STATE CLEARING HOUSE # (if applicable)
200

NT CLEARLY

CITY San Diego

STATE CA

CHECK APPLICABLE FEES: DFG 399054 Paid on 9/3/10
 Environmental Impact Report (EIR)
 Mitigated/Negative Declaration (ND)(MND)
 Application Fee Water Diversion (State Water Resources Control Board Only)

Private
279.25
47.00
 \$2,792.25 \$
 \$2,010.25 \$
 \$850.00 \$

 \$949.50 \$
 \$50.00 \$

Notice of Exemption
 DFG No Effect Determination (Form Attached)
 Other

PAYMENT METHOD:
 Cash Credit Check Other
 SIGNATURE

TOTAL RECEIVED \$
 TITLE

X

WHITE - PROJECT APPLICANT YELLOW - DFG/ASB PINK - LEAD AGENCY GOLDEN ROD - COUNTY CLERK FG 753.5a (Rev. 11/09)

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
 DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND LAND USE
 5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B
 San Diego, CA 92123
 858-694-2960

MISCELLANEOUS RECEIPT

Page: 1

RECEIPT #: 10-0652526
 RECEIPT DATE: 03-SEP-2010
 CASHIER: CTRIEUPL
 FROM: COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
 COMMENTS: SD COUNTY GENERAL PLAN UPDATE 02-ZA-001

FEE CODE	DESCRIPTION	FEE	PAYMENTS
9FSHGAMEXO	FISH & GAME	\$2,792.25	
CASHTRANSF	CASH TRANSFER #157476		\$2,792.25

TOTAL FEES: \$2,792.25
 TOTAL PMTS: \$2,792.25
 BALANCE: \$0.00
 RECEIVED: \$2,792.25
 CHANGE: \$0.00

State of California—The Resources Agency
 DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
 2010 ENVIRONMENTAL FILING FEE CASH RECEIPT

RECEIPT# 399054
 # (If Applicable)
 2002

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental Impact Report (EIR)	\$2,792.25	\$ <u>2,792.25</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Mitigated/Negative Declaration (ND)(MND)	\$2,010.25	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Application Fee Water Diversion (State Water Resources Control Board Only)	\$850.00	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Projects Subject to Certified Regulatory Programs (CRP)	\$949.50	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> County Administrative Fee	\$50.00	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Project that is exempt from fees		
<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Exemption		
<input type="checkbox"/> DFG No Effect Determination (Form Attached)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Other		\$

PAYMENT METHOD:
 Cash Credit Check Other

TOTAL RECEIVED \$

SIGNATURE

WHITE-PROJECT APPLICANT

YELLOW-DFG/ASS

PINK-LEAD AGENCY

GOLDEN ROD - COUNTY CLERK

FG7531a (Rev. 11/09)

Environmental Findings
2015 General Plan Clean-Up General Plan Amendment and Rezone
GPA 14-001; REZ 14-001; ER Log No. 14-00-001
November 18, 2015

Find that the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) dated August 3, 2011, on file with Planning and Development Services (PDS) as Environmental Review Number 02-ZA-00 was completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State and County CEQA Guidelines and that the Board of Supervisors has reviewed and considered the information contained therein, and the Addendum thereto dated September 18, 2015 on file with PDS as Environmental Review Number 14-00-001 before approving the project; and

Find that there are no changes in the project or in the circumstances under which the project is undertaken that involve significant new environmental impacts which were not considered in the previously certified EIR dated August 3, 2011, that there is no substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects, and that no new information of substantial importance has become available since the EIR was certified as explained in the Environmental Review Checklist Form dated September 18, 2015 (Attachment D of the Staff Report).



County of San Diego

MARK WARDLAW
DIRECTOR
PHONE (858) 694-2962
FAX (858) 694-2555

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 310, SAN DIEGO, CA 92123
www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds

DARREN GRETLER
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR
PHONE (858) 694-2962
FAX (858) 694-2555

AN ADDENDUM TO THE PREVIOUSLY CERTIFIED PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO GENERAL PLAN UPDATE (SCH 2002111067)

FOR PURPOSES OF CONSIDERATION OF A GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND REZONE FOR THE 2015 GENERAL PLAN CLEAN-UP GPA 14-001; REZ 14-001; ER LOG NO. 14-00-001

September 18, 2015

CEQA Guidelines, Section 15164(a) states that an Addendum to a previously certified EIR may be prepared if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 or 15163 calling for the preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR have occurred.

Introduction

There are some changes and additions, which need to be included in an Addendum to the previously certified Program EIR for the County of San Diego General Plan Update to accurately cover the new project in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15164(a). These modifications would not involve substantial changes in the magnitude of impacts identified in the Program EIR and would not create new potentially significant impacts that would require new mitigation.

Background

On August 3, 2011, the County of San Diego Board of Supervisors adopted a comprehensive update to the County of San Diego General Plan. The General Plan provides a framework for land use and development decisions in the unincorporated County, consistent with an established community vision. The General Plan Land Use Maps set the Land Use designations, and corresponding densities, for all of the land in the unincorporated County. A Program EIR for the County's General Plan Update, Environmental Review Number 02-ZA-00, State Clearing House Number 2002111067, was certified by the Board of Supervisors on August 3, 2011.

Staff and the Board of Supervisors anticipated that unforeseen inconsistencies and mapping errors, along with changed circumstances, would emerge during plan implementation that would require correction. For minor changes, efficiencies can be achieved by grouping the changes and processing them in a batch. By adopting a formal approach to such a review,

certainties and assurances can also be achieved in the process. Therefore, at the time of the adoption of the General Plan Update, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to bring forward a General Plan 'clean-up' every two years in the form of a General Plan Amendment. This General Plan Clean-Up is the second to be processed since the adoption of the updated General Plan in 2011.

Project Changes

Similar to the General Plan Update, the 2015 General Plan Clean-Up includes changes that encompass the entire unincorporated County of San Diego. This Clean-Up includes changes to the General Plan text, Implementation Plan, Mobility Element Network, community/subregional plans, the Land Use Map (with associated Regional Category Map changes in certain circumstances when required for consistency with the proposed Land Use Map change), and zoning. See Attachment B and this link for the Staff Recommendation document (describes all proposed changes in the project), in addition to maps and analysis worksheets of the proposed Land Use Map and/or zoning change items:

<http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/advance/2015gpcclean-up.html>

The Clean-Up process is only meant to be used for minor changes or additions to the General Plan that do not result in additional environmental impacts. As discussed in detail in the attached Environmental Review Checklist Form, the modifications would not involve substantial changes in the magnitude of impacts identified in the General Plan Update Program EIR, and would not create new potentially significant impacts that would require additional mitigation.

Attachments

- Environmental Review Checklist Form
- 2015 General Plan Clean-Up Staff Recommendation –
<http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/advance/2015gpcclean-up.html>



County of San Diego

MARK WARDLAW
DIRECTOR
PHONE (858) 694-2962
FAX (858) 694-2555

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 310, SAN DIEGO, CA 92123
www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds

DARREN GRETLER
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR
PHONE (858) 694-2962
FAX (858) 694-2555

September 18, 2015

Environmental Review Update Checklist Form For Projects with Previously Approved Environmental Documents

For Purposes of Consideration of a General Plan Amendment and Rezone for the 2015 General Plan Clean-Up; GPA 14-001; REZ 14-001; ER Log No. 14-00-001

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Sections 15162 through 15164 set forth the criteria for determining the appropriate additional environmental documentation, if any, to be completed when there is a previously adopted Negative Declaration (ND) or a previously certified environmental impact report (EIR) covering the project for which a subsequent discretionary action is required. This Environmental Review Update Checklist Form has been prepared in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15164(e) to explain the rationale for determining whether any additional environmental documentation is needed for the 2015 General Plan Clean-Up.

1. Background on the previously certified EIR:

A Program EIR for the County's General Plan Update, Environmental Review Number 02-ZA-00, State Clearing House Number 2002111067, was certified by the Board of Supervisors on August 3, 2011. The certified Program EIR evaluated potentially significant effects for the following environmental areas of potential concern: 1) Aesthetics; 2) Agricultural Resources; 3) Air Quality; 4) Biological Resources; 5) Cultural and Paleontological Resources; 6) Geology and Soils; 7) Hazards and Hazardous Materials; 8) Hydrology and Water Quality; 9) Land Use and Planning; 10) Mineral Resources; 11) Noise; 12) Population and Housing; 13) Public Services; 14) Recreation; 15) Transportation and Traffic; 16) Utilities and Service Systems, and 17) Climate Change.

Of these seventeen environmental subject areas, it was determined that only Geology/Soils and Population/Housing would not involve potentially significant impacts. The remaining environmental issues evaluated included impacts that would be significant and unavoidable with the exception of the following four subject areas in which all impacts would be mitigated below a level of significance: Cultural and Paleontological Resources, Land Use and Planning, Recreation, and Climate Change. For those areas in which environmental impacts will remain significant and unavoidable, even with the implementation of mitigation measures, overriding considerations exist which make the impacts acceptable. The

previously certified Program EIR is available at
<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/gpupdate/environmental.html>

- 2. Lead agency name and address:
County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 110
San Diego, CA 92123
 - a. Contact: Kevin Johnston, Project Manager
 - b. Phone number: (858) 694-3084
 - c. E-mail: kevin.johnston@sdcounty.ca.gov

- 3. Project applicant's name and address:
County of San Diego
Planning & Development Services
5510 Overland Ave., Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123

- 4. Does the project for which a subsequent discretionary action is now proposed differ in any way from the previously approved project?

YES

NO

As part of the August 3, 2011 adoption of the General Plan Update, the County Board of Supervisors directed staff to bring forward a General Plan 'clean-up' every two years in the form of a GPA. The Clean-Up GPA (project) is intended to provide a mechanism for making changes to the General Plan to allow for corrections discovered during the Plan's implementation or to reflect changing circumstances.

This is the second Clean-Up processed since the adoption of the General Plan Update. This General Plan Clean-Up includes changes to General Plan text, Implementation Plan, Mobility Element Network, Community/Subregional Plans, the General Plan Land Use Map (with associated Regional Category Map changes in certain circumstances when required for consistency with the proposed Land Use Map change), and zoning, as described below and discussed in detail in the 2015 General Plan Clean-Up Staff Recommendation. The Staff Recommendation document describes all proposed changes in the project, and is included as Attachment B in the project staff report, filed under the same project name and ER Log Number (PDS2014-GPA-14-001; PDS2014-REZ-14-001; ER Log No. 14-00-001). See this link for the Staff Recommendation, in addition to maps and analysis worksheets of the proposed Land Use Map and/or zoning change items – <http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/advance/2015gpcclean-up.html>

General Plan Text

Changes are proposed to the General Plan Land Use Element and Conservation and Open Space Element. These changes fall under the following categories:

- a. Internal Consistency and Clarifications – Revisions are included to provide consistency within the text and consistency between the text and mapping practices, associated with the mapping of Regional Categories for the Land Use designations of Open Space

(Conservation), Open Space (Recreation), and Public/Semi-Public Facilities. In addition, new text is proposed to note the purpose of the No Jurisdiction Regional Category.

- b. Error – A paragraph in the Conservation and Open Space Element was accidentally repeated in its entirety. The second occurrence of the paragraph is proposed for deletion.

Implementation Plan

Implementation measures 3.4.5.A and 3.4.5.B referenced the wrong General Plan policy as the justification for the implementation measures. As the implementation measures are related to reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities, the appropriate General Plan policy for reference is H-5.1.

Mobility Element Network

Revisions to the Mobility Element Network Appendix include the revising a noted improvement for consistency with the noted Mobility Element Network classification, the correction of a noted segment boundary for consistency with a Mobility Element Network map, and correcting the color shown on a Mobility Element Network map for consistency with the classification.

Community/Subregional Plans

Revisions are proposed for Community and Subregional Plans, under the following categories:

- a. Consistency – A revision is proposed to a minimum lot size policy in the Central Mountain Subregional Plan for consistency with existing zoning minimum lot sizes.
- b. Error – A revision is proposed to the page number reference for a map in the Pala/Pauma Subregional Plan.
- c. Minor Community Planning/Sponsor Group Requests – Additions and revisions are proposed for the Crest-Dehesa Community Plan, the Fallbrook Community Plan, and the Valley Center Community Plan, to accommodate minor requests of the associated planning groups which are consistent with the General Plan and existing regulations.

Land Use Map

The Clean-Up GPA proposes changes to General Plan Land Use designations of specific properties to ensure consistency with the goals and policies of the General Plan and to correct mapping errors, reflect ownership changes and incorporate minor Community Planning/Sponsor Group requests. In some cases, changes are required for the associated Regional Category Map designations and zoning use regulations and/or zoning development designators, when required for consistency with the proposed Land Use designation. Three items in the project (LS204, SW201, and VC202) involve zoning changes only, for consistency with the current Land Use designation, as discussed further in this document and in Staff Recommendation document (noted above with web link and staff report location). Overall, the proposed Land Use Map/zoning changes would reduce the estimated potential dwelling units by 325 units, on the properties associated with the proposed changes.

The proposed project also includes a contingent resolution and contingent ordinance to establish a County General Plan designation and zoning for property involved in a proposed detachment from the City of Encinitas into the unincorporated County jurisdiction. The draft contingent resolution and draft ordinance will be separate from the draft project resolution and draft project ordinance to be considered for final approval by the Board of Supervisors. The contingent resolution and ordinance will be contingent upon final approval of the detachment by the San Diego Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO). The Assessor Parcel Number (APN) proposed for detachment is 262-071-37. The subject parcel has historically been used as a backyard for APN 262-130-30 (within the unincorporated County). With the incorporation of the City of Encinitas in 1986, the parcel was mistakenly thought to be part of the adjacent San Elijo Lagoon County Park, which lies within the City of Encinitas jurisdiction. In 1981, prior to the 1986 incorporation of the City of Encinitas, the subject parcel was conveyed from the County to the Rancho Serena Community Association. Therefore, it has been determined that the inclusion of the parcel in the City of Encinitas jurisdiction was a mapping error during the incorporation process. Both the City of Encinitas and coordinating staff from the County Department of Parks and Recreation have concurred with this determination. On April 8, 2015, the City of Encinitas City Council adopted a Resolution supporting the proposed detachment of the parcel from the city. The detachment would allow for the most efficient provision of public services through service districts of the unincorporated County, which serve the parcel of the primary residence and the rest of the neighborhood. These districts include County Service Area 83 (San Dieguito Local Parks), the Rancho Santa Fe Community Services District (CSD), and the Rancho Santa Fe Fire Protection District. There is no legal access for the subject parcel, only for the adjacent parcel (APN 262-130-30) with the residence, for which the subject parcel serves as a backyard. The subject parcel is separated by the San Elijo Lagoon County Park, from developed areas of the City of Encinitas.

5. **SUBJECT AREAS DETERMINED TO HAVE NEW OR SUBSTANTIALLY MORE SEVERE SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS COMPARED TO THOSE IDENTIFIED IN THE PREVIOUS ND OR EIR.** The subject areas checked below were determined to be new significant environmental effects or to be previously identified effects that have a substantial increase in severity either due to a change in project, change in circumstances or new information of substantial importance, as indicated by the checklist and discussion on the following pages.

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NONE | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forest Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology & Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Haz Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology & Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this analysis, Planning & Development Services has determined that:

- No substantial changes are proposed in the project and there are no substantial changes in the circumstances under which the project will be undertaken that will require major revisions to the previous EIR due to the involvement of significant new environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. Also, there is no "new information of substantial importance" as that term is used in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3). Therefore, the previously certified EIR is adequate upon completion of an ADDENDUM.
- No substantial changes are proposed in the project and there are no substantial changes in the circumstances under which the project will be undertaken that will require major revisions to the previous EIR or ND due to the involvement of significant new environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. Also, there is no "new information of substantial importance" as that term is used in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3). Therefore, because the project is a residential project in conformance with, and pursuant to, a Specific Plan with a EIR completed after January 1, 1980, the project is exempt pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15182.
- Substantial changes are proposed in the project or there are substantial changes in the circumstances under which the project will be undertaken that will require major revisions to the previous ND due to the involvement of significant new environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. Or, there is "new information of substantial importance," as that term is used in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3). However all new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in severity of previously identified significant effects are clearly avoidable through the incorporation of mitigation measures agreed to by the project applicant. Therefore, a SUBSEQUENT ND is required.
- Substantial changes are proposed in the project or there are substantial changes in the circumstances under which the project will be undertaken that will require major revisions to the previous ND or EIR due to the involvement of significant new environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. Or, there is "new information of substantial importance," as that term is used in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3). Therefore, a SUBSEQUENT or SUPPLEMENTAL EIR is required.



Signature

September 18, 2015

Date

Kevin Johnston

Printed Name

Project Manager

Title

INTRODUCTION

CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 through 15164 set forth the criteria for determining the appropriate additional environmental documentation, if any, to be completed when there is a previously adopted ND or a previously certified EIR for the project.

CEQA Guidelines, Section 15162(a) and 15163 state that when an ND has been adopted or an EIR certified for a project, no Subsequent or Supplemental EIR or Subsequent Negative Declaration shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in light of the whole public record, one or more of the following:

1. Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
2. Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
3. New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
 - a. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or Negative Declaration; or
 - b. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previously adopted Negative Declaration or previously certified EIR; or
 - c. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
 - d. Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous Negative Declaration or EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

CEQA Guidelines, Section 15164(a) states that an Addendum to a previously certified EIR may be prepared if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR have occurred.

CEQA Guidelines, Section 15164(b) states that an Addendum to a previously adopted Negative Declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary.

If the factors listed in CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162, 15163, or 15164 have not occurred or are not met, no changes to the previously certified EIR or previously adopted ND are necessary.

The following responses detail any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that may cause one or more effects to environmental resources. The responses support the "Determination," above, as to the type of environmental documentation required, if any.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW UPDATE CHECKLIST

I. AESTHETICS -- Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause one or more effects to aesthetic resources including: scenic vistas; scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings within a state scenic highway; existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings; or day or nighttime views in the area?

YES

NO

When compared to the existing General Plan Land Use Map and zoning, the Land Use Map and zoning changes proposed with the project would reduce overall densities and intensity of allowed uses, resulting in less development and reduced impacts to scenic vistas, scenic resources, visual character and light pollution. The project proposes to add 622 acres of Open Space-Conservation designated lands in areas that would have allowed 32 potential dwelling units under the residential Land Use designations of the existing General Plan. This will improve the overall protection of scenic vistas, many of which exist on the properties proposed for Open Space-Conservation designations. Overall, the proposed Land Use Map/zoning changes would reduce the estimated potential dwelling units by 325 units, on the properties associated with the proposed changes. The County's Light Pollution Code classifies the areas that are considered most sensitive to light pollution as Zone A, which includes those properties within a 15 mile radius of the Palomar and Mount Laguna observatories. None of the proposed Land Use Map/zoning changes in the project fall within Zone A and none of the other proposed changes would result in additional development potential in Zone A.

Of the proposed Land Use Map and zoning changes that would retain development potential, only three of those would have the potential to result in an increase in density or intensity over the current Land Use Map. VC201 includes two alternatives analyzed in this document: a staff recommended proposed change and a CPG recommended proposed change. The staff recommendation entails no change to the Land Use designation and a change in the zoning use regulation, from RR (Rural Residential) to the lowest intensity commercial zoning of RC (Residential Commercial – a hybrid of residential and commercial zoning), which requires a discretionary permit and CEQA review for most commercial uses that could be allowed in the zone. The CPG recommended proposed change to the C34 (General Commercial/Residential) zoning requires changing the General Plan Land Use designation to C-1 (General Commercial). Each of the alternative maps in the General Plan EIR fully analyzed Rural Commercial on the

VC201 property, which allows compatible zoning use regulations that are of much higher intensity (greater range of allowed commercial uses) than either the C34 or RC zoning options proposed in the current project. In addition, either zoning option would involve an associated 'B' zoning special area regulation; requiring Site Plan review to ensure the project complies with the Valley Center Design Guidelines, which include aesthetic guidelines. The application of the B designator would ensure that any proposed commercial development would be compatible with the aesthetic character and scale of the immediate neighborhood, and with the nearby commercial uses in the North Village of Valley Center, and would result in the deterioration of the viewshed along this section of Valley Center Road, which is a designated County Scenic Highway in this area.

SV202 involves the correction of a mapping error and subsequent ownership change for a 0.9-acre property in Spring Valley. The property comprises two parcels, the largest of which is 0.7 acres and was transferred from County ownership to private ownership prior to the adoption of the General Plan Update in 2011. This parcel was zoned RS (Residential Single) with the General Plan Update, and that is also the current zoning. The current General Plan designation of Public/Semi-Public Facilities was a mapping error. Subsequent to the adoption of the General Plan Update, the adjacent 0.2-acre parcel was also transferred from the County to private ownership. General Plan Policy LU-1.6 applies an underlying density of RL-80 on properties that are transferred from public to private ownership. Per General Plan Policy LU-1.6, each parcel would be eligible for the construction of a single family residence, now that they are in private ownership (any legal lot owner has the ability to apply for a residence, regardless of the applicable density). This item is in the clean-up due to the mapping error during the General Plan Update and based on support for the change in the community. The proposed change to VR-7.3 would match the designation on the other properties in the neighborhood and would make the General Plan designation consistent with the current zoning on the most of the property, which is RS, as noted above. Under the RS zoning, single family residential was considered as part of the EIR analysis. The subject property was previously cleared and graded and it is surrounded by single family residences to the east and south, a mobile home park to the north, and Sweetwater Road to the west. The development of the parcel with single family residences would be infill and match the aesthetic character of the neighborhood, and would be less impactful on the viewshed than the mobile home park to the north.

SW201 involves a change from public to private ownership after the 2011 General Plan Update. As such, there is no mapping error on the property and the LU-1.6 allowance for the ability to apply for permits for one house on each legal lot would apply. The only change for SW201 in the project is to change the building type (to allow residential structures) and to add a zoning minimum lot size, as there is currently no lot size regulation on the properties that make up SW201. The LU-1.6 stipulation was included in the EIR analysis and the maximum potential of 2 houses (2 legal lots) would be consistent with the single family residential aesthetic character of the neighborhood.

Two of the proposed Land Use Map/zoning changes (LS201 and SV201) involve a change from commercial designations and zoning to residential designations and zoning. The existing commercial zoning on each of the subject parcels allows residential uses as secondary to commercial. The proposed change to residential zoning allows residential as a primary use. The existing design review designators would remain on each property, ensuring compliance with aesthetic guidelines in the Lakeside Design Guidelines and Spring Valley Design Guidelines, respectively.

As discussed in the project description, non-Land Use Map changes proposed in the project include changes to the Mobility Element Network, General Plan text, Implementation Plan, and community plan policies. The changes to the Mobility Element Network are minor corrections to ensure the text of the table and colors on the map are consistent with the noted Mobility Element Network classification. The changes to the General Plan text involve the deletion of a repeated paragraph and clarifications to ensure consistency between the General Plan text and mapping practices for the Regional Categories associated with certain designations, so that areas of 'no jurisdiction' are more clearly defined and mapped. Of the community plan revisions proposed in the project, one of the proposals for Fallbrook would likely result in improved protection of existing aesthetic resources because it would discourage GPAs that would apply new General Commercial (C-1) or Rural Commercial (C-4) General Plan Land Use designations outside of the Village boundary, as a way of preserving the rural character of the access roads. Proposals for the Valley Center Community Plan involve exception language for policies that seek to keep commercial uses within the two villages. The proposed exception language would apply to those properties that lost commercial zoning with the adoption of the General Plan Update, which is limited to eight parcels. Only one of these parcels is proposed for a change in the current project (VC201, noted above), and any if any zoning or General Plan change were proposed for any of the other seven parcels, it would be subject to full CEQA review. In addition, any future change to a commercial zoning use regulation would include a design review designator, ensuring compliance with the aesthetic guidelines in the Valley Center Design Guidelines.

When compared to the project analyzed in the General Plan EIR, the proposed project would entail a substantial reduction in development potential. Changes proposed in the project would not result in additional significant impacts to aesthetics, beyond those analyzed in the General Plan EIR. However, impacts would still be considered potentially significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 of the EIR would be required. Regarding the sub-categories of visual character or quality and light or glare, although impacts would not be greater than those analyzed in the General Plan EIR, project impacts would not be reduced to below a level of significance; thus, the overall impacts associated with these sub-categories would remain significant and unavoidable, consistent with the General Plan EIR.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES -- Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause one or more effects to agriculture or forestry resources including: conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to a non-agricultural use, conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use or Williamson Act contract, or conversion of forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

YES

NO

When compared to the existing General Plan Land Use Map and zoning, the Land Use Map and zoning changes proposed with the project would reduce overall densities and intensity of allowed uses, resulting in less development and reduced impacts to agriculture and forestry resources, visual character and light pollution. The project proposes to add 622 acres of Open Space-

Conservation designated lands in areas that would have allowed 32 potential dwelling units under the residential Land Use designations of the existing General Plan. Some of the lands that have been purchased for open space and are proposed for conversion to the Open Space-Conservation designation are adjacent to, or in close proximity to, existing agricultural operations. Open space areas provide an effective buffer between agricultural lands and incompatible land uses. The conversion of these properties to open space would be in accordance with General Plan Policy COS-6.3, which encourages siting open space areas adjacent to agricultural uses. None of the items in the project would place conflicting or incompatible General Plan designations or zoning use regulations in areas with Williamson Act contracts or forest lands.

Of the proposed Land Use Map and zoning changes that would retain development potential, only three of those would have the potential to result in an increase in density or intensity over the current Land Use Map. As noted above, VC201 includes two alternatives analyzed in this document: a staff recommended proposed change and a CPG recommended proposed change. The Land Use designations and zoning for each option are fully covered in terms of EIR analysis, as the alternative maps of the EIR included the Rural Commercial Land Use designation, which includes compatible zoning use regulations that are of higher intensity than the two zoning options discussed in this document. For the SV202 item, most of the property was analyzed for the RS (Residential Single) zoning, and the property is surrounded by relatively high density residential development and a transportation corridor. As such, the property is not an ideal site for agriculture, and there is no existing agriculture. The SW201 item would change the building type to allow residential structures (with no Land Use designation or zoning use regulation changes) for a parcel transferred to private ownership. The owner could apply for one residence per legal lot, consistent with the density applied per General Plan Policy LU-1.6, but no zoning use regulation change is proposed, so there would be no change in zoning allowances for agricultural uses. Though the change in building type would have the potential to allow 1-2 homes on the two lots, a build out of the current Public/Semi-Public designation would have the potential for more intense development than the minimal residential development.

Two of the Land Use Map/zoning items in the project involve properties that would be considered forest land (JL201 and JL202); however, each of these properties is proposed for the Open Space-Conservation designation, thus preserving the natural resources for public benefit.

As discussed in the project description, non-Land Use Map changes proposed in the project include changes to the Mobility Element Network, General Plan text, Implementation Plan, and community plan policies. The changes to a portion of the General Plan text describing Regional Categories will allow for more consistent application of Regional Categories, particularly for Open Space and Public-Semi Public Facilities designations. All areas under County planning jurisdiction would receive a Regional Category (Village, Semi-Rural, or Rural Lands) that is consistent with its location. This will be helpful if a public agency sells a property into private ownership. The underlying Regional Category would help to guide future Land Use Map changes and Rezones, with the understanding that agricultural operations are appropriate for Semi-Rural and Rural areas, where they can be more effectively buffered. The other proposed changes to the General Plan text, Implementation Plan, or to the policies of the community plans that would also not result in new significant impacts or more severe impacts to agriculture and forestry resources, beyond the analysis of the EIR.

When compared to the project analyzed in the General Plan EIR, the project would entail a substantial reduction in development potential. Changes proposed in the project would not result in additional significant impacts or substantially more severe environmental effects to agriculture and forestry resources, beyond those analyzed in the General Plan EIR. However, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 of the EIR would be required. Regarding the sub-categories of conversion of agricultural resources and indirect conversion of agricultural resources, although impacts would not be greater than those analyzed in the General Plan EIR, impacts would not be reduced to below a level of significance; thus, the overall impacts associated with these sub-categories would remain significant and unavoidable.

III. AIR QUALITY -- Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause one or more effects to air quality including: conflicts with or obstruction of implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP); violation of any air quality standard or substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation; a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard; exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or creation of objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

YES

NO

When compared to the existing General Plan Land Use Map, the Land Use Map changes proposed with the project would reduce overall densities and intensity of allowed uses, resulting in less development and reduced impacts to air quality. Overall, the proposed Land Use Map/zoning changes would reduce the estimated potential dwelling units by 325 units, on the properties associated with the proposed changes.

As discussed in the Project Description, non-Land Use Map changes proposed in the project include changes to the Mobility Element Network, the General Plan text, the Implementation Plan, and community plan policies. The changes to the Mobility Element Network are minor corrections to ensure the text of the table and colors on the map are consistent with the noted Mobility Element Network classification, and the proposed changes would not result in any increase in planned roadway widths or segment lengths. Thus the project would not result in an increase in criteria pollutant emission or potential impacts to air quality, compared to the planned roadways analyzed in the General Plan EIR. There are no proposed changes to the General Plan text, Implementation Plan, or to the policies of the community plans that would result in new significant impacts or more severe impacts to air quality, beyond the analysis of the EIR.

The San Diego Air Pollution Control District (APCD) is responsible for developing and implementing the Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) for attainment and maintenance of the ambient air quality standards in the San Diego Air Basin. The current RAQS and State Implementation Plan (SIP) are based on projections for residential, commercial, industrial, and recreational land uses contained in the previous General Plan. The existing General Plan would accommodate less growth than the previous General Plan. As previously discussed, the project would further reduce the potential growth accommodated in the General Plan. Therefore, the

project would be considered consistent with the underlying growth forecasts in the RAQS and SIP. Additionally, future development occurring on the properties associated with the project would be required to be consistent with the emission reduction strategies in the RAQS and the SIP.

Impacts to air quality violations, non-attainment of criteria pollutants, and sensitive receptors would be reduced with the changes proposed in the project. The potential dwelling units associated with the properties in the project would be reduced by approximately 325 units, compared to the existing potential density. In addition, the conversion of 622 acres of rural properties from residential designations to Open Space–Conservation would result in a substantial reduction in future potential vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Any new stationary sources of pollutants constructed under new designations would be subject to APCD requirements for permitting and must demonstrate that they will not cause or contribute to a violation of an air quality standard. The changes proposed with the project would result in less construction from new development and less emissions of particulate matter. Grading operations associated with the future construction on any of the properties subject to proposed Land Use Map or zoning changes would be subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures.

When compared to the project analyzed in the General Plan EIR, the project would entail a significant reduction in development potential. Changes proposed in the project would not result in additional significant impacts or substantially more severe environmental effects to air quality, beyond those analyzed in the General Plan EIR. However, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 of the EIR would be required. Regarding the sub-categories of air quality violations, non-attainment criteria pollutants, and sensitive receptors, although impacts would not be greater than those analyzed in the General Plan EIR, impacts would not be reduced to below a level of significance; thus, the overall impacts associated with these sub-categories would remain significant and unavoidable.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause one or more effects to biological resources including: adverse effects on any sensitive natural community (including riparian habitat) or species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in a local or regional plan, policy, or regulation, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; adverse effects to federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act; interference with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with wildlife corridors, or impeding the use of native wildlife nursery sites; and/or conflicts with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan, policies or ordinances?

YES

NO

When compared to the existing General Plan Land Use Map, the Land Use Map changes proposed with the project would reduce overall densities and intensity of allowed uses, resulting in less development and reduced impacts to biological resources from those analyzed in the General Plan EIR. The conversion of 622 acres of land from residential designations to Open Space–

Conservation would reduce impacts to special status plant and wildlife species, as many of these occur on the properties converted to open space. Similarly, the extensive open space additions would reduce impacts to wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites.

Potential impacts to riparian habitat would also be reduced with the corresponding overall reduction in development potential, associated with the project. In particular, the project would reduce development pressure in areas that include riparian habitat onsite or in close proximity. JL201 would place an Open Space-Conservation (OS-C) designation on a section of Banner Creek as the property has been purchased by the County to preserve the wetlands associated with the creek corridor, in addition to the surrounding southern riparian forest and coniferous forest and chaparral farther north in the preserve addition. LS203 would place an OS-C designation on a recent addition to the County's Sycamore Canyon Preserve. The property addition contains coast live oak riparian forest surrounding the wetlands of Clark Canyon Creek. SD202 would place an OS-C designation on an area of coast live oak riparian forest and chaparral uplands surrounding a section of Escondido Creek. These changes would not only reduce potential direct impacts to riparian habitat, but also reduce indirect impacts associated with polluted runoff from increased development.

The project would reduce overall impacts to federally protected wetlands. Wetlands occur onsite for the following Clean-Up items: AL201, JL201, LS203, and SD202. AL201 would correct a mapping error by changing a 90-acre property owned by the Grossmont Union High School district, from Village Residential 2.9 to Public/Semi-Public Facilities. This change would remove 258 potential units from the General Plan. While the site could be used for a high school in the future, the wetland is in the southern portion and any development would be required to avoid the wetland, in addition to a wetland buffer. The rest of these items would involve conversion to open space.

Of the proposed Land Use Map and zoning changes that would retain development potential, only three of those would have the potential to result in an increase in density or intensity over the current Land Use Map. VC201 includes two alternatives analyzed in this document: a staff recommended proposed change and a CPG recommended proposed change. The staff recommendation entails no change to the Land Use designation and a change in the zoning use regulation, from RR (Rural Residential) to the lowest intensity commercial zoning of RC (Residential Commercial – a hybrid of residential and commercial zoning), which requires a discretionary permit and CEQA review for most commercial uses that could be allowed in the zone. The CPG recommended proposed change to the C34 (General Commercial/Residential) zoning requires changing the General Plan Land Use designation to C-1 (General Commercial). Each of the alternative maps in the General Plan EIR fully analyzed Rural Commercial on the VC201 property, which allows compatible zoning use regulations that are of much higher intensity (greater range of allowed commercial uses) than either the C34 or RC zoning options proposed in the current project. In addition, either zoning option would involve an associated 'B' zoning special area regulation; requiring Site Plan review to ensure the project complies with the Valley Center Design Guidelines, which include guidelines for the preservation of oaks, sycamores, floodplain areas, and other biological resource considerations.

As discussed previously, SV202 involves the correction of a mapping error and subsequent ownership change for a 0.9-acre property in Spring Valley. The property comprises two parcels, the largest of which is 0.7 acres and was transferred from County ownership to private ownership

prior to the adoption of the General Plan Update in 2011. This parcel was zoned RS (Residential Single) with the General Plan Update, and that is also the current zoning. The current General Plan designation of Public/Semi-Public Facilities was a mapping error on the larger parcel. Subsequent to the adoption of the General Plan Update, the adjacent 0.2-acre parcel was also transferred from the County to private ownership. Per General Plan Policy LU-1.6, each parcel would be eligible for the construction of a single family residence, now that they are in private ownership. This item is in the clean-up due to the mapping error during the General Plan Update and based on overwhelming support for the change in the community. The proposed change to VR-7.3 would make the General Plan Land Use designation consistent with the current zoning on the most of the property, which is RS, as noted above. Under the RS zoning, single family residential was considered as part of the EIR analysis. The subject property was previously cleared and graded and it is surrounded by single family residences to the east and south, a mobile home park to the north, and Sweetwater Road to the west. The development of the parcel with single family residences would be infill and would not involve the loss of native habitat.

The SW201 item would change the building type to allow residential structures (with no Land Use designation or zoning use regulation changes) for a parcel transferred to private ownership. The owner could apply for one residence per legal lot, consistent with the density applied per General Plan Policy LU-1.6. Though the change in building type would have the potential to allow 1-2 homes on the two lots, a build out of the current Public/Semi-Public designation would have the potential for more intense development than the minimal residential development.

The SD201 Land Use Map/zoning change discussed previously involves a proposed detachment from the City of Encinitas. With the incorporation of the city in 1986, it's likely the subject parcel was assumed to be part of the adjacent San Elijo Lagoon County Park (within the city's planning jurisdiction); however, the subject parcel was conveyed from the County to the Rancho Serena Community Association in 1981 and then to the subsequent homeowners. In addition, the parcel has historically been used as a backyard for the adjacent parcel containing the primary residence, and was cleared of native vegetation several years ago.

Two of the proposed Land Use Map/zoning changes (LS201 and SV201) involve a change from commercial designations and zoning to residential designations and zoning. The existing commercial zoning on each of the subject parcels allows residential uses as secondary to commercial. The proposed change to residential zoning allows residential as a primary use. None of the properties associated with these two items contain sensitive habitats and all are within an urban/developed village setting. The SV201 properties are already developed with single family residences and associated improvements.

As discussed in the project description, non-Land Use Map changes proposed in the project include changes to the Mobility Element Network, General Plan text, Implementation Plan, and community plan policies. The changes to the Mobility Element Network are minor corrections to ensure the text of the table and colors on the map are consistent with the noted Mobility Element Network classification, and the proposed changes would not result in any increase in planned roadway widths or segment lengths. There are no proposed changes to the General Plan text, Implementation Plan, or to the policies of the community plans that would result in new significant impacts to biological resources, beyond the analysis of the EIR. The proposed policy revision for the Central Mountain Subregional Plan would actually improve capabilities for preserving large, connected open space areas in the Subregion as the revision would allow for lot sizes of less than

four acres outside the Village, if the current zoning minimum lot size allows. This revision would have no effect on density, but it would allow greater flexibility in lot size, which can help in avoiding the fragmentation of sensitive habitats.

When compared to the project analyzed in the General Plan EIR, the project would entail a significant reduction in development potential. Changes proposed in the project would not result in additional significant impacts or substantially more severe environmental effects to biological resources, beyond those analyzed in the General Plan EIR. However, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 of the EIR would be required. Regarding the sub-categories of special status species, riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities, and wildlife corridors and nursery sites, although impacts would not be greater than those analyzed in the General Plan EIR, impacts would not be reduced to below a level of significance; thus, the overall impacts associated with these sub-categories would remain significant and unavoidable.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause one or more effects to cultural resources including: causing a change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5; destroying a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; and/or disturbing any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

YES

NO

As described in the General Plan EIR, development of land uses proposed with the project would have the potential to impact cultural resources, archaeological resources, historical resources, paleontological resources, and human remains, through ground-disturbing activities or alteration or demolition of historic structures. When compared to the existing General Plan Land Use Map, the Land Use Map changes proposed with the project would reduce overall densities and intensity of allowed uses, resulting in less development and reduced impacts to cultural resources, archaeological resources, historical resources, paleontological resources, and human remains, from those analyzed in the General Plan EIR. The conversion of 622 acres of land from residential designations to Open Space—Conservation would prohibit most types of development and grading, thus minimizing potential impacts to underground artifacts and fossils, or human remains. In addition, the overall estimated potential dwelling units associated with the properties in the project would be reduced by 325 units under the new designations proposed. Higher density land uses are more likely to result in development that requires extensive excavation or grading activities. Thus, the project would reduce potential impacts to archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains.

As discussed in the project description, non-Land Use Map changes proposed in the project include changes to the Mobility Element Network, General Plan text, Implementation Plan and community plan policies. The changes to the Mobility Element Network are minor corrections to ensure the text of the table and colors on the map are consistent with the noted Mobility Element Network classification, and the proposed changes would not result in any increase in planned roadway widths or segment lengths. Therefore, the proposed Mobility Element Network changes

would not result in new potential impacts to cultural resources, archaeological resources, historical resources, paleontological resources, or human remains, compared to planned roadways analyzed in the General Plan EIR. There are no proposed changes to the General Plan text, Implementation Plan, or to the policies of the community plans that would result in new significant impacts to cultural/historical/archaeological resources, beyond the analysis of the EIR. The proposed policy revision for the Central Mountain Subregional Plan would actually improve capabilities for preserving large, connected open space areas in the Subregion as the revision would allow for lot sizes of less than four acres outside the Village, if the current zoning minimum lot size allows. This revision would have no effect on density, but it would allow greater flexibility in lot size, which can help in avoiding development in areas containing cultural/historical/archaeological resources, consistent with the goals of the Conservation Subdivision program.

When compared to the project analyzed in the General Plan EIR, the project would entail a significant reduction in development potential. Changes proposed in the project would not result in additional significant impacts or substantially more severe environmental effects to cultural resources, archaeological resources, historical resources, paleontological resources, and human remains; beyond those analyzed in the General Plan EIR. However, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 of the EIR would be required.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that result in one or more effects from geology and soils including: exposure of people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, strong seismic ground shaking, or landslides; result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil; produce unstable geological conditions that will result in adverse impacts resulting from landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse; being located on expansive soil creating substantial risks to life or property; and/or having soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

YES

NO

Impacts to geology and soils would have the potential to occur as a result of development in accordance with the proposed Land Use Map changes and other changes in the project. Potential impacts would be reduced with the project, compared to the existing General Plan.

As noted previously, when compared to the existing General Plan Land Use Map, the Land Use Map changes proposed with the project would reduce overall densities and intensity of allowed uses, resulting in less development and reduced impacts to geology and soils. The project proposes to add 622 acres of Open Space-Conservation lands in areas that would have allowed 32 dwelling units under the existing General Plan, because of the proposed removal of residential Land Use designations for these properties. In addition, the total potential dwelling units associated with the properties in the project would be reduced by 325 units under the new designations proposed.

Of the proposed Land Use Map and zoning changes that would retain development potential, only three of those would have the potential to result in an increase in density or intensity over the current Land Use Map. VC201 includes two alternatives analyzed in this document: a staff recommended proposed change and a CPG recommended proposed change. The staff recommendation entails no change to the Land Use designation and a change in the zoning use regulation, from RR (Rural Residential) to the lowest intensity commercial zoning of RC (Residential Commercial – a hybrid of residential and commercial zoning), which requires a discretionary permit and CEQA review for most commercial uses that could be allowed in the zone. The CPG recommended proposed change to the C34 (General Commercial/Residential) zoning requires changing the General Plan Land Use designation to C-1 (General Commercial). Each of the alternative maps in the General Plan EIR fully analyzed Rural Commercial on the VC201 property, which allows compatible zoning use regulations that are of much higher intensity (greater range of allowed commercial uses) than either the C34 or RC zoning options proposed in the current project.

As discussed previously, SV202 involves the correction of a mapping error and subsequent ownership change for a 0.9-acre property in Spring Valley. The property comprises two parcels, the largest of which is 0.7 acres and was transferred from County ownership to private ownership prior to the adoption of the General Plan Update in 2011. This parcel was zoned RS (Residential Single) with the General Plan Update, and that is also the current zoning. The current General Plan designation of Public/Semi-Public Facilities was a mapping error. Subsequent to the adoption of the General Plan Update, the adjacent 0.2-acre parcel was also transferred from the County to private ownership. Per General Plan Policy LU-1.6, each parcel would be eligible for the construction of a single family residence, now that they are in private ownership. This item is in the clean-up due to the mapping error during the General Plan Update and based on overwhelming support for the change in the community. The proposed change to VR-7.3 would make the General Plan designation consistent with the current zoning on the most of the property, which is RS, as noted above. Under the RS zoning, single family residential was considered as part of the EIR analysis.

The SW201 item would change the building type to allow residential structures (with no Land Use designation or zoning use regulation changes) for a parcel transferred to private ownership. The owner could apply for one residence per legal lot, consistent with the density applied per General Plan Policy LU-1.6. Though the change in building type would have the potential to allow 1-2 homes on the two lots, a build out of the current Public/Semi-Public designation would have the potential for more intense development than the minimal residential development.

Any new development in accordance with the General Plan designations proposed in the project would be subject to regulations in place to reduce erosion, septic system failure, and hazards associated with seismic activity, soil stability, and expansive soils. All future development associated with the land uses designated under the project would be required to comply with federal, state, and local building standards and regulations, including the CBC and County-required geotechnical reconnaissance reports and investigations. In order to minimize potential impacts from erosion, future development would be required to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program, which requires stormwater pollution prevention plans (SWPPPs) to be prepared and best management practices (BMPs) to be identified for construction sites greater than one acre. All construction activities occurring under the project designations would be required to comply with the CBC and the County Grading

Ordinance, both of which would ensure implementation of appropriate measures during grading and construction activities to reduce soil erosion. The County's Grading Ordinance also requires all clearing and grading to be carried out with dust control measures. In addition, all future development projects under the project designations would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations related to septic tanks and waste water disposal, including County Department of Environmental Health standards, to ensure that soils are capable of supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems.

As discussed in the project description, non-Land Use Map changes proposed in the project include changes to the Mobility Element Network, General Plan text, Implementation Plan, and community plan policies. The changes to the Mobility Element Network are minor corrections to ensure the text of the table and colors on the map are consistent with the noted Mobility Element Network classification, and the proposed changes would not result in any increase in planned roadway widths or segment lengths. As such, the geology and soils impacts related to planned roadways in the Mobility Element Network would not be increased. There are no proposed changes to the General Plan text, Implementation Plan, or to the policies of the community plans that would result in new significant impacts to geology and soils, beyond the analysis of the EIR.

When compared to the project analyzed in the General Plan EIR, the project would result in a significant reduction in development potential. Changes proposed in the project would not result in additional significant impacts or substantially more severe environmental effects to geology and soils; beyond those analyzed in the General Plan EIR.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS -- Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that result in one or more effects related to environmental effects associated with greenhouse gas emissions or compliance with applicable plans, policies or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions?

YES

NO

As noted previously, when compared to the existing General Plan Land Use Map, the Land Use Map changes proposed with the project would reduce overall densities and intensity of allowed uses, resulting in less development and reduced impacts associated with greenhouse gas emissions. The project proposes to add 622 acres of Open Space-Conservation lands in areas that would have allowed 32 dwelling units under the residential Land Use designations of the existing General Plan. The areas of the open space acquisitions are outside villages and mostly highly constrained areas with limited road access. As such, the conversion to open space will have a greater impact in reducing future vehicle miles traveled (VMT) than what would be associated with a 32 dwelling unit reduction in a village area, or more suburbanized area. This correlates to future GHG emissions. In addition, the total potential dwelling units associated with the properties in the project would be reduced by 325 units under the new designations proposed.

Of the proposed Land Use Map and zoning changes that would retain development potential, only three of those would have the potential to result in an increase in density or intensity over the current Land Use Map. VC201 includes two alternatives analyzed in this document: a staff

recommended proposed change and a CPG recommended proposed change. The staff recommendation entails no change to the Land Use designation and a change in the zoning use regulation, from RR (Rural Residential) to the lowest intensity commercial zoning of RC (Residential Commercial – a hybrid of residential and commercial zoning), which requires a discretionary permit and CEQA review for most commercial uses that could be allowed in the zone. The CPG recommended proposed change to the C34 (General Commercial/Residential) zoning requires changing the General Plan Land Use designation to C-1 (General Commercial). Each of the alternative maps in the General Plan EIR fully analyzed Rural Commercial on the VC201 property, which allows compatible zoning use regulations that are of much higher intensity (greater range of allowed commercial uses) than either the C34 or RC zoning options proposed in the current project.

As discussed previously, SV202 involves the correction of a mapping error and subsequent ownership change for a 0.9-acre property in Spring Valley. The property comprises two parcels, the largest of which is 0.7 acres and was transferred from County ownership to private ownership prior to the adoption of the General Plan Update in 2011. This parcel was zoned RS (Residential Single) with the General Plan Update, and that is also the current zoning. The current General Plan designation of Public/Semi-Public Facilities was a mapping error. Subsequent to the adoption of the General Plan Update, the adjacent 0.2-acre parcel was also transferred from the County to private ownership. Per General Plan Policy LU-1.6, each parcel to apply for permitting to construct a single family residence, now that they are in private ownership. This item is in the clean-up due to the mapping error during the General Plan Update and based on support for the change in the community. The proposed change to VR-7.3 would make the Land Use designation consistent with the current zoning on the most of the property, which is RS, as noted above. Under the RS zoning, single family residential was considered as part of the EIR analysis.

The SW201 item would change the building type to allow residential structures (with no Land Use designation or zoning use regulation changes) for a parcel transferred to private ownership. The owner could apply for one residence per legal lot, consistent with the density applied per General Plan Policy LU-1.6. Though the change in building type would have the potential to allow 1-2 homes on the two lots, a build out of the current Public/Semi-Public designation would have the potential for more intense development than the minimal residential development.

The County has prepared an interim guidance document to be used in addressing climate change in CEQA documents, titled, "2015 GHG Guidance – Recommended Approach to Addressing Climate Change in CEQA Documents." This document serves as interim guidance to be used by County staff for the review of discretionary projects, prior to an update of the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance – Climate Change, associated with the preparation of the County's Climate Action Plan, which is currently in progress. This guidance follows the recommendations of the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) for determining the need for additional analysis and mitigation for GHG-related impacts under CEQA. The County guidance uses CAPCOA's measurement of the annual 900 metric ton carbon dioxide equivalent (MT CO₂e) screening level threshold for determining the size of projects that would require further analysis and mitigation with regard to climate change. For single family residential, this threshold equates to 50 dwelling units or more. Per this threshold, the two items that would have minimal increases in development potential, beyond the analysis of the EIR (SV202 and SW201) would involve increases in potential dwelling units (4 and 2, respectively) that fall well below the threshold. In addition, under the current Land Use designations and zoning, these two items would have the

potential for much more intense development that could go beyond the square footage thresholds in the guidance document.

As discussed in the project description, non-Land Use Map changes proposed in the project include changes to the Mobility Element Network, General Plan text, Implementation Plan, and community plan policies. The changes to the Mobility Element Network are minor corrections to ensure the text of the table and colors on the map are consistent with the noted Mobility Element Network classification, and the proposed changes would not result in any increase in planned roadway widths or segment lengths. There are no proposed changes to the General Plan text or to the policies of the community plans that would result in new significant impacts associated with greenhouse gas emissions. A new policy proposed for the Fallbrook Community Plan would discourage General Plan Amendments that would apply new General Commercial (C-1) or Rural Commercial (C-4) Land Use designations outside of the Village Boundary, which would help in avoiding future increases in VMT within that community.

Compliance with AB 32 requires greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to be reduced to 1990 levels by the year 2020. When compared to the existing General Plan, the project would accommodate less growth and development in the unincorporated County, which would result in less GHG emissions. In addition, the project would result in fewer vehicle miles traveled (VMT), when compared to the existing General Plan. The changes associated with the project would direct even more growth to incorporated cities or unincorporated villages of the County, where the greater proximity of vehicle trip destinations and access to alternative modes of transportation could further reduce GHG emissions. Therefore, impacts would be lessened as compared to the existing General Plan. However, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 of the EIR would be required.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that result in one or more effects from hazards and hazardous materials including: creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes; creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment; production of hazardous emissions or handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; location on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 creating a hazard to the public or the environment; location within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport; within the vicinity of a private airstrip resulting in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; and/or exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

YES

NO

Hazardous Materials – transportation, use, disposal, accidental release, and existing hazardous materials sites

Similar to the existing General Plan, any future development of land uses, as designated under the project, would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations pertaining to the transportation, use, and disposal of hazardous materials. Compliance with existing regulations would keep impacts related to existing hazardous materials, and the transportation, use, and disposal of hazardous materials to a level less than significant. Additionally, compliance with these regulations would ensure that risks associated with hazardous emissions near schools would be kept to below a level of significance.

The San Diego County Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Division (DEH HMD) is the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) for San Diego County responsible for enforcing Chapter 6.95 of the Health and Safety Code. As the CUPA, the DEH HMD is required to regulate hazardous materials business plans and chemical inventory, hazardous waste and tiered permitting, underground storage tanks, and risk management plans. The Hazardous Materials Business Plan is required to contain basic information on the location, type, quantity and health risks of hazardous materials stored, used, or disposed of onsite. The plan also contains an emergency response plan which describes the procedures for mitigating a hazardous release, procedures and equipment for minimizing the potential damage of a hazardous materials release, and provisions for immediate notification of the HMD, the Office of Emergency Services, and other emergency response personnel such as the local Fire Agency having jurisdiction. Implementation of the emergency response plan facilitates rapid response in the event of an accidental spill or release, thereby reducing potential adverse impacts. Furthermore, the DEH HMD is required to conduct ongoing routine inspections to ensure compliance with existing laws and regulations; to identify safety hazards that could cause or contribute to an accidental spill or release; and to suggest preventative measures to minimize the risk of a spill or release of hazardous substances.

Public and Private Airports

Under the existing General Plan, some public airports would have the potential to be located adjacent to land uses, such as village residential, which would maintain higher density populations and therefore be considered potentially incompatible. Although any development under the existing General Plan would be required to comply with any applicable Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans, development within the Airport Influence Area (AIA) of a public airport would have the potential to increase the risk of people living or working in these areas to hazards associated with airport operations. In addition, the existing General Plan would allow development within two miles of a private airport. When compared to the existing General Plan, the project would not allow any increased development potential within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, within an Airport Influence Area, or within two miles of a public or private airport. Two of the items would involve changes in zoning (LS201 and SV201), related to allowed uses within the Gillespie Field Airport Influence Area; however, there would be no increase in the allowed height or allowed residential density (changes to residential zoning, allowing residential as primary use, instead of secondary). None of the other items in the project would allow any increased development potential within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, within an Airport Influence Area, or within two miles of a public or private airport. When compared to the existing General Plan Land Use Map, the Land Use Map changes proposed with the project would reduce overall densities and intensity of allowed uses. Therefore, impacts associated with airport hazards would be lessened by the project, as compared to the

existing General Plan. However, impacts would still be significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 of the EIR would be required.

Emergency Response, Evacuation Plans, and Wildland Fires

When compared to the existing General Plan Land Use Map, the Land Use Map changes proposed with the project would reduce overall densities and intensity of allowed uses, resulting in less development and reduced impacts associated with existing emergency response operations, evacuation plans, and wildland fire hazards. The project proposes to add 622 acres of Open Space-Conservation lands in areas that would have allowed 32 dwelling units under the existing General Plan. The properties converting to open space are mostly in high to very high fire hazard areas, with limited access. As such, these changes would result in reduced impacts to emergency response and evacuation in backcountry areas. In addition, the total potential dwelling units associated with the properties in the project would be reduced by 325 units under the new designations proposed, thus reducing the need for improved access and emergency response. When compared to the existing General Plan, the project reduces land use densities in areas that are served by fire agencies with greater distance to cover and in areas which have difficulty meeting fire code requirements due to limited access. Therefore, impacts would be lessened as compared to the existing General Plan. However, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 of the EIR would be required. Regarding impacts associated with wildland fire hazards, impacts would not be reduced to below a level of significance; thus, the overall impacts to wildland fire hazards would remain significant and unavoidable.

Vectors

Considering the existing regulations and processes in place in the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances (Vector Control and Stormwater and Discharge Control) and the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance – Vectors, the project would not create a potentially significant hazard to the public by substantially increasing human exposure to vectors. Due to existing regulations that projects must comply with, the General Plan EIR found a less than significant impact associated with Vector Hazards. Similarly, the project, which would reduce overall development potential, would not result in significant impacts.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause one or more effects to hydrology and water quality including: violation of any waste discharge requirements; an increase in any listed pollutant to an impaired water body listed under section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act ; cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses; substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level; substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner which would result in substantial erosion, siltation or flooding on- or off-site; create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems; provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; place housing or other structures which would impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps; expose

people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam; and/or inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

YES

NO

Similar to the existing General Plan, the project would have the potential to result in polluted runoff, flooding, erosion, and/or siltation, due to an increase in impervious surfaces, alteration of drainage patterns, non-point source pollution, and construction activities. The addition of impervious surfaces could contribute to runoff in a manner that could exceed existing stormwater drainage facilities. As noted previously, when compared to the existing General Plan Land Use Map, the Land Use Map changes proposed with the project would reduce overall densities and intensity of allowed uses, resulting in less development and reduced impacts to water quality and erosion. The project proposes to add 622 acres of Open Space-Conservation lands in areas that would have allowed 32 dwelling units under the residential Land Use designations of the existing General Plan. This entails a substantial reduction in the potential expansion of impervious surfaces and potential drainage pattern alterations. In addition, the total potential dwelling units associated with the properties in the project would be reduced by 325 units under the new designations proposed. As discussed in the Project Description, non-Land Use Map changes proposed in the project include changes to the Mobility Element Network, General Plan text, Implementation Plan, and community plan policies. The changes to the Mobility Element Network are minor corrections to ensure the text of the table and colors on the map are consistent with the noted Mobility Element Network classification, and the proposed changes would not result in any increase in planned roadway widths or segment lengths. There are no proposed changes to the General Plan text, Implementation Plan, or the policies of the community plans that would result in new significant impacts to hydrology and water quality.

The existing General Plan includes potential impacts associated with violating groundwater quality standards by designating land uses that would be groundwater dependent in areas that are currently experiencing groundwater contamination. In addition, the existing General Plan would allow land uses and development in areas currently experiencing groundwater supply impacts. The project would not allow for any additional development potential in groundwater dependent areas. With the project, overall density and intensity of land uses would be reduced in groundwater dependent areas. Although impacts to groundwater would be lessened as compared to the existing General Plan, impacts would not be reduced to below a level of significance; thus, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

There will not be increased impacts associated with development within 100-year flood hazard areas, and impeding or redirecting flood flows. The project does not propose any additional development potential within 100-year floodplains. One property that would have an increase in development potential as a result of the proposed changes associated with two alternatives considered in the project is VC201. As noted above, VC201 includes a staff recommended option of retaining the SR-2 General Plan designation and changing the zoning to Residential Commercial (RC); and a CPG recommended option of changing the zoning to C34 (General Commercial/Residential), which requires changing the General Plan designation to General Commercial (C-1). The southern 1/8 of an acre of the VC201 property is in the Keys Creek floodplain. Any development would be subject to General Plan policy S-9.5, which prohibits development in the floodplain within Semi-Rural and Rural Lands (property is within the Semi-

Rural Regional Category and that's not proposed to change), unless there is no other area for a residence. As such, the proposed General Plan and zoning changes would not result in additional development potential within the floodplain. In addition, each of the alternative maps in the General Plan EIR fully analyzed Rural Commercial on the VC201 property, which allows compatible zoning use regulations that are of much higher intensity (greater range of allowed commercial uses) than either the C34 or RC zoning options proposed in the current project.

Overall development potential associated with the project represents a substantial decrease from that allowed under the existing General Plan. Although impacts to hydrology and water quality would be lessened as compared to the existing General Plan, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 of the EIR would be required.

None of the proposed Land Use Map changes, Mobility Element changes, or policy changes involves increased development potential within a mile of the coast or along the shore of a lake or reservoir. As such, the project would not result in impacts associated with tsunami or seiche hazards. As discussed previously, the project would result in reduced overall development potential, and therefore, reduced risk to people or structures being exposed to mudflow hazards. However, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 of the EIR would be required.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause one or more effects to land use and planning including: physically dividing an established community; and/or conflicts with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

YES

NO

The project does not include any new railroad tracks or airports that would physically divide a community. The proposed Mobility Element Network revisions would not result in any increase in planned roadway widths. Because of the reduced development potential associated with the project, there would be some reduced need for future roads or road expansions. Therefore, impacts associated with physical divisions of established communities would be lessened, as compared to the existing General Plan. However, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 of the EIR would be required.

The project would not conflict with the following planning documents: Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), 2050 RTP, Congestion Management Program (CMP), San Diego Basin Plan (Basin Plan), airport land use compatibility plans (ALUCPs), RAQS, County Trails Program (CTP), spheres of influence (SOI), community plans, the County Zoning Ordinance, specific plans, and the goals and policies of the County General Plan. Though revisions are proposed for the General Plan text, Implementation Plan, and community plans, the proposed revisions are consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan. Where any community plan revisions are proposed for policies that are applied to particular goals and objectives within the community plan, the proposed policy revisions are consistent with the corresponding goal

and/or objective. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant impact associated with conflicts with land use plans, policies, and regulations.

Similar to the existing General Plan, future development under the project would be required to demonstrate compliance with any HCP or NCCP adopted for the project area, including the MSCP in areas located within the adopted South County MSCP Subarea Plan, or the Coastal Sage Scrub NCCP Process Guidelines for projects located outside of the adopted MSCP boundary. Therefore, similar to the existing General Plan, the project would not result in a significant impact associated with conflicts with HCPs or NCCPs. The General Plan EIR found a less than significant impact associated with conflicts with land use plans, policies and regulations, and conflicts with HCPs and NCCPs, and that finding would hold true with the changes proposed in the current project.

When compared to the project analyzed in the General Plan EIR, the project would result in a significant reduction in development potential. Changes proposed in the project would not result in additional significant impacts or substantially more severe environmental effects to land use planning; beyond those analyzed in the General Plan EIR.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause one or more effects to mineral resources including: the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state; and/or loss of locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

YES

NO

As with the existing General Plan, the project could result in the loss of mineral resources availability. When compared to the existing General Plan Land Use Map, the Land Use Map changes proposed with the project would reduce overall densities and intensity of allowed uses, resulting in less development and reduced impacts to potential extraction of mineral resources. The project proposes to add 622 acres of Open Space-Conservation lands in areas that would have allowed 32 dwelling units under the residential General Plan designations of the existing General Plan. In addition, the total potential dwelling units associated with the properties in the project would be reduced by approximately 325 units under the new designations proposed. The existing General Plan allows land uses that would be incompatible with mining and resource recovery operations in areas designated MRZ-2, MRZ-3, underlain by Quaternary alluvium or that contain or potentially contain important aggregate resources. Incompatible land uses include semi-rural residential and village residential land uses. Therefore, the existing General Plan would allow the development of incompatible land uses in areas that potentially contain mineral resources which would result in the loss of availability of recovery sites. The project would reduce development potential in MRZ-2 and MRZ-3 areas, compared to the existing General Plan. Although the proposed Land Use Map changes would result in reduced impacts to mineral resource recovery sites, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 of the EIR would be required. Impacts would not be reduced to below a level of significance; thus, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

XII. NOISE -- Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that result in one or more effects from noise including: exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies; exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels; a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project; a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project; for projects located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, or for projects within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

YES

NO

As with the existing General Plan, the Land Use designations proposed with the project would have the potential to expose people to excessive ground borne vibration, increases in ambient noise levels, and noise levels in excess of County Noise Element and Noise Ordinance regulations. When compared to the existing General Plan Land Use Map, the Land Use Map changes proposed with the project would reduce overall densities and intensity of allowed uses, resulting in less development and reduced impacts associated with excessive noise levels, excessive ground borne vibration, permanent and temporary increases in ambient noise levels, and excessive noise exposure from airports. The project proposes to add 622 acres of Open Space-Conservation lands in areas that would have allowed 32 dwelling units under the residential General Plan designations of the existing General Plan. This substantial addition of open space acreage would reduce potential noise impacts on adjacent residential uses and reduce potential increases in ambient noise levels, analyzed in the General Plan EIR. In addition, the total potential dwelling units associated with the properties in the project would be reduced by approximately 325 units under the proposed designations, which would further reduce ambient noise levels associated with human activity. In addition to reduced impacts from future developed properties, this overall reduction in potential density also would result in less potential impacts from construction noise. Two of the items would involve changes in zoning (LS201 and SV201), related to allowed uses within the Gillespie Field Airport Influence Area; however, there would be no increase in the allowed height or allowed residential density (changes to residential zoning, allowing residential as primary use, instead of secondary). None of the other items in the project would allow any increased development potential within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, within an Airport Influence Area, or within two miles of a public or private airport. In addition, the lower overall density associated with the project would correspond with a reduced likelihood of noise sensitive land uses being exposed to excessive aircraft noise. The proposed Mobility Element Network revisions would not involve any increases in planned roadway widths, thus the project would not involve an expansion of the 60 – 75 dB Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) noise contours on either side of Mobility Element roads. The project would result in an overall reduction in noise impacts compared to the existing General Plan. However, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 of the EIR would be required. Regarding permanent increases in ambient noise levels, impacts would not be reduced to below a level of significance; thus, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that result in one or more effects to population and housing including displacing substantial numbers of existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

YES

NO

The housing accommodated with the existing General Plan is consistent with regional growth forecasts. Future development under the project would be required to comply with the land use plan adopted as part of the General Plan, which includes a land use framework and policies for growth that would avoid unplanned growth beyond regional growth forecasts. The seven open space acquisitions in the project (all changing to the Open Space-Conservation designation) are already open space preserves and do not include any existing residences. Outside of the open space acquisitions, only one of the Land Use Map changes in the current plan entails a proposed switch from a residential designation to a non-residential designation. This is the one-acre parcel associated with VC201. This item includes two options for changing the existing SR-2 Land Use designation with RR (Rural Residential) zoning: a planning group recommended change to the General Commercial Land Use designation with C34 (General Commercial/Residential) zoning; and a staff recommended change to RC (Residential/Commercial) zoning, with no associated Land Use designation change necessary with that zoning change option. Though either of these options would entail new allowances for potential commercial uses (some commercial uses requiring additional discretionary permits), there is no existing housing on the parcel that would be displaced, and both zoning use regulation options would allow residential as primary or secondary to commercial. In addition, this parcel was analyzed for a commercial designation in the EIR alternatives analysis. As stated previously, none of the proposed Mobility Element Network revisions would result in any changes in planned roadway widths. Therefore, the project would not involve new significant impacts or substantially more severe environmental effects to population and housing. However, overall impacts would still be considered potentially significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 of the EIR would still be required.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES -- Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that result in one or more substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services: fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities?

YES

NO

When compared to the existing General Plan Land Use Map, the Land Use Map changes proposed with the project would reduce overall densities and intensity of allowed uses, resulting in

less development and reduced impacts to public services. The project proposes to add 622 acres of Open Space-Conservation lands in areas that would have allowed 32 dwelling units under the residential General Plan designations of the existing General Plan. The properties converting to open space are mostly in very high fire hazard areas, with limited access. As such, these changes would result in reduced impacts to fire protection and police protection in backcountry areas, and diminished need for new or expanded facilities. In addition, the total potential dwelling units associated with the properties in the project would be reduced by approximately 325 units under the new designations proposed. A proposed policy update for the Fallbrook Community Plan would discourage designating new commercial areas outside the Village, thus promoting a compact Village to aid in the efficient provision of infrastructure and services. Three proposed changes to policies in the Valley Center Community Plan that seek to avoid commercial outside the Villages would allow exceptions for those parcels that were zoned commercial in July 2011, just before the General Plan Update. The few parcels that the exception language could apply to were analyzed for commercial in the alternatives analysis of the EIR. None of the proposed policy changes or Mobility Element Network changes would result in increased demand for public services, beyond the analysis of the EIR. Therefore, with the significant decrease in development potential associated with the project, impacts would be lessened as compared to the existing General Plan. However, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 of the EIR would be required. After mitigation, impacts related to school facilities would remain significant and unavoidable due to the fact that the planning, approval, and construction of such facilities is not within the County's jurisdiction.

XV. RECREATION -- Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that result in an increase in the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated; or that include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

YES

NO

The projected population growth under the Land Use designations of the existing General Plan would result in an increase in the number of persons that utilize recreational facilities in the unincorporated County, particularly in areas within the Village regional category, where most of the increases in planned density occurred. The project would result in a net decrease in planned density in each of the Village areas with proposed Land Use Map and/or zoning changes, and therefore, would not exacerbate the need for new or expanded recreation facilities in these areas. As discussed earlier, the project would result in a reduction of approximately 325 dwelling units, when compared to the existing General Plan. Due to this substantial reduction in potential density, the project would not lead to increased impacts related to the deterioration of parks and recreation facilities or requiring the construction of new recreational facilities. The project proposes to add 622 acres of Open Space-Conservation lands. Some of the new open space areas will include new hiking, biking, and/or equestrian trails, to help improve recreational opportunities in the respective communities. None of the proposed policy changes or Mobility Element Network changes would result in increased impacts related to deterioration of parks and recreational facilities or necessitating the construction of new recreational facilities.

With the project, impacts to recreational facilities would be reduced as compared to the existing General Plan. However, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 of the EIR would be required.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause effects to transportation/traffic including: an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system; exceedance, either individually or cumulatively, of a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways; a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks; substantial increase in hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment); inadequate emergency access; inadequate parking capacity; and/or a conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

YES

NO

Similar to the existing General Plan, the project would have the potential to affect projected road network performance, add trips to deficient facilities, adjacent cities' traffic standards, rural road safety, and emergency access. As discussed previously, the total potential dwelling units associated with the properties in the project would be reduced by approximately 325 units under the new designations proposed. As a result of the reduction in overall development potential, there would be a reduced impact on transportation and traffic, when compared to the existing General Plan.

Three of the proposed Land Use Map/zoning changes would result in additional development potential, compared to the existing designation. As discussed previously, VC201 involves a staff recommended option and a planning group recommended option for changes in zoning (with the planning group recommendation also requiring a change in the General Plan designation), with each option providing more allowances for potential commercial uses. Neither option would entail the potential for more intensive commercial development than what was analyzed in the EIR. In addition, outside of the Land Use Map/zoning changes, three proposed changes to policies in the Valley Center Community Plan that seek to avoid commercial outside the Villages would allow exceptions for those parcels that were zoned commercial in July 2011, just before the General Plan Update. The few parcels that the exception language could apply to were analyzed for commercial in the alternatives analysis of the EIR. SV202 and SW201 involve the transfer of properties from public to private ownership. General Plan Policy LU-1.6 applies an underlying RL-80 density on properties that transfer from public to private ownership. As such, existing legal lots can apply for permits for a single family residence (regardless of the applicable density). SV202 is considered a mapping error, in that the larger of the two parcels was transferred into private ownership prior to the 2011 General Plan Update. This item would involve a proposed General Plan Land Use designation change for consistency with the existing zoning of RS (Residential Single). Though LU-1.6 would allow applications for a house on each legal lot under the existing conditions, the change to the VR-7.3 designation (to match the neighborhood) could conceivably

allow 4 additional residences, though access limitations are likely to reduce that amount. SW201 involves a change from public to private ownership after the 2011 General Plan Update. As such, there is no mapping error on the property and the LU-1.6 allowance for one house on each legal lot would apply. The only change for SW201 in the project is to change the building type (to allow residential structures) and to add a zoning minimum lot size, as there is currently no lot size regulation on the properties that make up SW201. The traffic model prepared for the 2011 General Plan Update and EIR assumed 268.5 Average Daily Trips (ADTs) per acre for undeveloped parcels in the Public/Semi-Public designation. The Traffic Model also assumed 12 ADTs for each single family residence. As such, the assumed ADTs for SV202 would be a maximum of 72 for the proposed designation, as opposed to 242 for the current Public/Semi-Public designation. The assumed ADTs for SW201 would be a maximum of 24 with building type allowance for residential structures, as opposed to 1,423 for a build out of the Public/Semi-Public designation. So, even though these two would result in a slight increase in potential dwelling units, the resulting assumed ADTs would be much lower. In addition, the overall project would result in a much larger reduction in assumed ADTs, as a result of the reduction in potential dwelling units by 325. The project will not have a direct impact related to a conflict with any performance measures establishing measures of effectiveness of the circulation system because any additional trips associated with the proposed changes that are beyond the analysis of the EIR do not exceed any of the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for direct impacts related to Traffic and Transportation.

With the project, revisions are proposed to the Mobility Element Network Appendix. The changes to the Mobility Element Network are minor corrections to ensure the text of the table and colors on the map are consistent with the noted Mobility Element Network classification. For Winter Gardens Boulevard in Lakeside, Lemon Crest Drive (representing a classification segment boundary) is misspelled, and the segment that is classified as a 4.1A Major Road lists a continuous turn lane improvement in the table, instead of the raised median improvement associated with that classification. In addition Woodside Avenue is listed as the northern boundary of the 4.1A Major Road classification for Winter Gardens Boulevard, when the correct northern boundary as shown on the Mobility Element map is Lemon Crest Drive. Each of these errors is proposed for correction and the corrections would have no impact on the LOS for the road or other traffic issues, as the changes are for consistency with the map. The only other proposed change is a correction of the map color for New Road 14 in Valley Center. The 2.3B Minor Collector classification calls for a light blue color on the map, so the current green on the map will be corrected.

The project proposes to add 622 acres of Open Space-Conservation lands in areas that would have allowed 32 dwelling units under the existing General Plan. The properties converting to open space are mostly in high to very high fire hazard areas, with limited access. As such, these changes would help to reduce potential impacts from inadequate emergency access in planned residential areas, along with improving rural road safety.

The County of San Diego has developed an overall programmatic solution that addresses existing and projected future road deficiencies in the unincorporated portion of San Diego County. This program includes the adoption of a Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program to fund improvements to roadways necessary to mitigate potential cumulative impacts caused by traffic from future development. This program is based on a summary of projections method contained in an adopted planning document, as referenced in the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15130 (b)(1)(B), which evaluates regional or area wide conditions contributing to

cumulative transportation impacts. Based on SANDAG regional growth and land use forecasts, the SANDAG Regional Transportation Model was utilized to analyze projected build-out (year 2030) development conditions on the existing Mobility Element roadway network throughout the unincorporated area of the County. Based on the results of the traffic modeling, funding necessary to construct transportation facilities that will mitigate cumulative impacts from new development was identified. Existing roadway deficiencies will be corrected through improvement projects funded by other public funding sources, such as TransNet, gas tax, and grants. Potential cumulative impacts to the region's freeways have been addressed in SANDAG's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This plan, which considers freeway buildout over the next 30 years, will use funds from TransNet, state, and federal funding to improve freeways to projected level of service objectives in the RTP.

For the reasons noted above, the project would result in reduced impacts in all the sub-categories of transportation and traffic. With the addition of the project, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 of the General Plan EIR would be required. Regarding adjacent cities' traffic and LOS standards, impacts would not be reduced to below a level of significance; thus, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause effects to utilities and service systems including: exceedance of wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board; require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities, new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; require new or expanded entitlements to water supplies or new water resources to serve the project; result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments; be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs; and/or noncompliance with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

YES

NO

When compared to the existing General Plan Land Use Map, the Land Use Map changes proposed with the project would reduce overall densities and intensity of allowed uses, resulting in less development and reduced impacts to utilities and service systems. The project proposes to add 622 acres of Open Space-Conservation lands in areas that would have allowed 32 dwelling units under the residential Land Use designations of the existing General Plan. Most of the properties converting to open space are in areas that would require septic systems for wastewater treatment. With the conversion to open space, the potential for future septic system failures and new growth inducing sewer connections is reduced. The majority of the density decrease associated with the project is attributed to the correction of a mapping error associated with AL201. This property (made up of 6 parcels) was mistakenly designated VR-2.9 with the General Plan Update. Since it's owned by the Grossmont Union High School District, the appropriate designation is Public/Semi-Public. This change of designation would reduce the need for

infrastructure, as a potential high school would not require the level of sewer infrastructure and stormwater facilities that 258 residential units and associated access roads would (potential dwelling units under the VR-2.9 designation). The overall reduction of 325 potential dwelling units associated with the project would reduce the need for sewer system expansions, reduce the potential for septic system failures and reduce the need for new/expanded water resources to serve development.

Discharged wastewater must conform to the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code. California Water Code Section 13282 allows RWQCBs to authorize a local public agency to issue permits for on-site wastewater systems (OSWS) "to ensure that systems are adequately designed, located, sized, spaced, constructed and maintained." The RWQCBs with jurisdiction over San Diego County have authorized the County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health (DEH) to issue certain OSWS permits throughout the County and within the incorporated cities. DEH review would be required for any new septic systems, pursuant to DEH, Land and Water Quality Division's, "On-site Wastewater Systems: Permitting Process and Design Criteria." Only one item in the project would result in additional development potential, beyond the analysis of the EIR, in an area relying on septic. In the case of SW201, policy LU-1.6 allows an underlying RL-80 density on properties that have transferred from public to private ownership. This underlying density would allow the owner to apply for permits to construct one house on a legal lot. The only changes in the project involve the change to the C building type, to allow residential, and a change to a one-acre minimum lot size (currently no minimum lot size). Any proposals for a residence here would be subject to DEH approval of the septic plan.

The total potential dwelling units associated with the properties in the project would be reduced by 325 units under the new designations proposed. In addition, no expansion in planned roadways is proposed with the Mobility Element Network changes. Considering the reduced development potential associated with the project, as compared to the existing General Plan, potential impacts to wastewater facilities, stormwater drainage facilities, water supplies, landfill capacity, and energy consumption would be reduced. However, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 of the EIR would be required. In the areas of adequate water supplies and sufficient landfill capacity, impacts would not be reduced to below a level of significance; thus, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable, as noted in the General Plan EIR.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE: Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that result in any mandatory finding of significance listed below?

Does the project degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

YES

NO

As discussed previously, the project would entail a substantial reduction in development potential, compared to the existing General Plan. Potential overall density would be reduced by 325 units, compared to current designations. All of the effects associated with mandatory findings of significance have been adequately addressed in the General Plan, including cumulative effects. All applicable mitigation from the General Plan EIR shall be carried forward with the project, and the project will also rely on statements of overriding consideration adopted with the General Plan EIR, for significant and unavoidable impacts discussed above. The project would not introduce new significant effects, beyond those analyzed in the General Plan EIR.

EIR and Project Reference Links

- Link to previous environmental review – County of San Diego General Plan EIR – <http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/pds/gpupdate/environmental.html>
- Link to the full Staff Recommendation with all proposed changes in the project, in addition to maps and analysis worksheets for proposed Land Use Map and/or zoning changes – <http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/advance/2015gp-clean-up.html>

**XVIII. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
UPDATE CHECKLIST FORM**

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Fish and Wildlife Code, Section 1600 *et. seq.*

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines

California Environmental Quality Act. 2001. California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3, Section 15382.

California Integrated Waste Management Board, Title 14, Natural Resources, Division 7

California Integrated Waste Management Board, Title 27, Environmental Protection, Division 2, Solid Waste

California Public Resources Code, CPRC, Sections 40000-41956

County Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Division 5, Chapter 3

County of San Diego 2015 GHG Guidance – Recommended Approach to Addressing Climate Change in CEQA Documents, January 21, 2015.

County of San Diego General Plan

County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Agricultural Resources, approved March 19, 2007.

County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Air Quality, approved March 19, 2007

County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Biological Resources, approved September 15, 2010

County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Cultural Resources: Archaeological and Historical Resources, approved December 5, 2007

County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Geologic Hazards, approved July 30, 2007

County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Mineral Resources, approved July 30, 2008

County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Noise, approved March 19, 2007

County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Transportation and Traffic, approved August 24, 2011

County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Vectors, approved January 15, 2009

County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Visual Resources, approved July 30, 2007

County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Wildland Fire and Fire Protection, approved August 31, 2010

County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance

County of San Diego. Resource Protection Ordinance, Article II (16-17). October 10, 1991

County of San Diego. 1997. Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Biological Mitigation Ordinance

County of San Diego Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426, County Codes §§ 67801 et seq.)

Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection

Order No. 2001-01, NPDES No. CAS 0108758, California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region

Ordinance 8334, An Ordinance to amend the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances relating to Flood Damage Prevention, Adopted by the Board of Supervisors on 12/7/93

Public Resources Code Sections 4290 and 4291

San Diego County Light Pollution Code (San Diego County Code Section 59.101)

The Importance of Imperviousness from *Watershed Protection Techniques* Vol. 1, No. 3 - Fall 1994 by Tom Schueler Center for Watershed Protection

The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), 1976

Uniform Fire Code, Article 9 and Appendix II-A, Section 16

Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin (9), California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region