

Origins of the Forest Conservation Initiative Lands GPA Project Alternatives

Alpine Alternative Land Use Map

This alternative is the same as the proposed Project, with the exception of two areas in the Alpine Community Planning Area (CPA). On June 25, 2014 the BOS considered land use map recommendations by staff and the Planning Commission, among others and endorsed one of the recommendations with the exception of the two areas in Alpine discussed below where no endorsement was made.

Area 1

1. For approximately 1,500 acres in the eastern portion of the Alpine CPA south of Interstate 8 and east of the existing Alpine Village (formerly referred to as AL5, AL6, AL7), the BOS directed County staff to:
 - Work with the Alpine Community Planning Group, U.S. Forest Service, and property owners to develop boundaries for a special study area to determine the appropriate land use densities;
 - Determine the feasibility of developing the needed infrastructure such as water, sewer, road access, and fire protection, to support a given density and protect the U.S. Forest Service lands from development impacts;
 - Explore funding mechanisms from property owners;
 - Analyze the Planning Commission, staff, and Planning Group recommendations; and
 - Return with a scope of work.

The Alpine Alternative Land Use Map for this area is the same as the land use densities assigned by the No Project Alternative, with the exception of an area assigned Village Residential 2 (two dwelling units per acre), which is the same as the Mid-density Alternative.

Area 2

The second area of this alternative is approximately 1,750 acres in the vicinity of Japatul Road south of the Alpine Village (formerly referred to as AL8). On June 25, 2014 the BOS referred the staff, Planning Commission and Community Planning Group recommendations for staff analysis in the Environmental Impact Report. The Alpine Alternative Land Use Map for this area is the same as the land use map recommended by the Planning Commission and considered by the BOS on June 25, 2014.

Modified FCI Condition Project Alternative (Environmentally Superior Alternative)

For the purpose of identifying feasible Project alternatives, certain comment letters were received during the NOP public review period for the SEIR circulated in 2013 that proposed reduced densities on specific parcels of the land use map preferred by community planning and

sponsor groups (referred to as the 2012 Initial Draft Land Use Map). That land use map was the proposed Project within the 2013 Draft SEIR. The NOP comment letters recommended less intensive land uses in certain areas 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 U.S. Forest Service (USFS) roads. The Modified Project Alternative was created as a result of these recommendations. However, a staff recommendation to the Planning Commission (October 2013 Staff Recommendation Alternative) was subsequently created in October 2013 after analysis of comments received from circulating the Draft SEIR in 2013. Further, in November 2013, the Planning Commission recommended changes to the October 2013 Staff Recommendation Land Use Map for specific parcels (Planning Commission Recommendation Land Use Map). For some parcels, the Staff Recommendation and/or Planning Commission Recommendation Land Use Maps assign less intensive land uses than the 2013 Modified Project Alternative. The Modified FCI Condition Alternative is based on the lowest intensity designation of either the 2103 Modified Project Alternative, October 2013 Staff Recommendation, or Planning Commission Recommendation Land Use Maps. The Modified FCI Condition Project Alternative, overall the least intensive alternative, is different from the original 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.

Mid-density Alternative

The Mid-density Alternative (previously known as the June 2014 Staff Recommendation Alternative) represents the land use map County staff recommended for consideration by the Board of Supervisors at the June 25, 2014 hearing, and is the same as the October 2013 Staff Recommendation Land Use Map that lead to the Modified FCI Condition Alternative, with the exception of two parcels in Pendleton/DeLuz. Those two parcels are assigned a Rural Lands 40 rather than a Rural Lands 80 land use designation on the Mid-density Alternative similar to the Planning Commission Recommendation Land Use Map. With the exception of those two parcels, the Mid-density Alternative is based on an analysis of the consistency of the 2012 Initial Draft Land Use Map with the General Plan Update's policies and planning principles as well as issues raised in public comment letters on the 2013 Draft SEIR. Based on the 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. As a result of this analysis, buildout of the Mid-density Alternative would result in 656 fewer dwelling units than the Proposed Project Alternative.

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. 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.