

SUMMARY

This chapter is a summary of the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) for the County of San Diego Forest Conservation Initiative (FCI) Lands General Plan Amendment (GPA), prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The environmental analyses and their technical appendices are included in Volume I of the SEIR. Changes between the Draft SEIR circulated for public review and the Final SEIR are shown in tracked changes mode. Comments on the Draft SEIR are provided in Volume II, which also includes responses to comments and a summary of revisions to the Draft SEIR. Finally, Volume III is an environmental analysis of the Recommended Project, which is the alternative derived through Planning Commission and Board of Supervisor hearings.

This chapter provides a brief summary of the Recirculated Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) prepared for the proposed County of San Diego General Plan Amendment (GPA) (herein referred to as the proposed Project), addressing approximately 71,700 acres of the former Forest Conservation Initiative (FCI) lands and approximately 400 acres of unincorporated lands adjacent to the former FCI lands (herein referred to as the Project areas). The proposed Project tiers from the San Diego County General Plan and the General Plan Update Program EIR (PEIR) adopted on August 3, 2011 (County of San Diego 2011a, 2011b). The General Plan Update PEIR evaluated a new General Plan for the County of San Diego, including comprehensive changes to the land use element, a new Mobility Element and new Goals and Policies governing development of the entire unincorporated County. While the General Plan EIR did not evaluate or consider the impact of adopting the General Plan land use element on the former FCI lands, it was prepared as a Program EIR and did consider the impacts of adoption of the Plan countywide, including impacts of the plan in all communities in which the former FCI lands are located. In addition, adoption of goals and policies countywide were considered in the environmental analysis for the Plan. Therefore, with the exception of changes to the land use designations of former FCI lands and changes to the mobility element proposed by this amendment, the General Plan and the General Plan Update PEIR considered all the impacts of the amendments throughout the unincorporated County. This document has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), as reflected in the findings prepared under CEQA Guidelines 15162 included as Appendix G of this document. The Notice of Preparation (NOP) and public comments received on the Draft SEIR, as well as a detailed project description and technical appendices for the environmental analysis, are included as Appendices A through E of this document. The Lead Agency, as defined in Section 15368 of the CEQA Guidelines, is the County of San Diego, which is responsible for certifying this SEIR.

As required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15123, this Executive Summary provides a brief description of the proposed Project, the Project objectives, and Project alternatives, and identifies the Known Areas of Controversy and Issues to be Resolved. Table S-2 provides a summary of the following: (1) direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts that would occur from implementation of the proposed Project; (2) the significance of each impact prior to implementation of mitigation

measures; (3) recommended mitigation measures that would avoid or reduce significant environmental impacts; and (4) the significance of each impact after mitigation measures are implemented. Table S-3 provides a comparison between the Project impacts and those anticipated with the Project alternatives.

S.1 Overview

In compliance with CEQA, and as reflected in the findings prepared under CEQA Guidelines 15162, attached hereto as Appendix G, this SEIR evaluates potential environmental impacts resulting from this proposed Project, and is tiered from the 2011 General Plan Update PEIR. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15163(b), this SEIR provides additional information, as necessary, that augments the existing conditions and regulatory framework discussions in the previous General Plan Update PEIR to provide current baseline conditions to ensure appropriate analysis of the Project as proposed. As required by CEQA, this SEIR (1) assesses the potentially significant direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental effects of the proposed Project, (2) identifies potential feasible means of avoiding or substantially lessening significant adverse impacts, and (3) evaluates a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed Project, including the required No Project Alternative.

Throughout Chapter 2.0 of this SEIR (Significant Environmental Effects of The Proposed Project), the sections rely on pertinent information that is provided in the General Plan Update PEIR, such as the Existing Conditions and Regulatory Framework discussions, and where necessary this information is updated to bring it current with any changes that have occurred since adoption of the General Plan (the General Plan Update PEIR can be viewed at <http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/pds/gpupdate/environmental.html>). In addition, the following list shows how the environmental topics within this SEIR correspond to the environmental topics within Volume I of the General Plan Update PEIR:

FCI Lands GPA SEIR

- 2.1 Aesthetics
- 2.2 Agricultural and Forestry Resources
- 2.3 Air Quality
- 2.4 Biological Resources
- 2.5 Cultural and Paleontological Resources
- Geology and Soils – N/A
- 2.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- 2.7 Hydrology and Water Quality
- 2.8 Land Use
- 2.9 Mineral Resources
- 2.10 Noise
- Population and Housing – N/A
- 2.11 Public Services

Volume I of General Plan Update PEIR

- 2.1 Aesthetics
- 2.2 Agricultural Resources
- 2.3 Air Quality
- 2.4 Biological Resources
- 2.5 Cultural and Paleontological Resources
- 2.6 Geology and Soils
- 2.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- 2.8 Hydrology and Water Quality
- 2.9 Land Use
- 2.10 Mineral Resources
- 2.11 Noise
- 2.12 Population and Housing
- 2.13 Public Services

2.12 Recreation

2.13 Transportation and Traffic

2.14 Utilities and Service Systems

2.15 Climate Change

2.14 Recreation

2.15 Transportation and Traffic

2.16 Utilities and Service Systems

2.17 Global Climate Change

It should be noted that Volume IV of the General Plan Update PEIR describes the reduced alternative that was ultimately approved by the County of San Diego Board of Supervisors (BOS), which is now the current General Plan. Where applicable, the environmental analysis in Chapter 2.0 of this SEIR incorporates by reference the relevant information from Volume IV of the General Plan Update PEIR. For example, the total acres of impact to vegetation communities associated with the proposed Project would be in addition to the 150,642 acres of impacts that was estimated for buildout under the 2011 General Plan per Volume IV of the Program EIR. Reference to tiering from and incorporation of the information in the General Plan Update PEIR is appropriate for the following reasons:

- The proposed Project addresses land uses on private parcels within the unincorporated County that were either minimally analyzed in the General Plan Update PEIR (e.g., the former FCI lands were only evaluated for traffic and cumulative impacts) or not included at all. Therefore, the environmental setting and existing condition discussions for the areas evaluated in the General Plan Update PEIR will apply equally to the Project areas addressed in this SEIR where they are adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, each other.
- The General Plan goals and policies discussed in the General Plan Update PEIR were adopted countywide and will be the same as those applied to the Project areas addressed in this SEIR.
- There are no new land use designations included in the proposed GPA for this Project that were not described in the General Plan Update PEIR.
- The Mitigation Measures/General Plan Implementation Policies discussed and included in the General Plan Update PEIR will be the same as those applied to the Project areas addressed in this SEIR.

S.2 Project Description

The Project areas are comprised of various privately-owned parcels lying within the unincorporated areas of the County of San Diego, with the former FCI parcels located mostly in and around the Cleveland National Forest (CNF), that are subject to a change in land use designation under the proposed Project. The lands affected by the proposed Project include the following Community Planning Areas (CPAs) and Subregional Planning Areas (Subregions):

- Alpine CPA
- Central Mountain Subregion (including the communities of Cuyamaca, Descanso, and Pine Valley)

- Desert Subregion
- Jamul/Dulzura Subregion
- Julian CPA,
- Mountain Empire Subregion (including the community of Campo/Lake Morena)
- North Mountain Subregion (including Palomar Mountain)
- Pendleton/De Luz CPA
- Ramona CPA

Forest Conservation Initiative Lands

The FCI was a voter-approved initiative requiring that approximately 71,300 acres of private lands within and adjacent to the CNF in San Diego County have a minimum lot size of 40 acres. The FCI was originally approved on November 2, 1993, and expired on December 31, 2010. The land use map revisions resulting with the update of the General Plan in 2011 excluded the FCI lands. Upon the expiration of the FCI, land in the affected areas reverted to the land use designations under the pre-FCI General Plan. As a result, the former FCI land use designations are not consistent with the 2011 General Plan land use designations, nor the Guiding Principles and Policies adopted with the General Plan. To correct these inconsistencies, the County of San Diego Planning & Development Services (PDS) is preparing a GPA to appropriately designate these lands with land use categories consistent with the Guiding Principles and Policies of the General Plan. Land Use Maps for the Project areas are included in Chapter 1 of this draft SEIR, Figures 1-2 through 1-14.

Other Land Use Designation Changes

The proposed Project would revise the land use designations for individual parcels totaling approximately 400 acres in the communities of Alpine, Julian, and Lake Morena/Campo that are adjacent to the former FCI lands to ensure that these parcels are designated in a consistent manner with the changes proposed for the former FCI lands. These parcels are illustrated in Figure 1-1 in Chapter 1 of this draft SEIR.

S.3 Community Plan and Subregional Plan Updates

As a result of the proposed Project, the County will prepare updates to the Alpine, Central Mountain, Jamul/Dulzura and North Mountain community and subregional plans based on the proposed land use changes. With respect to the former FCI lands, the proposed changes would include removal of any references to the former FCI from community and subregional plan text, goals, policies, or objectives that address future development. Specific changes proposed to the community and subregional plans shown in Chapter 1, Project Description (see Section 1.5.2.3).

S.4 Mobility Element Road Network Changes

The proposed land use map changes would result in impacts to Mobility Element road segments in the Alpine CPA. The improvements recommended in the General Plan Update PEIR (County of San Diego 2011b) for the impacted deficient roadways in Alpine would mitigate most of the impacts associated with the proposed land use changes in the Project areas. However, at buildout, nine roadway segments would either be maintained in their current classifications (and therefore operate at a deficient LOS) or upgraded to the reclassifications identified in Table S-1.

TABLE S-1. MOBILITY ELEMENT ROAD NETWORK CHANGES

Segment	LOS	Reclassification
Alpine Boulevard from:		
<i>Tavern Road to Boulders Road</i>	E	4.2B Boulevard (Intermittent Turn Lanes)
<i>West Victoria Drive to Louise Drive</i>	E	4.1B Major Rd (Intermittent Turn Lanes)
<i>Louise Drive to Viejas View Place</i>	F	4.2B Boulevard (Intermittent Turn Lanes)
<i>Viejas View Place to West Willows Road</i>	F	4.2A Boulevard (Raised Median)
<i>West Willows Road to eastern end of Willows Road</i>	F	4.2B Boulevard (Intermittent Turn Lanes)
South Grade Road from:		
<i>Eltinge Drive to Olive View Road</i>	E	4.2B Boulevard (Intermittent Turn Lanes)
West Willows Road (entire segment):	F	4.1A Major Road with Raised Median
Willows Road from:		
<i>Otto Avenue to Viejas Casino Road</i>	F	6.2 Prime Arterial
<i>Viejas Casino Road east to I-8 on-ramp</i>	F	6.2 Prime Arterial

S.5 San Diego County Zoning Ordinance Amendments

The proposed Project involves amendments to the Zoning Ordinance to ensure that the use regulations of the Project areas are consistent with the revised land use designations proposed in the GPA.

S.6 Project Objectives

The Project objectives are the same as those of the County of San Diego General Plan (County of San Diego 2011a):

- Support a reasonable share of projected regional population growth;
- Promote sustainability by locating new development near existing infrastructure, services, and jobs;

- Reinforce the vitality, local economy, and individual character of existing communities while balancing housing, employment, and recreational opportunities;
- Promote environmental stewardship that protects the range of natural resources and habitats that uniquely define the County's character and ecological importance;
- Ensure that development accounts for physical constraints and the natural hazards of the land;
- Provide and support a multi-modal transportation network that enhances connectivity and supports community development patterns;
- Maintain environmentally sustainable communities and reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that contribute to climate change;
- Preserve agriculture as an integral component of the region's economy, character, and open space network;
- Minimize public costs of infrastructure and services and correlate their timing with new development; and,
- Recognize community and stakeholder interests while striving for consensus.

S.7 Impact Summary

In accordance with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the potential environmental effects of the proposed Project are analyzed for the following issue areas:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| ▪ Aesthetics | ▪ Mineral Resources |
| ▪ Agricultural/Forestry Resources | ▪ Noise |
| ▪ Air Quality | ▪ Public Services |
| ▪ Biological Resources | ▪ Recreation |
| ▪ Cultural Resources | ▪ Transportation and Traffic |
| ▪ Hazards and Hazardous Materials | ▪ Utilities and Service Systems |
| ▪ Hydrology and Water Quality | ▪ Climate Change |
| ▪ Land Use and Planning | |

Potential impacts with regard to Geology/Soils and Population/Housing are identified as Effects Found Not to be Significant (and discussed in Section 3.2 of this SEIR), similar to the determinations made in the General Plan Update PEIR for these issues.

Table S-2 provides a summary of the Project's environmental impacts and mitigation measures, as identified through detailed analysis in Chapter 2.0 of this SEIR, along with the level of significance of the impacts before and after implementation of mitigation.

S.8 Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines states that an EIR shall address “a range of reasonable alternatives to the project which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.” Based on the significant impacts resulting with the proposed Project, the following feasible alternatives are identified and evaluated in Section 4.0 of this SEIR:

- **Modified FCI Condition Alternative (Environmentally Superior Alternative).** For the purpose of identifying feasible Project alternatives, certain comment letters were received during the NOP public review period for this SEIR (refer to Appendix B) that 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 U.S. Forest Service (USFS) roads. Based on the recommendations in these letters which propose reduced-density land use designations for specific parcels within and adjacent to the CNF lands, a Modified FCI Condition Alternative Map was created. Pursuant to Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines, this alternative is also considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative as it would accommodate less development than the proposed Project and all of the other alternatives, thus decreasing environmental impacts in all issue areas evaluated in Chapter 2.0 of this SEIR.
- **Mid-density Alternative.** 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 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.

During the NOP public review period for this SEIR, comments were received and considered by the County in the preparation of this document. For the purpose of identifying feasible Project alternatives, the following comment letters are considered in this analysis because they 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 “Mid-density Alternative.”

- **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 4-4A and 4-4B. 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 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 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-existing General Plan land use densities that currently apply to the former FCI lands would remain in effect. 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.

Table S-3 presents the significant environmental impacts resulting with each alternative considered, in comparison to those shown on the proposed land use maps prepared for evaluation in the SEIR.

S.9 Areas of Controversy and Issues to be Resolved by the Decision Making Body

Areas of Controversy Known to the Lead Agency

Per the requirements of CEQA (Section 15123(b)(2)), the following areas of potential controversy for the proposed Project were identified through written agency and public comments received during the NOP public review period (provided in Appendix B of this SEIR). In addition, oral and written public comments were received on the Staff Recommendation Land Use Map that was presented to the Planning Commission on November 15 and October 18, 2013, and on the Planning Commission Recommendation Land Use Map that was presented to the Board of Supervisors on June 25, 2014. The areas of controversy identified from this public input are summarized below:

- Various areas of controversy exist over the proposed land use designations in the Alpine Community that were raised during the course of Planning Commission and Board of Supervisor hearings. Major areas of concern include: 1) the proposed Village extension to the east along the north side of Interstate 8; and, 2) the appropriateness of the proposed land use designations adjacent to forest lands located in close proximity to the more developed areas of Alpine.
- During the NOP comment period, some commenters expressed a desire to retain a RL-40 land use designation throughout the former FCI lands, as opposed to designating lands with higher or lower densities in accordance with the General Plan Community Development Model.

Issues to be Resolved by the Decision Making Body

Section 15123(b)(3) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR address the issues to be resolved, which includes the choices among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate significant impacts. The County BOS will serve as the decision making body for the proposed Project. The major issues to be resolved regarding the Project include decisions by the Lead Agency as to whether or not:

- The Draft SEIR adequately describes the environmental impacts of the proposed Project;
- The recommended mitigation measures identified for the proposed Project should be adopted or modified; or
- Whether additional mitigation measures should be required; and
- Whether the proposed project or one of the alternatives should be adopted.

The following is a description of issues related to the Project that require resolution by the BOS prior to or at the time of Project approval and certification of the SEIR. Recommendations were developed by the County PDS staff, and in developing these recommendations and rendering a decision, the County has considered input provided by the public, other agencies, the community planning groups, and other advisory groups, as appropriate.

- **Final Composition of the GPA Land Use Maps.** The BOS must decide on the final composition of the proposed GPA land use maps, specifically addressing which land use designations will be assigned to specific properties. This SEIR evaluates the proposed Project, along with four alternatives: the Modified FCI Condition Alternative (Environmentally Superior Alternative), the Mid-density Alternative, the Alpine Land sue Map Alternative and, the No Project Alternative. The proposed Project and alternatives represent a range of development intensities with similar types of environmental effects, but with differing degrees of impact. Should the BOS decide to approve a land use alternative that is beyond the range considered in this SEIR, additional analysis may be necessary prior to certification of the SEIR.
- **Community Plan and Subregional Plan Updates and Amendments to Zoning Ordinance.** The BOS must decide on the final revisions to the relevant community and subregional plans to reflect the proposed changes to the existing land use designations for the Project areas addressed in this SEIR. The proposed changes would include removal of: (1) any references to the former FCI or to previous development or land use restrictions on former FCI lands; or, (2) any goals, policies, or objectives that address future development of or specific activities on such lands in the affected community and subregional plans. The BOS will also decide on the following: (1) revisions to the Land Use Distribution Maps for the affected community plans to match the General Plan land use designations for private parcels adjacent to the former FCI lands; (2) additional amendments to the North Mountain Subregional Plan; and (3) amendments to the Zoning Ordinance to ensure that the use regulations of the affected lands are consistent with the revised land use designations of the proposed Project. Any modification made by the BOS to these elements that are outside of the analysis contained in this SEIR may require additional analysis prior to approval and certification of the SEIR.
- **Proposed Mitigation.** The BOS must decide whether the mitigation measures described in Chapter 2.0 of this SEIR represent all feasible measures to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of the proposed Project. The BOS may decide to add or alter measures to improve effectiveness in lessening significant environmental effects. Additionally, the BOS may decide that certain measures are inappropriate or infeasible. Upon completion of the final Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the proposed Project, the County must then have detailed CEQA Findings prepared on the feasibility of the mitigation measures for adoption by the BOS.

- **Consideration of Project Alternatives.** The BOS must decide to adopt or reject part or all of any of the Project alternatives evaluated in Chapter 4.0 of this SEIR. For those alternative(s) that, on the whole, would result in an overall reduction in the significant environmental effects identified for the proposed Project, the BOS must either adopt the alternative(s) or find it (them) to be infeasible for specified reasons.
- **Benefits of the Project Compared to Environmental Risk.** This SEIR has identified adverse significant environmental effects that are unavoidable (unmitigable). The BOS must determine if these effects are considered acceptable with consideration of economic, legal, social, technological, and other relevant benefits of the Project. As part of the CEQA Findings described above, the County must then have detailed Statement of Overriding Considerations (SOC) prepared for adoption by the BOS. The SOC shall be prepared in compliance with CEQA Section 15093 to reflect the ultimate balancing of competing public objectives if the BOS decides to approve the proposed Project or an alternative which has the potential to cause one or more significant unavoidable (unmitigable) effects on the environment.
- **Project Approval.** Ultimately, the BOS must decide whether or how to approve or carry out the proposed Project.

TABLE S-2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS

Issue Topic	Potential Direct/ Indirect Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	General Plan Policies	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact After Mitigation
2.1 Aesthetics					
1. Scenic Vistas: The proposed Project would have the potential to result in the obstruction, interruption, or detracting of a scenic vista as a result of future development activity.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-6.2, LU-6.3, LU-6.4, LU-6.6, LU-6.7, LU-6.9, LU-10.1, LU-10.2, M-2.3, COS-11.1, COS-11.2, COS-11.3, COS-11.4, COS-11.5, COS-11.6, COS-11.7	Aes-1.1 through Aes-1.11	Less Than Significant
2. Scenic Resources: Implementation of the proposed Project would allow development to occur that would have the potential to impact scenic resources through the removal or substantial adverse change of features that contribute to the valued visual character or image of the neighborhood, community, State Scenic Highway, or localized area.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-6.2, LU-6.3, LU-6.4, LU-6.6, LU-6.7, LU-6.9, LU-10.1, LU-10.2, M-2.3, COS-11.1, COS-11.2, COS-11.3, COS-11.4, COS-11.5, COS-11.6, COS-11.7	Aes-1.1 through Aes-1.11	Less Than Significant
3. Visual Character or Quality: Implementation of the proposed Project would allow increased development densities to occur in some areas which would result in the potential degradation of the existing visual character or quality of a community.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-1.4, LU-2.1, LU-2.2, LU-2.3, LU-2.5, LU-4.1, LU-4.2, LU-4.3, LU-4.4, LU-11.2, LU-12.4, M-10.6, H-2.1	Aes-1.1 through Aes-1.11, Aes-3.1, Aes-3.2	Significant and Unavoidable
4. Light or Glare: The proposed Project would have the potential to result in increased light and glare within the County that would adversely affect day or nighttime views.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	COS-13.1, COS-13.2, COS-13.3	Aes-4.1 through Aes-4.3	Significant and Unavoidable
2.2 Agricultural and Forestry Resources					
1. Direct Conversion of Agricultural Resources: Implementation of the proposed Project would result in the potential conversion of agricultural resources to non-agricultural land uses.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-6.4, LU-7.1, LU-7.2, COS-6.4	Agr-1.1 through Agr-1.5	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE S-2, CONTINUED

Issue Topic	Potential Direct/ Indirect Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	General Plan Policies	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact After Mitigation
2. Conflicts with Agricultural or Forest Land: Implementation of the proposed Project would result in potential conflicts with Williamson Act contract lands or conflict with existing zoning for agriculture use or cause the rezoning of forest lands.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	LU-7.1, COS-6.3	Agr-2.1	Less Than Significant
3. Indirect Conversion of Agricultural Resources: Implementation of the proposed Project would redirect high density growth into areas containing agricultural resources and potentially cause some indirect conversion of agricultural resources to non-agricultural use.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-6.4, LU-7.1, LU-7.2, COS-6.2, COS-6.4, COS-6.3	Agr-1.1 through Agr-1.5	Significant and Unavoidable
4. Direct and Indirect Loss or Conversion of Forestry Resources: Implementation of the proposed Project would result in the potential loss of forestry resources or the conversion of forestry resources to non-forestry land uses.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-6.1, COS-1.10, COS-2.2	Bio-1.1, Bio-1.3, Bio-1.6	Significant and Unavoidable
2.3 Air Quality					
1. Air Quality Plans: The proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the RAQS or SIP.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None	None Required	Less Than Significant
2. Air Quality Violations: The proposed Project would have the potential to result in a violation of an air quality standard.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	COS-14.1, COS-14.2, COS-14.8, COS-14.9, COS-14.10, COS-15.1, COS-15.3, COS-15.4, COS-15.5, COS-16.2, COS-16.3, COS-20.3	Air-2.1 through Air-2.13	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE S-2, CONTINUED

Issue Topic	Potential Direct/ Indirect Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	General Plan Policies	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact After Mitigation
3. Non-Attainment Criteria Pollutants: The proposed Project would have the potential to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in pollutants for which the SDAB is listed as non-attainment.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	COS-14.1, COS-14.2, COS-14.8, COS-14.9, COS-14.10, COS-15.1, COS-15.3, COS-15.4, COS-15.5, COS-16.2, COS-16.3, COS-20.3	Air-2.1 through Air-2.13	Significant and Unavoidable
4. Sensitive Receptors: The proposed Project would have the potential to result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial amounts TACs or HAPs that would result in a potentially significant increase in cancer risk.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	None	Air-4.1	Significant and Unavoidable
5. Objectionable Odors: The proposed Project would comply with APCD regulations that require odor sources to reduce impacts to nearby receptors.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None	None Required	Less Than Significant
2.4 Biological Resources					
1. Special Status Species: Implementation of the proposed Project would have the potential to directly and indirectly result in impacts to special status species.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	COS-1.3, COS-1.6 through COS-1.11, COS-2.1, COS-2.2, LU-6.1 through LU-6.4, LU-6.6, LU-6.7, LU-10.2	Bio-1.1 through Bio-1.7	Significant and Unavoidable
2. Riparian Habitat and Other Sensitive Natural Communities: Implementation of the proposed Project would have the potential to result in direct and indirect impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	COS-1.3, COS-1.6 through COS-1.11, COS-2.1, COS-2.2, COS-3.1, LU-6.1 through LU-6.4, LU-6.6, LU-6.7, LU-10.2	Bio-1.1 through Bio-1.7, Bio-2.1 through Bio-2.4	Significant and Unavoidable
3. Federally Protected Wetlands: Implementation of the proposed Project would have the potential to result in a potentially significant direct impact to federally protected wetlands.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	COS-3.1 and COS-3.2	Bio-1.1, Bio-1.5, Bio-1.6, Bio-1.7, Bio-2.2 through Bio-2.4	Less Than Significant

TABLE S-2, CONTINUED

Issue Topic	Potential Direct/ Indirect Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	General Plan Policies	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact After Mitigation
4. Wildlife Movement Corridors and Nursery Sites: Implementation of the proposed Project would have the potential to impact wildlife movement corridors.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	COS-1.1 through COS-1.5, LU-6.1, LU-6.7	Bio-1.1 through Bio-1.7, Bio-2.3	Significant and Unavoidable
5. Local Policies and Ordinances: Implementation of the proposed Project would not conflict with local biological resources related policies and ordinances.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None Required; however, the following policies are applicable to this issue: COS-1.2, COS-1.3. COS-1.9	None Required	Less Than Significant
6. Habitat Conservation Plans and Natural Community Conservation Plans: Implementation of the proposed Project would not conflict with any applicable HCP or NCCP.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None Required; however, the following policies are applicable to this issue: COS-1.2, COS-1.3. COS-1.6 though COS-1.10	None Required	Less Than Significant
2.5 Cultural Resources					
1. Historical Resources: Implementation of the proposed Project would result in new development that would have the potential to result in substantial adverse changes to the significance of historical resources.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	COS-8.1	Cul-1.1 through Cul-1.8	Less Than Significant
2. Archaeological Resources: Implementation of the proposed Project would result in new development that would have the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, including the destruction or disturbance of an archaeological site that contains or has the potential to contain information important to history or prehistory.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	COS-7.1 through COS-7.4	Cul-1.1, Cul-1.6, Cul-2.1 through Cul-2.6	Less Than Significant
3. Paleontological Resources: Implementation of the proposed Project would result in new development that would have the potential to adversely impact unique paleontological resources.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	COS-9.1	Cul-3.1, Cul-3.2	Less Than Significant

TABLE S-2, CONTINUED

Issue Topic	Potential Direct/ Indirect Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	General Plan Policies	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact After Mitigation
4: Human Remains: Implementation of the proposed Project would result in new development that would have the potential to disturb human remains, including those discovered outside of formal cemeteries.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	COS-7.5	Cul-1.1, Cul-1.6, Cul-4.1	Less Than Significant
2.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials					
1. Transport, Use, and Disposal of Hazardous Materials: Implementation of the proposed Project would result in an increase in the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials; however, the Project would be required to comply with federal, State and local regulatory requirements, including RCRA, CERCLA, Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, CFC, Title 22, CCR Title 27, and the County Consolidated Fire Code, which strictly regulate the transportation, use and disposal of hazardous materials.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None Required; however, the following policies are applicable to this issue: S-1.1, S-1.2, S-11.1, and S-11.2	None Required	Less Than Significant
2. Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials: Implementation of the proposed Project would result in land uses that may store, use, or dispose of hazardous materials; however, all future development allowable under the proposed land uses of the proposed Project would be required to comply with applicable federal, State and local regulations related to the accidental release of hazardous materials.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None Required; however, the following policies are applicable to this issue: LU-11.9, LU-11.11, S-1.1, S-1.2, S-11.1, and S-11.2	None Required	Less Than Significant

TABLE S-2, CONTINUED

Issue Topic	Potential Direct/ Indirect Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	General Plan Policies	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact After Mitigation
3. Hazardous to Schools: The proposed Project may result in land uses that have a high potential for hazardous materials to be located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school or daycare; however, compliance with General Plan policies and federal and State regulations pertaining to hazardous wastes, including the CEQA Guidelines, would ensure that risks associated with hazardous emissions and schools would be below a level of significance.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None Required; however, the following policies are applicable to this issue: LU-11.10 and S-11.3	None Required	Less Than Significant
4. Existing Hazardous Materials Sites: Under implementation of the proposed Project, land uses and development may be located on a site that may create potentially 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, future development of land uses proposed under the proposed Project would be required to comply with applicable 2011 General Plan policies and existing federal, State, and local regulations related to existing on-site hazardous materials contamination.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None Required; however, the following policies are applicable to this issue: S-1.1, S-1.2, S-11.4, and S-11.5	None Required	Less Than Significant
5. Public and Private Airports: Implementation of the proposed Project may result in land use designations that would increase safety hazards for people residing or working in the vicinity of a public or private airport.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	LU-4.7, M-7.1, S-15.1 through S-15.4	Haz-1.1 through Haz-1.5, Haz-2.1	Less Than Significant
6. Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans: Implementation of the proposed Project would increase land uses and development in areas of the County that may not have accounted for this growth in their existing emergency response and evacuation plans.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	S-1.3, M-1.2, M-3.3, M-4.3	Haz-3.1 through Haz-3.3	Less Than Significant

TABLE S-2, CONTINUED

Issue Topic	Potential Direct/ Indirect Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	General Plan Policies	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact After Mitigation
7. Wildland Fires: Implementation of the proposed Project would result in land uses that allow development in areas that are prone to wildland fires. This is due to the fact that the majority of the unincorporated County is located in high or very high fire hazard severity zones. Implementation of the proposed Project would have the potential to expose people or structures to a potentially significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-6.11, LU-11.2, S-3.1 through S-3.4, S-3.6, S-4.1, COS-18.3	Haz-4.1 through Haz-4.4	Significant and Unavoidable
8. Vectors: Future development of land uses consistent with the proposed Project would have the potential to increase human exposure to vectors; however, Project compliance with existing regulations, policies, plans and guidelines associated with vector control would ensure that significant impacts do not occur.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None Required; however, the following policies are applicable to this issue: COS-3.1, COS-4.3, COS-5.2, COS-6.2, COS-6.3	None Required	Less Than Significant
2.7 Hydrology and Water Quality					
1. Water Quality Standards and Requirements: The development of future land uses as designated in the proposed Project would contribute pollutants that would significantly degrade water quality and in some instances exacerbate existing surface and groundwater pollution conditions in the unincorporated County. Additionally, occupants of the proposed land uses would not have access to quality groundwater supplies due to existing contamination.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-6.5, LU-6.9, LU-14.1 through LU-14.4, COS-4.2 through COS-4.4, COS-5.2, COS-5.3, COS-5.5	Hyd-1.1 through Hyd-1.10	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE S-2, CONTINUED

Issue Topic	Potential Direct/ Indirect Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	General Plan Policies	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact After Mitigation
2. Groundwater Supplies and Recharge: At full buildout of land uses designated in the proposed Project, groundwater supply and recharge impacts would occur in: 1) areas that experience a 50 percent reduction of groundwater in storage; 2) areas that experience supply issues from additional large quantity or clustered groundwater users; and, 3) areas that experience a high frequency of low well yield.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-8.1, LU-8.2, LU-13.1, LU-13.2, COS-4.1 through COS-4.4, COS-5.2	Hyd-1.1 through Hyd-1.5, Hyd-2.1 through Hyd-2.5	Significant and Unavoidable
3. Erosion or Siltation: Implementation of the proposed Project would result in increased runoff that has the potential to cause new erosion or worsen existing erosion problems.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-6.5, LU-6.9, COS-5.3	Hyd-1.2, Hyd-1.3, Hyd-1.5, Hyd-3.1 through Hyd-3.3	Less Than Significant
4. Flooding: Implementation of the proposed Project would convert permeable surfaces to impermeable surfaces, which have the potential to result in flooding on- or offsite.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-6.5, LU-6.10, S-9.2, S-10.2 through S-10.4, S-10.6	Hyd-1.1, Hyd-1.2, Hyd-1.3, Hyd-1.4, Hyd-1.5, Hyd-2.5, Hyd-4.1 through Hyd-4.3	Less Than Significant
5. Exceed Capacity of Stormwater Systems: Implementation of the proposed Project would exceed the capacity of existing stormwater drainage facilities.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	LU-6.5, LU-6.9, COS-4.3, COS-5.2, S-9.2, S-10.2 through S-10.6	Hyd-1.1 through Hyd-1.5, Hyd-2.5, Hyd-3.1, Hyd-4.1 through Hyd-4.3	Less Than Significant
6. Housing within a 100-year Flood Hazard Area: Implementation of the proposed Project would include land designated for residential land use within a 100-year flood plain.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None Required; however, the following policies are applicable to this issue: LU-6.12, COS-5.1, S-9.1 through S-9.5, S-10.1	None Required	Less Than Significant

TABLE S-2, CONTINUED

Issue Topic	Potential Direct/ Indirect Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	General Plan Policies	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact After Mitigation
7. Impeding or Redirecting Flood Flows: Implementation of the proposed Project would impede or redirect flood flows.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None Required; however, the following policies are applicable to this issue: LU-6.12, COS-5.1, S-9.1 through S-9.5, S-10.1	None Required	Less Than Significant
8. Dam Inundation and Flood Hazards: Implementation of the proposed Project would result in inundation risk associated with dam failure.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	COS-5.1, S-9.1, S-9.6, S-10.1	Hyd-1.2, Hyd-1.5, Hyd-2.5, Hyd-4.1 through Hyd-4.3, Hyd-6.1, Hyd-8.1, Hyd-8.2	Less Than Significant
9. Seiche, Tsunami, and Mudflow Hazards: Implementation of the proposed Project would result in an increased risk of exposing people or structures to damage in the event of a mudflow.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	COS-5.1, S-8.1, S-8.2, S-9.3, S-9.6	Hyd-3.1 through Hyd-3.3	Less Than Significant
2.8 Land Use					
1. Physical Division of an Established Community: Implementation of the proposed Project would not result in the construction, expansion, or extension of any roadways; planning for or construction of alternative transportation routes or associated large structures; or, establishment of any new large areas of open space that would have the potential to physically divide an established community.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-1.4, LU-2.1, LU-2.3, LU-2.5, LU-4.1 through LU-4.4, LU-11.2, LU-12.4, M-10.6, H-2.1, M-1.3	Lan-1.1 through Lan-1.3	Less Than Significant
2. Conflicts with Land Use Plans, Policies, and Regulations: Implementation of the proposed Project would not conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None Required	None Required	Less Than Significant

TABLE S-2, CONTINUED

Issue Topic	Potential Direct/ Indirect Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	General Plan Policies	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact After Mitigation
3. Conflicts with HCPs or NCCPs: Implementation of the proposed Project would conflict with any applicable HCP or NCCP.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None Required	None Required	Less Than Significant
2.9 Mineral Resources					
1. Mineral Resource Availability: Implementation of the proposed Project would have the potential to result in potentially significant impacts associated with the loss of availability of mineral resources.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	COS-10.1 through COS-10.4, COS-10.6, COS-10.8, COS-10.9	Min-1.1 through Min-1.3	Significant and Unavoidable
2. Mineral Resource Recovery Sites: Implementation of the proposed Project would have the potential to result in significant impacts associated with the loss of locally important mineral resource recovery sites.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	COS-10.1 through COS-10.4, COS-10.6, COS-10.8, COS-10.9	Min-1.1 through Min-1.3	Significant and Unavoidable
2.10 Noise					
1. Excessive Noise Levels: Implementation of the proposed Project would have the potential to expose land uses to noise levels in excess of noise compatibility guidelines.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-2.8, M-1.3, M-2.4, N-1.4, N-1.5, N-2.1, N-2.2, N-4.1 through N-4.3, N-4.5, N-4.7, N-4.8	Noi-1.1 through Noi-1.9	Less Than Significant
2. Excessive Groundborne Vibration: Implementation of the proposed Project would result in potential development subject to excessive groundborne vibration associated with construction projects and siting of development in proximity to mining/mineral extraction or railroad activities.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	N-3.1, N-4.7, N-5.2, N-6.3, N-6.4	Noi- 1.7, Noi-2.1 through Noi-2.4	Less Than Significant
3. Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Level: Implementation of the proposed Project would permanently increase ambient noise along roadways.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-2.8, M-1.3, M-2.4, N-1.5, N-4.1, N-4.2, N-4.6, N-5.1, N-5.2	Noi-1.3, Noi-1.4, Noi-1.5, Noi-1.8, Noi-2.3, Noi-2.4, Noi-3.1, Noi-3.2	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE S-2, CONTINUED

Issue Topic	Potential Direct/ Indirect Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	General Plan Policies	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact After Mitigation
4. Temporary Increase in Ambient Noise Level: Implementation of the proposed Project would have the potential to temporarily increase ambient noise from construction activity as well as other sources of temporary or nuisance noise.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	N-6.1 through N-6.6	Noi-4.1, Noi-4.2	Less Than Significant
5. Excessive Noise Exposure from a Public or Private Airport: Implementation of the proposed Project would have the potential to expose noise sensitive land use to excessive noise from a public or private airport.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	N-4.9, S-15.1, S-15.2, S-15.4	Noi-5.1 through Noi-5.3	Less Than Significant
2.11 Public Services					
1A. Fire Protection Services: Implementation of the proposed Project would result in a substantial adverse physical impact associated with the provision of new or physically altered police protection facilities.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-1.4, LU-6.4, LU-6.11, LU-12.3, LU-12.4, S-3.4, S-5.1, S-5.2, S-6.1 through S-6.5	Pub-1.1 through Pub-1.9	Less Than Significant
1B. Police Protection Services: Implementation of the proposed Project would result in a substantial adverse physical impact associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-1.4, LU-12.3, LU-12.4	Pub-1.1 through Pub-1.3	Less Than Significant
2A. Schools Services: Implementation of the proposed Project would include residential land use designations that would have the potential to result in the need to construct or expand school facilities that would result in a significant environmental impact.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-1.4, LU-9.4, LU-9.7, LU-12.3, LU-12.4, LU-17.1 through LU-17.4, LU-18.1, LU-18.2	Pub-1.1 through Pub-1.3, Pub-3.1, Pub-3.2	Significant and Unavoidable
2B. Libraries: Implementation of the proposed Project would include residential land use designations that would have the potential to result in the need to construct or expand library facilities that would result in a significant environmental impact.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-1.4, LU-9.4, LU-9.7, LU-12.3, LU-12.4, LU-17.1 through LU-17.4, LU-18.1, LU-18.2	Pub-1.1 through Pub-1.3	Less Than Significant

TABLE S-2, CONTINUED

Issue Topic	Potential Direct/ Indirect Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	General Plan Policies	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact After Mitigation
2.12 Recreation					
1. Deterioration of Parks and Recreational Facilities: Implementation of the proposed Project would result in the deterioration of parks and recreational facilities from future population growth.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-12.1, LU-12.2, M-12.1 through M-12.8, M-12.10, H-2.2, COS-21.1, COS-21.2, COS-22.1, COS-23.1, COS-23.2, COS-24.1, COS-24.2	Rec-1.1 through Rec-1.11	Less Than Significant
2. Construction of New Recreational Facilities: Implementation of the proposed Project would require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities to accommodate increased demand from future population growth.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-6.4, LU-9.7, LU-18.2, M-12.5, M-12.9, M-12.10, H-2.2, COS-21.2, COS-21.3, COS-21.4, COS-23.1, COS-23.3	Rec-1.1 through Rec-1.4, Rec-1.8, Rec-1.9, Rec-2.1 through Rec-2.6	Less Than Significant
2.13 Transportation and Traffic					
1. Traffic and LOS Standards: Implementation of the proposed Project would result in an increase in traffic on roadways within the unincorporated County that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system, or that would exceed an established LOS standard.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-5.1, LU-10.4, LU-11.8, LU-12.2, M-1.1 through M-1.3, M-2.1 through M-2.3, M-3.1, M-3.2, M-4.2, M-5.1, M-5.2, M-9.1, M-9.2	Tra-1.1 through Tra-1.7	Significant and Unavoidable
2. Rural Road Safety: Implementation of the proposed Project would increase trips on two-lane roads in rural areas that are not developed to current road standards, and would add traffic to roads with slow-moving agricultural equipment. Additionally, the proposed Project may pose an increased risk to pedestrians and bicyclists by increasing and/or redistributing traffic patterns. Implementation of the proposed Project would also have the potential to result in hazards from at-grade rail crossings.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-2.8, LU-6.10, M-4.3 through M-4.5, M-9.1	Tra-1.3, Tra-1.4, Tra-1.7, and Tra-3.1	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE S-2, CONTINUED

Issue Topic	Potential Direct/ Indirect Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	General Plan Policies	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact After Mitigation
3. Emergency Access: Implementation of the proposed Project would add additional traffic on a roadway network that is incomplete or not fully connected; on dead end roads; one-way roads; and/or, within gated communities in the unincorporated County, which would have the potential to impair emergency access.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	LU-2.8, LU-6.10, LU-12.2, M-1.2, M-3.3, M-4.4, S-3.4, S-3.5, S-14.1	Tra-1.3, Tra-1.4, Tra-1.6, Tra-4.1 through Tra-4.4	Less Than Significant
4. Parking Capacity: Implementation of the proposed Project would designate land uses within the unincorporated County that would require the development of parking facilities. All future development of parking facilities associated with these land uses would be required to follow existing parking standards and requirements, such as the County's Zoning Ordinance and roadway standards.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	M-8.6, M-9.3, M-9.4, M-10.1 through M-10.4	Tra-1.4, Tra-5.1 through Tra-5.3	Less Than Significant
5. Alternative Transportation: Implementation of the proposed Project would create provisions for alternative modes of transportation, including bike lanes, bus stops, trails, and sidewalks. While existing County policies and regulations and 2011 General Plan goals and policies are intended to promote alternative transportation plans and policies, implementation of the proposed Project would require coordination between the County and the agencies responsible for public transportation planning.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	LU-5.1, LU-5.4, LU-5.5, LU-9.8, LU-11.6, M-3.1, M-3.2, M-4.3, M-8.1 through M-8.7, M-9.2, M-9.4, M-11.1 through M-11.7	Tra-5.1, Tra-5.2, Tra-6.1 through Tra-6.9	Less Than Significant
2.14 Utilities and Service Systems					
1. Wastewater Treatment Requirements: Future development of land uses as designated with the proposed Project would result in the demand for wastewater treatment services to increase at a rate disproportionate to facility capabilities, which would result in a violation in wastewater treatment standards.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	LU-9.4, LU-12.1, LU-12.2, LU-14.1 through LU-14.4	USS-1.1 through USS-1.3	Less Than Significant

TABLE S-2, CONTINUED

Issue Topic	Potential Direct/ Indirect Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	General Plan Policies	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact After Mitigation
2. New Water of Wastewater Treatment Facilities: The development of future land uses as designated with the proposed Project would increase the demand for water and wastewater services, thereby requiring the construction of new facilities.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	LU-1.2, LU-4.3, H-1.3	USS-2.1 through USS-2.3	Less Than Significant
3. Sufficient Stormwater Drainage Facilities: The development of future land uses as designated with the proposed Project would require the construction of new stormwater facilities if existing facilities are not sized adequately to handle increased runoff flows.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	LU-6.5, LU-6.9, COS-4.3	USS-3.1 through USS-3.5	Less Than Significant
4. Adequate Water Supplies: The development of future land uses as designated with the proposed Project could result in development with an inadequate water supply.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-8.1, LU-8.2, LU-13.1, LU-13.2, COS-4.1 through COS-4.4, COS-5.2, COS-5.5	USS-4.1 through USS-4.7	Significant and Unavoidable
5. Adequate Wastewater Facilities: The development of future land uses as designated with the proposed Project would generate additional demand on existing wastewater systems that may result in inadequate capacity to serve the projected demand.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	LU-4.3	USS-1.1 through USS-1.3	Less Than Significant
6. Sufficient Landfill Capacity: The development of future land uses as designated with the proposed Project has the potential to be served by a landfill with insufficient capacity to accommodate solid waste disposal needs.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-12.1, LU-12.2, LU-16.1 through LU-16.3, COS-17.1 through COS-17.4, COS-17.6 through COS-17.8	USS-6.1 through USS-6.8	Significant and Unavoidable
7. Solid Waste Regulations: The development of future land uses as designated with the proposed Project would be required to comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None Required; however, the following policies are applicable to this issue: LU-12.1, LU-12.2, LU-16.1, LU-16.2, LU-16.3, COS-17.1 through COS-17.4, COS-17.7, COS-17.8	None Required	Less Than Significant

TABLE S-2, CONTINUED

Issue Topic	Potential Direct/ Indirect Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	General Plan Policies	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact After Mitigation
8. Energy: The development of future land uses as designated with the proposed Project would require energy facilities to be constructed or expanded, which would have the potential to result in significant environmental effects.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	COS-14.7, COS-15.1 through COS-15.5	USS-8.1 through USS-8.3	Less Than Significant
2.15 Global Climate Change					
1. Compliance with AB 32: The development of future land uses as designated with the proposed Project would be required to comply with AB 32 to meet established goals for the reduction of GHG emissions.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	COS-10.7, COS-15.1 through COS-15.3, COS-17.1, COS-17.5, COS-18.2, COS-20.2, COS-20.4	CC-1.1, CC-1.3 through CC-1.19	Significant and Unavoidable
2. Potential Effects of Global Climate Change on the Proposed Project: Climate change impacts that would be most relevant to the unincorporated County, and the proposed Project, include effects on water supply, wildfires, energy needs, and impacts to public health.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	COS-10.7, COS-15.1 through COS-15.3, COS-17.1, COS-17.5, COS-18.2, COS-20.2, COS-20.4	CC-1.1, CC-1.3 through CC-1.19 USS-4.1 through USS 4.7 Bio-1.1 through Bio-1.7 Haz 4.1 through Haz 4.4	Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-3. Comparison of Alternatives – Environmental Impacts

	Proposed Project		Alternatives to the Proposed Project			
	Without Mitigation	With Mitigation	Modified FCI Condition	Mid-density	Alpine Alternative Land Use Map	No Project
Issue Areas						
2.1 Aesthetics						
Scenic Vistas	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Scenic Resources	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Visual Character or Quality	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	—
Lighting and Glare	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
2.2 Agricultural Resources						
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	▼	▼	▼	▲
2.3 Air Quality						
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	—	—	—	—
2.4 Biological Resources						
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	—	—	—	—
2.5 Cultural Resources						
Historical Resources	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Archaeological Resources	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Paleontological Resources	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Human Remains	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲

TABLE S-3, CONTINUED

	Proposed Project		Alternatives to the Proposed Project			
	Without Mitigation	With Mitigation	Modified FCI Condition	Mid-density	Alpine Alternative Land Use Map	No Project
Issue Areas						
2.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials						
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
2.7 Hydrology and Water Quality						
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	▼	▼	▼	▲
2.8 Land Use						
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
2.9 Mineral Resources						
Mineral Resource Availability	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Mineral Resource Recovery Sites	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
2.10 Noise						
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 S-3, CONTINUED

	Proposed Project		Alternatives to the Proposed Project			
	Without Mitigation	With Mitigation	Modified FCI Condition	Mid-density	Alpine Alternative Land Use Map	No Project
Issue Areas						
2.11 Public Services						
Fire Protection Services	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Police Protection Services	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
School Services	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Library Services	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
2.12 Recreation						
Deterioration of Parks and Recreational Facilities	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Construction of New Recreational Facilities	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
2.13 Transportation and Traffic						
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	▼	▼	▼	▲
2.14 Utilities and Service Systems						
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	▼	▼	▼	▲
2.15 Global Climate Change						
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

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.