

## Hingtgen, Robert J

---

**From:** Fogg, Mindy  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 13, 2014 1:31 PM  
**To:** Asha Bleier  
**Cc:** Hingtgen, Robert J; Gungle, Ashley  
**Subject:** Finding of recirc or no recirc  
**Attachments:** G4-Wind Ord Recirc.docx; Decision Regarding Recirculation.GPU.docx

Asha,

In the meeting we agreed that you could start tracking any substantive changes to the EIR using the recirc findings doc. We don't have a template for this but we have examples previously used (attached). Hope that helps.

**Mindy Fogg** | Planning Manager | Project Planning  
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO | Planning & Development Services  
5510 Overland Avenue | Suite 310 | San Diego | CA | 92123  
T. 858.694.3831 | F. 858.694.2555 | MS: O650  
PDS Website <http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds>



# **Environmental Findings**

## **Decision and Explanation Regarding Recirculation of the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the County of San Diego Wind Energy Ordinance Amendment POD 10-007**

**DECISION AND EXPLANATION REGARDING RECIRCULATION  
OF THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

**WIND ENERGY ORDINANCE AMENDMENT  
(POD 10-007; LOG No. 09-00-003)  
SCH No. 2010091030**

**May 8, 2013**

Pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15088.5(a), the County of San Diego (County) is required to recirculate a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) when significant new information is added to the Draft EIR after public review of the Draft EIR, but before certification. Significant new information can include changes in the project or environmental setting, as well as additional data or other information. New information added to a Draft EIR is not significant unless the Draft EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including feasible alternatives) that the project's proponents have declined to implement.

**BACKGROUND:** The County prepared a Draft EIR for the Wind Energy Ordinance Amendment POD 10-007 and circulated the Draft EIR for public review from November 8, 2011 to December 23, 2011. Responses to all comments received during the public review period were prepared and are included in Appendix E of the Final EIR. Additionally, in response to some public comments and public testimony during Planning Commission hearings, the County made revisions to the Draft EIR. All revisions were evaluated to determine whether new or more severe impacts were identified, or whether feasible mitigation or avoidance measures were identified but rejected.

**DECISION:** No "significant new information" has been added to the Draft EIR since public notice was given of the availability of the Draft EIR for public review, and therefore, recirculation of the Draft EIR is not required. The following provides an explanation of the modifications made to the Draft EIR.

**EXPLANATION:** CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 states that new information added to a Draft EIR is not significant unless the Draft EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project's proponents have declined to implement. "Significant new information" requiring recirculation includes, for example, a disclosure showing that:

- (1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.
- (2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.
- (3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from the others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but the project's proponents decline to adopt it.

- (4) The Revised Draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

**CHANGES TO THE DRAFT EIR:** A Summary of Changes made to the Draft EIR subsequent to the public review period has been prepared and is included within Appendix F of the Final EIR. The summary provides changes in underline for new text and strike out for deleted text. Minor text changes, such as typographical errors, that were made to the Final EIR as necessary were not included. The changes do not alter the conclusions of the environmental analysis such that new significant environmental impacts have been identified, nor do they constitute significant new information. The following provides an explanation of notable changes to the project description, environmental analysis and mitigation measures.

### ***Project Description***

In response to comments, the project description was revised to clarify terminology and regulations, as well as to add environmental design considerations. The complete list of changes is available in Appendix F of the Final EIR. The most notable changes related to large wind turbines consist of clarifications to noise provisions. Originally, the Draft EIR referred to a “low frequency C-weighted sound level limit.” The EIR has been revised to refer to a “low frequency C-Weighted sound level setback.” The project description was also revised to clarify terminology for “C-Weighted sound level Residual Background Sound Criterion,” which was formerly referred to as “C-Weighted Sound level (dBC), Residual Background Sound Level.” These changes better reflect the methodology and regulations for analyzing low frequency noise of large wind turbines. These changes do not result in identification of new or more severe environmental impacts, nor do the changes result in feasible mitigation or avoidance measures identified but rejected.

For small wind turbines, a number of design considerations were added to Table 1-1, Environmental Design Considerations – Small Wind Turbines. These changes are as follows:

- No part of the wind turbine shall be closer than 300 feet or five times the turbine height, whichever is greater, from power transmission towers and lines.
- No part of the wind turbine shall be closer than 300 feet or five times the turbine height, whichever is greater, from blue line watercourse(s) as identified on the United States Geological Survey Topographic Map.
- No part of the wind turbine shall be closer than 300 feet or five times the turbine height, whichever is greater, from significant roost sites for bat species as mapped on the California Natural Diversity Database and San Diego Natural History Museum maps.
- No part of the wind turbine shall be closer than 300 feet or five times the turbine height, whichever is greater, from riparian vegetation as identified on the County Wetland Vegetation Map.
- No part of the wind turbine shall be closer than 300 feet or five times the turbine height, whichever is greater, from recorded open space easements and designated preserve areas
- No part of a wind turbine shall be closer than 4,000 feet from a known golden eagle nest site.
- The area of disturbance for a small wind turbine shall be limited to a 25-foot radius around the base of the tower and an access path to the tower that is a maximum of four feet wide.
- Tower structure lighting shall be prohibited unless required by law.

- No small turbine is allowed ministerially on properties designated as Pre-Approved Mitigation Area within the boundaries of the Multiple Species Conservation Program Subarea Plan.

The additional environmental design considerations were added in response to comments and would help to reduce potential impacts to biological resources, but not to a level less than significant. These changes do not result in identification of new or more severe environmental impacts, nor do the changes result in feasible mitigation or avoidance measures identified but rejected.

### ***Environmental Analysis***

The Final EIR includes changes to the environmental analysis provided in Chapter 2.0, Environmental Effects of the Proposed Project, and Chapter 4.0, Project Alternatives. These changes consist of clarifications and additional design considerations in response to comments received during public review of the Draft EIR and subsequent Planning Commission Hearings. The complete list of changes is available in Appendix F of the Final EIR. The following explains the most notable changes to the environmental analysis.

In Section 2.4, Biological Resources, additional environmental design considerations (as described above) were incorporated to reduce potential impacts to biological resources resulting from the development of small wind turbines. However, these additional measures would not reduce impacts to a level less than significant, and therefore, the conclusion of the analysis does not change. Also, throughout Section 2.4, Biological Resources, language was added to better explain potential impacts to certain types of avian species, such as eagles and other raptors. These changes do not result in identification of new or more severe environmental impacts, nor do these changes result in feasible mitigation or avoidance measures identified but rejected.

In Section 2.5, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, language was added to the regulatory setting to define a traditional cultural property (TCP). This definition helps to clarify what types of sites are listed in the National Register. This change does not result in identification of new or more severe environmental impacts, nor does this change result in feasible mitigation or avoidance measures identified but rejected.

In Section 2.8, Noise, changes consisted of clarifications to terminology and regulations related to the analysis of low frequency noise, as described above. In addition to these clarifications, changes to Section 2.8, Noise, include (1) the requirement for large wind turbines to undergo ongoing compliance review, and (2) the limiting of potential noise waivers for a reduced C-weighted sound setback to the designated Noise Waiver Area on the Wind Resources Map. These changes do not result in identification of new or more severe environmental impacts, nor do these changes result in feasible mitigation or avoidance measures identified but rejected.

In Chapter 4.0, Project Alternatives, a solar alternative was added in response to comments received during the Planning Commission hearing held on May 11, 2012. This alternative would allow solar projects rather than wind turbine projects. The alternative was considered but rejected because it would not accomplish most of the project objectives. The change does not result in identification of new or more severe environmental impacts, nor does the change result in feasible mitigation or avoidance measures identified but rejected.

### **Mitigation Measures**

The Final EIR includes the addition of two mitigation measures listed below. These additional mitigation measures do not result in identification of new or more severe environmental impacts, nor do the changes result in feasible mitigation or avoidance measures identified but rejected.

- M-BIO-3** All ministerial permits for small wind turbines will include a notice to the permittee explicitly stating that additional state and federal regulations may apply to the construction and operation of the wind turbine including, but not limited to, U.S. Endangered Species Act, the California Endangered Species Act, and the California Fish and Game Code related to Lake and Streambed Alteration.
- M-BIO-4** A joint evaluation between the County of San Diego, the California Department of Fish and Game, and the US Fish and Wildlife Service of the permitted small turbines will be conducted five years after the ordinance goes into effect and after the first 100 small wind turbines are permitted. These evaluations will summarize where the majority of turbines are located, how many are roof-mounted, how many are vertical axis, what the average height is, etc.

**CONCLUSION:** Modifications to the Draft EIR for inclusion in the Final EIR do not constitute “significant new information” as defined in Section 15088.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines. The modifications as discussed above and provided in the Summary of Changes in Appendix F of the Final EIR do not show: (1) new significant environmental impacts from the Project or from new mitigation measures; (2) a substantial increase in the severity of environmental impacts; (3) feasible project alternatives or mitigation measures considerably different from others previously analyzed that would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but which the Project proponents decline to adopt; or (4) that the Draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded. As such, the County’s decision not to recirculate the EIR would not deprive the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment on substantial adverse effects or feasible mitigation measures or alternatives. The revisions in the Final EIR, therefore, do not require recirculation of the document.



# **Environmental Findings**

## **Attachment H-3**

### **Decision and Explanation Regarding Recirculation of the Draft Environmental Impact Report General Plan Update**

**DECISION AND EXPLANATION REGARDING RECIRCULATION  
OF THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT  
GENERAL PLAN UPDATE  
SCH # 2002111067**

Pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15088.5(a), the County of San Diego is required to recirculate a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) when significant new information is added to the Draft EIR after public review of the Draft EIR, but before certification. Significant new information can include changes in the project or environmental setting, as well as additional data or other information. New information added to a Draft EIR is not significant unless the Draft EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including feasible alternatives) that the project's proponents have declined to implement.

**BACKGROUND:** The County prepared a Draft EIR for the General Plan Update and circulated the Draft EIR for public review from July 1, 2009 to August 31, 2009. The County received numerous comments, some of which stated that the County should add more information to the Draft EIR. Responses to all comments received during the public review period were prepared and are included in Volume III of the Final EIR.

In response to the comments, the County made changes in nearly all sections of the Draft EIR. All modifications were evaluated to determine whether new or more severe impacts were identified, or whether feasible mitigation or avoidance measures were identified but rejected. Subsequent to numerous Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors hearings, the County also added an amendment to the EIR to describe and analyze an additional alternative, which is the Recommended Project. The Recommended Project has substantially less environmental impacts when compared to the Proposed Project that was analyzed in the Draft EIR and is the project alternative presented to the decision makers for consideration.

**DECISION:** The Board of Supervisors has reviewed the changes made to the Draft EIR following public review, and determines that no "significant new information" has been added and therefore, recirculation of the Draft EIR is not required. The following provides an explanation of the modifications made to the Draft EIR.

**EXPLANATION:** CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 states that new information added to a Draft EIR is not significant unless the Draft EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project's proponents have declined to implement. "Significant new information" requiring recirculation includes, for example, a disclosure showing that:

- (1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.
- (2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.
- (3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from the others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but the project's proponents decline to adopt it.

- (4) The Revised Draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

**CHANGES TO THE DRAFT EIR:** A complete summary of changes made to the Draft EIR subsequent to the public review period has been prepared and is included within Volumes III and IV of the Final EIR. While an exhaustive list of changes is not included here, the following provides an explanation of relevant changes to the project description, the environmental impacts analysis, the mitigation measures, and the amendment to the EIR to describe and analyze the Recommended Project. Revisions to the EIR were made in response to comments made during public review and during the numerous hearings on the project. The Recommended project reflects these public comments. The Proposed Project analyzed in the EIR has significantly more impacts than the Recommended Project, therefore the changes to the EIR create no new significant environmental impacts, nor increase the severity of environmental impacts identified in the EIR.

***Changes to the Project Description of the Proposed Project***

In response to comments, the following changes were made to the description of the Proposed Project that was analyzed in the EIR. Changes are shown in ~~strikeout~~/underlined text.

*The following text has been revised under the heading Environmental Setting:*

- Table 1-13 provides the environmental baseline for each issue analyzed in this EIR. The environmental setting for each environmental issue is further explained in the beginning of each section of Chapter 2.0 and in the corresponding technical reports.

The following information has been added under the heading Housing:

- In accordance with State law, the Housing Element is updated every five years.

*The following information has been added under the heading Mobility:*

- When applicable, the Mobility Element road network has been coordinated with adjacent cities and Caltrans to ensure consistency when feasible.

*The following information has been added under the heading Community Plan Updates:*

- The communities proposing comprehensive updates to their community or subregional plans are Bonsall CPA, Pine Valley in the Central Mountain Subregional Planning Area, Borrego Springs in the Desert Subregional Planning Area, Fallbrook CPA, Boulevard and Potrero in the Mountain Empire Subregional Planning Area, the community of Warner Springs in the North Mountain Subregional Planning Area, Ramona CPA, the communities of Elfin Forest/Harmony Grove in the San Dieguito CPA, and Spring Valley CPA. In addition, the communities for which partial community or subregional plan updates were prepared include: Cuyamaca and Descanso in the Central Mountain Subregional Planning Area; Crest/Dehesa Subregional Planning Area; Jamul/Dulzura Subregional Planning Area; Campo/ Lake Morena, Jacumba and Tecate in the Mountain Empire Subregional Planning Area; the community of Palomar Mountain in the North Mountain Subregional Planning Area; Rainbow CPA; San Dieguito CPA; and Valle de Oro CPA. The community plans that are currently being updated are available on the General Plan Update website: <http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu/gpupdate/>

*The following information has been revised under the heading Pipeline Policies:*

- The policy developed for new PAAs and specific plans provides that applications submitted and deemed complete on or before August 6, 2003 ~~July 23, 2003~~ be processed under the provisions of the current General Plan while applications deemed complete after August 6, 2009 ~~July 23, 2003~~ be subject to the provisions of the General

Plan in effect when the project is approved or disapproved. A similar corresponding policy was developed for TMs and TPMs.

*The following information has been added under the heading "Differences with SANDAG Population Model Forecast":*

- Despite the difference in population forecasts between the County's model and SANDAG's model, the higher number provided by SANDAG was incorporated into the environmental analysis for issues where the most important factor in determining impacts was the future population number where appropriate, such as in the Population and Housing section (see Chapter 2.12), because the SANDAG forecast represents the more conservative population forecast.

*The following text has been added under the heading 2030 San Diego RTP:*

- The Regional Arterial System provides critical links to the highway network and serves as alternative routes to the regional highway network. The RAS is identified in Technical Appendix 7, Transportation Evaluation Criteria and Rankings, of the 2030 RTP; however, specific improvements to this network are not included. Planned improvements to the Regional Arterial System are identified in the local circulation elements of the cities and the county. Funding is intended to come from the local jurisdictions; however, as a result of Proposition 42 and the voter-approved \$2,071 per dwelling unit for regional arterials, TransNet funds contribute to the construction of these facilities.

*Table 1-13 was added at the end of the project description to provide the environmental baseline for each subject analyzed in the EIR.*

### **Environmental Analysis Changes**

The Final EIR includes a number of modifications to the analysis of environmental impacts in Chapter 2, Environmental Effects of the Proposed Project, and Chapter 4, Project Alternatives. These changes are associated with comments received during public review of the Draft EIR. The complete list of changes is available in Volume III of the Final EIR. The following notable changes are related to the environmental impacts of the Proposed Project and the alternatives.

*The following change was made to Section 2.1.3.4: Light or Glare (Aesthetics):*

- These CPA and Subregions are the Alpine CPA, Bonsall CPA, Central Mountain Subregion, Crest/Dehesa/Harbrison Canyon/Granite Hills CPA, Desert Subregion, Fallbrook CPA, Jamul/Dulzura CPA, Mountain Empire Subregion, North County Metro Subregion, North Mountain Subregion, and Valley Center CPA. Of particular note is the Tierra Del Sol Observation Site within the Subregion of Mountain Empire and more specifically within the Boulevard planning area. There is an on-going effort to protect the aesthetic and scientific value of this area from light pollution. As described above in Section 2.1.3.3, Issue 3, General Plan Update goals and policies would be implemented to maintain community character, including dark sky communities.

*The following change was made to Section 2.2.3.3: Indirect Conversion of Agricultural Resources:*

- Other indirect effects that would cause the conversion of agricultural resources to non-agricultural uses include various project features such as: 1) the proposed removal of

~~non-contracted lands from County adopted Agricultural Preserves, which would remove a barrier to growth in the vicinity of agricultural operations; 2) the placement of public trails on agricultural lands; and 3) the additional competition for water from proposed residential, commercial, industrial uses. The removal of non-contracted lands from Agricultural Preserves may remove a barrier to growth in the vicinity of existing agricultural operations, thereby resulting in indirect conversion to non-agricultural uses for some areas. Trails adjacent to agricultural lands can result in increased trespassing, theft, and potential disease to crops. For example, trails in avocado orchards can increase exposure to avocado root rot. Although policies within the County Trails Master Plan and the proposed General Plan Update specifically require trails to be placed a certain distance and downhill from orchards to avoid root rot, it is difficult to restrict hikers from veering off established trails and into agricultural areas. Root rot is easily transmitted to avocados because the spores of the disease move naturally through the soil and are spread on horse hoofs and on the shoes of trail users. Project features such as these would indirectly affect the viability of agricultural operations and induce the conversion of agricultural resources to non-agricultural uses. The competition over limited water resources in the region is an escalating issue that particularly affects farmers. Such water supply constraints may indirectly result in the conversion of existing agricultural resources to non-agricultural uses. Additional analysis regarding water supply in the County is included in Section 2.16.3.4, Issue 4: Adequate Water Supplies.~~

*The following change was made to Section 2.4.3.1: Special Status Plant and Wildlife Species*

- Edge effects would occur if blocks of habitat were fragmented. New construction and new roadways would have the potential to fragment habitats. Brush management and trail construction or use can also result in potentially significant edge effects to special status plants and wildlife species and/or their supporting habitats.

*The corrections shown on the next page were made to Table 2.4-1, Total Habitat Impacts by CPA and Subregion:*

CPA/Subregion	Total Acres Impacted
Alpine CPA Total	<u>5,975</u> 5,984
Bonsall CPA Total	<u>6,503</u> 6,510
Central Mountain Subregion Total	<u>4,640</u> 4,644
Pine Valley Total	<u>1,743</u> 1,744
County Islands CPA Total	32
Crest/Dehesa Subregion Total	<u>3,999</u> 4,003
Desert Subregion Total	<u>19,030</u> 19,101
Borrego Springs Total	<u>15,182</u> 15,238
Desert Remainder Total	<u>3,848</u> 3,863
Jamul/Dulzura Subregion Total	<u>12,832</u> 12,862
Julian CPA Total	<u>6,125</u> 6,126
Lakeside CPA Total	<u>6,828</u> 6,838
Lake Morena/Campo Total	<u>4,980</u> 4,909
North County Metro Subregion Total	<u>12,947</u> 12,954
North Mountain Subregion Total	<u>14,390</u> 14,392
North Mountain Remainder Total	<u>12,519</u> 12,524
Otay Subregion Total	<u>3,861</u> 3,864
Pala/Pauma Subregion Total	<u>9,798</u> 9,812
Ramona CPA Total	<u>15,245</u> 15,289
Spring Valley CPA Total	<u>756</u> 757
Valle De Oro CPA Total	<u>1,199</u> 1,200
Valley Center CPA Total	<u>14,259</u> 14,264
Countywide Total	<u>174,750</u> 174,969

The following corrections were made to Table 2.4-2, Total Habitat Impacts by CPA and Subregion:

Habitat Impacted	Total Acres Impacted
Chaparral	<u>55,058</u> 55,053
Field/Pasture	<u>8,410</u> 8,510
Engelmann Oak Woodland	<u>3,261</u> 3,250
Freshwater	<u>420</u> 424
Montane Chaparral	<u>414</u> 418
Alkali Seep	<u>340</u> 343
Disturbed Wetland	<u>60</u> 243
Desert Dunes	<u>74</u> 127

The following corrections were made to Table 2.4-4, Total Impacts to Riparian Vegetation Communities:

Vegetation Community Impacted	Total Acres Impacted
Freshwater	<u>420</u> 424
Alkali Seep	<u>340</u> 343
Disturbed Wetland	<u>60</u> 243
Countywide Total	<u>10,131</u> 10,324

The following addition was made to Section 2.5.3.1: Historical Resources:

- Impacts to communities with high concentrations of historic resources, and communities that have been surveyed for historic resources are at risk for direct and indirect impacts from development. To minimize impacts to historic resources, each Community Plan will include in the Conservation Section, a listing of historic buildings and sites that are important and significant to that community or, in the case of those with historic surveys, a reference to the survey will be made. All known historic buildings or sites have been flagged so that any permit activity relating to a property having known significant historic sites will be required to undergo additional review by an environmental specialist. All discretionary projects will be subject to a rigorous cultural review with the goal of identifying significant historic sites and conditioning their preservation.

The following change was made to Section 2.7.3.5: Public Airports (Hazards):

- Each of these airports have adopted ALUCPs that guide nearby property owners and local jurisdictions in determining what types of proposed new land uses are appropriate around airports. Brown Field Municipal Airport, located within and operated by the City of San Diego, also has an existing ALUCP whose compatibility requirements affect lands within County jurisdiction.

The following change was made to Section 2.8.3.1: Water Quality Standards and Requirements:

- In addition, the proposed General Plan Update would allow for the development of small lots on septic systems and agricultural operations, which have the potential to contribute nitrate in quantities that degrade water quality and contribute to the continual degradation of existing water quality impacted areas. For some future projects, mitigation could be implemented by providing a water treatment system that reduces impacts to below the MCL. To ensure proper water treatment in accordance with the California Safe Drinking Water Act, the County requires discretionary permits which require treatment to form or merge with a water system regulated by the County Department of Environmental Health (up to 200 service connections) or the State Department of Public Health (greater than 200 service connections). For smaller projects, the ongoing costs of a regulated water system may prove economically infeasible and for projects with less than five service connections, there is no feasible regulated water system category available. In some cases, such as aquifers contaminated with gasoline from a leaking underground fuel tank, the County may not approve projects reliant on groundwater in such areas. Therefore, it is likely there will be specific cases where water quality impacts would be significant and unmitigable.

*The following corrections were made to Section 2.8.3.2: Groundwater Supplies and Recharge:*

- The County General Plan Update Groundwater Study identified 40 11 groundwater basins as potentially experiencing substantial groundwater in storage depletion from build-out of the proposed General Plan Update. These include the Ballena Basin, Barona Basin, Engineer Springs Basin, Guatay Basin, Las Lomas Muertas Basin, Lee Basin, Lyon Basin, Morena South Basin, Pine South Basin, San Felipe South Basin, and Spencer Basin... . Therefore, this would be considered a potentially significant impact. However, it is important to understand that due to the sheer size and complexity of the 1,885 square mile study area, the long-term groundwater availability results (being based on a limited amount of readily available information) are subject to substantial error and uncertainty. Therefore, a conservative approach was mandatory in the study to bias any potential errors towards overestimation of potential impacts. It should further be understood that due to the nature of fractured rock aquifers, impacts to these basins would likely be limited to localized areas of higher groundwater use and do not necessarily extend basin-wide into areas with adequately spaced groundwater users. As discussed below, large quantity/clustered groundwater users identified within these 11 basins are areas where localized groundwater impacts are most likely to occur. Site-specific groundwater investigations would be necessary for future groundwater-dependent projects in these potentially impacted basins to provide specific details of the significance of groundwater impacts that cannot be provided at the screening level scale in which the study was conducted.

*The following change was made to Section 2.15.3.1: Unincorporated County Traffic and LOS Standards:*

- Typically more dispersed and segregated land uses result in greater VMT. VMT data used to evaluate existing conditions and the proposed project was based upon information provided by SANDAG that was derived from the GP Update traffic forecast model. Table 2.15-7 identifies daily VMT for the proposed General Plan Update. Any analysis of this data also needs to consider the associated population, which directly impacts the number of vehicles and vehicle trips. When compared to the existing VMT of 15,922,149, the proposed project would result in 9,448,742 additional VMT, which is approximately a 60 percent increase in VMT as compared to the existing condition. ~~Under implementation of the proposed project, the northwestern communities are projected to result in 13,844,846 VMT, southwestern communities are projected to result in 8,507,893 VMT, and eastern communities would result in 3,018,152 VMT for a total proposed VMT of 25,370,891. The northwestern communities would experience more than half of all total VMT. Planning areas that are projected to have the highest VMT include: Pendleton/De Luz CPA (3,799,101 VMT), North County Metro Subregion (2,815,934 VMT), Fallbrook CPA (2,373,498 VMT), Lakeside CPA (2,183,047 VMT), and Bonsall CPA (2,087,790 VMT).~~

*The following changes were made to Section 2.15.3.2: Adjacent Cities Traffic and LOS Standards*

- The Cities of Carlsbad, Del Mar, El Cajon, Encinitas, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, National City, Oceanside, Poway, ~~San Diego~~, San Marcos, Santee, Solana Beach and Vista utilize the SANTEC/ITE Guidelines for Traffic Impact Studies (TIS) in the San Diego Region (Amended February 2004) as the basis for defining project impacts. These thresholds are generally based upon an acceptable increase in the V/C ratio for roadway segments. Table 2.15-23 summarizes the impact significance thresholds as identified by the SANTEC/ITE Guidelines.

The following three ~~two~~ jurisdictions have modified requirements from those stated in Table 2.15-23.

The City of San Diego considers D to be the acceptable LOS for freeways, roadways and intersections, except in undeveloped locations where LOS C is considered to be acceptable. The City of San Diego uses the same thresholds identified in Table 2.15-23, SANTEC/ITE Measures of Significant Project Traffic Impacts, for projects resulting in LOS E. However, the City of San Diego applies the following thresholds for projects resulting in LOS F: 1) freeways are allowed up to a 0.005 change in V/C or 0.5 mph; 2) roadways are allowed up to a 0.01 change in V/C or 0.5 mph; 3) intersections are allowed a 1.0 second delay; and 4) ramp meters are allowed a 1.0 second delay.

*The following revisions were made to Table 2.15-16, Existing Conditions Roadway LOS by Jurisdiction:*

Roadway	Segment	Cross-Section	Capacity (LOS E)	ADT	LOS
San Diego					
Airway Rd	Michael Faraday Dr to SR-905	2-lane Collector	<del>10,000</del> <u>9,000</u>	6,600	C
Siempre Viva Rd	La Media Rd to SR-905-125	6-lane Major Arterial	50,000	10,900	A
	SR-905 125 to Enrico Fermi Dr	4-lane Major Arterial	40,000	19,400	<u>B</u> A

General Notes:

**Bold** letters indicate substandard LOS.

CLTL = Continuous left-turn lane.

Note 1: The segment of Siempre Viva Road between La Media Rd and Avenida Costa Brava/Melksee Street is not currently constructed to a 6-lane major arterial, and would have a LOS E capacity of 22,500 ADT, resulting in an acceptable LOS B along this segment.

Source: Wilson and Company 2009a

*The following changes were made to Section 2.16.3.4: Adequate Water Supplies (Utilities):*

- For these reasons, it is unlikely this alternative would be feasibly implemented by SDCWA. However, SDCWA and other local and regional water agencies are is currently implementing increased short-term and long-term water conservation measures to overcome water shortage obstacles and increase water supplies. For example, SDCWA has implemented a number of short-term conservation strategies, which include limiting irrigation of landscaping to certain days; prohibiting the washing down of paved surfaces; regulating individual car washing procedures; requiring the use of recycled or non-potable water during construction; prohibiting the use of ornamental fountains that do not utilize recycled water; and regulating restaurant and hotel operations.

Long-term water conservation strategies occur on both local and regional levels and are outlined in respective UWMPs, IRPs, Drought Management Plans and Regional IRWMPs.

Additionally, in 2008, Governor Schwarzenegger created a new State water conservation goal to achieve a 20 percent reduction in per capita water use statewide by 2020. To achieve this goal, the Governor created a "20 x 2020 Agency Team on Water Conservation" with the focus of developing a Water Conservation Plan to achieve this water conservation goal. Several agencies will help the 20 x 2020 Agency Team on Water Conservation create the Water Conservation Plan, including: the DWR, the SWRCB, the California Energy Commission, the Department of Public Health, the California Public Utilities Commission, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the California Water Conservation Council. In addition to the creation of a Water Conservation Plan, the Governor has identified the following existing long-term water conservation tools that water users and water agencies may use to achieve the 20 percent reduction in per capita water use statewide by 2020 (SWRCB 2010):

The California Water Plan. The latest update published in 2005 provides a strategic plan for water management, laying the foundation for water conservation and other resource management activities.

Bond funding. There is grant funding (Proposition 50 and Proposition 84) available to help agencies and regions plan and implement water management programs.

Access to funds. A new law enacted in 2007, Assembly Bill (AB) 1420, requires most water agencies to implement a series of water conservation measures in order to be eligible for water management grant funds.

Efficiency standards. Showerheads, faucets, toilets, and clothes washers are all more water-efficient because California has led the nation in establishing strong standards. New laws will require even more efficient toilets in the future, new standards for irrigation controllers are planned, and other new building and appliance standards are possible in the future.

New programs and tools. The California DWR is working on programs that will help communities and customers conserve water. A Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance was developed in 2009 that local governments can adopt as their own. Landscape conservation offers more potential savings than any other single conservation measure. Also, DWR is upgrading the California Irrigation Management Information System, a network of automated weather stations around the State that measure how much water landscapes or crops need. System upgrades will enable the system to communicate with a new generation of automated irrigation controllers.

Collaboration. Hundreds of water agencies, environmental organizations, and others work together under the banner of the California Urban Water Conservation Council (CUWCC). Since 1991, this organization has set voluntary standards for conservation programs. CUWCC's approach and standards ensure that California conservation programs are cost-effective and achieve the required savings.

Regulatory protection. The SWRCB is entrusted with the responsibility to ensure beneficial use of water in California and prevent waste and unreasonable use.

Although there are many long-term water conservation programs and plans that currently exist, it is likely new programs and approaches would be developed (outside of the 20 x 2020 Agency Team Water Conservation Plan) to meet the Governor's target and help ensure water supply reliability. For example, the California Public Utilities Commission is conducting several water conservation/efficiency pilots to determine associated energy savings pairing water and energy utilities' programs. The option of curtailing development (i.e., no project alternative) in the unincorporated County in locations where sufficient water is potentially not available at build-out would be the responsibility of the County, which has the land use authority to approve or deny proposed development projects.

*The following change was made to Section 2.17.3.2: Potential Effects of Global Climate Change on the General Plan Update:*

- Experts generally conclude that rainfall will continue to vary widely from year to year, leaving San Diego County highly vulnerable to drought. The changes in climate would have the potential to impact future development under the General Plan Update because the majority of the unincorporated County is located inland, where more extreme temperature increases are expected. Therefore, the unincorporated County would be vulnerable to potential drought, wildfires, and public health risks resulting from changes in climate in the County, as described below.

*The following change was also made to Section 2.17.3.2: Potential Effects of Global Climate Change on the General Plan Update:*

- Wetlands and estuaries could be devastated, leaving beaches exposed to more pollutants that endanger human and marine life. While most of the unincorporated County is located inland and would not be directly impacted by sea level rise, future development under the General Plan Update in the San Dieguito CPA would have the potential to be at risk for flooding because of its proximity to the coast. The coastal area of the Pendleton/De Luz CPA would also be at risk for flooding associated with sea level rise; however, this area is within the jurisdiction of USMC Camp Pendleton, not the County of San Diego.

*The following was added to Section 2.17.3.2: Potential Effects of Global Climate Change on the General Plan Update:*

- *Water Quality*  
Increased temperatures and changes in precipitation patterns can also affect the quality of water supplies (EPA 2009a). For example, changes in runoff patterns can result in additional pollution and sedimentation in surface waters; and changes in evaporation rates or sea level rise can increase salinity within freshwater bodies and within groundwater basins.

As discussed in Section 2.8.1.4, Water Quality, increased pollutants can lead to contaminated drinking water for humans and animals, potentially leading to adverse public health issues. Moreover, excessive sedimentation can adversely affect aquatic organisms, hinder photosynthesis, and disrupt lifecycle and behavioral activities of wildlife.

*The following changes were made to Section 4.2.2.4: Hybrid Map Alternative - Biological Resources:*

- This As shown in Table 4-8, this alternative would result in an estimated 157,139 acres of direct impacts to habitats that would have the potential to support special status plant and wildlife species, compared to 174,638 175,144 acres under the proposed project (DPLU GIS 2008). The most substantial reductions in direct impacts to habitat would occur for chaparral (5,981 acres), coastal sage scrub (2,348 acres), red shank chaparral (1,610 acres), Engelmann oak woodland (1,263 acres), and coast live oak woodland (1,178 acres). Additionally, this alternative would result in fewer indirect impacts to special status species because it would accommodate fewer commercial, industrial, and high density residential land uses, which are associated with intensive nighttime lighting and noise, both of which can adversely affect wildlife species.

*The following changes were made to Section 4.2.2.8: Hybrid Map Alternative – Groundwater Supplies and Recharge:*

- When compared to the proposed project, the Hybrid Map would reduce total housing within outside the SDCWA service area by 4,484 2,217 dwelling units (see Table 4-6). ~~and would accommodate 1,165 additional homes outside the SDCWA boundary.~~ Therefore, the Hybrid Map would result in a greater lesser impact to groundwater ~~because it would accommodate a greater proportion of growth in groundwater dependent areas. As such, impacts would be greater as compared to the proposed project.~~ Impacts would be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 would be required.

*The following changes were made to Section 4.2.2.16: Hybrid Map Alternative – Wastewater Treatment Requirements:*

- The Hybrid Map Alternative would accommodate a lower population in the SDCWA boundary than the proposed project (4,484 1,102 fewer residential units) and would result in a reduced demand for wastewater treatment services within the SDCWA. This alternative would also result in an decreased increased demand for wastewater treatments services in areas dependent on septic systems ~~rather than existing wastewater treatment facilities (1,165 additional 2,217 fewer residential units).~~ However Therefore, overall demand for wastewater treatment would decrease under this alternative ~~because it would have 3,000 fewer residential units total compared to the proposed project and impacts would be lessened.~~

*The following changes were made to Section 4.2.2.16: Hybrid Map Alternative – New Water and Wastewater Facilities:*

- As shown in Table 4-6, when compared to the proposed project, the Hybrid Map Alternative would reduce total housing within the SDCWA service area by 4,484 1,102 dwelling units. ~~The Hybrid Map Alternative would result in a lesser concentration of housing in areas with existing infrastructure, which would result in an increased need for new water or wastewater facilities to be constructed to meet future demands. Therefore, impacts would be greater as compared to the proposed project. Therefore, overall impacts related to water and wastewater treatment facilities would decrease under this alternative because demand would be lower than for the proposed project.~~

*The following changes were made to Section 4.2.2.16: Hybrid Map Alternative – Adequate Wastewater Facilities:*

- As shown in Table 4-6, when compared to the proposed project, the Hybrid Map Alternative would reduce housing within the SDCWA member agency service area by 4,484 1,102 dwelling units. Therefore, impacts related to adequate wastewater facilities would be reduced under this alternative because demand for wastewater facilities within the SDCWA boundary would be lessened. This alternative would ~~increase~~ also decrease impacts to wastewater service providers outside of the SDCWA boundaries and impacts to areas dependent on septic systems because this alternative proposes ~~1,165~~ 2,217 ~~additional~~ fewer residential units outside the SDCWA boundary. ~~However, the Hybrid Map Alternative would have less development throughout the unincorporated County (3,000 fewer residential units) and would reduce overall demand for wastewater facilities.~~

*The following changes were made to Section 4.3.2.4: Draft Land Use Map Alternative – Biological Resources:*

- Impacts to special status plant and wildlife species, riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities, federally protected wetlands, wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites, local policies and ordinances, and HCPs and NCCPs would be similar to those discussed for the Hybrid Map Alternative but to a lesser degree because of the overall decrease in development. As shown in Table 4-8 ~~For comparison purposes,~~ the Draft Land Use Map Alternative would impact approximately ~~22,858~~ 23,364 fewer acres of sensitive natural habitats potentially supporting special status plant and wildlife species, ~~833~~ 1,016 fewer acres of riparian habitat, and 121 fewer total acres of federally protected wetlands than the proposed project.

*The following changes were made to Section 4.3.2.8: Draft Land Use Map Alternative – Hydrology and Water Quality:*

- When compared to the proposed project, the Draft Land Use Map would reduce total housing within the SDCWA service area by 4,777 1,004 dwelling units (see Table 4-6) and would ~~increase~~ also decrease development outside of the SDCWA boundary by 4,165 2,736 residential units. Therefore, the Draft Land Use Map would result in a ~~greater~~ lesser impact to groundwater because it would ~~more~~ result in less growth in groundwater dependent areas.

*The following changes were made to Section 4.3.2.16: Draft Land Use Map Alternative – Utilities and Service Systems:*

- The Draft Land Use Map Alternative would accommodate a lower population than the proposed project within the SDCWA boundary (4,777 1,004 fewer residential units) and would accommodate ~~1,040 additional~~ 2,736 fewer residential units outside of the SDCWA boundary. ~~However~~ Therefore, overall impacts related to wastewater treatment requirements and adequate wastewater facilities would decrease under this alternative ~~because it proposes 3,700 fewer total residential units than the proposed project.~~ Therefore and impacts would be lessened as compared to the proposed project.

*The following changes were made to Section 4.4.2.2: Environmentally Superior Map Alternative – Agricultural Resources:*

- It is unlikely that impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance; thus, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Similar to the proposed project, implementation of the proposed Environmentally Superior Map Alternative would remove the agricultural preserve designator from any lands not currently under Williamson Act Contract. The removal of the agricultural preserve designator would potentially result in a conflict with existing Williamson Act Contracts or the provisions of the Williamson Act. This is because the Environmentally Superior Map would remove non-contracted lands from County-adopted Agricultural Preserves and would also remove the “A” designator from these lands. By removing lands from a preserve at the boundary of a Contract area, new incompatible land uses could be developed adjacent to existing agricultural resources. Similar to the proposed project, this would be considered a potentially significant land use conflict to Williamson Act Contract lands. Implementation of the proposed Environmentally Superior Map Alternative would also potentially result in a conflict with existing Williamson Act Contracts or with existing agricultural zoning.

*The following changes were made to Section 4.4.2.4: Environmentally Superior Map Alternative – Biological Resources:*

- ~~For comparison purposes~~ As shown in Table 4-8, the Environmentally Superior Map Alternative would impact approximately 51,094 ~~51,592~~ fewer acres of sensitive natural habitats potentially supporting special status plant and wildlife species, 2,522 ~~2,702~~ fewer acres of riparian habitat, and 404 fewer total acres of federally protected wetlands than the proposed project.

*The following changes were made to Section 4.4.2.8: Environmentally Superior Map Alternative – Hydrology and Water Quality:*

- When compared to the proposed project, the Environmentally Superior Map Alternative would reduce total housing within the SDCWA service area by ~~8,946~~ 7,182 dwelling units (see Table 4-6) and decrease development outside the SDCWA boundary by ~~5,755~~ 7,531 dwelling units.

*The following changes were made to Section 4.4.2.16: Environmentally Superior Map Alternative – Utilities and Service Systems:*

- The Environmentally Superior Map Alternative would accommodate a lower population than the proposed project within the SDCWA boundary (~~8,946~~ 7,182 fewer residential units) and outside of the SDCWA boundary (~~5,755~~ 7,531 fewer residential units).

*Table 4-6, Comparison of Alternatives - Projected Housing within the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) Service Area, was deleted and replaced with the table shown on the next page:*

Table 4-6. Comparison of Alternatives – Projected Housing within the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) Service Area<sup>(1)</sup>

	<u>Proposed Project</u>	<u>Hybrid Map Alternative</u>	<u>Draft Land Use Map Alternative</u>	<u>Environmentally Superior Map Alternative</u>	<u>No Project Alternative</u>
<u>Units Inside SDCWA</u>	<u>54,742</u>	<u>53,640</u>	<u>53,738</u>	<u>47,560</u>	<u>55,634</u>
<u>Units Outside SDCWA</u>	<u>23,664</u>	<u>21,447</u>	<u>20,928</u>	<u>16,133</u>	<u>57,766</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>78,406</u>	<u>75,087</u>	<u>74,666</u>	<u>63,693</u>	<u>113,400</u>

<sup>(1)</sup> Note: For the purpose of this analysis, the SDCWA service area is considered to include unincorporated areas that import water supplies from SDCWA.

In addition, two tables were added to Chapter 4.0, Project Alternatives: Table 4-7, Comparison of Alternatives – Future Housing Units by CPA and Subregion; and Table 4-8, Comparison of Alternatives – Habitat Impacts.

### **Changes to Mitigation Measures**

The Final EIR includes a number of additions and modifications to the mitigation sections within each subject area in Chapter 2, Environmental Effects of the Proposed Project. The changes are also reflected in Chapter 7, Mitigation Measures. These changes are in response to comments received during public review of the Draft EIR. The complete list of changes is available in Volume III of the Final EIR. The following is a list of substantive changes made with regard to mitigation measures. None of these changes would result in a new significant environmental impact

### **General Plan Policies**

*General Plan Policy LU-2.2 was added to Section 7.1.1.2: Visual Character or Quality (Aesthetics, as follows:*

- Policy LU-2.2: Relationship of Community Plans to the General Plan. Community Plans are part of the General Plan. These plans focus on a particular region or community within the overall General Plan area. They are meant to refine the policies of the General Plan as they apply to a smaller geographic region and provide a forum for resolving local conflicts. As legally required by State law, Community Plans must be internally consistent with General Plan goals and policies of which they are a part. They cannot undermine the policies of the General Plan. Community Plans are subject to adoption, review and amendment by the Board of Supervisors in the same manner as the General Plan.

*General Plan Policy COS-13.3 was added to Section 7.1.1.4: Light or Glare (Aesthetics), as follows:*

- Policy COS-13.3: Collaboration to Retain Night Skies. Coordinate with adjacent federal and State agencies, local jurisdictions, and tribal governments to retain the quality of night skies by minimizing light pollution.

*General Plan Policy COS-7.3 has been revised as follows in Section 7.1.5.2: Archaeological Resources (Cultural Resources) as follows:*

- Policy COS-7.3: Archaeological Collections. Require the appropriate treatment and preservation of archaeological collections in a culturally appropriate manner. Require all collections to be placed in a local curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79, with the exception of those required by law to be repatriated.

*General Plan Policy COS-7.5 has been revised as follows under Section 7.1.5.4: Human Remains (Cultural Resources) as follows:*

- Policy COS-7.5: Treatment of Human Remains. Require human remains be treated with the utmost dignity and respect and that the disposition and handling of human remains will be done in consultation with the Most Likely Descendant (MLD) and under the requirements of Federal, State and County Regulations.

*General Plan Policies LU-4.7 and M-7.1 have been added under Section 7.1.7.5: Public Airports (Hazards) as follows:*

- Policy LU-4.7: Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans (ALUCP). Coordinate with the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) and support review of Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans (ALUCP) for development within Airport Influence Areas.
- Policy M-7.1: Meeting Airport Needs. Operate and improve airport facilities to meet air transportation needs in a manner that adequately considers impacts to environmental resources and surrounding communities and to ensure consistency with Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans.

*General Plan Policy COS-18.3 has been added under Section 7.1.7.8: Wildland Fires (Hazards) as follows:*

- Policy COS-18.3: Alternative Energy Systems Impacts. Require alternative energy system operators to properly design and maintain these systems to minimize adverse impacts to the environment.

*General Plan Policy LU-14.4 has been revised under Section 7.1.8.1: Water Quality Standards and Requirements (Hydrology and Water Quality) and under Section 7.1.16.1 Wastewater Treatment Requirements (Utilities and Service Systems) as follows:*

- Policy LU-14.4: Sewer Facilities. Prohibit sewer facilities that would induce unplanned growth. Require sewer systems to be planned, developed, and sized to serve the land use pattern and densities depicted on the Land Use Map. Sewer systems and services shall not be extended beyond either Village boundaries or (extant Urban Limit Lines), whichever is more restrictive, except:
  - When necessary for public health, safety, or welfare;
  - When within existing sewer district boundaries;
  - When necessary for a conservation subdivision adjacent to existing sewer facilities; or
  - Where specifically allowed in the Community Plan.

The proposed revisions to Policy LU-14.4 are not considered to result in additional impacts. While the policy allows for sewer services in more areas, it does not allow for any increase in development, merely that the development would allow for smaller lot sizes. The revised policy language would still require that the sewer services being provided are sized only for the development included in the project application. This would prevent the provision of these services from contributing to unplanned growth in other areas. In addition, allowing for sewer services in conservation subdivisions would facilitate their implementation by allowing for smaller lot sizes so that more open space can be protected and environmental constraints can be avoided. Also, although most new development that is supported by sewer services can include smaller lots sizes, the Residential Subdivision Design Guidelines being prepared to implement the General Plan Update serve as a mitigation measure and would contribute to ensuring that any new development is consistent with community character.

*General Plan Policy LU-8.2 has been revised under Section 7.1.8.2: Groundwater Supplies and Recharge (Hydrology and Water Quality) and under Section 7.1.16.4: Adequate Water Supplies (Utilities and Service Systems) as follows:*

- Policy LU-8.2: Groundwater Resources. Require development to identify adequate groundwater resources in groundwater dependent areas, as follows:
  - In areas dependent on currently identified groundwater overdrafted basins, prohibit new development from exacerbating overdraft conditions. Encourage programs to alleviate overdraft conditions in Borrego Valley.
  - In areas without current overdraft groundwater conditions, ~~prohibit~~ evaluate new groundwater-dependent development to assure a sustainable long-term supply of groundwater is available that will not adversely impact existing groundwater users where overdraft conditions are foreseeable
  - ~~A groundwater basin is considered in an overdraft condition when, during average conditions over a number of years, the amount of water being withdrawn from the basin exceeds the amount of water that recharges the basin.~~

*General Plan Policies S-9.4 and S-9.5 have been revised under Section 7.1.8.6: Housing within a 100-year Flood Hazard Area and 7.1.8.7: Impeding or Redirecting Flood Flows (Hydrology and Water Quality) as follows:*

- Policy S-9.4: Development in Villages. Allow new uses and development within the floodplain fringe (land within the floodplain outside of the floodway) only when environmental impacts and hazards are mitigated. This policy does not apply to floodplains with unmapped floodways. Require land available outside the floodplain to be fully utilized before locating development within a floodplain. Development within a floodplain may be denied if it will cause significant adverse environmental impacts or is prohibited in the community plan. Channelization of floodplains is allowed within villages only when specifically addressed in community plans.
- Policy S-9.5: Development in the Floodplain Fringe. Prohibit development in the floodplain fringe when located on Semi-Rural and Rural Lands to maintain the capacity of the floodplain, unless specifically allowed in a community plan. For parcels located entirely within a floodplain or without sufficient space for a building pad outside the floodplain, development is limited to a single family home on an existing lot or those uses that do not compromise the environmental attributes of the floodplain or require further channelization.

~~This policy shall not apply when the lot is entirely within the floodplain or when sufficient land for development on a project site is not available and where clustering is not feasible to minimize encroachment on floodplains. In these instances, require development to minimize impacts to the capacity of the floodplain.~~

*Note: Sections 2.8.3.6 and 2.8.3.7 of the EIR analyze the potential impacts within a floodplain or floodplain fringe based on the project land use map prior to mitigation. Policy S-9.5 was identified as helping to reduce impacts by limiting development in a floodplain fringe except in certain circumstances where avoidance is infeasible. The language of the policy was further modified in the Safety Element and Final EIR to note that floodplain fringe development allowed in a community plan would also not be prohibited. This change was made to recognize that a few community plans already had non-residential uses, such as recreational facilities, proposed within a floodplain fringe. As such, this modification ensures there will not be a conflict between the Safety Element and certain community plans. However, this policy change does not change the scope of impacts as analyzed in the Draft and Final EIR, nor does it change the specific mitigation measures that still apply to all such development and reduce potential impacts to below significant. Those mitigation measures are: Hyd-1.2, Hyd-1.5, Hyd-2.5, Hyd-4.1, Hyd-4.2, Hyd-4.3, and Hyd-6.1*

*General Plan Policies COS-10.1 and COS-1.2 have been revised as follows under Sections 7.1.10.1 Mineral Resource Availability and 7.1.10.2: Mineral Resource Recovery Sites (Mineral Resources) as follows:*

- Policy COS-10.1: Siting of Development. Encourage the conservation (i.e., protection from incompatible land uses) of areas that designated as having substantial potential for mineral extraction. Discourage development that would substantially preclude the future development of mining facilities in these areas. Design development or uses to minimize the potential conflict with existing or potential future mining facilities. For purposes of this policy, incompatible land uses are defined by SMARA Section 3675.
- Policy COS-10.2: Protection of State-Classified or Designated Lands. Discourage development or the establishment of other incompatible land uses on or adjacent to areas classified or designated by the State of California as having important mineral resources (MRZ-2), as well as potential mineral lands identified by other government agencies. The potential for the extraction of substantial mineral resources from lands classified by the State of California as areas that contain mineral resources (MRZ-3) shall be considered by the County in making land use decisions.

*General Plan Policy LU-4.9 was added under Section 7.1.11.5: Excessive Noise Exposure from a Public or Private Airport (Noise) as follows:*

- Policy LU-4.9: Airport Compatibility. Assure the noise compatibility of any development projects that may be affected by noise from public or private airports and helipads during project review by coordinating, as appropriate, with appropriate agencies such as the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (SDCRAA) and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA).

*General Plan Policy COS-21.3 has been revised Under Section 7.1.14.2: Construction of New Recreational Facilities (Recreation) as follows*

- Policy COS-21.3: Park Design. Design parks that reflect community character and identity, incorporate local natural and cultural landscapes and features, and consider the surrounding land uses and urban form and cultural and historic resources.

*General Plan Policy M-2.1 has been revised under Section 7.1.15.1: Unincorporated County Traffic and Level of Service Standards (Transportation and Traffic) as follows:*

- Policy M-2.1: Level of Service Criteria. Require development projects to provide associated road improvements necessary to achieve a level of service of "D" or higher on all Mobility Element roads except for those where a failing level of service has been accepted by the County pursuant to the criteria specifically identified in the accompanying text box (Criteria for Accepting a Road Classification with Level of Service E/F). When development is proposed on roads where a failing level of service has been accepted, require feasible mitigation in the form of road improvements or a fair share contribution to a road improvement program, consistent with the Mobility Element road network.

*General Plan Policy M-8.1 has been revised under Section 7.1.15.6: Alternative Transportation (Transportation and Traffic) as follows:*

- Policy M-8.1: Maximize Transit Service for Transit-Dependent Populations Opportunities. Coordinate with SANDAG, the CTSA, NCTD, and MTS to provide capital facilities and funding, where appropriate, to:
  - Maximize opportunities for transit services in unincorporated communities
  - Maximize the speed and efficiency of transit service through the development of transit priority treatments such as transit signal priority, transit queue jump lanes, and dedicated transit only lanes
  - Provide for transit-dependent segments of the population, such as the disabled, seniors, low income, and children, where possible
  - Reserve adequate rights-of-way to accommodate existing and planned transit facilities including bus stops

*General Plan Policy LU-1.2 under Section 7.1.16.2: New Water and Wastewater Facilities (Utilities and Services Systems) has been revised as follows:*

- Policy LU-1.24: Leapfrog Development. Prohibit leapfrog development which is inconsistent with the Community Development Model ~~and Community Plans~~. Leapfrog Development restrictions do not apply to new villages that are designed to be consistent with the Community Development Model, that provide necessary services and facilities, and that are designed to meet the LEED-Neighborhood Development Certification or an equivalent. For purposes of this policy, leapfrog development is defined as village densities located away from established Villages or outside established water and sewer service boundaries. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]

*General Plan Policy COS-17.1 under Section 7.1.16.6 Sufficient Landfill Capacity (Utilities and Services Systems) has been revised as follows:*

- Policy COS-17.1: Reduction of Solid Waste Materials. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and future landfill capacity needs through reduction, reuse, or recycling of all types of solid waste that is generated. Divert solid waste from landfills in compliance with State law. ~~The California Integrated Waste Management Act (AB 939) that requires each local jurisdiction in the state to divert at least 50 percent of its solid waste from being placed into landfills~~

*General Plan Policy COS-10.7 was added under Section 7.1.17.1: Compliance with AB 32 (Climate Change) as follows:*

- COS-10.7: Recycling of Debris. Encourage the installation and operation of construction and demolition (C&D) debris recycling facilities as an accessory use at permitted (or otherwise authorized) mining facilities to increase the supply of available mineral resources.

### **Mitigation Measures**

*Mitigation Measure Aes-3.2 was added to Section 7.2.2.3: Visual Character or Quality (Aesthetic Resources) as follows:*

- Aes-3.2 Implement existing and prepare new community right-of-way development standards, as appropriate, that supplement the County road standards in order to recognize the unique constraints and character of different communities.

*Mitigation Measure Aes-4.3 was added Section 7.2.2.4: Light or Glare (Aesthetic Resources) as follows:*

- Aes-4.3 Participate in regional planning and planning by agencies operating within or adjacent to the County to the extent practicable. This includes participation in SANDAG and other regional planning forums, reviewing and commenting on planning and environmental documents issued by other agencies, and ongoing collaboration with Native American tribes and adjacent jurisdictions.

*Mitigation Measures Cul-1.7 and Cul-1.8 were added to Section 7.2.5.1: Historical Resources (Cultural Resources) as follows:*

- Cul-1.7 Identify potentially historic structures within the County and enter the information in the Department of Planning and Land Use property database. Identification will occur by compiling information from all available sources (e.g., County surveys, Historic Site Board, information received from SOHO and community planning groups, information from other jurisdictions, etc.) and shall be updated at least every five years.
- Cul-1.8 Revise the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) to apply to the demolition or alteration of identified significant historic structures.

*Mitigation Measures Cul-2.5 and Cul-2.6 were added to Section 7.2.5.2: Archaeological Resources (Cultural Resources) as follows:*

- Cul-2.5 Protect undiscovered subsurface archaeological resources by requiring grading monitoring by a qualified archaeologist and a Native American monitor for all ground disturbing activities, and also, when feasible, during initial surveys.
- Cul-2.6 Protect significant cultural resources by facilitating the identification and acquisition of important resources through regional coordination with agencies, and institutions, such as the South Coast Information Center (SCIC) and consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and local tribal governments, including SB-18 review, while maintaining the confidentiality of sensitive cultural information.

*Mitigation Measure Min-1.2 has been revised as follows in Sections 7.2.10.1 Mineral Resource Availability and 7.2.10.2: Mineral Resource Recovery Sites (Mineral Resources):*

- Min-1.2 Revise and update the County ordinances to designate areas of known importance for mineral resources as follows:
  - Update the Zoning Ordinance with the addition of a Mining Compatibility Designator or Overlay that identifies parcels with a high potential for mineral resources. The purpose is to take into account the potential mineral resources not to preclude the potential mining use. ~~place land use restrictions on areas in the vicinity of extractive uses to ensure incompatible uses do not impede mining operations.~~ In addition, specify that notification of potential mining use is provided to all parcels within a 1,500 foot radius of parcels with a Mining Compatibility Designator/Overlay.
  - Revise the Zoning Ordinance to facilitate recycling of salvaged concrete, asphalt, and rock by allowing this activity to occur by right at permitted mining facilities.
  - Revise the Zoning Ordinance and Grading Ordinance to authorize surface mining operations with a Surface Mining Permit rather than a MUP. Incorporate findings of approval that reflect Mineral Compatibility Designator, SMARA Sections 2762 and 2763, and the inherent nature of surface mining operations. Parcels with a high potential for mineral resources could include those areas designated as MRZ-2 or other areas identified as containing mineral resources that are located where a sufficient buffer is available so that extraction activities are feasible.

*Mitigation Measure Noi-5.1 has been revised as follows in Section 7.2.11.5: Excessive Noise Exposure from a Public or Private Airport (Noise):*

- Noi-5.1 Use the applicable Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan's (ALUCP) as guidance/reference during development review of projects that are planned within an Airport Influence Area (AIA). Any projects that are within the AIA shall be submitted to the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (SDCRAA) for review. ~~Found incompatible with the Airport Land Use Compatibility noise criteria should~~

*Mitigation Measure Pub-1.9 was added to Section 7.2.13.1: Fire Protection Services (Public Services) as follows:*

- Pub-1.9 Implement procedures to ensure new large development projects fund their fair share toward fire services facilities and explore, and if feasible, establish an impact fee

program or Mello-Roos District for all new development to fund their fair share contribution toward fire service facilities. Large development projects are required to provide their fair share contribution to fire services either by providing additional funds and/or development of infrastructure.

*Mitigation Measure Rec-1.6 has been revised as follows in Section 7.2.14.1: Deterioration of Parks and Recreational Facilities (Recreation):*

- ~~Rec-1.6 Acquire trail routes across private lands through direct purchase, easements, and dedication, or by other means from a willing property owner/seller. Develop an incentive program to e~~ Encourage the voluntary dedication of easements and/or gifts of land for trails through privately-owned lands, including agricultural and grazing lands. ~~Also, develop guidelines for trails in areas with active agricultural operations or active grazing lands that will minimize potential impacts and accommodate operational necessities through proper location, design, construction, and active management.~~

*Mitigation Measure Rec-1.10 was deleted as follows under Section 7.2.14.1: Deterioration of Parks and Recreational Facilities (Recreation). Mitigation Measures Rec-1.11 and Rec-1.12 were renumbered as Rec-1.10 and Rec-1.11, respectively.*

- ~~Rec-1.10 — Develop procedures to discourage non-consenting public use of private trail systems by restricting connections, establishing staging area locations, and promoting trail map publications.~~

*Mitigation Measures Tra-1.5 and Tra-1.6 were deleted as follows under Section 7.2.15.1: Unincorporated County Traffic and Level of Service Standards (Transportation and Traffic). Mitigation Measures Tra-1.7 and Tra-1.8 were renumbered as Tra-1.5 and Tra-1.7, respectively and a new mitigation measure Tra-1.6 was added as follows:*

- ~~Tra-1.5 Revise the Public Road Standards to include standards for the provision of parallel and diagonal on-street parking, according to Regional Category.~~
- ~~Tra-1.6 Revise the Zoning Ordinance to establish parking requirements according to regional category, land use, building size, proximity to transit, and availability of Transportation Demand Management programs. Also consider revising the Zoning Ordinance to reduce off-street parking requirements when on-street parking is provided, especially in villages to encourage pedestrian-oriented design. Also revise the Off-Street Parking Design Manual to include parking placement concepts that encourage pedestrian activity and concepts for providing shared parking facilities.~~
- Tra-1.57 Implement the Congestion Management Strategies identified in the Regional Transportation Plan SANDAG GMP and require large projects to mitigate impacts to the GMP network, including State highways and freeways.
- Tra-1.6 Develop project review procedures to require large commercial and office development to use Transportation Demand Management Programs to reduce single-occupant vehicle traffic generation and to prepare and forward annual reports to the County on the effectiveness of the program.

- Tra-1.78 Implement the San Diego County TIF Ordinance, which defrays the costs of constructing planned transportation facilities necessary to accommodate increased traffic generated by future development.

*Mitigation Measure Tra-5.3 was added to Section 7.2.15.5: Parking Capacity (Transportation and Traffic) as follows:*

- Tra-5.3 Revise the Public Road Standards to include standards for the provision of parallel and diagonal on-street parking, according to Regional Category.

#### ***Amendment to the EIR (Volume IV of the Final EIR)***

In response to comments on the draft General Plan and the Draft EIR, County staff made recommendations to the Planning Commission that differed from the Proposed Project analyzed in the EIR, primarily with respect to the land use map. The Planning Commission considered staff's recommendation along with public testimony and correspondence during nine public hearings which took place on November 6, 2009, November 19, 2009, November 20, 2009, December 4, 2009, February 19, 2010, March 12, 2010, April 16, 2010, July 9, 2010, and August 20, 2010. On August 20, 2010, the Planning Commission made a final recommendation to the County Board of Supervisors. The Planning Commission recommendation was then considered during Board of Supervisors hearings which took place on October 20, 2010, November 10, 2010, December 8, 2010, February 9, 2011, March 16, 2011, and April 13, 2011. On April 13, 2011, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to make specific changes to the Planning Commission recommendation. The directed changes included 58 property-specific changes to the land use map, changes to draft policies and General Plan text, changes to community plans, and changes to ordinances and programs associated with the General Plan Update. County staff incorporated these changes and also modified the land use map to reflect recent changes in public lands ownership and recently approved development projects. The revised recommendation serves as a reduced project alternative called the Recommended Project. Analysis of the Recommended Project Alternative has been included as an amendment to the EIR: Volume IV, Description and Analysis of the Recommended Project. Within the amendment, the Recommended Project is compared to the Proposed Project and evaluated in terms of its environmental impact. As described in EIR Volume IV and the Findings Regarding Significant Effects, the Recommended Project substantially lessens significant environmental impacts when compared to the Proposed Project, the Hybrid Map Alternative, and the Draft Land Use Map Alternative analyzed in the EIR. Moreover, the Recommended Project was prepared through an extensive public hearing process. Therefore, it does not qualify as a change "that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project's proponents have declined to implement."

**CONCLUSION:** Modifications to the Draft EIR for inclusion in the Final EIR do not constitute "significant new information" as defined in Section 15088.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines. The modifications as discussed above and provided in EIR Volumes III and IV do not show: (1) new significant environmental impacts from the Project or from new mitigation measures; (2) a substantial increase in the severity of environmental impacts; (3) feasible project alternatives or mitigation measures considerably different from others previously analyzed that would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but which the Project proponents decline to adopt; or (4) that the Draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and

conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded. As such, the County's decision not to recirculate the EIR would not deprive the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment on substantial adverse effects or feasible mitigation measures or alternatives. The described revisions in the Final EIR therefore do not require recirculation.