

## CHAPTER 4.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

CEQA requires in §15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed Project or to the proposed Project location that would feasibly attain most of the project objectives but would avoid or lessen any significant environmental impacts. An EIR should evaluate the environmental impacts of the alternatives compared to the proposed Project. This chapter of the EIR describes and evaluates alternative land use maps and is intended to implement the requirements set forth in the CEQA Guidelines. This chapter also identifies the Environmentally Superior Map Alternative as required by CEQA Guidelines §15126.6(e) (2). The requirements of §15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines pertaining to the alternatives analysis are summarized below.

The following discussion identifies a reasonable range of feasible alternatives that focuses on avoiding or substantially lessening significant effects resulting from implementation of the proposed Project, even if these alternatives would not attain all of the Project objectives or would be more costly, and is designed to foster meaningful public participation and informed decision-making. The following discussion focuses on Project alternatives that could meet the majority of the Project objectives, identified in Chapter 1.0 of this SEIR. According to the CEQA Guidelines, there are many factors that may be considered when determining the potential feasibility of alternatives, such as environmental impacts, site suitability (as it pertains to various land use designations), and economic viability, availability of infrastructure, regulatory limitations, and jurisdictional boundaries.

The alternatives analysis need not be as detailed as that conducted for the proposed Project. Furthermore, analysis of a No Project Alternative is required to be included in the range of alternatives. An EIR need not consider an alternative whose effects cannot be reasonably identified, whose implementation is remote or speculative, or that would not achieve the majority of the basic Project objectives. Finally, it is required, through the evaluation of Project alternatives considered, that the Environmentally Superior Alternative be identified. If the Environmentally Superior Alternative is not the No Project Alternative, the next Environmentally Superior Alternative shall be identified.

The alternatives analysis below meets the requirements of CEQA § 15126.6. The analysis includes sufficient information about each alternative to provide meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed Project. A detailed comparison and analysis of the differences between the proposed Project and the Project alternatives (Mid-density Alternative, Modified FCI Condition Alternative, and No Project Alternative) and the resulting environmental impacts is provided.

### 4.1 Rationale for Alternative Selection

Following the end of the public review period for the Draft SEIR distributed in 2013 the County reconsidered a number of project alternatives in an effort to better define the proposed land use

designations for the Project areas and to respond to comments received from the public on the Draft SEIR. The process followed by the County that resulted in the proposed Project and project alternatives analyzed in this SEIR is summarized below.

A new Land Use Map was developed in October 2013 based on an analysis of the consistency of the Land Use Map that was considered in the 2013 SEIR (circulated for review in early 2013) with the 2011 General Plan policies and planning principles as well as issues raised in public comment letters received during the circulation of the Draft SEIR. The resulting land use map became the *Mid-density Alternative* (June 2014 Staff Recommendation).

In October and November 2013, the Planning Commission considered the Land Use Map that was considered in the 2013 SEIR and the Mid-density Alternative Land use map. The Planning Commission supported the refined proposal of the Mid-density Land Use Map, except for some specific land use designations within the communities of Alpine, Cuyamaca, Lake Morena, Palomar Mountain, and Pendleton-DeLuz which. The exceptions lead to the development of the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map.

In June 2014, the County Board of Supervisors considered the land use designations presented in the *Mid-density Alternative* and the *Modified FCI Condition*. After consideration of both land use maps, along with public testimony and written correspondence, the BOS provided specific direction to prepare a new a land use map. In areas where the BOS did not provide specific direction, the most intensive land use designations that are consistent with the 2011 General Plan policies and planning principles was assigned. The resulting land use map is the *proposed Project* addressed in this SEIR.

The Project alternatives described below represent a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed Project. Each of the alternatives meets a majority of the basic project objectives and reduces the severity of negative effects upon certain resource areas as compared to the proposed Project. Numerous project alternatives were considered and some of them were rejected from further analysis as more fully described below, because they were deemed infeasible to implement, do not meet a majority of the project objectives or do not substantially lessen negative impacts when comparing their potential impacts level of significance to the proposed Project.

Table 4-1 summarizes the environmental impacts of the Project Alternatives compared to the proposed Project impacts. Table 4-2 summarizes the land use designations in acres as part of the proposed Project compared to the Project Alternatives. Table 4.3 summarizes the land use designations in acres for each of the CPAs and Subregions according to the proposed Project and Project Alternatives. Table 4-4 summarizes the buildout in dwelling units anticipated for each alternative. Alternatives that were considered but rejected are described below in section 4.1.1.

**Modified FCI Condition Alternative (Environmentally Superior).** The Modified FCI Condition Alternative proposes less intensive land uses in certain areas to further reduce the

proposed Project impacts associated with biological resources, fire hazards, increased urban interface (e.g., encroachment, habitat fragmentation, non-native invasive plants), unauthorized access (e.g., trails, roads) and off-highway vehicle use, and new construction of and improvements to infrastructure, public services and narrow County or U.S. Forest Service (USFS) roads. Similar to the proposed Project, the Modified FCI Condition Alternative is different from the former FCI condition because proposed land uses respond to specific physical and environmental conditions and stakeholder interests rather than the FCI's arbitrary application of a Rural Lands 40 designation (one dwelling unit per 40 acres (1 DU/40 AC) to the entire FCI Lands GPA planning area. As a result of this analysis, buildout of the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would result in 1,724 fewer dwelling units than the proposed Project (refer to Table 4-4). The Alternative Land Use Maps are provided as Figures 4-2.1A through 4-1.13.

**Mid-density Alternative.** The Mid-density Alternative is based on an analysis of the consistency of the proposed Project with the 2011 General Plan's policies and planning principles as well as issues raised in public comment letters on the Draft SEIR circulated for public review in 2013. In formulating the Mid-density Alternative, County staff also considered factors such as existing land use and parcel sizes, for example, two parcels in the Pendelton/DeLuz CPA which have been assigned a Rural Lands 40 land use designation rather than Rural Lands 80 that is assigned in the Modified FCI Condition Alternative. The Mid-density Alternative was also analyzed for conformance with the Community Development Model (the Community Development Model provides guidance to assist achieving a sustainable vision in the unincorporated communities of San Diego County), access to a public road, the extent of physical and environmental constraints, and proximity to environmentally sensitive CNF lands. As a result of this analysis, buildout of the Mid-density Alternative would result in 656 fewer dwelling units than the proposed Project (refer to Table 4-4). The Mid-density Alternative Land Use Maps are provided as Figures 4-2.1A through 4-2.13.

**Alpine Alternative Land Use Map.** The Alpine Alternative Land Use Map (Alpine Alternative) is the same as the proposed Project for the entire Project Area, with the exception of the Alpine Community Planning area (CPA). The Alpine Alternative is shown on Figures 4-3A and 4-3B. This alternative differs from the proposed Project in three primary areas, which total approximately 2,417 acres and are shown with a hatch. These three areas are described below.

Area 1, located east of the Alpine Village and south of Interstate 8, is surrounded by the CNF to the south and east. There are 1,015 acres within this area where the Alpine Alternative Land Use Map is proposing a different designation than the proposed Project. Both the proposed Project and the Alpine Alternative propose a linear expansion of the Alpine Village boundary along Alpine Boulevard, which will require an expansion of the County Water Authority boundary to accommodate public infrastructure (imported water and sanitary sewer). The remainder of this area would retain the existing General Plan densities of one dwelling unit per 4 acres (Semi-rural 4) and one dwelling unit per 40 acres (Rural Lands 40). The potential buildout of this area would

be 547 dwelling units or 466 fewer units than under the proposed Project. Additionally, Area 1 of the Alpine Alternative would result in three and one-half (3.5) acres of Rural Commercial, seven fewer acres than the proposed Project.

Area 2, located in the vicinity of Japatul Road south of the Alpine Village, is composed of 1,362 acres proposed for Rural Lands 40, as compared to a Rural Lands 20 designation assigned under the proposed Project. As a result, the potential build-out of this area is 32 dwelling units under the Alpine Alternative Land Use Map and 64 dwelling units under the proposed Project.

Area 3, located east of Rancho Palos Verde and south of the Alpine Village, consists of just two parcels proposed for Semi-rural 2 under the proposed Project and Rural Lands 40 under the Alpine Alternative. As a result, the Alpine Alternative would have a potential build-out of two dwelling units, or 14 less than under the proposed Project.

**No Project Alternative.** The No Project Alternative assumes that the pre-FCI General Plan land use densities apply to the former FCI lands and remain in effect. The County has determined that the sunset date of the voter-approved FCI refers to the initiative itself, which rendered the land use designations of FCI inapplicable to the Project areas beginning on January 1, 2011. As analyzed in Section 4.4 below, the No Project Alternative generally allows for higher densities within the Project areas, as compared to the proposed Project. As such, the No Project Alternative would also result in substantially more adverse effects to the environment when compared to the proposed Project or other alternatives. The purpose of describing and analyzing the No Project Alternative is to afford the Board an ability to compare the impacts of approving the proposed Project with the impacts of not approving the proposed Project. Buildout of the No Project Alternative would result in 8,849 more dwelling units than the proposed Project (refer to Table 4-4). The No Project Alternative Land Use Maps are provided as Figures 4-4.1A through 4-4.13.

Refer to table 4.1 for a comparison of the potential impacts of the proposed Project compared to this and all of the Alternatives. Tables 4.2 through 4.12 provide comparisons of the proposed Project and the Alternatives in terms of acres, dwelling units, agricultural lands, etc.

#### **4.1.1 Alternatives Considered but Rejected**


In addition to the Project alternatives described above, six additional alternatives were considered but rejected from further analysis in this SEIR because they did not accomplish most of the basic project objectives, were determined to be infeasible to implement due to their inconsistency with the 2011 General Plan or other resource constraints or, were found unable to avoid or significantly lessen identified environmental impacts. This section describes these alternatives.

### Reduced Development/No Build Alternative

Potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed Project could be curtailed by reducing growth accommodated by the proposed Project via lower density land use designations, and/or building permit limitations. Where future development would result in environmental impacts, a complete moratorium on such development (e.g. no new building permits within FCI Lands) would be the only method to avoid impacts. Implementation of such a moratorium would not be consistent with the proposed Project objectives, unlike the Mid-density, Modified FCI Condition and Alpine Alternative Land Use Map alternatives which represent reduced development alternatives that are consistent with the proposed Project objectives. These reduced development alternatives, like the proposed Project, were developed through a comprehensive planning process involving years of County outreach to the relevant community planning groups, sponsor groups, and other interested parties. Reducing planned growth beyond the contemplated reductions of the Mid-density, Modified FCI Condition and Alpine Alternative Land Use Map alternatives could not be accomplished without substantially deviating from the majority of the basic Project objectives, including supporting a reasonable share of projected regional population growth, recognizing community stakeholder interests and supporting a multi-modal transportation network, including transit operations that require certain densities for efficient operation. Therefore, it has been determined that the consideration of a Reduced Development/No Build Alternative that substantially reduces or precludes the proposed Project buildout yield beyond the reductions considered in the Mid-density, Modified FCI Condition and Alpine Alternative Land Use Map alternatives would not be consistent with the Project objectives, be politically infeasible to implement, and is rejected from further analysis herein.

### Increased Intensity Alternative (Alpine CPA)

This alternative considers shifting future growth from rural outlying lands of the Alpine CPA (primarily the parcels designated for low-density rural and semi-rural residential) to the proposed Alpine VCMU area through increased densities of village core mixed uses and rural commercial uses in this area. (See Exhibit 4-1)



**Exhibit 4-1: Proposed Project Land Use Map [Eastern Alpine]**

The land use intensity for the Increased Intensity Alternative (Alpine CPA) would fall between the proposed Project and the Modified FCI Condition Alternatives. As shown in the table below, the proposed Project assigns a high land use density of one dwelling unit per 14.5 acres to the proposed Alpine Village Core Mixed Use (VCMU) area, similar to the Increased Intensity Alternative, while the Modified FCI Condition assigns the lowest densities to the outlying areas of Alpine, similar to the Increased Intensity Alternative. Therefore, the buildout potential of the Increased Intensity Alternative would be between the proposed Project and Modified FCI Condition.

Alternative	Village Core Area		Outlying Areas
	Designation	Density	
Proposed Project	VCMU	14.5 DU/AC	Designations between VR-2 (2 DU/AC) and RL-40, where the higher densities are generally proposed as an extension of the Alpine Village
Mid-density Alternative	VCMU	10.9 DU/AC	Similar to the proposed Project, but at a lesser intensity
Modified FCI Condition	RL-40	1 DU/40 AC	Designations between SR-4 (1 DU/4 AC) and RL-40, where higher densities generally reflect existing parcel sizes
Increased Intensity Alt.	VCMU	14.5 DU/AC <sup>1</sup>	Similar to Modified FCI Condition

1 – Due to certain physical constraints on a portion of this area, 14.5 dwelling units per acre is considered the maximum feasible density.

Since the Modified FCI Condition Alternative achieves the same objective of reducing densities in the rural outlying areas as the Increased Intensity Alternative, the Increased Intensity Alternative would be necessary only if there were a Project objective to meet a certain population target. However, the only Project objective that addresses population growth states “support a reasonable share of projected regional population growth”, which does not include a specific population target. The proposed Project and Mid-density and modified FCI Condition Alternatives all would allow for population growth beyond that which would be allowed under the FCI condition of one dwelling unit per 40 acres.

In addition, buildout of the 2011 General Plan land use map, which applied Rural Lands 40 and Rural Lands 80 designations to FCI lands, would result in 65,955 future dwelling units from 2008 through 2050<sup>1</sup>. SANDAG projections result in 55,516 future dwelling units built in the unincorporated county during this same time period.<sup>2</sup> This Increased Intensity Alternative (Alpine CPA) would not substantially lessen the proposed Project’s negative impacts and may create greater localized impacts within the Alpine CPA with regards to traffic and scenic resources, in addition to biological and air quality impacts associated with significant expansion of public utilities infrastructure associated with potable water and sewer treatment facilities.

**FCI Density Alternative**

When enacted, the FCI affected privately-owned lands within and adjacent to the CNF and established 40 acres as the minimum parcel size for residential DUs (1 DU/40 AC, or 1:40) on such lands. The FCI Density Alternative would apply the Rural Lands 40 (RL-40) designation to all parcels throughout the Project area. The table below compares land use designations between the FCI Density Alternative, the three project alternatives and, the proposed Project, analyzed by this SEIR.

**Comparison of Alternatives to the FCI Condition**

Alternative	Acres (Percent)			
	>RL-40	RL-40 FCI Condition	RL-80	Other <sup>1</sup>
<b>FCI Density Alternative</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>97.0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3.0</b>
Proposed Project	18.6	35.1	43.3	3.0
Modified FCI Condition (lowest density)	13.0	30.9	53.1	3.0
Mid-density Alternative	15.9	35.5	45.6	3.0
Alpine Alternative Land Use Map	16.4	37.3	43.3	3.0
No Project (highest density)	95.0	3.7	0.0	1.3

Note 1: Includes Open Space, Public/Semi-Public, Public Agency Lands, and Tribal Lands designations


<sup>1</sup> This number is based on County projections for future dwelling units from 2005 through buildout of the land use map adopted in August 2011, minus the number of residential building permits from 2005 through 2007, as reported in the 2010 County Annual Housing Element Report to State Housing and community Development.

<sup>2</sup> SANDAG Profile Warehouse, October 2011 forecast.


The FCI Density Alternative was rejected from further analysis in this SEIR as it would not be consistent with several proposed Project objectives. Specifically, applying a 1:40 development density over all of the former FCI lands would not be consistent with the Guiding Principles and Land Use Goals and Policies, including the Community Development Model, of the 2011 General Plan. Those Project Objectives, Guiding Principles and related Policies are identified below. The rationale explains why the FCI Density Alternative would be inconsistent.

**Project Objective: Promote sustainability by locating new development near existing infrastructure, services, and jobs.**

<i>Related Policy</i>	<i>Rationale for Inconsistency</i>
<p><b>LU-1.1 Assigning Land Use Designations.</b> Assign land use designations on the Land Use Map in accordance with the Community Development Model and boundaries established by the Regional Categories Map.</p>	<p>A RL-40 designation across all of these lands would not assign densities consistent with the Community Development Model because it would not take into account existing village development and higher density semi-rural patterns of development adjacent to former FCI lands. The Project area includes or is adjacent to Village or Rural Village boundaries in the communities of Alpine, Descanso, and Ramona. Parcels, as small as one-quarter acre, are located in areas adjacent to Villages and Rural Villages. Therefore, a RL-40 designation is not appropriate in these areas.</p> <p>In contrast, the proposed Project assigns approximately 65 percent of the project area to designations other than RL-40. Of those parcels, higher density designations are assigned in 19 percent and lower densities (RL-80, open space, or public lands designations) are assigned in 46 percent of the Project area. A majority of the higher density land use designations are applied in the Alpine CPA where former FCI lands are located in close to proximity to existing village densities.</p> <p>Below are examples of very small parcel sizes within, adjacent to, or in the vicinity of village and rural village boundaries.</p>

<i>Related Policy</i>	<i>Rationale for Inconsistency</i>
<p><u>Alpine:</u>                      Parcels within area outlined in yellow range in size from one-fifth to two acres</p>	
<p><u>Descanso:</u>                      Parcels within area outlined in yellow range in size from one-quarter to one acre</p>	

**PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

<i>Related Policy</i>	<i>Rationale for Inconsistency</i>
<p><b>Ramona:</b> Parcels within area outlined in yellow average one-half acre</p>	 <p>The map shows a residential area with numerous small parcels. A yellow outline highlights a specific section of the area. A legend in the bottom left corner indicates that black shaded areas represent 'Former FCI Lands'. A red arrow points to a location labeled 'Ramona Academy'.</p>

**Project Objective:** Reinforce the vitality, local economy, and individual character of existing communities while balancing housing, employment, and recreational opportunities

<i>Related Policies</i>	<i>Rationale for Inconsistency</i>
<p><b>LU-2.3 Development Densities and Lot Sizes.</b> Assign densities and minimum lot sizes in a manner that is compatible with the character of each unincorporated community.</p>	<p>Approximately 72 percent of the entire proposed Project area consists of parcels 10 acres or less. These parcels are significantly smaller than the 40-acre minimum lot size imposed by the FCI. Therefore, for most parcels within the Project area, the density imposed is not consistent with existing parcel sizes. Assigning a RL-40 designation to small parcels adjacent to Villages and Rural Villages does not accurately reflect actual development patterns and is not consistent with the community character of the area since the lots are already subdivided to meet the land use designations.</p>

**PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

<i>Related Policies</i>	<i>Rationale for Inconsistency</i>
<p><b>LU-2.4 Relationship of Land Uses to Community Character.</b> Ensure that the land uses and densities within any Regional Category or Land Use Designation depicted on the Land Use Map reflect the unique issues, character, and development objectives for a community plan area, in addition to the General Plan Guiding Principles.</p>	<p>A blanket RL-40 designation would not reflect the unique issues of communities, as discussed in the two examples below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alpine — The RL-40 designation’s density is too low for many areas of this community, which seeks to be more self-sufficient with a larger population base to support a broader range of services (particularly a high school, health care facilities, and a larger jobs base) as well as additional infrastructure (including an additional fire station, secondary access for dead end roads, and an expanded water service area). There is little growth potential inside the existing Village boundaries and surrounding semi-rural areas; therefore expansion of these areas at densities greater than 1:40 is necessary to meet community objectives and retain a compact pattern of development.</li> <li>• Pine Valley — The RL-40 designation’s density is too high for this community. The Pine Valley Groundwater Study prepared for the General Plan Update PEIR determined that the sustainable yield for the Pine Valley South Basin would be exceeded under build-out of the 2011 General Plan land use alternatives. However, a RL-80 designation (1:80 density) would minimize potential future development in the Pine Valley South Basin to within the sustainable yield calculated within the study.</li> </ul>

**Project Objective: Ensure that development accounts for physical constraints and the natural hazards of the land.**

<i>Related Policy</i>	<i>Rationale for Inconsistency</i>
<p><b>LU-6.11 Protection from Wildfires and Unmitigable Hazards.</b> Assign land uses and densities in a manner that minimizes development in extreme, very high and high fire threat areas or other unmitigable hazardous areas.</p>	<p>Most lands included in the GPA planning area are within the very high fire hazard severity zone where additional development potential should be minimized whenever feasible. Some of these areas are located adjacent to Wilderness-designated portions of the CNF, which are best protected when development on adjacent private lands is minimal. A RL-40 designation applied under the FCI Density Alternative would maintain rural character and limit future development potential. However, for remote lands within the GPA planning area with very large parcel sizes, a RL-40 designation would allow nearly twice as much development potential as a RL-80 designation. Therefore, assigning a RL-80 designation would best minimize development potential in accordance with this Policy.</p> <p>Two examples where a RL-80 designation (1:80) density is</p>

## PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

<i>Related Policy</i>	<i>Rationale for Inconsistency</i>
	more appropriate than RL-40 are in the Jamul/Dulzura and Pendleton/DeLuz communities. The RL-40 designation's density is too high for these remote areas located entirely within the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone and surrounded by the Cleveland National Forest. An RL-80 designation for both the northeastern portion of Jamul/Dulzura and nearly the entire portion of Pendleton/DeLuz within the GPA planning area would best minimize future development and be most consistent with this policy.

**Project Objective: Recognize community and stakeholder interests while striving for consensus.**

*Rationale for Non-Conformance:*

The FCI Density Alternative does not take into account the interests of a broad range of stakeholders nor allow for community and area-specific implementation of the 2011 General Plan Goals and Policies. This Alternative would be opposed by more stakeholders than either the proposed Project, June 2014 Staff Recommendation, or Modified FCI Condition.

Provided below are various examples for how the FCI Density Alternative, which arbitrarily assigns a RL-40 designation with a 1:40 density, does not consider stakeholder interests.

- Alpine — The Alpine Community Planning Group supports higher densities east of the existing village boundaries that expand their population base to support additional facilities with a broader range of services, in particular a high school serving the Alpine community.
- Lake Morena — The Campo / Lake Morena Community Planning Group would be more opposed to a RL-40 designation than they are to the RL-20 designation assigned by the proposed Project. The RL-40 designation would remove any future development potential from an area only one-fifth mile from the Lake Morena Rural Village.
- Pendleton / DeLuz — The United States Forest Service (USFS) and Endangered Habitats League (EHL) are opposed to a 1:40 density that would allow more future development potential than a RL-80 designation in remote areas of DeLuz that have a very high risk of wildland fires and where privately-owned parcels are surrounded by Wilderness-designated portions of the CNF.
- Pine Valley — The Pine Valley Community Planning Group, USFS, and EHL are opposed to a 1:40 density that would allow more future development potential than a RL-80 designation. Buildout at the 1:40 density would exceed the sustainable yield for the Pine Valley South Groundwater Basin. All three of these stakeholders currently support the proposed Project, June 2014 Staff Recommendation, or Modified FCI Condition, which are the same for the Pine Valley planning area.

- Ramona — The Ramona Community Planning Group is opposed to a 1:40 density for the parcels within the FCI that generally range in size from one-half to 10 acres. Currently, there is no known opposition from project stakeholders to the proposed Project, June 2014 Staff Recommendation, or Modified FCI Condition for the Ramona planning area.

### No New East Willows Village Alternative

The No New East Willows Village Alternative was specifically designed to reduce significant traffic impacts identified with the proposed Project on roadways within the Alpine CPA. By reducing the intensity of Village land uses along Willows Road east of the Viejas Casino, a reduction in the total number of average daily traffic trips (ADT) may be generated. To accomplish this, a conceptual approach has been formulated in which this alternative would result in a slight increase in rural and semi-rural residential housing in the rural, outlying former FCI lands throughout the Project areas, within and near the CNF lands, while also reducing development intensity in the Alpine CPA east of the Viejas Casino and north of Interstate 8. Under this alternative, the proposed increase in residential units in the outlying areas would be incremental, consistent with existing rural land use patterns, and would be achieved through development transfers. For example, the proposed land use designations for some parcels would transition to the next higher density classification, as in the following progression: RL-80 to RL-40, RL-40 to RL-20, RL-20 to SR-10, and SR-10 to SR-4. To accomplish this increase of development densities in the outlying areas, conceptually the proposed VCMU designation to the east of the Viejas Casino would be replaced by the SR-4 designation (1 DU/4 AC) and the large area of proposed Rural Commercial designation adjacent to the east of the VCMU would be replaced by the RL-40 designation (1 DU/40 AC).

This approach would transfer the potential increase in future residential dwelling units from the VCMU and Rural Commercial designated areas in Alpine along Willows Road east of Viejas to outlying FCI lands throughout all of the Project areas to achieve the same overall buildout yield as in the proposed Project. Under this alternative, assigned densities would increase the development potential in outlying areas where jobs, services, and infrastructure is generally lacking, while decreasing development in areas with jobs, services, and infrastructure.

The No New East Willows Village Alternative was rejected from further analysis in this SEIR as it would increase density in outlying areas inconsistent with the Project objective to assign land use designations in a manner consistent with Guiding Principles, Goals and Policies of the 2011 General Plan. In addition, the objective of this alternative to reduce significant traffic impacts identified with the proposed Project on roadways within the Alpine CPA by reducing the intensity of Village land uses proposed for Alpine along Willows Road east of the Viejas Casino, is achieved by the Modified FCI Condition Alternative without the necessity to increase land use densities in remote areas. Therefore, an alternative which meets the same objective without causing additional significant impacts, the Modified FCI Condition Alternative, is analyzed for consideration. The rationale presented below explains why the No New East Willows Village

Alternative would be inconsistent with applicable 2011 General Plan goals and polices that form the basis of Project objectives identified for the proposed Project.

**Project Objective: Promote sustainability by locating new development near existing infrastructure, services, and jobs.**

<i>Related Policy</i>	<i>Rationale for Inconsistency</i>
<b>LU-1.1 Assigning Land Use Designations.</b> Assign land use designations on the Land Use Map in accordance with the Community Development Model and boundaries established by the Regional Categories Map.	This alternative would not be consistent with the Community Development Model as it proposes to increase density in areas that are remote from employment, services, and infrastructure. Additionally, such dispersal of development can result in corresponding increases in impacts on environmental resources and the costs of community infrastructure and services. Community services such as police and fire are provided from central locations and require travel times to access users. Those travel times increase with decreasing densities. Dispersed development patterns also increase travel distances and times from homes to jobs, shopping, and services. These, in turn, increase gasoline consumption, air pollution, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and time away from home and the family.

**Project Objective: Ensure that development accounts for physical constraints and the natural hazards of the land.**

<i>Related Policies</i>	<i>Rationale for Inconsistency</i>
<b>LU-6.11 Protection from Wildfires and Unmitigable Hazards.</b> Assign land uses and densities in a manner that minimizes development in extreme, very high and high fire threat areas or other unmitigable hazardous areas.	Most lands included in the GPA planning area are within the very high fire hazard severity zone where additional development potential should be minimized whenever feasible. Some of these areas are located adjacent to Wilderness-designated portions of the CNF, which are best protected when development on adjacent private lands is minimal. Increasing density on remote lands within the GPA planning area with very large parcel sizes would allow additional development potential.

**Project Objective #10: Recognize community and stakeholder interests while striving for consensus.**

*Rationale for Non-Conformance:*

The No New East Willows Village Alternative does not take into account the interests of the Alpine Community Planning Group, residents, and other stakeholder who support higher densities east of the existing village boundaries. Higher densities east of the existing village

would expand the community's population base to support additional facilities with a broader range of services, in particular a high school serving the Alpine community.

### City-Centered Alternative

The City-Centered Alternative was jointly submitted for consideration during the General Plan Update by the Save Our Forest and Ranchlands (SoFAR) and the Cleveland National Forest Foundation (CNFF). This alternative would channel much of the region's growth (approximately two-thirds of the projected growth) from the unincorporated areas of San Diego County into or immediately adjacent to existing incorporated cities within San Diego County. The intent of redirecting growth towards the existing incorporated cities under this alternative is to protect resources in the backcountry areas of the County, avoid sprawl, and encourage urban sustainability. Appropriating two-thirds of the projected growth in the unincorporated areas of the County into existing cities could reduce impacts on natural and agricultural resources in rural areas due to a decrease in development pressure in these areas.

Potential impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, noise, and traffic that typically occur as a result of development could also be reduced in the unincorporated areas of the County. However, redirecting most of the projected housing unit growth to existing cities would have negative effects resulting from the intensification of residential development in these urban areas and does not recognize stakeholder and community interests. The City Centered Alternative would potentially result in greater impacts to air quality, traffic, and noise from increased construction and development in proximity to sensitive receptors which are more difficult to avoid due to their abundance in urban areas. The additional development being proposed for cities; however, the County does not have land use jurisdictions in these areas. The increase in development in the existing urban areas under the City Centered Alternative could also increase impacts related to land use compatibility and community character. Therefore, the County finds it would be infeasible to consider this alternative given the following:

- The high potential for the additional development to result in increased impacts to air quality, traffic, noise and community character in the cities where it is being added; and
- The County does not have any land use jurisdiction in the cities to ensure that the additional development would be approved.

Consistent with concerns related to climate change impacts, locating additional residential development within low-lying coastal areas whereat much of the urban development of San Diego County resides may render the resulting development susceptible to rising sea levels.

Additionally, the County of San Diego is required to comply with State law concerning the provision of regional housing. This includes the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA), which sets forth the overall regional housing need by jurisdiction and income category as allocated by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG). The County of San Diego

is required to adopt a General Plan housing element that establishes a commitment to accommodate its share of lower income housing under the adopted RHNA to demonstrate compliance with the RHNA. The redirection of approximately two thirds of the projected residential unit growth in the unincorporated areas of the County to existing cities under the City Centered Alternative would negatively affect the County's ability to comply the RHNA and create a situation where new housing is disproportionately limited to the affordable housing range rather than provide for a mixture of housing types available to all incomes. Unfortunately, low income housing developed in the unincorporated areas of the County would also suffer from decreased access to employment, services, and infrastructure. The primary purpose of this project is to appropriately re-designate the Project areas (i.e. former FCI lands) which are not immediately adjacent or even near the incorporated cities; re-designating land adjacent to incorporated cities is not within the scope of this Project.

Therefore, the City Center Alternative is inconsistent with the 2011 General Plan Guiding Principles and the Community Development Model, constrains the ability of the County to meet their fair share housing requirements of the RHNA and would potentially require the re-designation of lands adjacent to incorporated cities which is not within the scope of the proposed Project so it is infeasible to implement, and was rejected for further analysis in this SEIR.


### Fisher Property Exemption

On June 25, 2014 the County BOS provided direction on land use designations for lands within the North Mountain Subregion, with the exception of the Fisher property. The Board motion exempted the Fisher property after testimony from Mr. Fisher requesting his property retain the land use density (1 DU/8 AC) in place prior to adoption of the FCI. The proposed Project is recommending that the Fisher parcel located within the Project area be assigned a Rural Lands 40 designation based on the rationale provided below.

The Fisher property consists of two parcels (APNs 135-320-02-00 and 136-210-01-00) totaling 87.5 acres spanning both the Pala-Pauma and North Mountain Subregions. However, only 13.5 acres of APN 136-210-01-00 located in the North Mountain Subregion were subject to the FCI and are included in the Proposed Project. The remaining 74 acres located in the Pala-Pauma Subregion are outside the purview of the FCI and were designated Rural Lands 40 and Rural Lands 80 under the 2011 General Plan. The lands within the Pala-Pauma Subregion (74 acres) are outside the Project areas of this GPA.

Retaining a density of 1 DU/8 AC would require assigning a semi-rural designation to the 13.5-acre portion of the Fisher property within the Project area. However, the remaining 74 acres would retain Rural Lands 40 and 80 designations as assigned under the 2011 General Plan. As shown in Exhibit 4-2, the Fisher parcels (shown with a yellow outline) are surrounded by the Cleveland National Forest (CNF), La Jolla Reservation, or other privately owned parcels designated Rural Lands 40 or Rural Lands 80. A semi-rural designation on the 13.5-acre portion of APN 136-210-01-00 would require that the parcel be split designated with 13.5 acres assigned

a Semi-Rural designation and the remaining 74 acres Rural Lands 40. Because a Semi-Rural designation would not be consistent with the 2011 General Plan Guiding Principles and Policies, as described below, the remaining 74 acres were not considered for re-designation as are some areas immediately adjacent to the FCI Lands, that is, the 400 acres under consideration by the proposed Project that are in addition to the FCI Lands. This alternative was rejected from further analysis due to its infeasibility related to inconsistency with the CDM, the majority of the Fisher property not properly related to the proposed Project action and thus the project objectives, and the alternative would not significantly reduce negative impacts of the proposed Project; this alternative may increase impacts such as air quality and climate change due to increased travel requirements for residents given the remote location and lack of infrastructure, employment opportunities and public services.



**Exhibit 4-2: Fisher Parcels**

**General Plan Planning Objective**

Guiding Principle #2, which establishes the Community Development Model (CDM). Per the CDM, “Village” and “Semi-rural” lands are surrounded by “Rural Lands” characterized by very low density residential areas that contain open space, habitat, recreation, agriculture, and other uses associated with rural areas.

Policy LU-1.1, Assigning Land Use Designations, which requires designating land uses in accordance with boundaries

**General Plan Consistency Determination**

A Semi-Rural designation for the Fisher property would not be consistent with the CDM. The 13.5-acre portion discussed above is located in a remote area, surrounded by either uninhabited public lands or very low density private lands with an average parcel size of over 100 acres. Therefore, per the CDM, only a Rural Lands designation is appropriate in this area.

A Semi-Rural designation for the Fisher property would not be consistent with Policy LU-1.1. The Fisher parcel is surrounded by other privately owned parcels assigned “Rural Lands”

<p>established by Regional Categories.</p>	<p>designations, or parcels within the CNF or La Jolla Indian Reservation.</p> <p>The nearest parcels with a semi-rural designation (Semi-Rural 10) are located over five miles to the west along State Route 76, on the other side of the La Jolla Indian Reservation. Therefore, a Semi-Rural designation would be well outside the Semi-Rural boundary established by the 2011 General Plan.</p>
--	---

## 4.2 Analysis of the Modified FCI Condition (Environmentally Superior) Alternative

### 4.2.1 Modified FCI Condition (Environmentally Superior) Alternative Description and Setting

As described in Section 1.6.1 (Additional Review and Consultation Requirements) of this SEIR, prior to and since the adoption of the General Plan in August 2011, the County PDS Department has been working with community planning and sponsor groups, and affected property owners, to plan for the appropriate and equitable application of land use and zoning designations for the former FCI lands, while ensuring consistency with the Guiding Principles of the 2011 General Plan. Through this process, different approaches for distributing density were considered among the former FCI lands, with an emphasis on future development which is more sensitive to the environmental resources and/or constraints on the subject properties. The General Plan Update PEIR forecasted growth within the former FCI lands consistent with the zoning designations established by the voter initiative which allowed one dwelling unit per 40 acres (1:40). The forecasted growth within the 2011 General Plan is approximately 233 dwellings units higher than the proposed Modified FCI Condition Alternative. The Modified FCI Condition Alternative was developed based on public comments received during the public review period for the SEIR in 2013 and the NOP public review period:

- Notice Of Preparation — During the NOP public review period for the SEIR circulated in 2013 (refer to Section 1.1.2.1), comments were received and considered by the County in effort to identify feasible Project alternatives. The comment letters propose reduced densities on specific parcels to further reduce Project impacts associated with biological resources, fire hazards, increased urban interface (e.g., encroachment, habitat fragmentation, non-native invasive plants), unauthorized access (e.g., trails, roads) and off-highway vehicle use, and new construction of and improvements to infrastructure, public services and narrow County or USFS roads (refer to Appendix B of this SEIR): Endangered Habitats League (dated September 19, 2012); USFS Cleveland National Forest (CNF) (dated September 28, 2012); and Nicole McDonough (dated September 24,

2012). These comments collectively form the basis of a new alternative referred to herein as the “Modified FCI Condition Alternative.”

- 2013 Public Review of Draft SEIR — The Draft SEIR was circulated for public review from February 1 to March 18, 2013, with 41 comment letters received, which are available at: <http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/advance/FCI.html>. In some instances, these comment letters raised the same and additional resource concerns and specific parcels voiced in the comment letters received in response to the 2013 NOP, and proposed reduced density on specific parcels.

Based on the recommendations in comment letters responding to the NOP and public review comment letters received during review of the Draft SEIR circulated in 2013, a Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map was created (Figures 4-1.1A through 4-1.13). The areas where the land use designations for the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map differ from the proposed Project Land Use Map are shown with a diagonal hatch. The Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map and the proposed Project Land Use Map are the same for the following communities: Desert, Mountain Empire, North Mountain, Pendleton-DeLuz, Pine Valley, and Ramona.

The Modified FCI Condition Alternative would support buildout of approximately 4,521 residential DUs, or approximately 1,724 less than the proposed Project Land Use Map. When compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would assign 2,505 additional acres as Semi-Rural and increase the amount of Rural Lands by 2,952 acres. In addition, this map would assign 191 less acres of Village Residential and 152 less acres of Village Core Mixed Use (VCMU) land uses than the proposed Project Land Use Map. The areas that would experience substantial increases in the Rural Lands designations under this alternative, and therefore less residential buildout compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, include Descanso Subarea (1,666 acres), Alpine CPA (946 acres); and Jamul/Dulzura Subregion (242 acres).

Specific differences in the two land use maps are shown in Tables 4-2, 4-3 and 4-4 and discussed in more detail below.

**Alpine CPA:** At buildout, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would result in 1,878 dwelling units, 1,673 fewer units than the proposed Project Land Use Map. Specific differences include changes to the following land use designations:

- 196 acres of Semi-Rural Residential (1 DU/10 AC) parcels located northwest and northeast of Viejas Reservation would be redesignated to Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/40 AC);
- 97 acres of Rural Commercial would be redesignated to Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/40 AC) at the eastern end of Willows Road;
- 152 acres of VCMU (14.5 DU/AC) would be changed to Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/40 AC) along Willows Road east of the Viejas Casino;

- 174 acres of Village Residential 2 (2 DU/AC) would be redesignated to Semi-Rural Residential (1 DU/1 AC and 1 DU/2 AC) parcels south of Alpine Boulevard near the Viejas Casino;
- 102 acres of Semi-Rural Residential (1 DU/AC) would be redesignated to Semi-Rural Residential (1 DU/2 AC and 1 DU/4 AC) in an area south of Interstate 8 and east of the existing Alpine Village;
- 274 acres of Semi-Rural Residential (1 DU/2 AC, 1 DU/4 AC, and 1 DU/10 AC) would be redesignated to Semi-Rural Residential (1 DU/10 AC) and Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/20 AC) in an area east of the existing Alpine Village adjacent to the CNF;
- 427 acres of Semi-Rural Residential (1 DU/AC) and (1 DU/2 AC) and Rural Commercial parcels would be redesignated to Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/40 AC) south of the eastern end of Alpine Boulevard;
- 40 acres of Semi-Rural Residential (1 DU/2 AC) parcels would be redesignated to Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/40 AC) in an area east of Rancho Palos Verde southeast of the existing Alpine Village; and
- 1,748 of Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/20 AC) would be redesignated to Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/40 AC) in the vicinity of Japatul Valley Road in the southeastern portion of the CPA.

**Central Mountain Subregion – Cuyamaca:** At buildout, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would result in 87 dwelling units, 20 fewer units than the proposed Project Land Use Map. The Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would redesignate 2,411 acres from Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/40 AC) assigned on the proposed Project Land Use Map to Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/80 AC) along Boulder Creek Road, in the northwestern portion of the subarea.

**Central Mountain Subregion – Descanso:** At buildout, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would result in 606 dwelling units, nine (9) fewer units than the proposed Project Land Use Map. Specific differences include changes to the following land use designations:

- 1,026 acres of Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/40 AC) parcels would be redesignated to Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/80 AC) in the Sherilton Valley area in the northwestern portion of the subarea;
- 1,560 acres of Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/40 AC) and Semi-Rural Residential (1 DU/10 AC) parcels would be redesignated to Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/80 AC and 1 DU/40 AC) in the Boulder Creek Road area northwest of the Descanso Rural Village;
- 171 acres of Semi-Rural Residential (1 DU/10 AC) parcels would be redesignated to Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/20) southwest portion of the Descanso Rural Village;
- 474 acres of Semi-Rural Residential (1 DU/10 AC) parcels would be redesignated to Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/20 AC) in the vicinity of Old Ranch Road south of Interstate 8; and

- 430 acres of Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/40 AC) would be redesignated to Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/80 AC) in the southernmost portion of the subarea.

**Central Mountain Subregion – Unrepresented:** At buildout, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would result in 105 dwelling units, which is the same number of dwelling units that would result from the proposed Project Land Use Map. However, there are 201 acres in the eastern portion of the subarea that under the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would be redesignated from Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/40 AC) to Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/80 AC).

**Jamul/Dulzura Subregion:** At buildout, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would result in 53 dwelling units, five (5) fewer units than the proposed Project Land Use Map. Specific differences include changes to the following land use designations:

- 234 acres of Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/40 AC) parcels would be redesignated to Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/80 AC) in an eastern area of the Subregion bisected by Lyons Valley Road; and
- 241 acres of Semi-Rural Residential (1 DU/10 AC) would be redesignated to Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/80 AC) at the end of Deerhorn Valley Road.

**Mountain Empire Subregion – Lake Morena/Campo:** At buildout, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would result in 48 dwelling units, one less than the proposed Project Land Use Map. Approximately 29 acres (two parcels located south of the Lake Morena Rural Village along Lake Morena Drive) are designated Semi-Rural Residential (1 DU/10 AC) under the proposed Project Land Use Map, as compared to Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/20 AC) under the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map.

**North Mountain Subregion – Palomar Mountain:** At buildout, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would result in 806 dwelling units, which is the same number of dwelling units that would result from the proposed Project Land Use Map. However, there are 81 acres located along State Park Road west of the Palomar Mountain Village that the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would redesignate from Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/20 AC) to Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/40 AC).

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6(e)(2), the Modified FCI Condition Alternative is considered to be the Environmentally Superior Alternative considering it would accommodate less development (28% fewer dwelling units) than the proposed Project Land Use Map, thus decreasing the potential for environmental impacts associated with future development. This alternative better accounts for environmental considerations and constraints by restricting growth in remote areas within and adjacent to the CNF to a greater degree than that associated with the proposed Project and the other alternatives.

## 4.2.2 Comparison of the Effects of the Modified FCI Condition (Environmentally Superior) Alternative to the Proposed Project

### 4.2.2.1 *Aesthetics*

#### Scenic Vistas

Similar to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map recommends land use designations that would have the potential to obstruct, interrupt, or detract from scenic vistas (refer to Section 4.2.2.1 regarding interruption of scenic expanse of open space and inconsistency with surrounding landscapes). Compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would result in an overall reduced intensity of commercial and residential development within and adjacent to the CNF, which would result in less obstructions or distractions to scenic vistas in these areas.

The Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would result in a reduction in land use intensity for an area in Alpine east of Viejas Casino, both north (249 acres) and south (424 acres) of Interstate 8, when compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map. The Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map assigns a Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/40 AC), as compared to a Rural Commercial and VCMU (14.5 DU/AC) north of Interstate 8 and Rural Commercial and Semi-Rural Residential (1 DU/AC) south of Interstate 8 under the proposed Project Land Use Map.

As such, future development under this alternative would result in fewer direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to scenic vistas compared to the proposed Project; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.1.4 of this SEIR would be required.

#### Scenic Resources

Similar to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map recommends land use designations that would result in the removal or substantial adverse change to features that contribute to the valued visual character or image of a neighborhood, community, State Scenic Highway, or localized area, including landmarks, (designated) historic resources, trees, and rock out-croppings. For example, future development under this alternative could result in the removal or destruction of a scenic resource during construction or demolition activities. Additionally, if future development is inconsistent with surrounding scenic resources, it would detract from the visual quality of the resources. Compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, The Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would result in an overall reduced density of residential development within and adjacent to the CNF. As such, future development under this alternative would result in fewer direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to scenic resources from construction or demolition activities compared to the proposed Project; however, impacts

would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.1.4 of this SEIR would be required.

### Visual Character or Quality

Similar to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map recommends land use designations that could degrade the existing visual character or quality of backcountry areas. While most land use designations would generally be compatible with existing communities, the proposed VCMU, Village Residential and Rural Commercial land uses within town centers could result in a substantial change to the existing community character of a CPA, particularly if future development is improperly designed or located; however, this alternative would provide lower density designations within the Alpine Town Center when compared to the proposed Project which would lessen impacts to existing community character.

When compared to the proposed Project, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would accommodate 1,724 fewer housing units with less potential to impact the existing visual character or quality of a community. As such, future development under this alternative would result in less direct and cumulative visual character impacts compared to the proposed Project; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.1.4 of this SEIR would be required. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that these impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance for the same reasons given in Section 2.1.4.3 of this SEIR; thus, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

### Light or Glare

Similar to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map recommends land use designations that would result in new sources of light or glare from building materials and outdoor lighting used in new residential, commercial, or public/semi-public developments allowable under its land uses. Such additional night lighting is detrimental to astronomy research at the Palomar and Mount Laguna Observatories. As shown in Table 4-5, within Zone A, which represents areas that have the greatest impact on the Palomar and Mount Laguna Observatories, the potential buildout of the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would result in 12 fewer dwelling units within Zone A than the proposed Project Land Use Map. These 12 units are all within the sphere of the Mount Laguna Observatory; nine in the Descanso Subarea, two in the Cuyamaca Subarea, and one in the Lake Morena Subarea. Therefore, this alternative would have less potential for structures to cause substantial new sources of light or glare compared to the proposed Project. As such, future development under this alternative would result in fewer direct and cumulative impacts to dark skies compared to the proposed Project; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.1.4 of this SEIR would be required. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that these impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance for the same reasons given in Section 2.1.4.4 of this SEIR; thus, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

#### **4.2.2.2      *Agricultural and Forestry Resources***

Impacts related to the direct and indirect conversion of agricultural and forestry resources, and land-use conflicts with agricultural/timberland production zoning would be similar to those discussed for the proposed Project but to a lesser degree because of the overall decrease in development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative.

##### **Direct Conversion of Agricultural Resources**

Potential impacts to County agricultural resources from the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would be the same as that of the proposed Project. Similar to the impact assumptions for the proposed Project (per the General Plan Update Program EIR), the proposed Village Residential, VCMU, and Rural Commercial land use designations would result in direct conversion of all existing agricultural resources on the affected parcels because these land uses would result in parcels too small for viable agriculture. However, based on the County's GIS data there are not any agricultural resources on parcels assigned Village Residential, VCMU, and Rural Commercial land use designations under both the proposed Project and Modified FCI Condition Land Use Maps. Future development under this alternative would result in the same direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to agricultural resources compared to the proposed Project. Therefore, impacts would still be considered significant, and the mitigation identified in Section 2.2.4 of this SEIR would be required. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that these impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance for the same reasons given in Section 2.2.4.1 of this SEIR; thus, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

##### **Conflicts with Agricultural and Forestry Lands**

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative could result in significant direct and indirect land use conflicts with agricultural uses, Williamson Act Contract lands, forest land, timberland, or areas zoned for Timberland Production. Land use/ agricultural interface issues would have the potential to occur such as dust, noise, and conflicts with pesticide use. In addition, future development adjacent to forest lands could conflict with the use and management of such lands as envisioned by the CNF Land Management Plan, such as the production of wood products and fuel wood harvesting activities; however, fewer acres of incompatible land uses would be placed near agricultural resources and forest lands under this alternative due to the overall decrease in development compared to the proposed Project. As such, future development under this alternative would result in fewer direct, indirect and cumulative impacts associated with potential conflicts with adjacent agricultural uses, Williamson Act Contract lands, or forest lands compared to the proposed Project; however, these conflicts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.2.4 of this SEIR would be required. With implementation of the mitigation measures, this impact would be reduced to less than significant.

### Indirect Conversion of Agricultural Resources

Although the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would increase lower density land uses while decreasing higher density land uses, as compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, future development under this alternative would place some incompatible land uses in the vicinity of surrounding agricultural uses creating the potential for an indirect conversion of these lands to non-agricultural uses. As shown in Table 4-6, impacts to agricultural land associated with buildout of the proposed Project and this alternative would be the same at approximately 48.5 acres. When compared to the proposed Project, fewer acres of incompatible land uses would be placed near agricultural lands, thereby reducing the potential for such indirect conversions. As such, future development under this alternative would be less likely to cause an indirect conversion of these lands to non-agricultural uses compared to the proposed Project; however, the direct and cumulative impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.2.4 of this SEIR would be required. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that these impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance for the same reasons given in Section 2.2.4.3 of this SEIR; thus, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

### Direct and Indirect Conversion of Forestry Resources

The County of San Diego does not include lands zoned for forest land, timberland, or timberland production. Rather, these lands are located on State parks and National forests, including CNF lands which are under the jurisdiction of USFS; however, some private parcels within the Project areas which are under the jurisdiction of the County may contain lands that would be defined as “forestry resources” or “timberland” by USFS (e.g., trees that can be processed for timber products). Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative may result in the permanent loss of such forestry resources or timberland on private lands, or the direct conversion of such lands to non-forest use. Additionally, future development under this alternative may result in land uses that are incompatible with adjacent or nearby CNF lands, such as the construction of a housing tract next to a heavily forested area. Such development could eventually lead to permanent impacts on the CNF lands due to factors such as erosion/siltation, invasive plants, edge effects (e.g., human intrusion, predation by pets), noise (e.g., nest abandonment), night-lighting (e.g., nocturnal wildlife predation), and habitat fragmentation, or the indirect conversion of such lands to non-forest use. This alternative would result in less overall direct and indirect impacts to forestry resources, as compared to the proposed Project, because it would involve a reduction in residential densities in outlying areas within and near the CNF lands which contain forestry resources. As shown in Table 4-7, under this alternative 721.4 acres of forest vegetation and 839 acres of woodlands are assigned a Residential Semi-Rural land use designation, as compared with 790 acres of forest vegetation and 1,549 acres of woodlands that are assigned a Semi-Rural land use designation under the proposed Project Land Use Map. However, the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.2.4 of this SEIR would

be required. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that these impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance for the same reasons given in Section 2.2.4.4 of this SEIR; thus, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

#### **4.2.2.3 Air Quality**

##### **Air Quality Plans**

The Modified FCI Condition Alternative would accommodate less growth than the proposed Project; therefore, it would result in fewer emissions Countywide than were accounted for in the Regional Air Quality Strategies (RAQS) and State Implementation Plan (SIP). Additionally, future development under this alternative would be required to be consistent with the emission reduction strategies in the RAQS and SIP. Therefore, this alternative would not result in significant conflicts with the RAQS and SIP.

##### **Air Quality Violations**

Temporary construction-related air pollutant emissions under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would be less than the proposed Project because less development would be accommodated. Similar to the proposed Project, new stationary sources of pollutants under this alternative would be subject to the APCD requirements for permitting and must demonstrate that they will not cause or contribute to a violation of an air quality standard; however, future development under this alternative would result in less vehicle miles traveled (VMT), and corresponding emissions that would violate air quality standards, compared to the proposed Project. As such, future development under this alternative would result in fewer direct and cumulative impacts associated with air quality violations compared to the proposed Project; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.3.4 of this SEIR would be required. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that these impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance for the same reasons given in Section 2.3.4.2 of this SEIR; thus, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

##### **Non-attainment of Criteria Pollutants**

Similar to the proposed Project, the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would result in new construction activities and vehicle trips that would result in temporary and permanent increases in emissions of non-attainment criteria pollutants. As discussed in the preceding paragraph, this alternative would result in less construction and fewer VMT, and therefore fewer corresponding emissions that would violate air quality standards, as compared to the proposed Project. As shown in Table 4-8, buildout of the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would result in less annual emissions of VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, Sox, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> than that associated with the proposed Project. As such, future development under this alternative would result in fewer direct and cumulative impacts associated with potential exceedances of non-attainment criteria air

pollutants compared to the proposed Project; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.3.4 of this SEIR would be required. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that these impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance for the same reasons given in Section 2.3.4.3 of this SEIR; thus, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

### **Sensitive Receptors**

Similar to the proposed Project, the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would result in increased truck trips and use of construction equipment for new development which would emit diesel particulate matter and increase the exposure of sensitive receptors to Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs). As discussed in the preceding paragraph, this alternative would result in less construction and fewer VMT, and therefore fewer corresponding emissions that would violate air quality standards, as compared to the proposed Project. As such, future development under this alternative would result in fewer direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to sensitive receptors compared to the proposed Project; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.3.4 of this SEIR would be required. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that these impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance for the same reasons given in Section 2.3.4.3 of this SEIR; thus, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

### **Objectionable Odors**

Similar to the proposed Project, odor generating land uses proposed under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would be required to comply with APCD Rule 51 and County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Sections 63.401 and 63.402, which prohibit nuisance odors from affecting nearby receptors. Therefore, this alternative would not result in a significant impact associated with objectionable odors.

## **4.2.2.4 *Biological Resources***

### **Special Status Plant and Wildlife Species**

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would result in direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to special status plant and wildlife species and their habitats. This analysis is based on the same impact assumptions used for the proposed Project (refer to Section 4.2.2.4). The Modified FCI Condition Alternative would involve approximately 2,952 additional acres of rural lands, resulting in less biological impacts compared to the proposed Project, and approximately 2,952 fewer acres of higher density land uses (i.e., Semi-Rural Residential, Village Residential, VCMU, and Rural Commercial) which would otherwise result in greater impacts. As shown in Table 4-9, development under this alternative would result in impacts to approximately 10,432 acres of

sensitive vegetation communities compared with the 12,256 acres of impact associated with the proposed Project. As a result, implementation of the alternative would result in fewer direct and cumulative impacts to sensitive vegetation communities that would have the potential to support special status plant and wildlife species, compared to the proposed Project. Additionally, this alternative would result in fewer indirect impacts to special status species because it would accommodate fewer high-density land uses that are associated with intensive nighttime lighting and noise which can adversely affect wildlife; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.4.4 of this SEIR would be required. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that these impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance for the same reasons given in Section 2.4.4.1 of this SEIR; thus, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

### Riparian Habitat and Other Sensitive Natural Communities

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would result in direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities by the removal or destruction of such habitat for new development or infrastructure. Potential indirect impacts include adverse effects to water quality in riparian habitat from pollutants in runoff and sedimentation during construction, and fugitive dust produced by construction that would have the potential to disperse onto sensitive vegetation adjacent to construction sites. As discussed in the preceding paragraph, future development under this alternative would result in fewer impacts to habitats (including riparian habitat and other sensitive vegetation communities), compared to the 5,142 acres impacted under the proposed Project (refer to Table 2.4-2 of this SEIR), due to an increase in rural lands, which result in less biological impacts, and a decrease in higher density land uses (i.e., semi-rural residential), which would otherwise result in greater impacts; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.4.4 of this SEIR would be required. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that these impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance for the same reasons given in Section 2.4.4.2 of this SEIR; thus, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

### Federally Protected Wetlands

Similar to the proposed Project, impacts to federally protected wetlands from future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would involve actions such as direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other destructive modifications associated with new development and infrastructure. As discussed in the preceding paragraphs, future development under this alternative would result in fewer impacts to habitats (including wetlands) compared to the proposed Project, due to an increase in rural lands, which result in less biological impacts, and a decrease in higher density land uses (i.e., semi-rural residential), which would otherwise result in greater impacts; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the

mitigation identified in Section 2.4.4 of this SEIR would be required. With implementation of the mitigation measures, this impact would be reduced to less than significant.

### Wildlife Movement Corridors and Nursery Sites

As discussed in the preceding paragraphs, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would result in fewer impacts to habitats (that may function as wildlife movement corridors or nursery sites), compared to the 5,142 acres impacted under the proposed Project (refer to Table 2.4-2 of this SEIR), due to an increase in rural lands, which result in less biological impacts, and a decrease in higher density land uses (i.e., semi-rural residential), which would otherwise result in greater impacts; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.4.4 of this SEIR would be required. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that these impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance for the same reasons given in Section 2.4.4.4 of this SEIR; thus, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

### Local Policies and Ordinances

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would not conflict with programs and ordinances that protect biological resources because discretionary projects are required to comply with the County's MSCP Subarea Plan, BMO, HLP Ordinance, and RPO, and the Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub NCCP Process Guidelines.

### HCPs and NCCPs

As stated above, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would not conflict with the County's MSCP Subarea Plan and the Coastal Sage Scrub NCCP Process Guidelines, which are the applicable HCPs for the Project areas within the unincorporated County lands.

## **4.2.2.5 Cultural Resources**

### Historical Resources

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative could result in direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to historical resources. In addition to direct disturbance from demolition, destruction, alteration, or structural relocation, direct impacts include redevelopment of a historical structure or site that is not compatible with the authenticity of a resource and would substantially alter its significance. Indirect impacts may involve the potential to adversely affect historical sites through the introduction of visual, audible, or atmospheric effects that are out of character with the historical resource. Compared to the proposed Project, this alternative would involve an overall decrease in development intensity

within the Project areas (i.e., increase in rural lands and decrease in higher density land uses such as semi-rural residential) resulting in fewer potential impacts to historical resources; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.5.4 of this SEIR would be required.

### Archaeological Resources

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative could result in direct and cumulative impacts to archaeological resources. These impacts include ground-disturbing activities, such as excavation and grading, that have the potential to damage or destroy archaeological resources that may be present on or below the ground surface, particularly in areas that have not previously been developed. Compared to the proposed Project, this alternative would involve an overall decrease in development intensity within the Project areas (i.e., increase in rural lands and decrease in higher density land uses such as semi-rural residential) which are expected to result in less excavation or grading activities than the higher density land uses; thereby resulting in fewer potential impacts to archaeological resources; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.5.4 of this SEIR would be required.

### Paleontological Resources

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative could result in direct and cumulative impacts to paleontological resources. These impacts include ground-disturbing activities, such as excavation and grading, that have the potential to damage or destroy fossils in the underlying rock units, particularly in areas that have not previously been developed. Compared to the proposed Project, this alternative would involve an overall decrease in development intensity within the Project areas (i.e., increase in rural lands and decrease in higher density land uses such as semi-rural residential) which are expected to result in less excavation or grading activities than the higher density land uses; thereby resulting in fewer potential impacts to paleontological resources; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.5.4 of this SEIR would be required.

### Human Remains

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative could result in direct and cumulative impacts to archaeological resources which are often associated with human remains. These impacts include ground-disturbing activities, such as excavation and grading, that have the potential to damage or destroy human remains that may be present on or below the ground surface, particularly in areas that have not previously been developed. Compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would involve an overall decrease in development intensity within the Project areas

(i.e., increase in Rural Lands and decrease in higher density land uses such as Rural Commercial, Village Residential, VCMU, and Semi-Rural Residential) which are expected to result in less excavation or grading activities than the higher density land uses; thereby resulting in fewer potential impacts to human remains; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.5.4 of this SEIR would be required.

#### **4.2.2.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

##### **Transportation, Use, and Disposal of Hazardous Materials**

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative may involve the use, disposal, or transport of hazardous materials. Although hazardous materials can be found in all land uses, the proposed rural commercial designation is more likely to result in uses that regularly involve hazardous materials; however, all development is required to comply with applicable federal, State, and local regulations pertaining to the transportation, use, and disposal of hazardous materials. Due to the 103-acre reduction in Rural Commercial and 152-acre reduction in VCMU land uses in the Alpine CPA, compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would result in less potential for impacts associated with the use, disposal, or transport of hazardous materials. Nevertheless, compliance with existing regulations would reduce such impacts to below a level of significance.

##### **Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials**

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative may involve uses that could result in accidental release of hazardous materials. Although hazardous materials can be found in all land uses, the proposed rural commercial designation is more likely to result in uses that regularly involve hazardous materials. Additionally, existing industries and businesses that use hazardous materials would have the potential to expand or increase to accommodate the anticipated growth under this alternative; however, all development is required to comply with applicable federal, State, and local regulations pertaining to the transportation, use, and disposal of hazardous materials. Due to the reduction in Rural Commercial and VCMU land uses in the Alpine CPA, compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would result in less potential for impacts associated with the accidental release of hazardous materials. Nevertheless, compliance with existing regulations would reduce such impacts to below a level of significance.

##### **Hazards to Schools**

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative may involve land uses that have a high potential for hazardous materials usage which would be located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school or daycare. Although

hazardous materials can be found in all land uses, the proposed rural commercial designation is more likely to result in uses that regularly involve hazardous materials. Additionally, existing industries and businesses that use hazardous materials would have the potential to expand or increase to accommodate the anticipated growth under this alternative; however, all development is required to comply with applicable federal, State, and local regulations pertaining to the transportation, use, and disposal of hazardous materials. Due to the reduction in Rural Commercial and VCMU land uses in the Alpine CPA, compared to the proposed Project, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would result in less potential for impacts associated with the potential release of hazardous materials near schools or daycare facilities. Nevertheless, compliance with existing regulations would reduce such impacts to below a level of significance.

### Existing Hazardous Material Sites

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative may result in the placement of designated land uses on or near sites that would have the potential to create significant hazards to the public or environment, such as those pursuant to Government Code 65962.5; burn dump sites; active, abandoned, or closed landfills; FUDS; areas with historic or current agriculture; or areas with petroleum contamination; however, all development is required to comply with applicable federal, State, and local regulations pertaining to remediation efforts and/or protection of new development in the vicinity of known hazardous materials sites. Compliance with these regulations would reduce such impacts to below a level of significance.

### Public and Private Airports

As discussed in Section 2.6.3.5 (Public and Private Airports) of this SEIR, there are no public airports within the unincorporated County that would be affected by the Project areas addressed in this SEIR, but there would be four private airports in the communities of Alpine (U.S. Forest Service), and North Mountain (Ward Ranch, Warner Springs, and Loma Madera Ranch) which would be affected by the proposed Project areas. Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative may involve the siting of new land uses within two miles from one of these private airports, thereby resulting in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of these airports; however, this alternative would designate lower density development near these airports (i.e., 1 DU/80 AC or 1 DU/40 AC versus the semi-rural residential land uses under the proposed Project), resulting in a reduced risk to people living or working in areas associated with potential airport operation hazards. Nevertheless, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.6.4 of this SEIR would be required. With implementation of the mitigation measures, these impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

### Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans

Similar to the proposed Project, construction activities associated with development occurring under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would have the potential to interfere with adopted emergency plans and procedures if authorities are not properly notified or if multiple roadways used for emergency routes are concurrently blocked. There is also a potential that the existing emergency response and evacuation plans that serve the unincorporated County lands in the vicinity of the Project areas may not account for the different development patterns associated with Project buildout. This could cause an inadvertent impairment of the existing emergency response plans and policies, which could result in a loss of life and/or property in the event of an emergency; however, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would designate lower density development throughout the backcountry areas within and near the CNF (i.e., 1 DU/80 AC or 1 DU/40 AC versus the semi-rural residential land uses under the proposed Project Land Use Map), resulting in less development with the potential to impair emergency response and evacuation plans. Nevertheless, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.6.4 of this SEIR would be required. With implementation of the mitigation measures, these impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

### Wildland Fires

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would occur in areas that are prone to wildland fires and would, therefore, have the potential to expose 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 residents are intermixed with wildlands; however, the FCI Condition Map would designate 2,952 additional acres of lower density Rural Lands Residential development throughout the backcountry areas within and near the CNF (i.e., 1 DU/80 AC or 1 DU/40 AC) and, in exchange, would designate 2,952 less acres of Semi-Rural Residential, Village Residential, VCMU, and Rural Commercial land uses than under the proposed Project Land Use Map), resulting in less development and reduced risk to people living or working in areas subject to wildfires. Additionally, when compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map specifically reduces land use densities in the backcountry areas that are served by fire agencies with greater distance to cover (longer travel times) and in areas which have difficulty meeting fire code requirements due to limited access; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.6.4 of this SEIR would be required. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that these impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance for the same reasons given in Section 2.6.4.7 of this SEIR; thus, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

## Vectors

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would not create a potentially significant hazard to the public or the environment by substantially increasing human exposure to vectors. This alternative would not result in sources of standing water bodies or other vector breeding sources such as composting or manure management facilities. As such, a significant impact would not occur.

### **4.2.2.7 Hydrology and Water Quality**

#### Water Quality Standards and Requirements

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would have the potential to result in the following: (1) substantial additional sources of polluted runoff which would have short-term impacts on surface water; (2) pollutants, such as soils, debris, and other materials, in quantities that would potentially exceed water quality standards and otherwise significantly degrade water quality; (3) non-point source pollution into surface and groundwater bodies; and (4) violate groundwater quality standards by designating land uses that would be groundwater dependent in areas that are currently experiencing groundwater contamination (i.e., new wells constructed to support development in these areas would be susceptible to the contaminated groundwater supply which would have the potential to result in a non-potable water supply). Compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would involve an overall decrease in development intensity within the Project areas (i.e., increase in rural lands and decrease in higher density land uses such as semi-rural residential) resulting in less development and less surface and groundwater quality impacts; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.7.4 of this SEIR would be required. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that these impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance for the same reasons given in Section 2.7.4.1 of this SEIR; thus, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

#### Groundwater Supplies and Recharge

As discussed in the 2011 General Plan Update Groundwater Study (County of San Diego 2008), multiple areas of the unincorporated County are currently experiencing groundwater supply impacts. Similar to the proposed Project, additional development reliant on groundwater sources under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would occur in areas already impacted by large quantity groundwater users and clustered development, and in areas experiencing a high frequency of wells with low yield, thereby worsening an unsustainable groundwater supply. Compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the FCI Condition Map would involve an overall decrease in development intensity within the Project areas (i.e., increase in Rural Lands and decrease in higher density land uses such as Rural Commercial, Village Residential, VCMU, and Semi-Rural Residential) resulting in less development and less reliance on groundwater

sources; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.7.4 of this SEIR would be required. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that these impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance for the same reasons given in Section 2.7.4.2 of this SEIR; thus, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

### Erosion or Siltation

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would result in permanent alterations to existing drainage patterns by converting areas from pervious surfaces to impervious surfaces, thereby increasing runoff volumes and erosion/ siltation. Compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would involve an overall decrease in development intensity within the Project areas (i.e., increase in Rural Lands designation and decrease in higher density land uses such as Rural Commercial, Village Residential, VCMU, and Semi-Rural Residential) resulting in less potential for erosion/siltation impacts; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.7.4 of this SEIR would be required.

### Flooding

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would result in permanent alterations to existing drainage patterns by converting areas from pervious surfaces to impervious surfaces, thereby increasing the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site during and after construction activities. The Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map assigns 3.4 acres as Rural Commercial, the same number of acres as the proposed Project Land Use Map. However, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would designate 356.2 acres within a 100-year flood area as Rural Lands and 41.5 acres as Semi-Rural Residential (see Table 4-10), which is 56.5 more acres of Rural Lands than the proposed Project Land Use Map. Although the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would assign the Rural Lands designation to more acres in areas with a greater potential for flooding impacts when compared to the proposed Project, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.7.4 of this SEIR would be required. With implementation of the mitigation measures, these impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

### Exceed Capacity of Stormwater Systems

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would result in permanent alterations to existing drainage patterns by converting areas from pervious surfaces to impervious surfaces, thereby increasing the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which could exceed the capacity of stormwater drainage facilities and require the construction of new facilities. Compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would involve an overall decrease in development

intensity within the Project areas (i.e., increase in Rural Lands and decrease in higher density land uses such as Rural Commercial, Village Residential, VCMU, and Semi-Rural Residential) resulting in less potential for runoff to exceed the capacity of stormwater drainage facilities; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.7.4 of this SEIR would be required. With implementation of the mitigation measures, these impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

### Housing within a 100-year Flood Hazard Area

Similar to the proposed Project, and as discussed in Section 2.7.3.6 (Housing within a 100-year Flood Hazard Area) of this SEIR, the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would not result in development (including housing) within a 100-year flood hazard area. As such, a significant impact would not occur.

### Impeding or Redirecting Flood Flows

As discussed in the preceding paragraph, the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would not result in development within a 100-year flood hazard area which could otherwise impede or redirect flood flows. As such, a significant impact would not occur.

### Dam Inundation and Flood Hazards

As shown in Table 4-10, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would assign a Residential Rural Lands designation to 157.8 of the 199.2 acres of lands within a dam inundation area. This alternative would assign 56.5 more acres as the less intense Rural Lands within dam inundation areas than the proposed Project, which would assign those 56.5 acres as Semi-Rural. However, similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would place housing or structures within dam inundation areas, thereby increasing the potential for a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding. Impacts related to dam inundation and flooding hazard areas would be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.7.4 of this SEIR would be required. With implementation of the mitigation measures, these impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

### Seiche, Tsunami, and Mudflow Hazards

Similar to the proposed Project, due to the inland location of the Project areas and the history of minor tsunami events, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would not expose people or structures to hazards associated with inundation by a tsunami, nor result in land uses within areas subject to inundation from a seiche. As such, a significant impact would not occur.

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative could be susceptible to mudflows. Compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would involve an overall decrease in development

intensity within the Project areas (i.e., increase in Rural Lands and decrease in higher density land uses such as Rural Commercial, Village Residential, VCMU, and Semi-Rural Residential) resulting in reduced risk to people or structures being exposed to mudflow hazards; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.7.4 of this SEIR would be required. With implementation of the mitigation measures, these impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

#### **4.2.2.8 Land Use**

##### **Physical Division of an Established Community**

Similar to the proposed Project, the Modified FCI Condition Alternative does not include any new or improved roadways, railroad tracks, airports, or other features that would physically divide a community. As such, a significant impact would not occur.

##### **Conflicts with Land Use Plans, Policies, and Regulations**

Similar to the proposed Project, the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would not conflict with the following planning documents: RCP, RTP, CMP, San Diego Basin Plan, ALUCPs, RAQS, CTP, SOI, community plans, the County Zoning Ordinance, and specific plans. The proposed Project is aimed at ensuring consistency with the 2011 General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, and other relevant plans, as appropriate. Further, this alternative would allow for development of the former FCI lands in a manner that would be consistent with the intended future growth anticipated under the 2011 General Plan but only if these areas are re-designated according to the same mapping principles used for the 2011 General Plan. For example, if the “Rural Lands” designation is applied in areas otherwise designated as “Semi-Rural,” and “Rural Commercial” to “Semi-rural Residential” within the Alpine CPA, then these changes would be inconsistent with the mapping principles of the 2011 General Plan. Because consistent mapping principles are proposed with this alternative, it would not result in a significant impact associated with conflicts with land use plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

##### **Conflicts with HCPs or NCCPs**

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would not conflict with MSCP and the Coastal Sage Scrub NCCP Process Guidelines, which are the applicable HCPs for the unincorporated County, because discretionary projects are required to comply with these guidelines. Therefore, this alternative would not result in a significant impact associated with conflicts with HCPs or NCCPs.

#### **4.2.2.9 Mineral Resources**

##### **Mineral Resource Availability**

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative could result in direct and cumulative impacts related to the loss of mineral resources availability. Additionally, this alternative would place residential land uses in the backcountry which would result in constraints that would make permitting new mines more difficult. Compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the FCI Condition Map would involve an overall decrease in development intensity within the Project areas (i.e., increase in Rural Lands and decrease in higher density land uses such as Rural Commercial, Village Residential, VCMU, and Semi-Rural Residential) which are expected to result in less excavation or grading activities than the higher density land uses; thereby resulting in fewer potential impacts to mineral resources; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.9.4 of this SEIR would be required. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that these impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance for the same reasons given in Section 2.9.4.1 of this SEIR; thus, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

##### **Mineral Resource Recovery Sites**

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would be incompatible with mining and mineral resource recovery operations in areas that are designated MRZ-2 and MRZ-3, underlain by Quaternary alluvium, or contain or potentially contain important aggregate resources. Incompatible land uses include semi-rural residential and village residential land uses. As shown in Table 4-11, compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the FCI Condition Map would involve an overall decrease in development intensity within areas designated as MRZ-2 or MRZ-3 (i.e., As shown in Table 4-11 under the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map an increase in Rural Lands and decrease in higher density land uses such as Rural Commercial, Village Residential, VCMU, and Semi-Rural Residential) would occur compared to the proposed Project. Increasing the extent of Rural Lands under this alternative within MRZ-2 and MRZ-3 areas could result in less potential for incompatibility with mining and mineral resource recovery operations than that associated with the proposed Project; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.9.4 of this SEIR would be required. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that these impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance for the same reasons given in Section 2.9.4.1 of this SEIR; thus, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

#### **4.2.2.10 Noise**

##### **Excessive Noise Levels**

Similar to the proposed Project Land Use Map, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would designate land uses near noise-generating sources that would have the potential to expose people to noise levels in excess of the County's compatibility guidelines (refer to Table 2.11-9 of this SEIR). Compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the FCI Condition Map would involve an overall decrease in development intensity within the Project areas (i.e., increase in Rural Lands and decrease in higher density land uses such as Rural Commercial, Village Residential, VCMU, and Semi-Rural Residential) resulting in lower density land uses that are less likely to be exposed to excessive noise levels because it is assumed that less development would be constructed on larger lots and buffered from noise-generating land uses due to intervening open space; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.10.4 of this SEIR would be required.

##### **Excessive Groundborne Vibration**

Future development of infrastructure in all Project areas would have the potential to result in substantial groundborne vibration and noise levels from construction. Under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative, planning areas that would accommodate a substantial amount of new development, and thus have the potential to result in vibration from construction, include Alpine CPA, Central Mountain Subregion (Cuyamaca and Descanso CPAs), and North Mountain Subregion. Compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would involve an overall decrease in development intensity within the Project areas (i.e., increase in Rural Lands and decrease in higher density land uses such as Rural Commercial, Village Residential, VCMU, and Semi-Rural Residential) resulting in lower density development that would have fewer impacts from construction vibration because it is assumed that less construction would take place, and less new vibration sensitive land uses would be constructed; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.10.4 of this SEIR would be required.

##### **Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels**

Under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative, planning areas that would accommodate a substantial amount of new development, major roadway improvements and other noise generating land uses, and thus have the potential to result in a significant increase in ambient noise levels, include Alpine CPA, Central Mountain Subregion (Cuyamaca and Descanso CPAs), and North Mountain Subregion. Compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would involve an overall decrease in development intensity within the Project areas (i.e., increase in Rural Lands and decrease in higher density land uses such as Rural Commercial, Village Residential, VCMU, and Semi-Rural Residential) resulting in lower

density development that would be less likely to expose people to permanent increases in traffic noise because it is assumed that less development would be constructed on larger lots and buffered from roadways due to intervening open space; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.10.4 of this SEIR would be required. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that these impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance for the same reasons given in Section 2.10.4.3 of this SEIR; thus, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

### Temporary Increase in Ambient Noise Levels

Construction of new development and infrastructure in all Project areas would have the potential to result in substantial construction noise levels. In addition, similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would accommodate intensified residential and rural commercial development in town centers that would have the potential to increase nuisance noise and associated noise complaints from neighboring uses. Compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the FCI Condition Map would involve an overall decrease in development intensity within the Project areas (i.e., increase in Rural Lands and decrease in higher density land uses such as Rural Commercial, Village Residential, VCMU, and Semi-Rural Residential) resulting in lower density land uses that are less likely to be exposed to substantial construction noise levels because it is assumed that less development would be constructed on larger lots and buffered from temporary construction-related noise activities due to intervening open space; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.10.4 of this SEIR would be required.

### Excessive Noise Exposure from a Public or Private Airport

As discussed in Section 2.6.3.5 (Public and Private Airports) of this SEIR, there are no public airports within the unincorporated County that would be affected by the Project areas addressed in this SEIR, but there would be four private airports in the communities of Alpine (U.S. Forest Service), and North Mountain (Ward Ranch, Warner Springs, and Loma Madera Ranch) which would be affected by the Project areas. Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative may involve the siting of new land uses near some of these private airports, thereby exposing people to excessive noise levels from airplane overflights. Compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would involve an overall decrease in development intensity within the Project areas (i.e., increase in Rural Lands and decrease in higher density land uses such as Rural Commercial, Village Residential, VCMU, and Semi-Rural Residential) resulting in lower density land uses that are less likely to be exposed to excessive airport-related noise levels because it is assumed that less development would be constructed on larger lots and buffered from private airports due to intervening open space; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.10.4 of this SEIR would be required.

#### **4.2.2.11     *Public Services***

##### **Fire Protection, Police, School, and Library Services**

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would impose demands on fire protection, police, school, and library services throughout the Project areas. To maintain or achieve acceptable service standards, new or physically altered fire, police, school, and library facilities would be required. Compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would involve an overall decrease in development intensity within the Project areas (i.e., increase in Rural Lands and decrease in higher density land uses such as Rural Commercial, Village Residential, VCMU, and Semi-Rural Residential) resulting in less population growth throughout the Project areas and less demand for fire, police, school, and library facilities to be constructed or expanded; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.11.4 of this SEIR would be required. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that the impacts on schools would be reduced to below a level of significance for the same reasons given in Section 2.11.4.2 of this SEIR; thus, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

#### **4.2.2.12     *Recreation***

##### **Deterioration/Construction of Parks and Recreational Facilities**

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would increase the existing demand for recreational facilities throughout the Project areas, which would have the potential to result in accelerated deterioration of the facilities and the need for new or expanded facilities. The construction of any future recreational projects, including those proposed by the County Department of Parks and Recreation, would have the potential to cause additional secondary environmental effects. Compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would involve an overall decrease in development intensity within the Project areas (i.e., increase in Rural Lands and decrease in higher density land uses such as Rural Commercial, Village Residential, VCMU, and Semi-Rural Residential) resulting in less population growth throughout the Project areas and less demand for recreational facilities leading to reduced deterioration of facilities and increased need for such facilities to be constructed or expanded; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.12.4 of this SEIR would be required.

#### **4.2.2.13     *Transportation and Traffic***

##### **Unincorporated County Traffic and LOS Standards**

As evaluated in Section 2.13.3.1 of this SEIR, the traffic impacts associated with the proposed Project are focused in the Alpine CPA because this is where the highest density of proposed land

use changes would occur relative to the remaining Project areas which would be primarily rural and semi-rural residential uses spread out among several parcels within and near the CNF. The analysis for the proposed Project identified eleven roadway segments in Alpine that would operate at a deficient level of service (LOS) with the increased average daily traffic (ADT) forecast by buildout of the proposed Project Land Use Map for Alpine.

As a result of Senate Bill 743, (SB 743) the California State Office of Planning and Research (OPR) is currently in the process of drafting regulations for traffic analysis under CEQA which would require that public agencies not utilize LOS for traffic analysis and instead rely on another metric—likely vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Therefore, although analysis of traffic using VMT is not yet required (because OPR has not finalized the new regulations and so the Natural Resources Agency has yet to approve them), an analysis of VMT generated by the proposed Project is contained Chapter 2, section 2.15 Global Climate Change, for informational purposes. Compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would assign an overall decrease in development intensity within the Project areas (i.e., reduction in Rural Commercial and Village Residential, and removal of VCMU land use resulting in less vehicle trips generated on Alpine roadways). As described in Appendix F and shown in Table 4-12, buildout of the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map is forecast to generate 92,096 less ADT in Alpine, a 72 percent reduction, when compared to buildout of the proposed Project Land Use Map. As shown in Table 4-12, with the overall decrease in ADT associated with this alternative, in comparison to the proposed Project, not all of the Alpine segments would deteriorate to unacceptable LOS, and this alternative would, therefore, have a reduced impact on the following facilities.

Road	Classification	LOS	
		Proposed Project	Modified FCI Condition
Alpine Boulevard (West Willows Rd. to eastern end of Willows Rd.)	2.1C Community Collector with Intermittent Turn Lanes	F	D
Viejas Casino Road	4.2A Boulevard with Raised Median	B	A
West Willows Road (Alpine Blvd. to Otto Ave./Willows Rd.)	2.2E Light Collector	F	E
Willows Road (Viejas Casino Rd. east to WB I-8 on ramp)	2.2E Light Collector	F	C

However, the other affected roadway segments would still be significantly impacted with buildout of the Modified FCI Condition Alternative and the mitigation identified in Section 2.13.4.1 of this SEIR would be required. It is unlikely that the impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance for the same reasons given in Section 2.13.4.1 of this SEIR; thus, the impacts associated with buildout of this alternative would remain significant and unavoidable.

### Rural Road Safety

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would increase trips on two lane roads in rural areas that are not developed to current road safety standards; add traffic to roads with slow moving agricultural equipment; and contribute to road safety conflicts (e.g., pedestrians, bicyclists, at grade railroad crossings). Compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would involve an overall decrease in development intensity within the Project areas (i.e., increase in Rural Lands and decrease in higher density land uses such as Rural Commercial, Village Residential, VCMU, and Semi-Rural Residential) resulting in less vehicle trips generated on local roadways which would translate to fewer people exposed to rural road safety hazards; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.13.4.2 of this SEIR would be required. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that these impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance for the same reasons given in Section 2.13.4.2 of this SEIR; thus, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

### Emergency Access

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative could add traffic on a roadway network that is incomplete or not fully connected; on roadways that are dead-end and one-way; or within gated communities, all of which have the potential to impair emergency access. Compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would involve an overall decrease in development intensity within the Project areas (i.e., increase in Rural Lands and decrease in higher density land uses such as Rural Commercial, Village Residential, VCMU, and Semi-Rural Residential) resulting in less vehicle trips generated on local roadways which would translate to fewer conflicts with emergency access; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.13.4 of this SEIR would be required.

### Parking Capacity

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would be required to comply with the parking standards set forth in the County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance, Parking Regulations, Sections 6750–6799 and the County of San Diego Off-Street Parking Design Manual, which implements Section 6793(c) of the County Zoning Ordinance. Compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would involve an overall decrease in higher density land uses (e.g., less Rural Commercial, Village Residential, and VCMU) within the community town centers resulting in less parking demand in these areas; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.13.4 of this SEIR would be required.

### Alternative Transportation

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would provide for alternative modes of transportation, including bike lanes, bus stops, trails, and sidewalks. While existing County policies and regulations are intended to promote alternative transportation, this alternative may conflict with those of other agencies responsible for alternative transportation planning (e.g., SANDAG, Caltrans, transit agencies, and adjacent jurisdictions). Compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would involve an overall decrease in higher density land uses (e.g., less Rural Commercial, Village Residential, and VCMU) and would not assign densities to expand the existing Alpine Village boundary resulting in less demand for alternative transportation infrastructure; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.13.4 of this SEIR would be required.

#### **4.2.2.14 Utilities and Service Systems**

### Wastewater Treatment Requirements

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would have the potential to violate wastewater treatment standards if the demand for wastewater treatment services increases at a rate disproportionate to the capacity of treatment facilities. Additionally, residential development in the eastern portion of the County could violate water quality standards and wastewater discharge requirements if residences do not adequately maintain septic systems. Compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the FCI Condition Map would involve an overall decrease in development intensity within the Project areas (i.e., increase in rural lands and decrease in higher density land uses such as Rural Commercial, Village Residential, and VCMU) resulting in less population growth throughout the Project areas and less demand for wastewater treatment in areas dependent on septic systems; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.14.4 of this SEIR would be required. With implementation of the mitigation measures, these impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

### New Water and Wastewater Facilities

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would increase the demand for new or expanded water and wastewater facilities throughout the Project areas, the construction of which would have the potential to cause additional secondary environmental effects. Compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the FCI Condition Map would involve an overall decrease in development intensity within the Project areas (i.e., increase in Rural Lands and decrease in higher density land uses such as Rural Commercial, Village Residential, and VCMU) resulting in less population growth throughout the Project areas and less demand for water and wastewater facilities to be constructed or expanded.

As such, the overall environmental impacts related to the construction of new or expanded water and wastewater facilities would decrease under this alternative because demand would be lower than for the proposed Project; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.14.4 of this SEIR would be required. With implementation of the mitigation measures, these impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

### Sufficient Stormwater Drainage Facilities

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would increase the amount of impermeable surfaces from new development within the Project areas, thereby increasing the amount of stormwater runoff potentially exceeding the capacity of stormwater drainage systems and requiring new or expanded facilities which would have the potential to cause additional secondary environmental effects. Compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would involve an overall decrease in development intensity within the Project areas (i.e., increase in Rural Lands and decrease in higher density land uses such as Rural Commercial, Village Residential, VCMU and Semi-Rural Residential) resulting in less development (impermeable surfaces) throughout the Project areas and less demand for stormwater drainage facilities to be constructed or expanded. As such, the overall environmental impacts related to the construction of new or expanded stormwater drainage facilities would decrease under this alternative because demand would be lower than for the proposed Project; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.14.4 of this SEIR would be required. With implementation of the mitigation measures, these impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

### Adequate Water Supplies

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would increase the population and housing units within the service areas of SDCWA member water districts and groundwater dependent water districts, thereby increasing the demand for water supplies to serve the Project areas that may not have been accounted for in the most current water planning documents. This would potentially result in some groundwater dependent districts having inadequate water supply to serve the projected demand as some basins may experience substantial declines in groundwater storage. More wells may need to be replaced as water levels drop below perforated levels. The drawdown of groundwater supplies from increased water supply sources would result in significantly lower groundwater levels in an area and therefore cause a loss of flow in a surrounding river or other water body due to seepage through the riverbed. Compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the FCI Condition Map would involve an overall decrease in development intensity within the Project areas (i.e., increase in Rural Lands and decrease in higher density land uses such as Rural Commercial and Village Residential, VCMU and Semi-Rural Residential) resulting in lesser concentration of

housing units occurring in areas that import water or are groundwater dependent and therefore less demand for water supplies; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.14.4 of this SEIR would be required. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that the impacts on water supplies would be reduced to below a level of significance for the same reasons given in Section 2.14.4.4 of this SEIR; thus, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

### **Adequate Wastewater Facilities**

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would increase wastewater treatment demand due to increased sewage flows from future residential, commercial and industrial land uses. Some wastewater districts may have inadequate capacity to serve the projected demand in addition to their existing commitments. In addition, this alternative would designate land uses that would increase population and housing in areas where wastewater districts do not have adequate service systems in place to serve the projected growth of the community. Compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Modified FCI Condition Land Use Map would involve an overall decrease in development intensity within the Project areas (i.e., increase in Rural Lands and decrease in higher density land uses such as Rural Commercial, Village Residential, VCMU, and Semi-Rural Residential) resulting in lesser concentration of housing units occurring in areas that import water or are groundwater dependent and therefore less demand for wastewater treatment. This alternative would also decrease impacts to wastewater service providers outside of the SDCWA service area boundary and impacts to areas dependent on septic systems because this alternative proposes fewer residential units outside the SDCWA boundary; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.14.4 of this SEIR would be required. With implementation of the mitigation measures, these impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

### **Sufficient Landfill Capacity**

If additional landfills are not constructed and existing landfills are not expanded, it is anticipated that the County will run out of physical landfill capacity by 2024. Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would result in an increase in solid waste disposal needs for which there will be insufficient landfill capacity to accommodate these needs. Compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the FCI Condition Map would involve an overall decrease in development intensity within the Project areas (i.e., increase in Rural Lands and decrease in higher density land uses such as Rural Commercial, Village Residential, VCMU, and Semi-Rural Residential) resulting in less population growth throughout the Project areas and less demand for landfill capacity; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.14.4 of this SEIR would be required. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that the impacts on landfill capacity would be reduced to

below a level of significance for the same reasons given in Section 2.14.4.6 of this SEIR; thus, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

### **Solid Waste Regulations**

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would be required to comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Compliance with existing regulations would ensure that impacts to solid waste regulations would be reduced to below a level of significance. Therefore, this alternative would not result in a significant impact associated with conflicts with solid waste regulations.

### **Energy**

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would require energy for construction and operation, thereby increasing energy demand in the County. To accommodate the projected increase in energy demand, energy facilities would need to be constructed or expanded, the construction of which would have the potential to cause additional secondary environmental effects. Compared to the proposed Project, this alternative would involve an overall decrease in development intensity within the Project areas (i.e., increase in Rural Lands and decrease in higher density land uses such as Rural Commercial, Village Residential, VCMU, and Semi-Rural Residential) resulting in less population growth throughout the Project areas and less demand for energy facilities to be constructed or expanded. As such, the overall environmental impacts related to the construction of new or expanded energy facilities would decrease under this alternative because demand would be lower than for the proposed Project; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.14.4 of this SEIR would be required. With implementation of the mitigation measures, these impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

#### **4.2.2.15 *Climate Change***

### **Compliance with California GHG Reduction Goals**

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would result in an increase in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Compared to the proposed Project, this alternative would involve an overall decrease in development intensity within the Project areas (i.e., increase in Rural Lands and decrease in higher density land uses such as Rural Commercial, Village Residential, VCMU, and Semi-Rural Residential) resulting in less population growth throughout the Project areas and less GHG emissions overall; however, this alternative would result in less concentrated growth within town centers, such as in the community of Alpine, which would be less consistent with applicable 2011 General Plan goals and policies relative to AB 32 compliance and long-term GHG emissions reductions than the

proposed Project. Nevertheless, GHG impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.15.4 of this SEIR would be required. It is not known whether this alternative would achieve GHG reduction targets identified for the years after 2020, because important factors are not currently known. The unknown factors include: GHG emissions target in effect at the time that subdivisions are submitted after 2020; the effectiveness of regulatory actions already adopted as part of the implementation of the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006; and the potential for application of new regulations and their effectiveness. Further, the cost and feasibility of certain policies that would be mandated as mitigation are not known. Therefore, GHG impacts would not be feasibly mitigated to adopted GHG target levels for 2020 and beyond. For this reason, and because this alternative would emit a substantial level of GHG emissions, the residual impact is potentially significant and unavoidable.

### Adverse Climate Change Impacts

Climate change impacts that would be most relevant to the unincorporated County are the effects on water supply, wildfires, energy needs, and impacts to public health. Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Modified FCI Condition Alternative would result in additional residents exposed to general climate change effects such as decreases in available water supply, increased frequency of wildfires, increased demand for energy as a result of the greater need for summer cooling, and impacts to public health related to increased heat, air pollution, wildfires, and infectious diseases. Compared to the proposed Project, this alternative would involve an overall decrease in development intensity within the Project areas (i.e., increase in Rural Lands and decrease in higher density land uses such as Rural Commercial, Village Residential, VCMU, and Semi-Rural Residential) resulting in less population growth throughout the Project areas and less GHG emissions overall; however, GHG impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.15.4 of this SEIR would be required. Development areas envisioned under this alternative provide a greater number of natural, physical, and environmental constraints than urbanized areas in the County, a higher occurrence of sensitive plant or animal species, and limitations in adequate provision of infrastructure and utilities or public services (e.g., fire protection, water supply). Some of these impacts, such as those related to water supply, wildland fires and ecosystems are expected to be more severe for this alternative as compared to the projected development under the 2011 General Plan due to the proposed development in and around the Cleveland National Forest which comprises of sensitive natural resources in comparison to urbanized areas of the County. However, these impacts would be reduced under this alternative due to the decreased number of potential dwelling units that could be constructed under this alternative; but this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

### **4.3 Analysis of the Mid-density Alternative**

#### **4.3.1 Mid-density Description and Setting**

As described in Section 1.6.1 (Additional Review and Consultation Requirements) of this SEIR, prior to and since the adoption of the General Plan in August 2011, the County PDS Department has been working with community planning and sponsor groups, and affected property owners, to plan for the appropriate and equitable application of land use and zoning designations for the former FCI lands, while ensuring consistency with the Guiding Principles of the 2011 General Plan. Through this process, different approaches for distributing density were considered among the former FCI lands, with an emphasis on future development which is more sensitive to the environmental resources and/or constraints on the subject properties.

The Mid-density Alternative Land Use Map is based on an analysis of the consistency of the 2012 Initial Draft Land Use Map with the 2011 General Plan Update's policies and planning principles as well as issues raised in public comment letters on the Draft SEIR circulated for public review in 2013. Based on these comment letters, staff identified several areas of consideration for further analysis. In formulating a recommendation for each area, County staff considered factors such as existing land use and parcel sizes, conformance with the Community Development Model, access to a public road, the extent of physical and environmental constraints, and proximity to environmentally sensitive CNF lands. Tables 4-2, 4-3, and 4-4 include a comparison of the Mid-density Alternative to the proposed Project and the other alternatives. As shown in Table 4-4 the Mid-density Land Use Map would result in buildout of less dwelling units than the proposed Project Land Use Map in the Alpine and Central Mountain CPAs. The land use designations assigned by the proposed Project and Mid-density Land Use Maps are the same for all communities with the exception of Alpine, Cuyamaca, and Palomar Mountain. The Mid-density Land Use Maps are provided as Figures 4-2.1A through 4-2.13.

The Mid-density Land Use Map land use designations are less intensive than the proposed Project Land Use Map and would result in similar but reduced environmental impacts. This Map would support buildout of approximately 5,589 residential DUs, or approximately 656 less than the proposed Project Land Use Map. When compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Mid-density Land Use Map would assign 277 additional acres as Semi-Rural and 253 acres as Rural Lands, but would assign 24 less acres as Village Residential. In addition, this map would assign a lower density to the VCMU land uses than the proposed Project Land Use Map (10.9 rather than 14.5 DUs per acre).

The Mid-density Land Use Map would accommodate less development than the proposed Project Land Use Map, thus decreasing environmental impacts. As such, this alternative better accounts for environmental considerations and constraints, compared to the proposed Project, by permitting less growth within and adjacent to the CNF in remote areas of the Cuyamaca subarea and Alpine CPA.

Specific differences in the two land use maps are shown in Tables 4-2, 4-3 and 4-4 and discussed in more detail below.

**Alpine CPA:** At buildout, the Mid-density Land Use Map would result in 2,921 dwelling units, 640 fewer units than the proposed Project Land Use Map. Specific differences include changes to the following land use designations:

- 152 acres of VCMU where the density is decreased from 14.5 DU/AC to 10.9 DU/AC along Willows Road east of the Viejas Casino;
- 27 acres of Village Residential 2 (2 DU/AC) would be redesignated to Semi-Rural Residential (1 DU/4 AC) parcels south of Alpine Boulevard near the Viejas Casino;
- 10 acres of Semi-Rural Residential (1 DU/4 AC) would be redesignated to Semi-Rural Residential (1 DU/10 AC) approximately one-half mile southeast of the existing Alpine Village;
- 311 acres of Semi-Rural Residential (1 DU/AC) would be redesignated to Semi-Rural Residential (1 DU/4 AC) south of the eastern end of Alpine Boulevard;
- 268 acres of Semi-Rural Residential (1 DU/2 AC) would be redesignated to Semi-Rural Residential (1 DU/10 AC), most of which is adjacent to the CNF in an area approximately one-half mile south of Interstate 8 and east of the existing Alpine Village;
- 80 acres of Semi-Rural Residential (1 DU/10 AC) parcels would be redesignated to Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/40 AC) approximately three-quarter mile south of Alpine Boulevard and southeast of the Viejas Casino;
- 40 acres of Semi-Rural Residential (1 DU/2 AC) parcels would be redesignated to Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/40 AC) in an area east of Rancho Palos Verde southeast of the existing Alpine Village; and
- 1,748 of Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/20 AC) would be redesignated to Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/40 AC) in the vicinity of Japatul Valley Road in the southeastern portion of the CPA.

**Central Mountain Subregion – Cuyamaca:** At buildout, the Mid-density Land Use Map would result in 90 dwelling units, 17 fewer units than the proposed Project Land Use Map. The Mid-density Land Use Map would redesignate 1,480 acres from Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/40 AC) assigned on the proposed Project Map to Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/80 AC) along Boulder Creek Road, in the northwestern portion of the subarea.

**Central Mountain Subregion – Unrepresented:** At buildout, the Mid-density Land Use Map would result in 105 dwelling units, the same as the proposed Project Map, although the Mid-density Land Use Map would reassign 201 acres from Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/40 AC) assigned on the proposed Project Land Use Map to Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/80 AC) in the eastern portion of the Subarea adjacent to the CNF.

**North Mountain Subregion – Palomar Mountain:** At buildout, the Mid-density Land Use Map would result in 807 dwelling units, one more unit than the proposed Project Land Use Map. Specific differences include changes to the following land use designations:

- 82 acres of Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/20 AC) parcels would be redesignated to Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/40 AC) south of State Park Road; and
- 360 acres of Rural Lands Residential (1 DU/20 AC) would be redesignated to Semi-Rural Residential (1 DU/10 AC) along State Park Road west of the village area.

#### **4.3.2 Comparison of the Effects of the Mid-density Alternative to the Proposed Project**

The Mid-density Alternative proposes greater residential development densities and number of residential dwelling units than the other alternatives but less development density and fewer residential dwelling units than the proposed Project. In some cases the Mid-density Alternative would result in similar impacts to the Modified FCI Condition Alternative but are often reduced or less significant than the proposed Project.

##### **4.3.2.1 *Aesthetics***

Impacts to scenic vistas, scenic resources, visual character or quality, and light or glare associated with buildout of the Mid-density Alternative would be reduced from that associated with the proposed Project. The Mid-density Land Use Map would permit a smaller number of homes (656 fewer homes) than the proposed Project would allow for. The reduced density of residential development within and adjacent to the CNF associated with this alternative would result in fewer obstructions or distractions within scenic vistas and direct impacts to scenic resources. In addition, as shown in Table 4-5, this alternative would accommodate only one additional home within Zone A of the Palomar Observatory and two fewer homes within Zone A of Mount Laguna Observatory as compared to the proposed Project.

Although implementation of this alternative would possibly reduce the extent of impacts to scenic vistas, scenic resources, and visual character and reduce the sources of light and glare, development would occur that could result in adverse impacts related to aesthetics. Impacts to scenic vistas, scenic resources, visual character and increased sources of light and glare associated with this alternative would therefore be considered significant and would need to be mitigated with those measures identified in Section 2.1.4 of this SEIR. Impacts to scenic vistas and scenic resources would be mitigated to a less than significant level; however, it is unlikely that impacts associated with visual character or quality and light or glare would be reduced to below a level of significance; thus, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

### **4.3.2.2      *Agricultural and Forestry Resources***

Impacts related to the direct conversion of farmland, land use conflicts with agricultural or forestry uses, and indirect conversion of farmland and forest resources would be similar to those discussed for the proposed Project. This alternative would impact the same number of acres of agricultural resources as the proposed Project; both alternatives would result in 48.5 acres of agricultural resources (see Table 4-6). Therefore, impacts related to direct and indirect conversion of farmland would be the same as compared to the proposed Project. As shown in Table 4-7, this alternative would result in similar conversion of forestry resources compared with the proposed Project. Therefore, impacts associated with these issues would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.2.4 of this SEIR would be required. For the reasons described in Sections 2.2.4.12.2.4.3 and 2.2.4.4, impacts resulting from the direct conversion of agricultural resources, indirect and cumulative impacts with regard to conversion of agricultural resources and impacts related to the direct loss or conversion of forestry resources, respectively, associated with this alternative would remain significant and unavoidable.

For the reasons described in Section 2.2.4.2, impacts with regard to conflicts with agricultural and forestry lands, associated with this alternative would be reduced to a level below significant with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in Section 2.2.4.

### **4.3.2.3      *Air Quality***

Impacts to air quality plans, air quality violations, non-attainment criteria pollutants, sensitive receptors, and objectionable odors would be similar to those discussed for the proposed Project, but to a lesser degree because of the overall decrease in development of 656 DUs. As shown in Table 4-8, buildout of this Alternative would result in less annual emissions of VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, Sox, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> than that associated with the proposed Project. Similar to the proposed Project, the Mid-density Alternative would not result in a significant impact associated with conflicts with air quality plans considering future development under this alternative would be required to be consistent with the emission reduction strategies in the RAQS and SIP. However, similar to the proposed Project, impacts from source and mobile emissions to sensitive receptors, air quality violations, and non-attainment criteria pollutants would be considered significant and mitigation in Section 2.3.4 of this SEIR would be required for this alternative. It is unlikely that impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance for the same reasons provided in Section 2.3.4 of this SEIR; thus, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Similar to the proposed Project, odor generating land uses proposed under the Mid-density Alternative would be required to comply with APCD Rule 51 and County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Sections 63.401 and 63.402, which prohibit nuisance odors from affecting nearby receptors. Therefore, this alternative would not result in a significant impact

associated with objectionable odors. Additionally, future development under this alternative would be required to be consistent with the emission reduction strategies in the RAQS and SIP.

#### **4.3.2.4 Biological Resources**

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Mid-density Alternative would result in direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to special status plant and wildlife species, riparian habitat, wetlands and wildlife corridors through the removal or destruction of habitat for new development or infrastructure. This analysis is based on the same impact assumptions used for the proposed Project. As shown in Table 4-9, development under this alternative would result in impacts to approximately 11,854 acres of sensitive vegetation communities compared with the 12,256 acres of impact associated with the proposed Project. Implementation of this alternative would result in reduced direct and cumulative impacts to sensitive vegetation communities that would have the potential to support special status plant and wildlife species, compared to the proposed Project. However, impacts associated with buildout of this alternative would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.4.4 of this SEIR would be required. It is unlikely that the impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance for the same reasons given in Section 2.4.4 of this SEIR; thus, the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to special status plant and wildlife species, riparian habitat and wildlife corridors associated with buildout of this alternative would remain significant and unavoidable.

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Mid-density Alternative would not conflict with programs and ordinances that protect biological resources because discretionary projects are required to comply with the County's MSCP Subarea Plan, BMO, HLP Ordinance, and RPO, and the Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub NCCP Process Guidelines. Future development under the Mid-density Alternative would not conflict with the County's MSCP Subarea Plan and the Coastal Sage Scrub NCCP Process Guidelines, which are the applicable HCPs for the Project areas within the unincorporated County lands.

Similar to the proposed Project, direct and indirect effects would occur with future development under the Mid-density Alternative, which could result in substantial adverse effects on wetlands (i.e., removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other disturbances) from ground disturbing activities (such as grading and excavation) in previously undeveloped lands. The potentially significant direct and indirect effects would be reduced to below a level of significance by the mitigation measures identified in Section 2.4.4.3. In addition, as existing regulations would ensure that cumulative projects would meet the no-net-loss standard, the Mid-density Alternative would not contribute to significant cumulative impacts to federally protected wetlands, and no additional mitigation measures would be required.

#### **4.3.2.5 Cultural Resources**

Impacts to historical resources, archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains would be similar to those discussed for the proposed Project but to a lesser degree because of the overall decrease in development of 656 DUs. Development under the Mid-density Land Use Map would have the potential to substantially alter the significance of historical resources, or destroy archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains that are potentially present on or below the ground surface during ground-disturbing construction activities. High intensity development would have a higher potential to impact the significance of cultural resources because it would require more ground-disturbing construction activities than lower intensity development. Compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Mid-density Land Use Map would decrease the overall development in the Plan area and would result in fewer potential impacts to cultural resources due to destruction during construction or alteration to the significance of a resource post-construction. Therefore, impacts would be lessened as compared to the proposed Project. However, impacts from ground disturbance associated with future development under this alternative to historical resources, archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains would still be considered significant for the reasons described in Section 2.5.3 and the mitigation identified in Section 2.5.4 of this SEIR would be required.

#### **4.3.2.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Mid-density Alternative may involve the use, disposal, or transport of hazardous materials. Although hazardous materials can be found in all land uses, the proposed Rural Commercial designation is more likely to result in uses that regularly involve hazardous materials. The Mid-density Land Use Map assigns the same number of acres of Rural Commercial land uses as the proposed Project Land Use Map; therefore, would result in a similar potential for impacts associated with the use, disposal, or transport of hazardous materials as the proposed Project. Similar to the proposed Project, for the reasons described in section 2.6.3.8 of the SEIR the Mid-density Alternative would not create a potentially significant hazard to the public or the environment by substantially increasing human exposure to vectors and a significant impact would not occur. Therefore, for the reasons described in Sections 2.6.3.1 through 2.6.3.4 and 2.6.3.8 of the SEIR through compliance with existing County, state and federal regulations direct and cumulative impacts related to the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, hazards to schools, hazardous materials sites and vectors associated with the alternative would be less than significant and mitigation would not be required.

When compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Mid-density Land Use Map would have lower density development and would accommodate a smaller population (656 fewer DUs), which would result in a reduced risk to people living or working in areas associated with private

airport operation hazards, and would result in less reallocated growth and less development with the potential to impair the implementation of emergency response and evacuation plans. Therefore, for the reasons described in Sections 2.6.3.5 and 2.6.3.6 of the SEIR through compliance with existing regulations and mitigation identified in Section 2.6.4 of this SEIR direct and cumulative impacts related to proximity or airports or emergency response and evacuation plans associated with the alternative would be reduced to less than significant.

The Mid-density Land Use Map reduces land use densities in remote areas of the Alpine CPA and Cuyamaca Subarea that are served by fire agencies in areas which have difficulty meeting fire code requirements due to limited access compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map. Therefore, impacts to wildland fires would be lessened as compared to the proposed Project in these areas. However, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.6.4 of this SEIR would be required. It is unlikely that impacts to wildland fires would be reduced to below a level of significance; thus, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

#### **4.3.2.7      *Hydrology and Water Quality***

When compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Mid-density Alternative would have lower density development and would accommodate less population growth (656 fewer DUs), which would result in less development in the Alpine CPA and the Cuyamaca Subarea that would have fewer non-point source pollutants, reduced risk for groundwater contamination, less permanent development of impervious surfaces, reduced alteration of existing drainage patterns. However, impacts associated with buildout of this alternative related to water quality standards and requirements, and groundwater supplies and recharge would still be considered significant because: 1) substantial additional sources of polluted runoff which would have short-term impacts on surface water; 2) pollutants, such as soils, debris, and other materials, in quantities that would potentially exceed water quality standards and otherwise significantly degrade water quality; 3) non-point source pollution into surface and groundwater bodies; and 4) violate groundwater quality standards by designating land uses that would be groundwater dependent in areas that are currently experiencing groundwater contamination (i.e., new wells constructed to support development in these areas would be susceptible to the contaminated groundwater supply which would have the potential to result in a non-potable water supply). Compared to the proposed Project, this alternative would involve an overall decrease in development intensity within the Alpine CPA and the Cuyamaca Subarea, resulting in less development and less surface and groundwater quality impacts; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.7.4 of this SEIR would be required. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that these impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance for the same reasons given in Section 2.7.3.1 and 2.7.3.2 of this SEIR; thus, the impacts associated with water quality standards and requirements, groundwater supplies and recharge of this alternative would remain significant and unavoidable.

Erosion or siltation or exceedance of stormwater system capacity would be lessened as compared to the proposed Project. However, impacts associated with buildout of this alternative would still be considered significant for the reasons described in Sections 2.7.3.3 and 2.7.3.5 of this SEIR and the mitigation identified in Section 2.7.4 of this SEIR would be required. With implementation of the mitigation measures, these impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

Table 4-10 identifies proposed land uses under implementation of the Mid-density Land Use Map that would occur within a 100-year flood area. Both the Mid-density Land Use Map and proposed Project Land Use Maps would assign lands within a 100-year flood area as follows: 3.4 acres as Rural Commercial, 98.1 acres as Residential Semi-Rural, and 299.7 acres as Residential Rural Lands. Therefore, impacts related to housing or structures within a 100-year flood hazard area and impeding or redirecting flood flows would be similar to the proposed Project. Therefore, impacts associated with buildout of this alternative would still be considered less than significant for the reasons described in Sections 2.7.3.6 and 2.7.3.7 and mitigation would not be required.

When compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Mid-density Land Use Map would not change the land use designations within dam inundation zones which is more fully discussed in Section 2.7.3.8. For reasons described in Section 2.7.3.9 of this SEIR, a significant impact related to tsunami, or seiche would not occur with implementation of the Mid-density Alternative, essentially due to the distant proximity of the FCI lands to the coastal zone.

However, implementation of the Mid-density Alternative, similar to the proposed Project, would result in potentially significant direct impacts with regard to mudflows because future development would occur in areas where steep slopes or unvegetated hillsides are present. As discussed in Section 2.7.3.4, the risk of flooding is potentially a significant impact. Therefore, impacts associated with the Mid-density Alternative would be considered significant for the reasons described in Sections 2.7.3.4, 2.7.3.8 and 2.7.3.9 of this SEIR and the mitigation identified in Section 2.7.4 would be required. With implementation of the mitigation measures, these impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

#### **4.3.2.8      *Land Use***

Impacts related to the physical division of an established community; conflicts with existing land use plans, policies, and regulations; and conflicts with adopted HCPs associated with buildout of this alternative would be similar to those described for the proposed Project in sections 2.8.3.1 through 2.8.3.2 of the SEIR. Both the proposed Project and Mid-density Alternative include the widening of only one road segment, Willows Road in Alpine from Viejas Casino Road east to the Interstate 8 westbound on-ramp from two to four lanes. As discussed further in Section 4.4.2.13, there would be a reduced need for future roads or road expansions under this alternative, compared to the proposed Project, because this alternative would accommodate less growth (656 less DUs). The Mid-density Alternative would not conflict with land use plans,

policies, and regulations This alternative would allow for development of the former FCI lands in a manner that would be consistent with the intended future growth anticipated under the 2011 General Plan but only if these areas are re-designated according to the same mapping principles used for the 2011 General Plan. In addition future development under the Mid-density Land Use Map would be required to demonstrate compliance with any adopted HCP or NCCP. Therefore, similar to the proposed Project, the Mid-density Alternative would not result in a significant impact associated with conflicts with land use plans, policies, or regulations, or applicable HCPs or NCCPs.

#### **4.3.2.9      *Mineral Resources***

Impacts related to mineral resource availability and mineral resource recovery sites would be similar to those discussed for the proposed Project but to a lesser degree because of the overall decrease in development in the Alpine CPA and Cuyamaca Subarea. For comparison purposes, the Mid-density Land Use Map would accommodate 656 less DUs than the proposed Project Land Use Map. The decreased development density would result in less incompatible land uses that would limit mineral resource availability or access to mineral resource recovery sites. For example, portions of the Alpine and Ramona CPAs and Palomar Mountain Subarea have been designated as MRZ-2. As shown in Table 4-11, the Mid-density Land Use Map assigns a less dense Semi-Rural Residential designation within areas that have been designated as MRZ-3 than the proposed Project. However, similar to the proposed Project as shown in Table 4-11 land use designations under this alternative are located within areas identified as MRZ-2 and MRZ-3. The loss of mineral resource availability would be unavoidable due to planned growth under the Mid-density Alternative within areas identified as MRZ-2 and MRZ-3. Impacts to mineral resource availability and mineral resource recovery sites would be considered significant for the reasons described in Sections 2.9.3.1 and 2.9.3.2 of this SEIR and the mitigation in Section 2.9.4 of this SEIR would be required. It is unlikely that impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance; thus, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable for this alternative for the reasons described in Section 2.9.4 of this SEIR.

#### **4.3.2.10     *Noise***

Impacts related to excessive noise levels, excessive groundborne vibration, permanent increases in the ambient noise level, temporary increases in ambient noise levels, and excessive noise exposure from a public or private airport would be similar to those discussed for the proposed Project but to a lesser degree because of the overall decrease in development of 656 DUs in the Alpine CPA and Cuyamaca Subarea (see Table 4-4). As shown in Table 4-3, under this alternative more Rural Residential land use designations and less Village Residential and Semi-Rural Residential would be built out in the Alpine CPA than compared to the proposed Project. Under this alternative less intense development would result in less construction noise, exposure to fewer noise receptors, and more development spaced away from noise sources than that

associated with buildout of the proposed Project. Due to the potential for decreased development under this alternative the potential for exposure to noise levels in excess of noise compatibility guidelines, excessive groundborne vibration, temporary increases in ambient noise levels, and excessive noise exposure from a private airport would be reduced. However, considering buildout of the alternative would result in increased development impacts related to noise associated with buildout of this alternative would still be considered significant for the reasons described in Sections 2.10.3.1 through 2.10.3.2 and 2.10.4.4 of this SEIR and the mitigation identified in Section 2.10.4 of this SEIR would be required.

Buildout of lower density development in the Alpine CPA under this alternative would also be less likely to result in permanent increases in the ambient noise level compared to the proposed Project. However, impacts related to increases in ambient noise levels associated with this alternative would still be considered significant for the reasons described in Section 2.10.3.3 of this SEIR and the mitigation identified in Section 2.10.4 would be required. It is unlikely that impacts associated with permanent increases in the ambient noise level associated with buildout of this alternative would be reduced to below a level of significance for the reasons described in Section 2.10.4.3 of this SEIR; thus, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

#### **4.3.2.11 Public Services**

New development under the Mid-density Alternative would increase the existing demand for fire protection services, police protection services, school facilities, and library facilities. To maintain or achieve acceptable service standards, new or physically altered fire, police, school, and library facilities would be required. As shown in Table 4-4, when compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Mid-density Land Use Map would accommodate less population growth (656] fewer residential units in the Alpine CPA and Cuyamaca Subarea), and therefore would result in a reduced need for new or additional fire, police, school, and library facilities to be constructed or expanded. Therefore, impacts to public services would be lessened as compared to the proposed Project. However, considering buildout of the alternative would result in increased development impacts would still be considered significant for the reasons described in Sections 2.11.3.1 and 2.11.3.2 of this SEIR and the mitigation identified in Section 2.11.4 of this SEIR would be required. After mitigation, impacts related to school facilities associated with buildout of this alternative would remain significant and unavoidable, due to the fact that the construction of such facilities is outside the jurisdiction of the County.

#### **4.3.2.12 Recreation**

Impacts related to deterioration of parks and recreational facilities and construction of new recreational facilities would be similar to those discussed for the proposed Project but to a lesser degree because of the decrease in development proposed in the Alpine CPA and Cuyamaca Subarea under the Mid-density Land Use Map. As shown in Table 4-4, when compared to the

proposed Project, the Mid-density Alternative would accommodate a smaller population (656 fewer DUs) in the Alpine CPA and Cuyamaca Subarea, and, therefore, would result in less demand for recreational facilities than the proposed Project. However, the projected population growth anticipated under the Mid-density Land Use Map would result in an increase in the number of persons that utilize recreational facilities in the unincorporated County as compared to existing conditions, which could result in accelerated deterioration of the facilities and create a need for new or expanded recreational facilities. Impacts associated with buildout of this alternative would still be considered significant for the reasons described in Sections 2.12.3.1 and 2.12.3.2 and the mitigation identified in Section 2.12.4 of this SEIR would be required.

#### **4.3.2.13      *Transportation and Traffic***

As evaluated in Section 2.13.3.1 of this SEIR, the traffic impacts associated with the proposed Project are focused in the Alpine CPA because this is where the highest density of proposed land uses changes would occur relative to the remaining Project areas which would be primarily rural and semi-rural residential uses spread out among several parcels within and near the CNF. The Mid-density Land Use Map roadway network is the same as the proposed Project. Table 4-12 identifies the number of trips by CPA resulting from this Project and compares the trips generated in each community with the number of trips forecast with buildout of the 2011 General Plan (see also Appendix F of this SEIR, Technical Memorandum—Traffic Impacts Analysis: Comparison of SEIR Alternatives). As shown in Table 4-12, the Mid-density Land Use Map would generate a total of 6,262 less vehicle trips (6,072 trips of the reduction are in the Alpine CPA). Due to less development in the remote areas of Alpine and Central Mountain (Cuyamaca Subregion), the Mid-density Land Use Map would also generate less VMT than the proposed Project Land Use Map. As a result, the Mid-density Alternative would result in the same deficient road segments in Alpine as the proposed Project with the exception of the eastern end of Willows Road which is forecast to operate at LOS E, rather than LOS F under this alternative.

As shown in Table 4-12 ADT generated by buildout of this alternative would be similar to the proposed Project for all CPAs with the exception of Alpine. Impacts associated with buildout of this alternative related to traffic and LOS standards, adjacent jurisdictions traffic and LOS standards would be similar to those discussed for the proposed Project but to a lesser degree because of the 640 DU decrease in development within the Alpine CPA (656 DU decrease for the entire Project area within this alternative). As described in Appendix F, impacts related to LOS standards, adjacent jurisdictions traffic and LOS standards, associated with this alternative would still be considered significant for the affected roadways identified in Section 2.13 and the mitigation identified in Section 2.13.4 of this SEIR would be required. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that the impacts related to LOS standards associated with buildout of this alternative would be reduced to below a level of significance for the same reasons given in Sections 2.13.5.1 of this SEIR; thus, the impacts related to traffic and LOS standards would remain significant and unavoidable.

As a result of Senate Bill 743, (SB 743) the California State Office of Planning and Research (OPR) is currently in the process of drafting regulations for traffic analysis under CEQA which would require that public agencies not utilize LOS for traffic analysis and instead rely on another metric—likely vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Therefore, although analysis of traffic using VMT is not yet required (because OPR has not finalized the new regulations and so the Natural Resources Agency has yet to approve them), an analysis of VMT generated by the proposed Project is contained Chapter 2, section 2.15 Global Climate Change, for informational purposes.

### Rural Road Safety

The Mid-density Alternative Land Use Map would support a smaller population (656 DUs) which would translate to fewer people exposed to rural road safety concerns or that would impair emergency access than the proposed Project Land Use Map. This alternative would also result in the need for fewer modifications to existing public transportation plans to accommodate growth in the County. When compared to the proposed Project, the existing conditions that would potentially impair emergency access would remain the same under the Mid-density Alternative. Therefore, the Mid-density Alternative would result in a lesser impact to rural road safety, than the proposed Project. However, impacts associated with buildout of this alternative would still be considered significant for the reasons described in Sections 2.13.5.2 through 2.13.5.5 of this SEIR and the mitigation identified in Section 2.13.4 of this SEIR would be required. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that the impacts related to rural road safety associated with buildout of this alternative would be reduced to below a level of significance for the same reasons given in Sections 2.13.5.2 of this SEIR; thus, the impacts related to would remain significant and unavoidable.

### Emergency Access

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Mid-density Alternative could add traffic on a roadway network that is incomplete or not fully connected; on roadways that are dead-end and one-way; or within gated communities, all of which have the potential to impair emergency access. Compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Mid-density Land Use Map would involve an overall decrease in development intensity within the Project areas (i.e., increase in Rural Lands and decrease in higher density land uses such as Rural Commercial, Village Residential, VCMU, and Semi-Rural Residential) resulting in less vehicle trips generated on local roadways which would translate to fewer conflicts with emergency access; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.13.4 of this SEIR would be required.

### Parking Capacity

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Mid-density Alternative would be required to comply with the parking standards set forth in the County of San Diego Zoning

Ordinance, Parking Regulations, Sections 6750–6799 and the County of San Diego Off-Street Parking Design Manual, which implements Section 6793(c) of the County Zoning Ordinance. Compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Mid-density Land Use Map would involve an overall decrease in higher density land uses (e.g., less Rural Commercial, Village Residential, and VCMU) within the community town centers resulting in less parking demand in these areas; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.13.4 of this SEIR would be required.

### Alternative Transportation

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Mid-density Alternative would provide for alternative modes of transportation, including bike lanes, bus stops, trails, and sidewalks. While existing County policies and regulations are intended to promote alternative transportation, this alternative may conflict with those of other agencies responsible for alternative transportation planning (e.g., SANDAG, Caltrans, transit agencies, and adjacent jurisdictions). Compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the Mid-density alternative Land Use Map would involve an overall decrease in higher density land uses (e.g., less Rural Commercial, Village Residential, and VCMU) and would not assign densities to expand the existing Alpine Village boundary resulting in less demand for alternative transportation infrastructure; however, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.13.4 of this SEIR would be required.

#### **4.3.2.14 Utilities and Service Systems**

Impacts related to wastewater treatment requirements, new water or wastewater treatment facilities, sufficient stormwater drainage facilities, adequate water supplies, adequate wastewater facilities, sufficient landfill capacity, solid waste regulations, and energy would be similar to those discussed for the proposed Project but to a lesser degree because of the decrease in development in the Alpine CPA and Cuyamaca Subarea. The Mid-density Land Use Map would accommodate the same population as the proposed Project Map within the SDCWA boundary and would accommodate 656 fewer residential units outside of the SDCWA boundary. Considering buildout of this alternative would result in development of fewer dwelling units than the proposed Project, overall impacts related to wastewater treatment requirements and adequate wastewater facilities would decrease under this alternative. Additionally, a reduction in development in the Alpine CPA and Cuyamaca Subarea would result in less impermeable space and runoff, fewer solid waste disposal needs, and less energy demand in those areas. Similar to the proposed Project development of future land uses under the Mid-density Land Use Map would be required to comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. As described in Section 2.14.4.7 of the SEIR, a significant impact would not occur if future development is required to comply with applicable regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, impacts associated with buildout of this alternative related to stormwater drainage

facilities, landfill capacity, and energy would be lessened as compared to the proposed Project in those areas. However, impacts associated with this alternative would still be considered significant for the reasons described in Sections 2.14.3.1 through 2.14.3.6 and 2.14.3.8 of this SEIR and the mitigation identified in Section 2.14.4 of this SEIR would be required. With implementation of the mitigation measures, these impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

Impacts related to landfill capacity associated with buildout of this alternative would still be considered significant for the reasons described in Section 2.14.4.6 and the mitigation identified in Section 2.14.4 would be required. It is unlikely that impacts of the alternative to landfill capacity would be reduced to below a level of significance for the reasons described in Section 2.14.4.6 of this SEIR; thus, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Both the proposed Project and Mid-density Land Use Maps assign land use designations in the Alpine CPA that require the expansion of the SDCWA boundary to provide imported water and sanitary sewer services. The Mid-density Land Use Map assigns approximately 655 acres with land use designations that would require the expansion of imported water services outside the SDCWA boundary, 592 less acres than on the proposed Project Land Use Map. Also, the Mid-density Land Use Map assigns approximately 655 acres with land use designations that would require the expansion of sanitary sewer services outside the SDCWA boundary, 324 less acres than on the proposed Project Land Use Map. However, there are not any differences between the proposed Project and Mid-density Maps for land use designations assigned inside the SDCWA boundary. Therefore, inside the SDCWA boundary impacts to new water and wastewater facilities and adequate water supply associated with buildout of this alternative would be the same as the proposed Project. Impacts associated with this alternative would therefore be considered significant for the reasons described in Sections 2.14.3.4 and the mitigation identified in Section 2.14.4 would be required. It is unlikely that impacts of the alternative to adequate water supplies would be reduced to below a level of significance for the reasons described in Section 2.14.4.4 of this SEIR; thus, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

#### **4.3.2.15      *Climate Change***

##### **Compliance with California GHG Reduction Goals**

Impacts related to compliance with California GHG reduction goals would be similar to those discussed for the proposed Project but to a lesser degree because of the overall decrease in development under this alternative. As shown in Table 4-4, the Mid-density Land Use Map would accommodate less growth and development in the Project areas (656 less DUs in the Alpine CPA and Cuyamaca Subarea) than the proposed Project Land Use Map, which would translate to lower GHG emissions from operation of development proposed under this alternative. Additionally, the Mid-density Land Use Map would result in less VMT than the proposed Project Land Use Map, which would translate to less GHG emissions from

transportation. Therefore, the Mid-density Alternative would result in fewer impacts related to compliance with AB 32 and longer-term GHG emissions targets as compared to the proposed Project. Impacts associated with buildout of this Alternative would still be considered significant for the reasons described in Section 2.15.3.1 of this SEIR and the mitigation identified in Section 2.15.4 of this SEIR would be required. It is not known whether this alternative would achieve GHG reduction targets identified for the years after 2020, because important factors are not currently known. The unknown factors include: GHG emissions target in effect at the time that subdivisions are submitted after 2020; the effectiveness of regulatory actions already adopted as part of the implementation of the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006; and the potential for application of new regulations and their effectiveness. Further, the cost and feasibility of certain policies that would be mandated as mitigation are not known. Therefore, GHG impacts would not be feasibly mitigated to adopted GHG target levels for 2020 and beyond. For this reason, and because this alternative would emit a substantial level of GHG emissions, the residual impact is potentially significant and unavoidable.

### Adverse Climate Change Impacts

Impacts associated with adverse climate change effects would be similar to those discussed for the proposed Project but to a lesser degree because of the overall decrease in development under this Alternative. Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Mid-Density Alternative would result in additional residents exposed to general climate change effects such as decreases in available water supply, increased frequency of wildfires, increased demand for energy as a result of the greater need for summer cooling, and impacts to public health related to increased heat, air pollution, wildfires, and infectious diseases. Compared to the proposed Project, this alternative would involve an overall decrease in development intensity within the Project areas resulting in fewer people being exposed to the adverse effects of climate change; however, climate change impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.15.4 of this SEIR would be required. The Project areas of this alternative provide a greater number of natural, physical, and environmental constraints than urbanized areas in the County, a higher occurrence of sensitive plant or animal species, and limitations in adequate provision of infrastructure and utilities or public services (e.g., fire protection, water supply). Some of these impacts, such as those related to water supply, wildland fires and ecosystems are expected to be more severe for this alternative as compared to the projected development under the 2011 General Plan due to the proposed development in and around the Cleveland National Forest which is comprised of more sensitive natural resources in comparison to urbanized areas of the County. However, these impacts would be reduced under this alternative due to the decreased number of potential dwelling units that could be constructed under this alternative; but, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

#### **4.4 Analysis of the Alpine Alternative Land Use Map**

##### **4.4.1 Alpine Alternative Land Use Map Description and Setting**

The Alpine Alternative Land Use Map (Alpine Alternative) proposes the same land use designations as the proposed Project for all communities, with the exception of the Alpine Community Planning Area (Alpine CPA). See Figures 4-3A and 4-3B for the Alpine Alternative Land Use Map. Within the Alpine CPA, the Alpine Alternative proposes different land use designations than the proposed Project in three areas as described below.

- Eastern Alpine, south of the Viejas Reservation (1,510 acres) — This area, south of Interstate 8 and adjacent to the Cleveland National Forest to the south and east, assigns either Semi-rural 4 (1:4 acres), or Rural Lands 40 (1:40 acres) under the Alpine Alternative rather than Rural Commercial, Village Residential 2 (2:1 acre), Semi-rural 1 (1:1 acre), Semi-rural 2 (1:2 acre), Semi-rural 10 (1:10 acres), or Rural Lands 20 (1:20 acres) under the proposed Project. The potential buildout of the Alpine Alternative (547 dwelling units) is 466 dwelling units less than under the proposed Project (1,013 dwelling units).
- East of Rancho Palos Verde (40 acres) — Two parcels would be assigned Rural Lands 40 (1:40 acres) rather the Semi-rural 2 (1:2 acres) assigned under the proposed Project. This would reduce the potential buildout from 14 dwelling unit under the proposed Project to two dwelling units under the Alpine Alternative.
- Japatul Valley — (1,362 acres) — The Alpine Alternative proposes Rural Lands 40 (1:40 acres) for 16 parcels rather than Rural Lands 20 (1:20 acres) assigned under the proposed Project. This different land use designation would reduce the potential buildout of these parcels from 64 dwelling units under the proposed Project to 32 dwelling units under the Alpine Alternative.

The Alpine Alternative land use designations are less intensive and would accommodate less development than the proposed Project and would generally result in similar but reduced environmental impacts. The Alpine Alternative would support buildout of approximately 5,734 residential dwelling units (DUs), or approximately 510 less DUs than the proposed Project. When compared to the proposed Project, the Alpine Alternative would assign 206 additional acres as Rural Lands, but would assign 24 less acres as Village Residential, 174 less acres as Semi-rural, and seven less acres as Rural Commercial.

##### **4.4.2 Comparison of the Effects of the Alpine Alternative Land Use Map Alternative to the Proposed Project**

The Alpine Alternative Land Use Map (Alpine Alternative) proposes greater residential development densities and number of residential dwelling units than the Mid-density and Modified FCI Condition alternatives, but less development density and fewer residential

dwelling units than the proposed Project. In some cases the Alpine Alternative would result in similar impacts to the Mid-density and Modified FCI Condition Alternatives but impacts are often reduced or less significant than the proposed Project.

#### **4.4.2.1      *Aesthetics***

Impacts to scenic vistas, scenic resources, visual character or quality, and light or glare associated with buildout of the Alpine Alternative would be reduced from that associated with the proposed Project in the Alpine CPA only. The Alpine Alternative would permit a smaller number of homes (510 fewer homes) in the Alpine CPA than the proposed Project would allow for. The reduced density of residential development within and adjacent to the CNF associated with this alternative would result in fewer obstructions or distractions within scenic vistas and direct impacts to scenic resources. However, the parcels proposed for a different land use designation than assigned to the proposed Project are located outside Zone A of the Mount Palomar and Mount Laguna Observatories. Therefore, as shown in Table 4-5, the same number of dwelling units at buildout would be located within Zone A for this alternative when compared to the proposed Project.

Although implementation of this alternative would possibly reduce the extent of impacts to scenic vistas, scenic resources, and visual character and reduce the sources of light and glare, development would occur that could result in adverse impacts related to aesthetics. Impacts to scenic vistas, scenic resources, visual character and increased sources of light and glare associated with this alternative would therefore be considered potentially significant and would need to be mitigated with those measures identified in Section 2.1.4 of this SEIR. Impacts to scenic vistas and scenic resources would be mitigated to a less than significant level; however, it is unlikely that impacts associated with visual character or quality and light or glare would be reduced to below a level of significance; thus, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

#### **4.4.2.2      *Agricultural and Forestry Resources***

Impacts related to the direct conversion of farmland, land use conflicts with agricultural zoning, and indirect conversion of farmland and forest resources would be similar to those discussed for the proposed Project. This alternative would impact the same number of acres of agricultural resources as the proposed Project; both alternatives would result in impacts to 48.5 acres of agricultural resources (see Table 4-6). Therefore, impacts related to direct and indirect conversion of farmland would be the same as compared to the proposed Project. As shown in Table 4-7, this alternative would result in similar conversion of forestry resources compared with the proposed Project. Therefore, impacts associated with these issues would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.2.4 of this SEIR would be required. For the reasons described in Sections 2.2.4.1, 2.2.4.3 and 2.2.4.4, impacts resulting from the direct and

indirect conversion of agricultural resources, and cumulative impacts with regard to conversion of agricultural resources and the direct or indirect conversion or loss of forestry resources would remain significant and unavoidable.

For the reasons described in Section 2.2.4.2, impacts with regard to conflicts with Agricultural and forestry lands would be reduced to a level below significant with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in Section 2.2.4.

#### **4.4.2.3      *Air Quality***

Impacts to air quality plans, air quality violations, non-attainment criteria pollutants, sensitive receptors, and objectionable odors would be similar to those discussed for the proposed Project, but to a lesser degree because of the overall decrease in development of 510 DUs in the Alpine CPA. As shown in Table 4-8, buildout of this Alternative would result in less annual emissions of VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, Sox, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> than that associated with the proposed Project. Similar to the proposed Project, the Alpine Alternative would not result in a significant impact associated with conflicts with air quality plans considering future development under this alternative would be required to be consistent with the emission reduction strategies in the RAQS and SIP. Impacts from source and mobile emissions effecting sensitive receptors, air quality violations, and non-attainment criteria pollutants would be considered significant and mitigation in Section 2.3.4 of this SEIR would be required for this alternative. It is unlikely that impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance for the same reasons provided in Section 2.3.4 of this SEIR; thus, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Similar to the proposed Project, odor generating land uses proposed under the Alpine Alternative would be required to comply with APCD Rule 51 and County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Sections 63.401 and 63.402, which prohibit nuisance odors from affecting nearby receptors. Therefore, this alternative would not result in a significant impact associated with objectionable odors. Additionally, future development under this alternative would be required to be consistent with the emission reduction strategies in the RAQS and SIP.

#### **4.4.2.4      *Biological Resources***

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Alpine Alternative would result in direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to special status plant and wildlife species, riparian habitat, wetlands and wildlife corridors through the removal or destruction of habitat for new development or infrastructure. This analysis is based on the same impact assumptions used for the proposed Project as discussed in Section 2.4.3.1. As shown in Table 4-9, development under this alternative would result in impacts to approximately 11,948 acres of sensitive vegetation communities compared with the 12,256 acres of impact associated with the proposed Project. Implementation of this alternative would result in reduced direct and cumulative impacts to sensitive vegetation communities that would have the potential to support special status plant and

wildlife species, compared to the proposed Project. However, impacts associated with buildout of the Alpine Alternative would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.4.4 of this SEIR would be required. It is unlikely that the impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance for the same reasons given in Section 2.4.4 of this SEIR; thus, the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to special status plant and wildlife species, riparian habitat, wildlife corridors and nursery sites associated with buildout of the Alpine Alternative would remain significant and unavoidable.

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Alpine Alternative would not conflict with programs and ordinances that protect biological resources because discretionary projects are required to comply with the County's MSCP Subarea Plan, BMO, HLP Ordinance, and RPO, and the Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub NCCP Process Guidelines. Future development under the Alpine Alternative would not conflict with the County's MSCP Subarea Plan and the Coastal Sage Scrub NCCP Process Guidelines, which are the applicable HCPs for the Project areas within the unincorporated County lands.

Similar to the proposed Project, direct and indirect effects would occur with future development within the Alpine CPA of the Alpine Alternative, which could result in substantial adverse effects on wetlands (i.e., removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other disturbances) from ground disturbing activities (such as grading and excavation) in previously undeveloped lands. The potentially significant direct and indirect effects would be reduced to below a level of significance by the mitigation measures identified in Section 2.4.4.3. In addition, as existing regulations would ensure that cumulative projects would meet the no-net-loss standard, the Alpine Alternative would not contribute to significant cumulative impacts to federally protected wetlands, and no additional mitigation measures would be required.

#### **4.4.2.5 Cultural Resources**

Impacts to historical resources, archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains would be similar to those of the proposed Project but to a lesser degree in the Alpine Alternative because of the overall decrease in development of 510 DUs. Development under the Alpine Alternative would have the potential to substantially alter the significance of historical resources, or destroy archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains that are potentially present on or below the ground surface during ground-disturbing construction activities. High intensity development would have a higher potential to impact the significance of cultural resources because it would require more ground-disturbing construction activities than lower intensity development. Compared to the proposed Project, the Alpine Alternative would decrease the overall development in the Alpine CPA and would result in fewer potential impacts to cultural resources due to destruction during construction or alteration to the significance of a resource post-construction. Therefore, impacts would be lessened as compared to the proposed Project. However, impacts from ground disturbance associated with future development under

the Alpine Alternative to historical resources, archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains would still be considered significant for the reasons described in Section 2.5.3 and the mitigation identified in Section 2.5.4 of this SEIR would be required and would reduce these impacts to a level of less than significant.

#### **4.4.2.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Alpine Alternative may involve the use, disposal, or transport of hazardous materials. Although hazardous materials can be found in all land uses, the proposed Rural Commercial designation is more likely to result in uses that regularly involve hazardous materials such as the sale of chemical fertilizers, pesticides and cleaning products. The Alpine Alternative assigns seven fewer acres of Rural Commercial land uses than the proposed Project. Therefore, the potential for accidental release of hazardous materials and associated hazards to schools and existing hazardous material sites would result in less potential for impacts. Similar to the proposed Project, the Alpine Alternative would not create a potentially significant hazard to the public or the environment by substantially increasing human exposure to vectors.

Therefore, for the reasons described in Sections 2.6.3.1 through 2.6.3.4 and 2.6.3.8 of the SEIR, through compliance with existing County, state and federal regulations, direct and cumulative impacts related to the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, hazards to schools, hazardous materials sites and vectors associated with the Alpine Alternative would be less than significant and mitigation would not be required.

The Alpine Alternative would have lower density development and accommodate a smaller population (510 fewer DUs) in the Alpine CPA compared to the proposed Project, which would result in a reduced risk to people living or working in areas associated with private airport operation hazards, and would result in less reallocated growth and less development with the potential to impede the implementation of emergency response and evacuation plans. Therefore, for the reasons described in Sections 2.6.3.5 and 2.6.3.6 of the SEIR through compliance with existing regulations and mitigation identified in Section 2.6.4 of this SEIR, direct and cumulative impacts related to proximity to public and private airports or emergency response and evacuation plans associated with the Alpine Alternative would be less than significant.

The Alpine Alternative reduces land use densities in the Alpine CPA that are served by fire agencies in areas which have difficulty meeting fire code requirements due to limited access, compared to the proposed Project. Therefore, potential impacts from wildland fires would be reduced when compared to the proposed Project in the Alpine Alternative CPA areas. However, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.6.4 of this SEIR would be required. It is unlikely that impacts from wildland fires would be reduced to below a level of significance; thus, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

#### **4.4.2.7      *Hydrology and Water Quality***

The Alpine Alternative would reduce total housing outside the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) service area by 510 DUs, compared to the proposed Project. Therefore, the Alpine Alternative would result in less impact to groundwater and water quality standards and requirements in the Alpine CPA because it would result in less growth in groundwater dependent areas resulting in a reduced need to comply with standards and regulations. However, impacts associated with buildout of the Alpine Alternative relative to water quality standards and requirements and groundwater supplies and recharge would still be considered significant because: 1) substantial additional sources of polluted runoff which would have short-term impacts on surface water; 2) pollutants, such as soils, debris, and other materials, in quantities that would potentially exceed water quality standards and otherwise significantly degrade water quality; 3) non-point source pollution into surface and groundwater bodies; and 4) violate groundwater quality standards by designating land uses that would be groundwater dependent in areas that are currently experiencing groundwater contamination (i.e., new wells constructed to support development in these areas would be susceptible to the contaminated groundwater supply which would have the potential to result in a non-potable water supply). For the reasons described in Sections 2.7.3.1 and 2.7.3.2 and the mitigation identified in Section 2.7.4 of this SEIR would be required. It is unlikely that impacts to groundwater supplies and recharge and water quality standards and requirements would be reduced to below a level of significance; thus, for the reasons described in Sections 2.7.3.1 and 2.7.3.2 these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

The Alpine Alternative would have lower density development and accommodate less population growth (510 fewer DUs) in the Alpine CPA compared to the proposed Project, which would result in less development in the Alpine CPA and fewer non-point source pollutants, reduced risk for groundwater contamination, less permanent development of impervious surfaces, and reduced alteration of existing drainage patterns. Therefore, impacts associated with buildout of the Alpine Alternative related to erosion or siltation or exceedance of stormwater system capacity would be less than the proposed Project. However, impacts associated with buildout of the Alpine Alternative would still be considered significant for the reasons described in Sections 2.7.3.3 and 2.7.3.5 of this SEIR and the mitigation identified in Section 2.7.4 of this SEIR would be required. With implementation of the mitigation measures, these impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

Table 4-10 identifies proposed land uses of the Alpine Alternative that would occur within a 100-year flood area. Both the Alpine Alternative and the proposed Project would assign lands within a 100-year flood area as follows: 3.4 acres as Rural Commercial, 98.1 acres as Residential Semi-Rural, and 299.7 acres as Residential Rural Lands. Therefore, impacts related to housing or structures within a 100-year flood hazard area, flooding in general and impeding or redirecting flood flows under the Alpine Alternative would be similar to the proposed Project and are

considered less than significant due to the compliance of regulations restricting habitable structures within a 100-year flood hazard area and thus impeding or redirecting flood flows. Therefore, impacts associated with buildout of the Alpine Alternative would not be considered significant for the reasons described in Sections 2.7.3.4, 2.7.3.6 and 2.7.3.7 and mitigation would not be required.

When compared to the proposed Project, the Alpine Alternative would not change the land use designations within dam inundation zones. A significant impact related to tsunami, or seiche would not occur with implementation of the Alpine Alternative, essentially due to the distant proximity of the FCI lands to the coastal zone. However, implementation of the Alpine Alternative, similar to the proposed Project, would result in potentially significant direct impacts with regard to mudflows because future development would occur in areas where steep slopes or un-vegetated hillsides are present. Therefore, impacts associated with the Alpine Alternative relative to dam inundation and flood hazards, and seiche, tsunami and mudflow hazards would be considered significant for the reasons described in Sections 2.7.3.8 and 2.7.3.9 of this SEIR and the mitigation identified in Section 2.7.4 would be required. With implementation of the mitigation measures, these impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

#### **4.4.2.8 Land Use**

Impacts related to the physical division of an established community; conflicts with existing land use plans, policies, and regulations; and conflicts with adopted HCPs associated with buildout of the Alpine Alternative would be similar to those described for the proposed Project in sections 2.8.3.1 through 2.8.3.2 of the SEIR. Both the proposed Project and Alpine Alternative include the widening of only one road segment, Willows Road in Alpine from Viejas Casino Road east to the Interstate 8 westbound on-ramp from two to four lanes. As discussed further in Section 4.4.2.13, there would be a reduced need for future roads or road expansions under the Alpine Alternative, compared to the proposed Project, because the Alpine Alternative would accommodate less growth (510 less DUs) in the Alpine CPA. The Alpine Alternative would not conflict with land use plans, policies, and regulations because development of the former FCI lands under the Alpine Alternative would be regulated in a manner consistent with the intended future growth anticipated under the 2011 General Plan, assuming these areas are re-designated according to the same land use distribution principles of the Community Development Model used for the 2011 General Plan, which the proposed Project and the Alpine Alternative have been. In addition, future development under the Alpine Alternative would be required to demonstrate compliance with any adopted HCP or NCCP. Therefore, similar to the proposed Project, the Alpine Alternative would not result in a significant impact associated with conflicts with land use plans, policies, or regulations, or applicable HCPs or NCCPs.

#### **4.4.2.9 Mineral Resources**

Impacts related to mineral resource availability and mineral resource recovery sites would be similar to those discussed for the proposed Project but to a lesser degree because of the overall decrease in development in the Alpine CPA. For comparison purposes, the Alpine Alternative would accommodate 510 less DUs than the proposed Project in the Alpine CPA. The decreased development density would result in less incompatible land uses that would limit mineral resource availability or access to mineral resource recovery sites. For example, portions of the Alpine and Ramona CPAs and Palomar Mountain Subarea have been designated as MRZ-2. As shown in Table 4-11, the Alpine Alternative assigns the same density designations within areas that have been designated as MRZ-3 as the proposed Project. Similar to the proposed Project, as shown in Table 4-11, land use designations under the Alpine Alternative are located within areas identified as MRZ-2 and MRZ-3. The loss of mineral resource availability would be unavoidable due to planned growth under the Alpine Alternative within areas identified as MRZ-2 and MRZ-3. Impacts to mineral resource availability and mineral resource recovery sites would be considered significant for the reasons described in Sections 2.9.3.1 and 2.9.3.2 of this SEIR and the mitigation in Section 2.9.4 of this SEIR would be required. It is unlikely that impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance; thus, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable for the Alpine Alternative for the reasons described in Section 2.9.4 of this SEIR.

#### **4.4.2.10 Noise**

Impacts related to excessive noise levels, excessive groundborne vibration, permanent increases in the ambient noise level, temporary increases in ambient noise levels, and excessive noise exposure from a public or private airport would be similar to those discussed for the proposed Project but to a lesser degree because of the overall decrease in development of 510 DUs in the Alpine CPA (see Table 4-4). As shown in Table 4-3, the Alpine Alternative designates 206 more acres of Rural Residential lands and 174 fewer acres of Semi-rural Residential and 25 fewer acres of Village Residential lands in the Alpine CPA when compared to the proposed Project. Under the Alpine Alternative less intense development would result in less construction noise, exposure to fewer noise receptors, and more development spaced away from noise sources in the Alpine CPA than that associated with buildout of the proposed Project. Due to the potential for decreased development under the Alpine Alternative, the potential for exposure to noise levels in excess of noise compatibility guidelines, excessive groundborne vibration, temporary increases in ambient noise levels, and excessive noise exposure from a private airport would also be reduced as compared to the proposed Project. However, development impacts related to noise associated with buildout of the Alpine Alternative would still be considered significant for the reasons described in Sections 2.10.3.1 through 2.10.3.2 and 2.10.4.4 of this SEIR and the mitigation identified in Section 2.10.4 of this SEIR would be required. With implementation of the mitigation measures, these impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

Buildout of the lower density development in the Alpine CPA under the Alpine Alternative would be less likely to result in permanent increases in the ambient noise level compared to the proposed Project. However, impacts related to increases in ambient noise levels associated with the Alpine Alternative would still be considered significant for the reasons described in Section 2.10.3.3 of this SEIR and the mitigation identified in Section 2.10.4 would be required. It is unlikely that impacts associated with permanent increases in the ambient noise level associated with buildout of this alternative would be reduced to below a level of significance for the reasons described in Section 2.10.4.3 of this SEIR; thus, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

#### **4.4.2.11 Public Services**

New development under the Alpine Alternative would increase the existing demand for fire protection services, police protection services, school facilities, and library facilities. To maintain or achieve acceptable service standards, new or physically altered fire, police, school, and library facilities would likely be required. As shown in Table 4-4, the Alpine Alternative would, when compared to the proposed Project, accommodate less population growth due to fewer residential units (510 fewer DUs) in the Alpine CPA, therefore it would result in a reduced need for new or additional fire, police, school, and library facilities to be constructed or expanded compared to the proposed Project. Therefore, impacts to public services would be lessened as compared to the proposed Project. However, considering buildout of the Alpine Alternative would result in the increased need for public services, impacts would still be considered significant for the reasons described in Sections 2.11.3.1 and 2.11.3.2 of this SEIR and the mitigation identified in Section 2.11.4 of this SEIR would be required. With implementation of the mitigation measures, impacts to the provision of fire, police and library services would be reduced to less than significant.

After mitigation, impacts related to school facilities would remain significant and unavoidable, due to the fact that the construction of such facilities is outside the jurisdiction of the County.

#### **4.4.2.12 Recreation**

Impacts related to deterioration of parks and recreational facilities and construction of new recreational facilities would be similar to those discussed for the proposed Project but to a lesser degree under the Alpine Alternative because of the proposed decrease in development compared to the proposed Project. As shown in Table 4-4, when compared to the proposed Project, the Alpine Alternative would accommodate a smaller population (510 fewer DUs) in the Alpine CPA and, therefore, would result in less demand for recreational facilities than the proposed Project. However, the projected population growth anticipated under the Alpine Alternative would still result in an increase in the number of persons that utilize recreational facilities in the unincorporated County as compared to the proposed Project, which could result in accelerated deterioration of the facilities and create a need for new or expanded recreational facilities.

Impacts associated with buildout of the Alpine Alternative would still be considered significant for the reasons described in Sections 2.12.3.1 and 2.12.3.2 and the mitigation identified in Section 2.12.4 of this SEIR would be required. With implementation of the mitigation measures, these impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

#### **4.4.2.13      *Transportation and Traffic***

As evaluated in Section 2.13.3.1 of this SEIR, the traffic impacts associated with the proposed Project are focused in the Alpine CPA because this is where the highest density of proposed land uses changes would occur relative to all of the Project areas. The other Project areas (excluding the Alpine CPA) of the proposed Project would be primarily rural and semi-rural residential uses spread out among several parcels within and near the CNF. The proposed Alpine Alternative roadway network is the same as the proposed Project. Table 4-12 identifies the number of vehicle trips by Project area resulting from the proposed Project, and compares the vehicle trips generated in each community with the number of vehicle trips forecasted at buildout of the 2011 General Plan (see also Appendix E of this SEIR, Technical Memorandum—Traffic Impacts Analysis: Comparison of SEIR Alternatives). As shown in Table 4-12, the Alpine Alternative would generate a total of 7,546 less vehicle trips within the Alpine CPA. Due to less development in eastern Alpine south of Interstate 8, the Alpine Alternative would also generate less vehicle miles traveled (VMT) than the proposed Project Land Use Map. In addition, the Alpine Alternative would result in one less road segment forecast to operate at LOS E or F. Alpine Boulevard from West Willows Road to the eastern end of Willows Road is forecast to operate at LOS D with build-out of the Alpine Alternative Land Use Map, rather than LOS F with build-out of the proposed Project.

As shown in Table 4-12 average daily traffic (ADT) generated by build-out of the Alpine Alternative would be the same as the proposed Project for all Project areas, with the exception of the Alpine CPA. Impacts associated with buildout of the Alpine Alternative related to unincorporated County traffic and LOS standards and rural road safety, would be similar to those for the proposed Project but to a lesser degree because of the decrease in development (510 fewer dwelling units) within the Alpine CPA. As described in Appendix D, impacts related to unincorporated County traffic and LOS standards and rural road safety, associated with the Alpine Alternative would be considered significant for the affected roadways identified in Section 2.13 and the mitigation identified in Section 2.13.4 of this SEIR would be required. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that the impacts related to unincorporated County traffic and LOS standards and rural road safety associated with build-out of this alternative would not be reduced to below a level of significance for the same reasons given in Sections 2.13.5.1 and 2.13.3.2 of this SEIR; thus, the impacts related to unincorporated County traffic and LOS standards and rural road safety would remain significant and unavoidable.

As discussed in section 2.13.3.3 of this SEIR, buildout of the Alpine Alternative would result in existing inadequate roadway widths, dead-end roads, and one-way roads, and gated communities continuing to occur in the unincorporated County, all of which have the potential to impair emergency access. However, these potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts to emergency access would be reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in Section 2.13.4, in addition to compliance with applicable regulations.

Future development of parking facilities associated with development under the Alpine Alternative would be required to follow existing parking standards and requirements, such as the County's Zoning Ordinance and roadway standards. Similar impacts from implementation of the proposed Project, projects under the Alpine Alternative would address through parking standards as set forth in the County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance, Parking Regulations, Sections 6750-6799 and the County of San Diego Off-Street Parking Design Manual, which implements Section 6793(c) of the County Zoning Ordinance. Almost all land uses under the proposed Project would require parking facilities when developed although parking capacity issues could be frustrated by new projects and lead to potentially significant impacts. However, these potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts to parking capacity would be reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in Section 2.13.4, in addition to compliance with applicable regulations.

Similar impacts on alternative transportation would occur with the Alpine Alternative when compared to the proposed Project although those impacts would be reduced due to the reduction in residential development. For the reasons discussed in Section 2.13.3.5 of this SEIR, the Alpine Alternative could result in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts to alternative transportation plans and policies; however, such potentially significant impacts would be reduced by the mitigation measures in Section 2.13.4.5 to below a level of significance.

As a result of Senate Bill 743, (SB 743) the California State Office of Planning and Research (OPR) is currently in the process of drafting regulations for traffic analysis under CEQA which would require that public agencies not utilize LOS for traffic analysis and instead rely on another metric—likely vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Therefore, although analysis of traffic using VMT is not yet required (because OPR has not finalized the new regulations and so the Natural Resources Agency has yet to approve them), an analysis of VMT generated by the proposed Project is contained Chapter 2, section 2.15 Global Climate Change, for informational purposes.

#### **4.4.2.14 Utilities and Service Systems**

Impacts related to wastewater treatment requirements, new water or wastewater treatment facilities, sufficient stormwater drainage facilities, adequate water supplies, adequate wastewater facilities, sufficient landfill capacity, solid waste regulations, and energy of the Alpine Alternative would be similar to the proposed Project but to a lesser degree because of the

decrease in development in the Alpine CPA. The Alpine Alternative would accommodate the same population as the proposed Project within the SDCWA boundary. However, the Alpine Alternative would accommodate 510 fewer residential units located outside of the SDCWA boundary (in the Alpine CPA). Considering buildout of the Alpine Alternative would result in development of fewer dwelling units than the proposed Project, overall impacts related to wastewater treatment requirements and adequate wastewater facilities would decrease under the Alpine Alternative. Additionally, a reduction in development in the Alpine CPA would result in less impermeable surfaces and thus urban stormwater runoff, fewer solid waste disposal needs, and less energy demand in the Alpine CPA. Therefore, impacts associated with buildout of the Alpine Alternative related to stormwater drainage facilities, landfill capacity, and energy, compared to the proposed Project, would be reduced in the Alpine CPA. Similar to the proposed Project, development of land uses under the Alpine Alternative would be required to comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. As described in Section 2.14.4.7 of the SEIR, a significant impact would not occur if future development is required to comply with applicable regulations related to solid waste. However, impacts associated with the Alpine Alternative would still be considered significant for the reasons described in Sections 2.14.3.1 through 2.14.3.6 and 2.14.3.8 of this SEIR and the mitigation identified in Section 2.14.4 of this SEIR would be required. With implementation of the mitigation measures, these impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

Impacts related to landfill capacity associated with buildout of the Alpine Alternative would be considered significant for the reasons described in Section 2.14.4.6 and the mitigation identified in Section 2.14.4 would be required. It is unlikely that impacts of the alternative to landfill capacity would be reduced to below a level of significance for the reasons described in Section 2.14.4.6 of this SEIR; thus, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Both the proposed Project and Alpine Alternative assign land use designations in the Alpine CPA that require expansion of the SDCWA boundary to provide imported water and sanitary sewer services. The Alpine Alternative assigns approximately 441 acres with land use designations that would require the expansion of imported water services outside the SDCWA boundary, 806 less acres than the proposed Project. Further, the Alpine Alternative assigns approximately 441 acres with land use designations that would require the expansion of sanitary sewer services outside the SDCWA boundary, 538 less acres than on the proposed Project. Land use designations assigned inside the SDCWA boundary are the same for the proposed Project and the Alpine Alternative. Therefore, inside the SDCWA boundary impacts to new water and wastewater facilities and adequate water supply associated with buildout of the Alpine Alternative would be the same as the proposed Project.

It is unlikely that impacts of the Alpine Alternative to adequate water supplies would be reduced to below a level of significance for the reasons described in Section 2.14.4.4 of this SEIR; thus, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

#### **4.4.2.15     *Climate Change***

##### **Compliance with California GHG Reduction Goals**

Impacts related to compliance with California GHG reduction goals would be similar to those discussed for the proposed Project but to a lesser degree because of the overall decrease in development of the Alpine Alternative. As shown in Table 4-4, the Alpine Alternative would accommodate less growth and development in the Alpine CPA (510 fewer dwelling units) than the proposed Project, which would translate to lower GHG emissions from operation of development proposed under this Alternative. Additionally, the Alpine Alternative would result in less VMT than the proposed Project, which would result in less GHG emissions from transportation. Therefore, the Alpine Alternative would reduce impacts related to compliance with AB 32 and longer-term GHG emissions targets as compared to the proposed Project. Impacts associated with buildout of the Alpine Alternative would still be considered significant for the reasons described in Section 2.15.3.1 of this SEIR and the mitigation identified in Section 2.15.4 of this SEIR would be required.

It is not known whether this alternative would achieve GHG reduction targets identified for the years after 2020, because important factors are not currently known. The unknown factors include: GHG emissions target in effect at the time that subdivisions are submitted after 2020; the effectiveness of regulatory actions already adopted as part of the implementation of the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006; and the potential for application of new regulations and their effectiveness. Further, the cost and feasibility of certain policies that would be mandated as mitigation are not known. Therefore, GHG impacts would not be feasibly mitigated to adopted GHG target levels for 2020 and beyond. For this reason, and because this alternative would emit a substantial level of GHG emissions, the residual impact is potentially significant and unavoidable.

##### **Adverse Climate Change Impacts**

Impacts associated with adverse climate change effects would be similar to those discussed for the proposed Project but to a lesser degree because of the overall decrease in development under this alternative. Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the Alpine Alternative would result in additional residents exposed to general climate change effects such as decreases in available water supply, increased frequency of wildfires, increased demand for energy as a result of the greater need for summer cooling, and impacts to public health related to increased heat, air pollution, wildfires, and infectious diseases. Compared to the proposed Project, this alternative would involve an overall decrease in development intensity within the Project areas resulting in fewer people being exposed to the adverse effects of climate change; however, climate change impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.15.4 of this SEIR would be required. Project areas of this alternative provide a greater number of natural, physical, and environmental constraints than urbanized

areas in the County, a higher occurrence of sensitive plant or animal species, and limitations in adequate provision of infrastructure and utilities or public services (e.g., fire protection, water supply). Some of these impacts, such as those related to water supply, wildland fires and ecosystems are expected to be more severe for this alternative as compared to the projected development under the 2011 General Plan due to the proposed development in and around the Cleveland National Forest which is comprised of more sensitive natural resources in comparison to urbanized areas of the County. However, these impacts would be reduced under this alternative due to the decreased number of potential dwelling units that could be constructed under this alternative; but, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

#### **4.5 Analysis of the No Project Alternative**

##### **4.5.1 No Project Alternative Description and Setting**

The No Project Alternative assumes that the pre-FCI General Plan (the Plan in place prior to adoption of the 2011 General Plan) land use densities apply to the former FCI lands and remain in effect. The County has determined that the sunset date of the voter-approved FCI refers to the initiative itself, which rendered the land use designations of FCI inapplicable to the Project areas beginning on January 1, 2011. As such, the No Project Alternative generally allows higher densities in areas outside of the SDCWA boundary, as compared to the proposed Project. As shown in Table 4-4, whereas the proposed Project Land Use Map would allow for approximately 6,245 DUs, the No Project Alternative Land Use Map would allow for approximately 15,094 DUs. As shown in Table 4-2, the proposed Project Land Use Map assigns 184 acres Rural Commercial and 152 acres Village Core Mixed Use; whereas, the No Project Alternative does not contain the Rural Commercial or VCMU land use designations. Additionally, the land use categories currently in effect on those lands previously under the FCI are not consistent with the 2011 General Plan land use categories.. These inconsistent land use designations on the former FCI lands may present substantial conflicts with adjacent properties that are developed according to the 2011 General Plan land use designations. For example, the 2011 General Plan land use designations promote future development which is more sensitive to existing environmental and infrastructure constraints, particularly in the outlying areas within and near the CNF lands, than the land use designations that are in effect now (due to the 2011 General Plan not applying land use designations to the FCI lands) and would remain under the No Project Alternative. Accordingly, the No Project Alternative land use designations are indifferent to the environmental (i.e., biological resources, steep slopes) and infrastructure (i.e., groundwater resources) constraints of the FCI lands.

## **4.5.2 Comparison of the Effects of the No Project Alternative to the Proposed Project**

### **4.5.2.1 *Aesthetics***

Impacts to scenic vistas, scenic resources, visual character or quality, and light or glare would be greater than those discussed for the proposed Project Land Use Map because the No Project Alternative Land Use Map would accommodate approximately 8,849 more DUs than the proposed Project Land Use Map. Buildout of the No Project Alternative Land Use Map would result in 2,678 additional dwelling units within Zone A of the Palomar Observatory and 3,885 additional dwelling units within Zone A of Mount Laguna Observatory as compared to buildout of the proposed Project Land Use Map (See Table 4-5). Considering implementation of this alternative would result in more intense development and a greater number of dwelling units than the proposed Project Map, impacts to scenic vistas, scenic resources, visual character or quality, and light or glare associated with this alternative, would be considered significant and mitigated with those measures identified in Section 2.1.4 of this SEIR. However, it is unlikely for the reasons described in Sections 2.1.4.3 and 2.1.4.4 of the SEIR that impacts of this alternative associated with visual character or quality and light or glare would be reduced to below a level of significance; thus, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

### **4.5.2.2 *Agricultural Resources***

Impacts related to the direct conversion of farmland, land use conflicts with agricultural zoning, and indirect conversion of farmland would be greater than those discussed for the proposed Project. This alternative would impact 765 more acres of agricultural resources than the proposed Project; 813.5 acres compared with 48.5 acres by the proposed Project (see Table 4-6). Therefore, impacts related to direct and indirect conversion of farmland would be greater compared to the proposed Project. Therefore, impacts associated with buildout of this alternative related to agricultural resources would be considered significant for the reasons described in Sections 2.2.3.1 through 2.2.3.3 of this SEIR and the mitigation identified in Section 2.2.4 of this SEIR would be required. The impacts associated with the No Project Alternative related to direct conversion of farmland, conflicts with ag zoning and indirect conversion of farmland would remain significant and unavoidable for the reasons described in Sections 2.2.4.1 through 2.2.4.3 of this SEIR.

Impacts related to the direct and indirect conversion of forestry resources would be greater under this alternative, as compared with the proposed Project. As shown in Table 4-7, under the No Project Alternative Land Use Map 13,934 acres of forest vegetation and 13,769 acres of woodlands are assigned a Residential Semi-Rural land use designation, as compared with only 790 acres of forest vegetation and 1,549 acres of woodlands that are assigned a Semi-Rural land use designation under the proposed Project Map. Also, only 82 acres of forest vegetation and

378 acres of woodlands are assigned a Residential Rural Lands designation under the No Project Alternative Land Use Map, as compared with 13,197 acres of forest vegetation and 12,449 acres of woodlands that are assigned the less intense Rural Lands land use designation under the proposed Project Map. The impacts associated with the No Project Alternative related to direct conversion of forestry resources would remain significant and unavoidable for the reasons described in Section 2.2.4.4 of this SEIR.

#### **4.5.2.3      *Air Quality***

##### Air Quality Plans

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the No Project Alternative would be required to be consistent with the emission reduction strategies in the RAQS and SIP. Therefore, this alternative would not result in significant conflicts with the RAQS and SIP.

##### Air Quality Violations, Non-Attainment Criteria Pollutants, and Sensitive Receptors

Compared to the proposed Project, the No Project Alternative would involve more development in the outlying rural lands, within and near the CNF lands, thereby resulting in increased VMT for residents to obtain goods and services from urban areas. As shown in Table 4-8, the additional development in rural lands would in turn result in an overall increase in total emissions that could potentially violate air quality standards, greater emissions of non-attainment criteria pollutants, as compared to the proposed Project. For the reasons described in Sections 2.3.4.2 through 2.3.4.4 of the SEIR, the impacts associated with buildout of this alternative would be significant and unavoidable.

##### Objectionable Odors

Similar to the proposed Project, any odor generating land uses that may occur with future development under the No Project Alternative would be required to comply with APCD Rule 51 and County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Sections 63.401 and 63.402, which prohibit nuisance odors from affecting nearby receptors. Therefore, this alternative would not result in a significant impact associated with objectionable odors.

#### **4.5.2.4      *Biological Resources***

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the No Project Alternative would result in direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to special status plant and wildlife species and their habitats. This analysis is based on the same impact assumptions used for the proposed Project (refer to Section 4.2.2.4 of this SEIR). As shown in Table 4-9, development under this alternative would result in impacts to approximately 13,574 acres of sensitive vegetation communities compared with the 12,256 acres of impact associated with the proposed Project. As

a result, future development under this alternative would result in greater direct and cumulative impacts to habitats that would have the potential to support special status plant and wildlife species than associated with the proposed Project Land Use Map. Therefore, impacts would be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.4.4 of this SEIR would be required. It is unlikely that these impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance for the same reasons given in Section 2.4.4 of this SEIR; thus, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

#### **4.5.2.5 Cultural Resources**

Impacts to historical resources, archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains would be similar to those discussed for the proposed Project but to a greater degree because of the overall increase in development of 8,849 DUs associated with this alternative. Development under the No Project Alternative Land Use Map would have the potential to substantially alter the significance of historical resources, or destroy archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains that are potentially present on or below the ground surface during ground-disturbing construction activities. High intensity development would have a higher potential to impact the significance of cultural resources because it would require more ground-disturbing construction activities than lower intensity development. Compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the No Project Alternative Land Use Map would increase the overall development in the Plan area and would result in more potential impacts to cultural resources due to destruction during construction or alteration to the significance of a resource post-construction. Therefore, impacts would be increased as compared to the proposed Project, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.5.4 of this SEIR would be required.

#### **4.5.2.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

##### Transportation, Use, Disposal, and Accidental Release (Including Hazards to Schools) of Hazardous Materials or Existing Hazardous Material Sites

Compared to the proposed Project, the No Project Alternative would result in more land uses that may involve the use, disposal, transport or accidental releases of hazardous materials (e.g., rural commercial, VCMU), including the siting of such uses within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school or daycare, due to an increase in development intensity within all Project areas. In addition, existing industries and businesses that use hazardous materials would have the potential to expand or increase to accommodate the anticipated growth under this alternative. Furthermore, future development under this alternative may be located on sites that have the potential to create significant hazards to the public or environment including: sites pursuant to Government Code 65962.5; burn dump sites; active, abandoned, or closed landfills; FUDS; areas with historic or current agriculture; or areas with petroleum contamination. Similar to the

proposed Project, any future development of such uses would be required to comply with all applicable federal, State, and local regulations pertaining to the transportation, use, and disposal of hazardous materials which, as discussed further in Sections 2.6.3.1; 2.6.3.2 and 2.6.3.4 of this SEIR, would reduce such impacts to below a level of significance.

### Public and Private Airports

As discussed in Section 2.6.3.5 (Public and Private Airports) of this SEIR, there are no public airports within the unincorporated County that would be affected by the Project areas addressed in this SEIR, but there would be four private airports in the communities of Alpine (U.S. Forest Service), and North Mountain (Ward Ranch, Warner Springs, and Loma Madera Ranch) which would be affected by the Project areas. Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the No Project Alternative may involve the siting of new land uses within two miles from one of these private airports, thereby resulting in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of these airports. In addition, under this alternative, some private 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. These impacts associated with this alternative would be significant and mitigation required for the reasons described in Section 2.6.4.5 of this SEIR.

### Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans

Similar to the proposed Project, construction activities associated with future development under the No Project Alternative would have the potential to interfere with adopted emergency plans and procedures if authorities are not properly notified or multiple roadways used for emergency routes are concurrently blocked. This alternative would also result in additional residential development in the outlying areas which could cause an inadvertent impairment to existing emergency response plans and policies. Compared to the proposed Project, this alternative would result in more residential development with the potential to impair emergency response and evacuation plans in these outlying areas. These impacts associated with this alternative would be significant and mitigation required for the reasons described in Section 2.6.4.6 of this SEIR.

### Wildland Fires

Similar to the proposed Project, future development in the outlying rural areas under the No Project Alternative would be prone to wildland fires and therefore have the potential to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death, particularly where residents are intermixed with wildlands. Compared to the proposed Project, this alternative would have an increased wildland fire risk because it proposes more residential development in the outlying areas that may be served by fire agencies with greater distance to cover (longer travel times) or in areas that have difficulty meeting fire code requirements due to limited access. These impacts would be significant and unavoidable for the reasons described in Section 2.6.4.7 of this SEIR.

## Vectors

Compared to the proposed Project, future development under the No Project Alternative may involve land uses, such as manufacturing facilities for animal products (e.g., dairy, egg production), that create potentially significant hazards to the public or the environment by substantially increasing human exposure to vectors. Such land uses may also result in sources of standing water bodies or other vector breeding sources including composting or manure management facilities. As discussed further in Section 2.6.3.8 of the SEIR, compliance with existing County regulations would ensure that impacts related to vectors associated with buildout of this alternative would be less than significant.

### **4.5.2.7 Hydrology and Water Quality**

Impacts associated with buildout of the No Project Alternative related to water quality standards and requirements, groundwater supplies and recharge, erosion or siltation and the capacity of stormwater systems would be greater than those discussed for the proposed Project because of the overall increase in development. As shown in Table 4-4, when compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the No Project Alternative Land Use Map would have higher density development and would accommodate more than two times the population growth (8,848 additional DUs), which would result in more development in every community, with the exception of Alpine. Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the No Project Alternative would have the potential to result in the following: 1) substantial additional sources of polluted runoff which would have short-term impacts on surface water; 2) pollutants, such as soils, debris, and other materials, in quantities that would potentially exceed water quality standards and otherwise significantly degrade water quality; 3) non-point source pollution into surface and groundwater bodies; and 4) violate groundwater quality standards by designating land uses that would be groundwater dependent in areas that are currently experiencing groundwater contamination (i.e., new wells constructed to support development in these areas would be susceptible to the contaminated groundwater supply which would have the potential to result in a non-potable water supply). In addition, for the communities with increased development potential under this alternative, the result would include greater non-point source pollutants, a greater risk for groundwater contamination, more permanent development of impervious surfaces and increased alteration of existing drainage patterns compared with the proposed Project Land Use Map. Therefore, impacts related to water quality standards and requirements, erosion or siltation, exceedance of stormwater system capacity would be increased as compared to the proposed Project. Therefore, impacts associated with buildout of this alternative would be considered significant for the reasons described in Sections 2.7.3.1; 2.7.3.3 and 2.7.3.5 and the mitigation identified in Section 2.7.4 of this SEIR would be required. However for the reasons described in Sections 2.7.4.1 impacts related to water quality standards associated with buildout of this alternative would remain significant and unavoidable.

When compared to the proposed Project Land Use Map, the No Project Alternative Land Use Map would increase total housing outside the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) service area. Therefore, the No Project Alternative Land Use Map would result in a greater impact to groundwater because it would result in more growth in groundwater dependent areas. Therefore, impacts associated with buildout of this alternative would be considered significant for the reasons described in Section 2.7.3.2 of this SEIR and the mitigation identified in Section 2.7.4 of this SEIR would be required. For the reasons described in Section 2.7.4.2 of this SEIR the impact related to groundwater supplies would remain significant and unavoidable for this alternative.

As shown in Table 4-10 the No Project Alternative Land Use Map would assign 401.1 acres as Semi-Rural Residential within a 100-year flood area; whereas, the proposed Project Land Use Map would assign 299.7 acres the lower density Rural Lands land use designation; 98.1 acres designated as Semi-Rural Residential and the remaining 3.4 acres as Rural Commercial, all within a 100-year flood area. Consequently, the No Project Alternative results in more acreage within 100-year flood areas having a land use designation affording greater development potential. Therefore, under the No project Alternative, impacts related to flooding, and housing within 100-year flood hazard areas would be greater than under the proposed Project. These impacts would be considered significant for the reasons described in Sections 2.7.3.4; and 2.7.3.6 of this SEIR and the mitigation identified in Section 2.7.4 of this SEIR would be required.

As shown in Table 4-10, the No Project Alternative Land Use Map would assign 158.7 acres within dam inundation areas with Semi-Rural Residential and 40.5 acres with Rural Lands land use designations. These figures compare to 41.4 acres assigned by the proposed Project Land Use Map with Semi-Rural Residential and 157.8 acres assigned with the less dense Rural Lands land use designation. Therefore, the No Project Alternative land use designations afford greater development over more acres within flood inundation areas than the proposed Project. Thus impacts associated with buildout of the No Project Alternative would be greater than the proposed Project and considered significant for the reasons described in Section 2.7.3.8 of this SEIR and the mitigation identified in Section 2.7.4 would be required.

For reasons described in Section 2.7.3.9 of this SEIR, a significant impact related to tsunami, or seiche would not occur with implementation of the proposed Project Land Use Map and development on former FCI Lands. However, implementation of the No Project Alternative, similar to the proposed Project Alternative, would result in potentially significant direct impacts with regard to mudflows because future development would occur in areas where steep slopes or unvegetated hillsides are present. Therefore, impacts associated with the No Project Alternative would be considered significant for the reasons described in Section 2.7.4.9 of this SEIR and the mitigation identified in Section 2.7.4 would be required.

#### **4.5.2.8 Land Use**

##### **Physical Division of an Established Community**

Similar to the proposed Project, the No Project Alternative may involve the construction of new or improved roadways, railroad tracks, airports, or other features that would physically divide a community. These impacts would be significant and require additional mitigation measures, such as the rerouting of such facilities through the CNF lands which could result in a number of other significant environmental effects. Therefore, it is unlikely that these impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance, and they would remain significant and unavoidable.

##### **Conflicts with Land Use Plans, Policies, and Regulations**

Compared to the proposed Project, future development under the No Project Alternative could conflict with the following planning documents: RCP, RTP, CMP, Basin Plan, ALUCPs, RAQS, CTP, SOI, community plans, the County Zoning Ordinance, specific plans, the MSCP Subarea Plans, and Coastal Sage Scrub NCCP Process Guidelines. Future development under this alternative may also be inconsistent with the intended growth anticipated under the 2011 General Plan for the Project areas within the unincorporated County lands. These impacts would be significant and require additional mitigation measures that may result in other significant environmental effects. Therefore, it is unlikely that these impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance, and they would remain significant and unavoidable.

#### **4.5.2.9 Mineral Resources**

Impacts related to mineral resource availability and mineral resource recovery sites would be similar to those discussed for the proposed Project but to a greater degree because of the overall increase in development for all communities, with the exception of Alpine. For comparison purposes, No Project Alternative Land Use Map would accommodate 8,849 more DUs than the proposed Project Land Use Map. The increased development density would result in more incompatible land uses that would limit mineral resource availability or access to mineral resource recovery sites. For example, portions of the Alpine and Ramona CPAs and Palomar Mountain Subarea have been designated as MRZ-2. As shown in Table 4-11, compared with the proposed Project, the No Project Alternative Land Use Map assigns the higher density semi-rural residential land use designation to the areas within these communities that have been designated as MRZ-2 and MRZ-3. Therefore, similar to the proposed Project, the loss of mineral resource availability would be unavoidable due to planned growth under the No Project Alternative Land Use Map. Impacts to mineral resource availability and mineral resource recovery sites would be considered significant and the mitigation in Section 2.9.4 of this SEIR would be required. It is unlikely, for the reasons described in Section 2.9.4.1 of this SEIR that impacts associated with this alternative would be reduced to below a level of significance; thus, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

#### **4.5.2.10     *Noise***

Impacts related to excessive noise levels, excessive groundborne vibration, permanent increases in the ambient noise level, temporary increases in ambient noise levels, and excessive noise exposure from a public or private airport associated with buildout of the No Project Alternative would be similar to those discussed for the proposed Project but to a greater degree because of the overall increase in development of 8,849 DUs. The increased development would be more likely to result in noise impacts including the exposure of land uses to noise levels in excess of noise compatibility guidelines, excessive groundborne vibration, temporary increases in ambient noise levels, and excessive noise exposure from a private airport because more development would result in greater construction noise, more noise receptors, and less development spaced away from noise sources. Higher density development in these communities would also be more likely to result in permanent increases in the ambient noise level. As a result, impacts would be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.10.4 of this SEIR would be required. It is unlikely that impacts associated with buildout of this alternative related to permanent increases in ambient noise levels would be reduced to below a level of significance for the reasons described in Section 2.10.4.3 of this SEIR; thus, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

#### **4.5.2.11     *Public Services***

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the No Project Alternative would impose demands on fire protection, police, school, and library services. To maintain or achieve acceptable service standards, new or physically altered fire, police, school, and library facilities would be required. The construction of any future facilities would have the potential to cause additional secondary environmental effects. Compared to the proposed Project, this alternative would increase the demand for services in all Project areas and result in longer response times for emergency services to reach these areas. The impacts to public services associated with buildout of this alternative would be considered significant for the reasons described in Sections 2.11.3.1 and 2.11.3.2 of this SEIR. The impacts of this alternative on school services would remain significant and unavoidable for the reasons described in Section 2.11.4.2 of this SEIR.

#### **4.5.2.12     *Recreation***

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the No Project Alternative would increase the demand for recreational facilities throughout the Project areas, which would have the potential to result in accelerated deterioration of the facilities and the need for new or expanded facilities. The construction of any future recreational projects would have the potential to cause additional secondary environmental effects. Compared to the proposed Project, this alternative would accommodate an overall greater population increase and corresponding greater demand for recreational facilities. As a result, impacts associated with buildout of this

alternative would still be considered significant for the reasons described in Sections 2.12.3.1 and 2.12.3.2 and the mitigation identified in Section 2.12.4 of this SEIR would be required.

#### **4.5.2.13     *Transportation and Traffic***

##### **Unincorporated County Traffic and LOS Standards**

As evaluated in Section 2.13.3.1 of this SEIR, the traffic impacts associated with the proposed Project are focused in the Alpine CPA because this is where the highest density of proposed land use changes would occur relative to the remaining Project areas which would be primarily rural and semi-rural residential uses spread out over several parcels within and near the CNF. As shown in Table 4-12, the analysis for the proposed Project identified six roadway segments in Alpine forecast to operate at LOS E or F that would worsen with the addition of Project traffic and five road segments that would deteriorate from a forecasted acceptable LOS D or better to a deficient LOS E or F with the addition of the proposed Project traffic. As described in Appendix F to this SEIR and shown in Table 4-12, the deficient LOS is forecast to improve to an acceptable level for the following segments under the No Project Alternative:

- Alpine Boulevard from West Willows Road to eastern end of Willows Road (LOS F to LOS A)
- West Willows Road from Alpine Boulevard to Willows Road (LOS F to LOS E)
- Willows Road from Viejas Casino Road to westbound Interstate 8 on-ramp (LOS F to LOS C)

However, the No Project Alternative would accommodate an overall greater population increase than the proposed Project and thus, it would likely cause additional significant traffic impacts on rural roads (i.e., worsening of one or more of the affected roadway segments mentioned above or degradation of additional roadways). As such, impacts of this alternative related to deficient LOS for the reasons described in Section 2.13.5.1 of this SEIR would remain significant and unavoidable.

As a result of Senate Bill 743, (SB 743) the California State Office of Planning and Research (OPR) is currently in the process of drafting regulations for traffic analysis under CEQA which would require that public agencies not utilize LOS for traffic analysis and instead rely on another metric—likely vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Therefore, although analysis of traffic using VMT is not yet required (because OPR has not finalized the new regulations and so the Natural Resources Agency has yet to approve them), an analysis of VMT generated by the proposed Project is contained Chapter 2, section 2.15 Global Climate Change, for informational purposes.

### Rural Road Safety

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the No Project Alternative would increase trips on two lane roads in rural areas that are not developed to current road safety standards; add traffic to roads with slow moving agricultural equipment; and contribute to road safety conflicts (e.g., pedestrians, bicyclists, at grade railroad crossings). Compared to the proposed Project, this alternative would increase development in all Project areas, resulting in a higher concentration of people potentially exposed to road hazards in such rural areas. These impacts associated with this alternative would remain significant and unavoidable for the reasons described in Section 2.13.5.2 of this SEIR.

### Emergency Access

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the No Project Alternative could add traffic on a roadway network that is incomplete or not fully connected; on roadways that are dead-end and one-way; or within gated communities, all of which have the potential to impair emergency access. Compared to the proposed Project, the conditions that would potentially impair emergency access would be greater due to the overall greater population increase associated with buildout of this alternative. Therefore, this alternative would result in a significant impact with regard to emergency access for the reasons described in Section 2.13.3.3 of this SEIR and the mitigation required in Section 2.13.5.3 of this SEIR would be required.

### Parking Capacity

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the No Project Alternative would be required to comply with the parking standards set forth in the County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance, Parking Regulations, Sections 6750–6799 and the County of San Diego Off-Street Parking Design Manual, which implements Section 6793(c) of the County Zoning Ordinance. Compared to the Project, this alternative would allow for more development in all Project areas, which would result in greater parking demands. Therefore, this alternative would result in a significant impact with regard to parking capacity for the reasons described in Section 2.13.3.4 of this SEIR and the mitigation required in Section 2.13.5.4 of this SEIR would be required.

### Alternative Transportation

Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the No Project Alternative would provide for alternative modes of transportation, including bike lanes, bus stops, trails, and sidewalks. While existing County policies and regulations are intended to promote alternative transportation, this alternative may conflict with those of other agencies responsible for alternative transportation planning (e.g., SANDAG, Caltrans, transit agencies, and adjacent jurisdictions). Compared to the proposed Project, this alternative would result in increased densities in all Project areas, which could increase the potential for conflicts with existing public transportation plans due to a higher population of potential users of alternative modes of

transportation in these areas. Therefore, this alternative would result in a significant impact with regard to parking capacity for the reasons described in Section 2.13.3.5 of this SEIR and the mitigation required in Section 2.13.5.5 of this SEIR would be required.

#### **4.5.2.14 Utilities and Service Systems**

Impacts related to wastewater treatment requirements, new water or wastewater treatment facilities, sufficient stormwater drainage facilities, adequate water supplies, adequate wastewater facilities, sufficient landfill capacity, solid waste regulations, and energy would be similar to those discussed for the proposed Project but to a greater degree because of the increase in development in all communities with the exception of Alpine. The No Project Alternative Land Use Map would accommodate the same population as the proposed Project Land Use Map within the SDCWA boundary in the Ramona CPA, but would accommodate less development inside the SDCWA boundary in the Alpine CPA. However, the No Project Alternative Land Use Map would accommodate greater development outside the SDCWA in every community, with the exception of the Alpine CPA. Overall impacts related to wastewater treatment requirements and adequate wastewater facilities would increase under this alternative and impacts would be greater as compared to the proposed Project. Therefore, impacts would be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.14.4 of this SEIR would be required.

Additionally, the overall increase in development associated with alternative would result in more impermeable surfaces and runoff, greater solid waste disposal needs, and more energy demand in those areas compared to the proposed Project. The increase in development accommodated by the No Project Alternative would require greater landfill capacity than the proposed Project. Therefore, impacts to stormwater drainage facilities, landfill capacity, and energy would be increased as compared to the proposed Project in those areas, and impacts would be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Section 2.14.4 would be required. As a result, for the reasons described in Section 2.14.4.6 of this SEIR, the impact of the alternative on landfill capacity would remain significant and unavoidable.

Unlike the proposed Project Land Use Map, the No Project Alternative Land Use Map does not assign land use designations in the Alpine CPA that require the expansion of the SDCWA boundary to provide imported water and/or sanitary sewer services. However, impacts associated with buildout of this alternative on imported water and sanitary sewer services would still be considered significant for the reasons described in Section 2.14.3.2 of this SEIR and the mitigation identified in Section 2.14.4.2 would be required.

Development of future land uses under the No Project Alternative Land Use Map would be required to comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. A significant impact would not occur. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would result in a similar impact to solid waste regulations as compared to the proposed Project. For the reasons

described in Section 2.14.3.7 of this SEIR implementation of this alternative would not result in a significant impact related to implementation of solid waste regulations.

#### **4.5.2.15 Climate Change**

##### **Compliance with California GHG Reduction Goals**

Future development under the No Project Alternative would result in greater VMT than the proposed Project due to more development in all Project areas which would translate to increased GHG emissions from transportation. This alternative results in a higher number of dwelling units when compared to the proposed Project and the other alternatives analyzed, which would generate higher GHG emissions from the energy and water consumption and solid waste generation, in addition to transportation and, thus a greater impact (further inconsistency) to compliance with California GHG reduction goals. As a result, for the reasons described in Section 2.15.3.1, these impacts of this alternative would be significant and mitigation identified in Section 2.15.4.1 would be required.

It is not known whether this alternative would achieve GHG reduction targets identified for the years after 2020, because important factors are not currently known. The unknown factors include: GHG emissions target in effect at the time that subdivisions are submitted after 2020; the effectiveness of regulatory actions already adopted as part of the implementation of the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006; and the potential for application of new regulations and their effectiveness. Further, the cost and feasibility of certain policies that would be mandated as mitigation are not known. Therefore, GHG impacts would not be feasibly mitigated to adopted GHG target levels for 2020 and beyond. For this reason, and because this alternative would emit a substantial level of GHG emissions, the residual impact is potentially significant and unavoidable.

##### **Adverse Climate Change Impacts**

Climate change impacts that would be most relevant to the unincorporated County are the effects on water supply, wildfires, energy needs, and impacts to public health. Similar to the proposed Project, future development under the No Project Alternative would result in additional residents exposed to general climate change effects such as decreases in available water supply, increased frequency of wildfires, increased demand for energy as a result of the greater need for summer cooling, and impacts to public health related to increased heat, air pollution, wildfires, and infectious diseases. Compared to the proposed Project, this alternative would result in more development in all Project areas which would expose a higher number of residents to adverse climate change impacts. As a result, for the reasons described in Section 2.15.3.2, the effects of climate change on future development associated with buildout of this alternative would be significant and mitigation identified in Section 2.15.4.2 would be required. The Project areas of this alternative provide an even greater number of natural, physical, and environmental

constraints than urbanized areas in the County, a higher occurrence of sensitive plant or animal species, and limitations in adequate provision of infrastructure and utilities or public services (e.g., fire protection, water supply). Some of these impacts, such as those related to water supply, wildland fires and ecosystems are expected to be more severe for this alternative as compared to the projected development under the 2011 General Plan due to the proposed development in and around the Cleveland National Forest which is comprised of more sensitive natural resources in comparison to urbanized areas of the County. Additionally, these impacts would be greater under this alternative due to the increased number of potential dwelling units that could be constructed under this alternative. Therefore, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

**Table 4-1. Comparison of Alternatives – Environmental Impacts**

Issue Areas	Proposed Project		Alternatives to the Proposed Project			
	Without Mitigation	With Mitigation	Modified FCI Condition	Mid-density	Alpine Alternative Land Use Map	No Project
<b>2.1 Aesthetics</b>						
Scenic Vistas	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Scenic Resources	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Visual Character or Quality	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	—
Lighting and Glare	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
<b>2.2 Agricultural Resources</b>						
Direct Conversion of Agricultural Resources	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Conflicts with Agricultural or Forestry Resources	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▼
Indirect Conversion of Agricultural Resources	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Direct/Indirect Loss or Conversion of Forestry Resources	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
<b>2.3 Air Quality</b>						
Air Quality Plans	LS	LS	—	—	—	—
Air Quality Violations	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Non-attainment of Criteria Pollutants	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Sensitive Receptors	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Objectionable Odors	LS	LS	—	—	—	—
<b>2.4 Biological Resources</b>						
Special Status Plant and Wildlife Species	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Riparian Habitat and Other Sensitive Natural Communities	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Federally Protected Wetlands	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Wildlife Movement Corridors and Nursery Sites	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Local Policies and Ordinances	LS	LS	—	—	—	—
Habitat Conservation Plans and Natural Community Conservation Plans	LS	LS	—	—	—	—
<b>2.5 Cultural Resources</b>						
Historical Resources	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Archaeological Resources	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Paleontological Resources	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Human Remains	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲

TABLE 4-1, CONTINUED

	Proposed Project		Alternatives to the Proposed Project			
	Without Mitigation	With Mitigation	Modified FCI Condition	Mid-density	Alpine Alternative Land Use Map	No Project
<b>Issue Areas</b>						
<b>2.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>						
Transport, Use, and Disposal of Hazardous Materials	LS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials	LS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Hazards to Schools	LS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Existing Hazardous Materials Sites	LS	LS	—	—	—	▲
Public and Private Airports	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	—
Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Wildland Fires	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Vectors	LS	LS	—	—	—	▲/SU
<b>2.7 Hydrology and Water Quality</b>						
Water Quality Standards and Requirements	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Groundwater Supplies and Recharge	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Erosion or Siltation	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Flooding	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Exceed Capacity of Stormwater Systems	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Housing within a 100-year Flood Hazard Area	LS	LS	—	—	—	▲/SU
Impeding or Redirecting Flood Flows	LS	LS	—	—	—	▲/SU
Dam Inundation and Flood Hazards	PS	LS	—	—	—	▲
Seiche, Tsunami, and Mudflow Hazards	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
<b>2.8 Land Use</b>						
Physical Division of an Established Community	LS	LS	—	—	—	▲/SU
Conflicts with Land Use Plans, Policies, and Regulations	LS	LS	—	—	—	▲/SU
Conflicts with HCPs or NCCPs	LS	LS	—	—	—	▲/SU
<b>2.9 Mineral Resources</b>						
Mineral Resource Availability	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Mineral Resource Recovery Sites	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
<b>2.10 Noise</b>						
Excessive Noise Levels	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Excessive Groundborne Vibration	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Temporary Increase in Ambient Noise Levels	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Excessive Noise Exposure from a Public or Private Airport	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲

TABLE 4-1, CONTINUED

Issue Areas	Proposed Project		Alternatives to the Proposed Project			
	Without Mitigation	With Mitigation	Modified FCI Condition	Mid-density	Alpine Alternative Land Use Map	No Project
<b>2.11 Public Services</b>						
Fire Protection Services	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Police Protection Services	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
School Services	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Library Services	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
<b>2.12 Recreation</b>						
Deterioration of Parks and Recreational Facilities	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Construction of New Recreational Facilities	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
<b>2.13 Transportation and Traffic</b>						
Unincorporated County Traffic and LOS Standards	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Rural Road Safety	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Emergency Access	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Parking Capacity	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Alternative Transportation	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
<b>2.14 Utilities and Service Systems</b>						
Wastewater Treatment Requirements	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
New Water or Wastewater Treatment Facilities	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Sufficient Stormwater Drainage Facilities	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Adequate Water Supplies	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Adequate Wastewater Facilities	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Sufficient Landfill Capacity	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Solid Waste Regulations	LS	LS	—	—	—	—
Energy	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
<b>2.15 Global Climate Change</b>						
Compliance with AB 32	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Effects of Global Climate Change on the Proposed Project	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲

▲ Alternative is likely to result in greater impacts to issue when compared to proposed Project.  
 — Alternative is likely to result in a similar impacts to issue when compared to proposed Project.  
 ▼ Alternative is likely to result in less impacts to issue when compared to proposed Project, however, impacts would still be significant before mitigation.  
 PS = potentially significant impact; LS = less than significant impact; SU = potentially significant and unavoidable impact.

**Table 4-2. Comparison of Alternatives  
GPA Planning Area Land Use Distribution in Acres**

Land Use Designation	Alternative				
	Proposed Project	Alpine Alternative	Mid-density	Modified FCI Condition	No Project
Village Residential	308	284	284	117	44
Semi-Rural Residential	8,352	8,178	8,629	5,847	67,868
Rural Lands	60,544	60,750	60,291	63,496	2,660
Specific Plan Area	22	22	22	22	181
Rural Commercial	183	180	183	83	0
Industrial	0	0	0	0	16
Village Core Mixed Use	152	152	152	0	N/A <sup>(1)</sup>
Public/Semi-Public & Recreational Open Space	144	144	144	144	152
Public Agency Lands	1,571	1,571	1,571	1,571	367
Tribal Lands	98	98	98	98	343
Telecommunications	N/A <sup>(1)</sup>	N/A <sup>(1)</sup>	N/A <sup>(1)</sup>	N/A <sup>(1)</sup>	50
Open Space (Conservation)	337	337	337	337	34
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>71,715</b>	<b>71,715</b>	<b>71,715</b>	<b>71,715</b>	<b>71,715</b>

Source: County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services, 2015.

1) NA = An equivalent land use designation does not exist for this alternative

**PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

**Table 4-3. Comparison of Alternatives  
CPA and Subregion Land Use Distribution in Acres<sup>(1)</sup>**

Land Use Designation	Alternative				
	Proposed Project	Alpine Alternative	Mid-density	Modified FCI Condition	No Project
<b>Alpine</b>					
Village Residential	258	233	233	67	0
Semi-Rural Residential	4,205	4,031	4,122	3,706	11,377
Rural Lands	8,897	9,103	9,005	9,843	2,353
Rural Commercial	146	139	146	43	0
Industrial	0	0	0	0	16
Village Core Mixed Use	152	152	152	0	0
Public/Semi-Public & Recreational Open Space	0	0	0	0	1
Tribal Lands	90	90	90	90	0
<b>TOTAL CPA<sup>(2)</sup></b>	<b>13,748</b>	<b>13,747</b>	<b>13,748</b>	<b>13,749</b>	<b>13,747</b>
<b>Central Mountain - Cuyamaca</b>					
Semi-Rural Residential	12	Same as Proposed Project	12	12	2,910
Rural Lands	2,953		2,953	2,953	56
<i>TOTAL Subarea<sup>(2)</sup></i>	<i>2,965</i>		<i>2,965</i>	<i>2,965</i>	<i>2,966</i>
<b>Central Mountain - Descanso</b>					
Village Residential	7	Same as Proposed Project	7	7	0
Semi-Rural Residential	1,900		1,900	234	5,662
Rural Lands	3,674		3,674	5,340	0
Specific Plan Area	0		0	0	83
Rural Commercial	5		5	5	0
Public Agency Lands	159		159	159	0
<i>TOTAL Subarea</i>	<i>5,745</i>	<i>5,745</i>	<i>5,745</i>	<i>5,745</i>	
<b>Central Mountain – Pine Valley</b>					
Rural Lands	12,382	Same as Proposed Project	12,382	12,382	12,459
Rural Commercial	4		4	4	0
Public Agency Lands	527		527	527	120
Tribal Lands	0		0	0	335
<i>TOTAL Subarea<sup>(2)</sup></i>	<i>12,913</i>		<i>12,913</i>	<i>12,913</i>	<i>12,914</i>

Table 4-3, Continued

Land Use Designation	Alternative				
	Proposed Project	Alpine Alternative	Mid-density	Modified FCI Condition	No Project
<b>Central Mountain - Unrepresented</b>					
Semi-Rural Residential	0	Same as Proposed Project	0	0	5,065
Rural Lands	4,922		4,922	4,922	119
Public Agency Lands	163		163	163	163
Open Space (Conservation)	262		262	262	0
<i>TOTAL Subarea</i>	<i>5,347</i>		<i>5,347</i>	<i>5,347</i>	<i>5,347</i>
<b>Total Subregion<sup>(2)</sup></b>	<b>26,970</b>		<b>26,970</b>	<b>26,970</b>	<b>26,972</b>
<b>Desert</b>					
Semi-Rural Residential	0	Same as Proposed Project	0	0	166
Rural Lands	166		166	166	0
Public Agency Lands	4		4	4	4
<b>TOTAL Subregion</b>	<b>170</b>		<b>170</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>170</b>
<b>Jamul/Dulzura</b>					
Semi-Rural Residential	242	Same as Proposed Project	242	0	1,246
Rural Lands	1,004		1,004	1,246	0
<b>TOTAL Subregion</b>	<b>1,246</b>		<b>1,246</b>	<b>1,246</b>	<b>1,246</b>
<b>Julian</b>					
Semi-Rural Residential	953	Same as Proposed Project	953	953	8,281
Rural Lands	7,426		7,426	7,426	133
Public/Semi-Public & Recreational Open Space	49		49	49	54
Open Space (Conservation)	40		40	40	0
<b>TOTAL CPA</b>	<b>8,468</b>		<b>8,468</b>	<b>8,468</b>	<b>8,468</b>
<b>Lake Morena/Campo</b>					
Semi-Rural Residential	58	Same as Proposed Project	58	29	1,526
Rural Lands	1,232		1,232	1,261	0
Public Agency Lands	271		271	271	36
<i>TOTAL Subarea<sup>(2)</sup></i>	<i>1,561</i>		<i>1,561</i>	<i>1,561</i>	<i>1,562</i>
<b>Mountain Empire - Unrepresented</b>					
Semi-Rural Residential	0	Same as Proposed Project	0	0	450
Rural Lands	130		130	130	0
Public Agency Lands	360		360	360	39
<i>TOTAL Subarea</i>	<i>490</i>		<i>490</i>	<i>490</i>	<i>489</i>
<b>TOTAL Subregion</b>	<b>2,051</b>		<b>2,051</b>	<b>2,051</b>	<b>2,051</b>

Table 4-3, Continued

Land Use Designation	Alternative					
	Proposed Project	Alpine Alternative	Mid-density	Modified FCI Condition	No Project	
<b>Palomar Mountain</b>						
Semi-Rural Residential	302	Same as Proposed Project	662	232	12,028	
Rural Lands	11,741		11,380	11,811	0	
Rural Commercial	29		29	29	0	
Public/Semi-Public & Recreational Open Space	6		6	6	0	
Public Agency Lands	4		4	4	4	
Tribal Lands	8		8	8	8	
Telecommunications	N/A <sup>(3)</sup>		N/A <sup>(3)</sup>	N/A <sup>(3)</sup>	50	
<i>TOTAL Subarea</i>	<i>12,090</i>			<i>12,090</i>	<i>12,090</i>	<i>12,090</i>
<b>North Mountain - Unrepresented</b>						
Semi-Rural Residential	0	Same as Proposed Project	0	0	5,003	
Rural Lands	5,006		5,006	5,006	0	
Specific Plan Area	22		22	22	98	
Public/Semi-Public & Recreational Open Space	0		0	0	9	
Public Agency Lands	82		82	82	0	
Open Space (Conservation)	18		18	18	18	
<i>TOTAL Subarea</i>	<i>5,128</i>			<i>5,128</i>	<i>5,128</i>	<i>5,128</i>
<b>TOTAL Subregion</b>	<b>17,218</b>			<b>17,218</b>	<b>17,218</b>	<b>17,218</b>
<b>Pendleton/DeLuz</b>						
Semi-Rural Residential	0	Same as Proposed Project	0	0	1,011	
Rural Lands	1,011		1,011	1,011	0	
<b>TOTAL CPA</b>	<b>1,011</b>			<b>1,011</b>	<b>1,011</b>	<b>1,011</b>
<b>Ramona</b>						
Village Residential	44	Same as Proposed Project	44	44	44	
Semi-Rural Residential	682		682	682	682	
Public/Semi-Public & Recreational Open Space	89		89	89	89	
Open Space (Conservation)	16		16	16	16	
<b>TOTAL CPA</b>	<b>831</b>			<b>831</b>	<b>831</b>	<b>831</b>

Source: County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services, 2014.

- 1) Totals represent GPA planning area portion of CPA or subregion only.
- 2) Differences in totals are attributed to rounding.
- 3) NA = An equivalent land use designation does not exist for this alternative.

PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Table 4-4. Comparison of Alternatives – Dwelling Units at Buildout

Community	Acres	SEIR Alternatives					Reduction from Proposed Project		
		No Project	Proposed Project	Alpine Alt. Land Use Map	Mid-Density	Modified FCI Condition	Alpine Alt. Land Use Map	Mid-density	Modified FCI Condition
<b>Alpine</b>	<b>13,748</b>	<b>2,329</b>	<b>3,561</b>	<b>3,051</b>	<b>2,921</b>	<b>1,878</b>	<b>510</b>	<b>640</b>	<b>1,683</b>
<b>Central Mtn.</b>	<b>26,970</b>	<b>5,618</b>	<b>1,082</b>	<b>Same as Proposed Project</b>	<b>1,065</b>	<b>1,053</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>29</b>
<i>Cuyamaca</i>	<i>2,965</i>	<i>289</i>	<i>107</i>		<i>90</i>	<i>87</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Descanso</i>	<i>5,744</i>	<i>1,340</i>	<i>615</i>		<i>615</i>	<i>606</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Pine Valley</i>	<i>12,914</i>	<i>2,862</i>	<i>255</i>		<i>255</i>	<i>255</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
<i>Unrepresented</i>	<i>5,347</i>	<i>1,127</i>	<i>105</i>		<i>105</i>	<i>105</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
<b>Desert</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Jamul/Dulzura</b>	<b>1,246</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>58</b>		<b>58</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Julian</b>	<b>8,467</b>	<b>2,489</b>	<b>384</b>		<b>384</b>	<b>378</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Mtn. Empire</b>	<b>2,052</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>52</b>		<b>52</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>L. Morena/Campo</i>	<i>1,562</i>	<i>331</i>	<i>49</i>		<i>49</i>	<i>48</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Unrepresented</i>	<i>490</i>	<i>54</i>	<i>3</i>		<i>3</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
<b>North Mnt.</b>	<b>17,221</b>	<b>3,612</b>	<b>907</b>		<b>908</b>	<b>907</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(1)</b>	<b>0</b>
<i>Palomar Mnt.</i>	<i>12,093</i>	<i>3,022</i>	<i>806</i>		<i>807</i>	<i>806</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>(1)</i>	<i>0</i>
<i>Unrepresented</i>	<i>5,128</i>	<i>590</i>	<i>101</i>		<i>101</i>	<i>101</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
<b>Pendleton/DeLuz</b>	<b>1,011</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>19</b>		<b>19</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Ramona</b>	<b>830</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>71,715</b>	<b>15,094</b>	<b>6,245</b>	<b>5,735</b>	<b>5,589</b>	<b>4,521</b>	<b>510</b>	<b>656</b>	<b>1,724</b>

Source: County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services, 2015.

**Table 4-5. Comparison of Alternatives –  
Dwelling Units within Palomar and Mount Laguna Observatory Zone A at Buildout**

Community	Acres	Alternative				
		Proposed Project	Alpine Alt. Land Use Map	Mid-density	Modified FCI Condition	No Project
<b>Palomar Mountain — Inside Zone A</b>						
North Mountain	16,548	890	Same as Proposed Project	891	890	3,569
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>16,548</b>	<b>890</b>		<b>891</b>	<b>890</b>	<b>3,569</b>
<b>Mount Laguna — Inside Zone A</b>						
Alpine	952	66	Same as Proposed Project	66	66	133
Cuyamaca	948	40		38	38	120
Descanso	5,745	615		615	606	1,340
Pine Valley	12,914	255		255	255	2,862
Julian	1,440	129		129	129	287
L. Morena/Campo	1,373	40		40	39	288
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>23,372</b>	<b>1,145</b>		<b>1,143</b>	<b>1,133</b>	<b>5,030</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>39,920</b>	<b>2,035</b>	<b>2,034</b>	<b>2,023</b>	<b>8,599</b>	

Source: County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services, 2015.

**Table 4-6. Comparison of Alternatives – County Identified Agricultural Lands and Impact Estimates**

Land Use Designation	Impact Assumption	Agricultural Lands Within Project Area (acres)			Agricultural Impacts (acres)		
		Proposed Project	Modified FCI Condition, Alpine Land Use Map, Mid-density	No Project	Proposed Project	Modified FCI Condition, Alpine Land Use Map, Mid-density	No Project
Village Residential	100%	0.0	Same as Proposed Project	0.0	0.0	Same as Proposed Project	0.0
Village Core Mixed Use	100%	0.0		N/A	0.0		N/A
Rural Commercial	100%	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
Semi-Rural Residential	1.5 acres per unit	164.5		5,569.3	13.6		811.1
Rural Lands	1.5 acres per unit	5,615.9		334.2	34.9		2.4
Specific Planning Area	0%	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
Open Space	0%	5.3		5.3	0.0		0.0
Public/Semi-Public Facilities	100 %	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
Tribal Lands	0%	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
Public Agency Lands	0%	123.2		0.2	0.0		0.0
<b>Total</b>	—		<b>5,909.0</b>		<b>48.5</b>	<b>813.5</b>	

Source: County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services, 2015.

**Table 4-7. Comparison of Alternatives – Proposed Land Uses in Forest Resources**

Land Use Designation	Alternative									
	Proposed Project		Alpine Alternative Land Use Map		Mid-density		Modified FCI Condition		No Project	
	Forest Vegetation	Woodlands	Forest Vegetation	Woodlands	Forest Vegetation	Woodlands	Forest Vegetation	Woodlands	Forest Vegetation	Woodlands
Village Residential	0.0	15.0	0.0	14.6	0.0	14.6	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0
Semi-Rural Residential	790.0	1,548.7	790.0	1,539.6	1,087.5	1,553.5	721.4	839.1	13,934.0	13,768.6
Rural Lands	13,196.6	12,449.4	13,196.6	12,458.8	12,899.1	12,444.9	13,265.1	13,169.6	81.9	378.01
Specific Plan Area	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8
Rural Commercial	33.0	3.9	33.0	3.9	33.0	3.9	33.0	2.3	0.0	0.0
Industrial	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.5
Village Core Mixed Use	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Public/Semi-Public & Recreational Open Space	9.0	0.6	9.0	0.6	9.0	0.6	9.0	0.6	5.7	1.4
Public Agency Lands	229.8	258.0	229.8	258.0	229.8	258.0	229.8	258.0	67.0	129.0
Tribal Lands	7.0	2.7	7.0	2.7	7.0	2.7	7.0	2.7	193.7	0.0
Open Space (Conservation)	54.5	12.5	54.5	12.5	54.5	12.5	54.5	12.5	37.5	11.6
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>14,319.8</b>	<b>14,291.4</b>	<b>14,319.8</b>	<b>14,291.4</b>	<b>14,319.8</b>	<b>14,291.4</b>	<b>14,319.8</b>	<b>14,291.4</b>	<b>14,319.8</b>	<b>14,291.4</b>

Source: County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services, 2015.

**Table 4-8. Area-Wide and Mobile Source Emissions Alternatives Comparison**

	VOC	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	SO <sub>x</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
<b>Tons/year, Annual Average<sup>1</sup></b>						
Proposed Project	220.24	1,556.67	306.84	4.74	64.46	35.45
Modified FCI Condition Alternative	57.08	281.20	71.61	0.85	12.69	7.58
Mid-density Alternative	206.15	1,469.95	288.04	4.48	60.75	33.34
Alpine Alternative Land Use Map	200.50	1,452.03	283.21	4.39	59.80	32.66
No Project Alternative	291.02	1,825.27	390.45	5.55	77.57	43.79

1) Mitigated emissions area shown.

**Table 4-9. Biological Resources Impacts Comparison**

Vegetation Categories	Impacted Acres				
	Proposed Project	Alpine Alt. Land Use Map	Modified FCI Condition	Mid-density	No Project
<b>Non Sensitive Vegetation Communities</b>					
11300 Disturbed Habitat	14	14	14	14	9
12000 Urban/Developed	1,036	990	731	982	474
18000 General Agriculture	230	202	170	184	176
18100 Orchards and Vineyards	5	5	5	5	7
18200 Intensive Agriculture - Dairies, Nurseries, Chicken Ranches	0	0	0	0	0
18300 Extensive Agriculture - Field/Pasture, Row Crops	74	74	59	73	46
18310 Field/Pasture	81	81	81	83	98
18320 Row Crops	9	9	9	9	30
<i>Total impact to non-sensitive vegetation communities</i>	<i>1,449</i>	<i>1,376</i>	<i>1,069</i>	<i>1,350</i>	<i>840</i>

Table 4-9, Continued

Vegetation Categories	Impacted Acres				
	Proposed Project	Alpine Alt. Land Use Map	Modified FCI Condition	Mid-density	No Project
<b>Sensitive Vegetation Communities</b>					
32500 Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	279	279	271	275	424
35200 Sagebrush Scrub	52	52	52	52	55
35210 Big Sagebrush Scrub	32	32	32	32	5
37000 Chaparral	122	117	122	122	143
37120 Southern Mixed Chaparral	1,182	1,144	844	1,151	467
37121 Granitic Southern Mixed Chaparral	1,487	1,391	1,305	1,332	1,162
37122 Mafic Southern Mixed Chaparral	39	39	39	39	20
37130 Northern Mixed Chaparral	766	766	630	753	972
37131 Granitic Northern Mixed Chaparral	1,075	1,034	935	1,008	1,180
37132 Mafic Northern Mixed Chaparral	77	77	65	77	118
37200 Chamise Chaparral	721	627	374	604	529
37210 Granitic Chamise Chaparral	355	353	348	355	319
37220 Mafic Chamise Chaparral	16	16	16	16	5
37300 Red Shank Chaparral	83	83	83	83	149
37400 Semi-Desert Chaparral	4	4	4	4	4
37500 Montane Chaparral	15	15	14	15	37
37520 Montane Manzanita Chaparral	5	5	5	5	4
37530 Montane Ceanothus Chaparral	2	2	2	2	3
37540 Montane Scrub Oak Chaparral	14	14	14	14	5
37900 Scrub Oak Chaparral	85	85	71	85	117
37A00 Interior Live Oak Chaparral	3	3	3	3	5
37G00 Coastal Sage-Chaparral Transition	230	226	221	221	198
37K00 Montane Buckwheat Scrub	104	102	80	111	47

Table 4-9, Continued

Vegetation Categories	Impacted Acres				
	Proposed Project	Alpine Alt. Land Use Map	Modified FCI Condition	Mid-density	No Project
42000 Valley and Foothill Grassland	87	87	74	87	207
42100 Native Grassland	20	20	20	20	2
42110 Valley Needlegrass Grassland	3	3	2	2	4
42120 Valley Sacaton Grassland	97	97	96	97	36
42200 Non-Native Grassland	98	98	86	98	87
42300 Wildflower Field	1	1	1	1	1
42400 Foothill/Mountain Perennial Grassland	258	258	245	258	607
45100 Montane Meadow	6	6	6	6	10
45110 Wet Montane Meadow	92	92	97	97	177
45400 Freshwater Seep	54	54	52	53	61
52400 Freshwater Marsh	0	0	0	0	0
61300 Southern Riparian Forest	14	14	14	14	13
61310 Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest	213	213	207	211	170
61330 Southern Cottonwood-Willow Riparian Forest	29	35	21	24	29
61510 White Alder Riparian Forest	7	7	5	7	24
62000 Riparian Woodlands	9	9	9	9	8
62400 Southern Sycamore-Alder Riparian Woodland	2	2	2	2	3
63300 Southern Riparian Scrub	128	128	111	128	41
63310 Mule Fat Scrub	0	0	0	0	0
63320 Southern Willow Scrub	11	11	11	11	12
64140 Freshwater	49	49	49	49	67
64200 Non-Vegetated Channel or Floodway	7	7	7	7	3
70000 Woodland	2	2	2	2	3
71100 Oak Woodland	0	0	0	0	1
71120 Black Oak Woodland	133	133	134	134	180

Table 4-9, Continued

Vegetation Categories	Impacted Acres				
	Proposed Project	Alpine Alt. Land Use Map	Modified FCI Condition	Mid-density	No Project
71160 Coast Live Oak Woodland	12	12	12	12	21
71161 Open Coast Live Oak Woodland	72	72	72	72	61
71162 Dense Coast Live Oak Woodland	902	890	663	894	693
71180 Engelmann Oak Woodland	0	0	0	0	0
71181 Open Engelmann Oak Woodland	535	518	419	499	598
71182 Dense Engelmann Oak Woodland	154	154	134	146	294
77000 Mixed Oak Woodland	490	490	469	490	1,307
78000 Undifferentiated Open Woodland	16	16	14	16	47
79000 Non-Native Woodland	4	4	3	4	11
79100 Eucalyptus Woodland	2	2	1	2	3
81100 Mixed Evergreen Forest	507	507	464	531	577
81300 Oak Forest	1	1	1	1	3
81310 Coast Live Oak Forest	12	12	12	12	19
81320 Canyon Live Oak Forest	1	1	1	1	1
81340 Black Oak Forest	117	117	117	117	21
84140 Coulter Pine Forest	13	13	13	13	26
84150 Bigcone Spruce (Bigcone Douglas Fir)-Canyon Oak Forest	265	265	265	298	282
84230 Sierran Mixed Coniferous Forest	402	402	334	379	619
84500 Mixed Oak/Coniferous/Bigcone/Coulter Forest	470	470	436	470	1,115
85100 Jeffrey Pine Forest	213	213	213	213	162
<b>Total Impact to Sensitive Vegetation Communities</b>	<b>12,256</b>	<b>11,948</b>	<b>10,432</b>	<b>11,854</b>	<b>13,574</b>

**Table 4-10. Comparison of Alternatives – Proposed Land Use within Flood Areas**

Land Use Designation	Alternative							
	Proposed Project		Alpine Alt. Land Use Map & Mid-density		Modified FCI Condition		No Project	
	100-year Flood Area <sup>(1)</sup>	Dam Inundation	100-year Flood Area <sup>(1)</sup>	Dam Inundation	100-year Flood Area <sup>(1)</sup>	Dam Inundation	100-year Flood Area <sup>(1)</sup>	Dam Inundation
Village Residential	0.0	0.0	Same as Proposed Project	Same as Proposed Project	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Semi-Rural Residential	98.1	41.4			41.5	41.4	401.1	158.7
Rural Lands	299.7	157.8			356.2	157.8	0.0	40.5
Specific Plan Area	0.0	0.0			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rural Commercial	3.4	0.0			3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Industrial	0.0	0.0			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Village Core Mixed Use	0.0	0.0			0.0	0.0	N/A <sup>(2)</sup>	N/A <sup>(2)</sup>
Public/Semi-Public & Recreational Open Space	0.0	0.0			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Public Agency Lands	0.0	0.0			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Tribal Lands	0.0	0.0			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Telecommunications	N/A <sup>(2)</sup>	N/A <sup>(2)</sup>			N/A <sup>(2)</sup>	N/A <sup>(2)</sup>	0.0	0.0
Open Space (Conservation)	0.0	0.0			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>401.1</b>	<b>199.2</b>	<b>401.1</b>	<b>199.2</b>	<b>401.1</b>	<b>199.2</b>	<b>401.1</b>	<b>199.2</b>

Source: County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services, 2015.

- 1) Areas within a 100-year floodplain and/or a 100-year floodway
- 2) NA = An equivalent land use designation does not exist for this alternative.

**Table 4-11. Comparison of Alternatives – Proposed Land Uses in Designated MRZ Area**

Land Use Designation	Proposed Project		Alternative							
			Alpine Alternative Land Use Map		Mid-density		Modified FCI Condition		No Project	
	MRZ-2	MRZ-3	MRZ-2	MRZ-3	MRZ-2	MRZ-3	MRZ-2	MRZ-3	MRZ-2	MRZ-3
Village Residential	0.0	15.5	Same as Proposed Project	Same as Proposed Project	0.0	15.5	0.0	15.5	0.0	1.8
Semi-Rural Residential	0.0	236.0			0.0	230.3	0.0	230.3	46.2	345.5
Rural Lands	46.2	90.3			46.2	96.1	46.2	96.1	0.0	0.0
Specific Plan Area	0.0	0.0			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rural Commercial	0.0	21.9			0.0	21.9	0.0	21.9	0.0	0.0
Industrial	0.0	0.0			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.5
Village Core Mixed Use	0.0	0.0			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Public/Semi-Public & Recreational Open Space	0.0	0.0			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Public Agency Lands	0.0	0.0			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Tribal Lands	0.0	0.0			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Open Space (Conservation)	0.0	0.0			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>46.2</b>	<b>363.7</b>	<b>46.2</b>	<b>363.7</b>	<b>46.2</b>	<b>363.7</b>	<b>46.2</b>	<b>363.7</b>	<b>46.2</b>	<b>363.7</b>

Source: County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services, 2015.

**Table 4-12. Comparison of Alternatives  
Community-Level Forecast Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Generation**

Community	2011 General Plan	Proposed Project		Alpine Alternative Land Use Map		Mid-density		Modified FCI Condition		No Project	
		Increase	Total	Increase	Total	Increase	Total	Increase	Total	Increase	Total
Alpine	18,937	108,222	127,159	100,676	119,613	102,150	121,087	16,162	35,063	11,417	30,354
Central Mountain	13,222	1,641	14,863	Same as Proposed Project	Same as Proposed Project	1,437	14,659	1,292	14,514	53,201	66,423
Desert	26	0	26			0	26	0	26	65	91
Jamul/Dulzura	804	(72)	732			(72)	732	(132)	672	1,548	2,352
Julian	4,056	556	4,612			556	4,612	484	4,540	25,816	29,872
Mountain Empire	216	15	231			15	231	3	219	2,869	3,085
North Mountain	11,044	3,660	14,704			3,672	14,716	3,660	14,704	33,268	44,312
Pendleton/DeLuz	336	(72)	264			(72)	264	(72)	264	2,352	2,688
Ramona	2,296	314	2,610			314	2,610	314	2,610	1,022	3,318
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>50,937</b>	<b>114,264</b>	<b>165,201</b>			<b>106,718</b>	<b>157,655</b>	<b>108,000</b>	<b>158,937</b>	<b>21,674</b>	<b>72,612</b>

Source: San Diego County, September 2015