

# **Attachment D – Environmental Findings and Documentation**

This page intentionally left blank

# NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

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

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

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

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

Project Name and Number(s): 2013 General Plan Clean-Up General Plan Amendment & Rezone; 3800 12-007; 3600 13-002

State Clearinghouse No.: 2002111067

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

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

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

Agency Approving Project: County of San Diego

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

Date Form Completed: June 18, 2014

This is to advise that the County of San Diego Board of Supervisors has approved the above described project on June 18, 2014, Item # and has made the following determinations:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Date received for filing and posting at OPR: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Telephone: (858) 694-3084

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

This notice must be filed with the Recorder/County Clerk within five working days after project approval by the decision-making body. The Recorder/County Clerk must post this notice within 24 hours of receipt and for a period of not less than 30 days. At the termination of the posting period, the Recorder/County Clerk must return this notice to the Department address listed above along with evidence of the posting period. The originating Department must then retain the returned notice for a period of not less than twelve months. Reference: CEQA Guidelines Section 15075 or 15044.



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

MISCELLANEOUS RECEIPT

Page: 1

RECEIPT #: 11-0673007  
 RECEIPT DATE: 05-JAN-2011  
 CASHIER: CTRIEUPL  
 FROM: COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO  
 COMMENTS: DFG 399113/399054 UPDATE LOG 02-ZA-001

FEE CODE	DESCRIPTION	FEES	PAYMENTS
9FSHGAMEXO	FISH & GAME	\$47.00	
CASHTRANSF	CASH TRANSFER #174288		\$47.00

TOTAL FEES: \$47.00  
 TOTAL PMTS: \$47.00  
 BALANCE: \$0.00  
 RECEIVED: \$47.00  
 CHANGE: \$0.00



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

RECEIPT# 399113  
 STATE CLEARING HOUSE # (if applicable)  
 200211167

SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON REVERSE. TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

LEAD AGENCY: DPLH

COUNTY/STATE AGENCY OF FILING: County of San Diego

PROJECT TITLE: San Diego County General Plan Update, Log # 02-ZA-001

PROJECT APPLICANT NAME: County of San Diego

PROJECT APPLICANT ADDRESS: 5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B CITY: San Diego STATE: CA

PHONE NUMBER: (858) 694-3831 ZIP CODE: 92123

PROJECT APPLICANT (Check appropriate box):  
 Local Public Agency     School District     Other Special District     State Agency     Private Entity

CHECK APPLICABLE FEES: DFG 399054 Paid on 9/3/10

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental Impact Report (EIR)	\$2,792.25	\$ 2,792.25
<input type="checkbox"/> Mitigated/Negative Declaration (ND)(MND)	\$2,010.25	\$ 47.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Application Fee Water Diversion (State Water Resources Control Board Only)	\$850.00	
<input type="checkbox"/> Projects Subject to Certified Regulatory Programs (CRP)	\$949.50	
<input type="checkbox"/> County Administrative Fee	\$50.00	
<input type="checkbox"/> Project that is exempt from fees		
<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Exemption		
<input type="checkbox"/> DFG No Effect Determination (Form Attached)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Other		\$ _____

PAYMENT METHOD:  
 Cash     Credit     Check     Other Cash Transfer

TOTAL RECEIVED \$ 2,839.25

SIGNATURE: X TITLE: Cashier



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

**MISCELLANEOUS RECEIPT**

Page: 3

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

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

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



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

RECEIPT# 399054  
 STATE CLEARING HOUSE # (if applicable)  
 200211167

SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON REVERSE. TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

LEAD AGENCY: DPLU DATE: 9/3/10  
 COUNTY/STATE AGENCY OF FILING: County of San Diego DOCUMENT NUMBER:  
 PROJECT TITLE: San Diego County General Plan Update, Log # 02-ZA-001  
 PROJECT APPLICANT NAME: County of San Diego PHONE NUMBER: (858) 694-3831  
 PROJECT APPLICANT ADDRESS: 5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B CITY: San Diego STATE: CA ZIP CODE: 92123  
 PROJECT APPLICANT (Check appropriate box):  
 Local Public Agency     School District     Other Special District     State Agency     Private Entity

CHECK APPLICABLE FEES:

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

PAYMENT METHOD:

- Cash     Credit     Check     Other Cash Transfer

TOTAL RECEIVED \$ 2,792.25

SIGNATURE

X [Signature]

TITLE

Cashier

This page intentionally left blank

**Environmental Findings**  
**2013 General Plan Clean-Up General Plan Amendment and Rezone**  
**GPA 12-007; REZ 13-002**  
**June 18, 2014**

Find that the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) dated August 3, 2011 on file with Planning & Development Services as Environmental Review Number 02-ZA-00 was completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State and County CEQA Guidelines and that the Board of Supervisors has reviewed and considered the information contained therein, and the Addendum thereto dated June 18, 2014 on file with DPLU as Environmental Review Number 13-00-002 before approving the project; and

Find that there are no changes in the project or in the circumstances under which the project is undertaken that involve significant new environmental impacts which were not considered in the previously certified EIR dated August 3, 2011, that there is no substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects, and that no new information of substantial importance has become available since the EIR was certified as explained in the Environmental Review Checklist Form dated June 18, 2014 (Attachment D of the Staff Report).

This page intentionally left blank



**MARK WARDLAW**  
*Director*

**County of San Diego**  
**PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

**DARREN GRETLER**  
*Assistant Director*

5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 110, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92123  
INFORMATION (858) 694-2960  
TOLL FREE (800) 411-0017  
[www.sdcountry.ca.gov/pds](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/pds)

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

**FOR PURPOSES OF CONSIDERATION OF  
THE 2013 GENERAL PLAN CLEAN-UP; GPA 12-007**

**January 24, 2014**

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

**Introduction**

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

**Background**

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

Staff and the Board of Supervisors anticipated that unforeseen inconsistencies and mapping errors, along with changed circumstances, would emerge during plan implementation that would require correction. For minor changes, efficiencies can be achieved by grouping the

changes and processing them in a batch. By adopting a formal approach to such a review, certainties and assurances can also be achieved in the process. Therefore, at the time of the adoption of the General Plan Update, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to bring forward a General Plan 'clean-up' every two years in the form of a General Plan Amendment. This General Plan Clean-Up is the first to be processed since the adoption of the updated General Plan in 2011.

### **Project Changes**

Similar to the General Plan Update, the General Plan Clean-Up includes changes that encompass the entire unincorporated County of San Diego. This Clean-Up includes changes to the Land Use Map (and some associated zoning and Regional Category Map changes, when necessary for consistency), policy documents, Glossary, Mobility Element Network, and community/subregional plans, as discussed in detail in Attachment B: 2013 General Plan Clean-Up Staff Recommendation (also available online at: [http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/advance/2013\\_GP\\_Clean-up/GP\\_Clean-Up\\_Staff\\_Rec.pdf](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/advance/2013_GP_Clean-up/GP_Clean-Up_Staff_Rec.pdf)).

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

### **Attachments**

- Environmental Review Checklist Form
- 2013 General Plan Clean-Up Staff Recommendation – [http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/advance/2013\\_GP\\_Clean-up/GP\\_Clean-Up\\_Staff\\_Rec.pdf](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/advance/2013_GP_Clean-up/GP_Clean-Up_Staff_Rec.pdf)



**MARK WARDLAW**  
*Director*

**County of San Diego**  
**PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

**DARREN GRETLER**  
*Assistant Director*

5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 110, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92123  
INFORMATION (858) 694-2960  
TOLL FREE (800) 411-0017  
[www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds)

January 24, 2014

**Environmental Review Checklist Form for Projects with Previously  
Approved Environmental Documents**

**For Purposes of Consideration of a General Plan Amendment for the  
2013 General Plan Clean-Up; GPA 12-007**

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Sections 15162 through 15164 set forth the criteria for determining the appropriate additional environmental documentation, if any, to be completed when there is a previously certified environmental impact report (EIR) covering the project for which a subsequent discretionary action is required. These environmental findings have been prepared in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15164(e) to explain the rationale for determining whether any additional environmental documentation is needed for the General Plan Clean-Up, General Plan Amendment (GPA) 12-007.

1. Background on the previously certified EIR:

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

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

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

3. Project applicant's name and address:

County of San Diego  
Planning & Development Services  
5510 Overland Ave., Suite 310  
San Diego, CA 92123

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

YES

NO

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

This is the first Clean-Up processed since the adoption of the General Plan Update. This General Plan Clean-Up includes changes to the General Plan Land Use Map, General Plan text, Mobility Element Network, and Community/Subregional Plans, as described below and discussed in detail in Attachment B: 2013 General Plan Clean-Up Staff Recommendation. (also available online at:

[http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/advance/2013\\_GP\\_Clean-up/GP\\_Clean-Up\\_Staff\\_Rec.pdf](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/advance/2013_GP_Clean-up/GP_Clean-Up_Staff_Rec.pdf)

#### Land Use Maps

The Clean-Up GPA proposes changes to Land Use designations of specific properties to ensure consistency with the goals and policies of the General Plan and to correct mapping errors, reflect ownership changes and incorporate minor Community Planning Group requests.

#### General Plan Text

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

- a. Errors and Omissions — Corrections to policy text and numbering;
- b. Clarifications — The GPA includes additional definitions in the Glossary or additional detail in a table, as well as text change clarifications in the Land Use Element;
- c. Internal Consistency — Revisions are included that make the Conservation and Open Space Element consistent with roads identified in community plans; and

- d. Legacy Communities – Analysis of disadvantaged communities in the unincorporated County has been added in accordance with Senate Bill 244.

Mobility Element

Revisions to the General Plan Mobility Element Appendix include corrections to fix typographical errors, incorrect classifications and segment boundaries, or mapping inconsistencies. Minor CPG requests for modified road classifications are proposed to comply with initial CPG intentions that were not clearly conveyed.

Community/Subregional Plans

Minor clarifications, revisions, and edits are proposed to community and subregional plans, such as the following:

- Board Direction — At the June 27, 2012 Board of Supervisor’s hearing, the Board directed staff to add language to the North Mountain Subregional Plan.

The following language would be added to the Commercial Policies section of the Subregional Plan: “Consider designating an additional five acres of commercial along the west side of State Route 79, slightly extending the existing commercial area at the intersection of SR-78 and SR-79 should the Williamson Act contract on this property be cancelled.”

- Internal Consistency — Revisions to policies to address legal inconsistencies with state law or local regulations.

For example, a revision is proposed for Policy LU 2.4.1 (establishing a minimum number of parking spaces for multi-family development) in the Spring Valley Community plan. A revision is proposed to allow accommodations for appropriate reductions, in accordance with General Plan Policy M-10.5, for development associated with transit nodes, low-income housing, senior housing, Transportation Demand Management programs, and other parking demand reduction techniques.

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

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

**DETERMINATION:**

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

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

Signature 

**January 24, 2014**

Date

**Kevin Johnston**

Printed Name

**Land Use/**

**Environmental Planner**

Title

## INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW UPDATE CHECKLIST

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

YES

NO

When compared to the existing General Plan Land Use Map, the Land Use Map changes proposed with the project would reduce overall densities and intensity of allowed uses, resulting in less development and reduced impacts to scenic vistas, scenic resources, visual character, and light pollution. The project proposes to add 2,346 acres of Open Space-Conservation lands in areas that would have allowed 375 potential dwelling units under the residential Land Use designations of the existing General Plan. This will improve the overall protection of scenic vistas, many of which exist on the properties proposed for designation as open space. The County's Light Pollution Code classifies the areas that are considered most sensitive to light pollution as Zone A, which includes those properties within a 15 mile radius of the Palomar and Mount Laguna observatories. None of the proposed changes in the project would result in additional development potential in Zone A.

Five of the proposed Land Use Map changes would result in additional development potential, compared to the existing designation. JD101 involves the proposed conversion from Public/Semi-Public to SR-2 for an eight-acre lot in Jamul, because the parcel was transferred from Otay Water District ownership to private ownership. The proposed changes to JD101 could result in the potential subdivision of this lot into three lots. However, any potential increase in development potential on JD101 would be more than offset by the proposed removal of almost 400 units from the overall General Plan density, associated with the entire project. LS102 proposes the conversion of 2 parcels totaling approximately one acre from Public/Semi-Public to General Commercial, as a result of the recent sale of these properties into private ownership. These parcels are already zoned C36 (General Commercial), and are fully developed with a large structure, parking, and lighting. SV101 would correct a mapping error/inconsistency on an existing 0.4 acre Spring Valley commercial parcel, changing the designation from VR-15 to Neighborhood Commercial. The parcel is currently developed with parking necessary to support the existing shopping center on the adjacent parcel, and the existing zoning is C36 (General Commercial). RB4 involves adding additional commercial area to a large parcel in Rainbow that already has approximately three acres of commercial. The proposed additional six acres of commercial was fully analyzed in the General Plan EIR, as part of the Referral Map. The six-acre area was not included in the commercially-designated area, due to a mapping error. Finally, the AL101 proposal calls for the conversion of two parcels in Alpine (totaling 1.5 acres), from Limited Impact Industrial to Rural Commercial. These parcels are located in a valley area, much lower than surrounding ridgelines, and are adjacent to the freeway and existing development. As such, any effect on scenic vistas would be negligible. The intensity of development allowed under the Limited Impact Industrial and Rural Commercial designations is very similar, with Rural Commercial development generally viewed as more appealing aesthetically. Any commercial development on these parcels would be subject to a 'B Designator' per zoning, requiring design review and adherence to the Alpine Design Guidelines and County Light Pollution Code. In viewing the comparison of analysis of commercial designations in the General Plan EIR and those in the project, the project proposes the conversion of 3.4 acres of commercially-designated land to residential designations (JL101 and ME104

- removing split designations on the parcels) with no additional subdivision potential (or other potential dwelling units) resulting from the additional residential area.

As discussed in the Project Description, non-Land Use Map changes proposed in the project include changes to the Mobility Element Network, policy documents, and community plan policies. The changes proposed to the Mobility Element Network are mostly clarifications in text to correspond with approved maps, and minor changes would result in an overall reduction in planned roadway widths, thus reducing potential aesthetic impacts, compared to planned roadways analyzed in the General Plan EIR. The only proposed change to the policy documents of the main General Plan that could result in additional development potential is the additional wording proposed on the Village Core Mixed Use designation regulations of table LU-1. The current language allows an increase in allowed floor area ratio (FAR) from 0.7 to 1.3 if offsite parking is provided. The added language would also allow the noted increase in FAR if underground parking is provided. The potential of 1.3 FAR in the Village Core Mixed Use designation was fully analyzed for aesthetic impacts in the General Plan EIR. A change is proposed to Borrego Springs Community Plan policy LU-3.9.1 to change the one-story restriction outside the Village to a preference/recommendation. This change would not result in additional aesthetic impacts beyond those analyzed in the General Plan EIR, because the project analyzed in the EIR included zoning regulations that allow 2 story structures outside the Village in Borrego Springs.

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

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

YES

NO

When compared to the existing General Plan Land Use Map, the Land Use Map changes proposed with the project would reduce overall densities and intensity of allowed uses, resulting in less development and reduced impacts to agriculture and forestry resources. The project proposes to add 2,346 acres of Open Space-Conservation lands in areas that would have allowed 375 dwelling units under the residential Land Use designations of the existing General Plan. A substantial portion of the lands that have been purchased for open space and are proposed for conversion to the Open Space-Conservation designation are adjacent to, or in close proximity to, existing agricultural operations. Open space areas provide an effective buffer between agricultural lands and incompatible land uses. The conversion of these properties to open space would be in accordance with General Plan Policy COS-6.3, which encourages siting open space areas adjacent to agricultural uses. None of the items in the

project would place conflicting or incompatible General Plan designations or zoning use regulations in areas with Williamson Act contracts or forest lands.

Five of the proposed Land Use Map changes would result in additional development potential, compared to the existing designation. JD101 involves the proposed conversion from Public/Semi-Public to SR-2 for an eight-acre lot in Jamul, because the parcel was transferred from Otay Water District ownership to private ownership. Although the proposed changes to JD101 could result in the potential subdivision of this lot into three lots, it would not result in additional impacts to agriculture or forestry resources because the property does not support existing agricultural operations, agricultural preserves, or forestry resources, is not adjacent to any agricultural operations, agricultural preserves, or forestry resources, and there are no prime agricultural soils onsite or in close proximity to the property. LS102 and SV101 involve conversions to commercial designations to reflect a change in ownership and a mapping error, respectively. The properties associated with these items are in fully developed commercial areas with no onsite or nearby agricultural operations or forestry resources; or suitable sites for agriculture. RB4 involves adding additional commercial area to a large parcel in Rainbow that already has approximately three acres of commercial. The proposed additional six acres of commercial was fully analyzed in the General Plan EIR, as part of the Referral Map. The six-acre area was not included in the commercially-designated area, due to a mapping error. AL101 calls for the conversion of two parcels in Alpine (totaling 1.5 acres), from Limited Impact Industrial to Rural Commercial. Similar to the other items noted above, the properties associated with RB4 and AL101 do not support existing agricultural operations, agricultural preserves, or forestry resources, are not adjacent to any agricultural operations, agricultural preserves, or forestry resources, and contain no prime agricultural soils onsite or in close proximity to the property.

As discussed in the project description, non-Land Use Map changes proposed in the project include changes to the Mobility Element Network, policy documents, and community plan policies. The changes proposed to the Mobility Element Network are mostly clarifications in text to correspond with approved maps, and minor changes would result in an overall reduction in planned roadway widths, thus reducing potential impacts to agriculture and forestry resources, compared to planned roadways analyzed in the General Plan EIR. There are no proposed changes to the policy documents of the General Plan or to the policies of the community plans that would result in new impacts to agriculture or forestry resources.

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

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

federal or state ambient air quality standard; exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or creation of objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

YES

NO

When compared to the existing General Plan Land Use Map, the Land Use Map changes proposed with the project would reduce overall densities and intensity of allowed uses, resulting in less development and reduced impacts to air quality.

As discussed in the Project Description, non-Land Use Map changes proposed in the project include changes to the Mobility Element Network, policy documents, and community plan policies. The changes proposed to the Mobility Element Network are mostly clarifications in text to correspond with approved maps, and minor changes would result in an overall reduction in planned roadway widths. Thus the project would not result in an increase in criteria pollutant emission or potential impacts to air quality, compared to the planned roadways analyzed in the General Plan EIR. There are no proposed changes to the policy documents of the General Plan or to the policies of the community plans that would result in new significant impacts or more severe impacts to air quality.

The San Diego Air Pollution Control District (APCD) is responsible for developing and implementing the Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) for attainment and maintenance of the ambient air quality standards in the San Diego Air Basin. The current RAQS and State Implementation Plan (SIP) are based on projections for residential, commercial, industrial, and recreational land uses contained in the previous General Plan. The existing General Plan would accommodate less growth than the previous General Plan. As previously discussed, the project would further reduce the potential growth accommodated in the General Plan. Therefore, the project would be considered consistent with the underlying growth forecasts in the RAQS and SIP. Additionally, future development occurring on the properties associated with the project would be required to be consistent with the emission reduction strategies in the RAQS and the SIP.

Impacts to air quality violations, non-attainment of criteria pollutants, and sensitive receptors would be reduced with the changes proposed in the project. The potential dwelling units associated with the properties in the project would be reduced by almost 400 units, compared to the existing potential density. In addition, the conversion of 2,346 acres of rural properties from residential designations to Open Space–Conservation would result in a substantial reduction in future potential vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Any new stationary sources of pollutants constructed under new designations would be subject to APCD requirements for permitting and must demonstrate that they will not cause or contribute to a violation of an air quality standard. The changes proposed with the project would result in less construction from new development and less emissions of particulate matter. Grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures.

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

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

YES

NO

When compared to the existing General Plan Land Use Map, the Land Use Map changes proposed with the project would reduce overall densities and intensity of allowed uses, resulting in less development and reduced impacts to biological resources from those analyzed in the General Plan EIR. The conversion of 2,346 acres of land from residential designations to Open Space–Conservation would reduce impacts to special status plant and wildlife species, as many of these occur on the properties converted to open space. Similarly, the extensive open space additions would reduce impacts to wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites.

Potential impacts to riparian habitat would also be reduced with the corresponding overall reduction in development potential, associated with the project. In particular, the project would reduce development pressure in areas that include riparian habitat onsite or in close proximity. JL101 would remove the commercial designation on the western end of a parcel that contains a section of Bailey Creek in Julian, without leading to any new subdivision potential on the parcel. VC102 would convert 910 acres surrounding a large section of Keys Creek in Valley Center, from SR-2 and RL-20 residential designations to Open Space–Conservation. VDO103 would reduce subdivision potential on a group of 15 parcels adjacent to the Sweetwater River. LS103 would convert 158 acres near the eastern portion of the San Diego River from residential to Open Space–Conservation. These changes would not only reduce potential direct impacts to riparian habitat, but also reduce indirect impacts associated with polluted runoff from increased development.

The project would reduce overall impacts to federally protected wetlands. Wetlands occur onsite for the following Clean-Up items: CD101, CM101, JL101, LS105, RM101, and VC102. JL101 would remove a commercial designation on the western portion of the parcel, but would not allow any subdivision potential as a result of the larger residential area. The rest of these items would involve conversion to open space.

Five of the proposed Land Use Map changes would result in additional development potential, compared to the existing designation. JD101 involves the proposed conversion from Public/Semi-Public to SR-2 for an eight-acre lot in Jamul, because the parcel was transferred from Otay Water District ownership to private ownership. This change could result in the potential subdivision of this lot into three lots. However, the impacts associated with the potential subdivision of this lot into three lots would be more than offset by the proposed removal of almost 400 units from the overall General Plan density, associated with the entire project. LS102 and SV101 involve conversions to commercial designations to reflect a change in ownership and a mapping error, respectively. Both of these items are located in extensively developed commercial areas, with no remaining native habitat onsite or

adjacent. RB4 involves adding additional commercial area to a large parcel in Rainbow that already has approximately three acres of commercial. The proposed additional six acres of commercial was fully analyzed in the General Plan EIR, as part of the Referral Map. The six-acre area was not included in the commercially-designated area, due to a mapping error. Finally, the AL101 proposal calls for the conversion of two parcels in Alpine (totaling 1.5 acres), from Limited Impact Industrial to Rural Commercial. These parcels are currently developed with single family residential uses. The intensity of development allowed under the Limited Impact Industrial and Rural Commercial designations is very similar, and due to the small size of the parcels, there would not be potential to develop beyond the extent analyzed in the General Plan EIR, under the Limited Impact Industrial designation. In viewing the comparison of analysis of commercial designations in the General Plan EIR and those in the project, it is important to note the project proposes the conversion of 3.4 acres of commercially-designated land to residential designations (JL101 and ME104 - removing split designations on the parcels) with no additional subdivision potential (or other potential dwelling units) resulting from the additional residential area.

Future development under the proposed changes in the project would not conflict with programs and ordinances that protect biological resources because future proposed discretionary projects would be required to comply with the adopted Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan and Biological Mitigation Ordinance where applicable, Habitat Loss Permit Ordinance, the Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP) Process Guidelines, and the Resource Protection Ordinance in order to be approved and developed.

As discussed in the Project Description, non-Land Use Map changes proposed in the project include changes to the Mobility Element Network, policy documents, and community plan policies. The changes proposed to the Mobility Element Network are mostly clarifications in text to correspond with approved maps, and minor changes would result in an overall reduction in planned roadway widths, thus reducing potential impacts to biological resources, compared to planned roadways analyzed in the General Plan EIR. There are no proposed changes to the policy documents of the General Plan or to the policies of the community plans that would result in new impacts to biological resources.

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

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

YES

NO

As described in the General Plan EIR, development of land uses proposed with the project would have the potential to impact cultural resources, archaeological resources, historical resources, paleontological resources, and human remains, through ground-disturbing activities or alteration or demolition of historic structures. When compared to the existing General Plan Land Use Map, the Land Use Map changes proposed with the project would reduce overall densities and intensity of allowed uses, resulting in less development and reduced impacts to cultural resources, archaeological resources, historical resources, paleontological resources, and human remains, from those analyzed in the General Plan EIR. The conversion of 2,346 acres of land from residential designations to Open Space–Conservation would prohibit most types of development and grading, thus minimizing potential impacts to underground artifacts and fossils, or human remains. In addition, the potential dwelling units associated with the properties in the project would be reduced by almost 400 units under the new designations proposed. Higher density land uses are more likely to result in development that requires extensive excavation or grading activities. Thus, the project would reduce potential impacts to archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains.

As discussed in the project description, non-Land Use Map changes proposed in the project include changes to the Mobility Element Network, policy documents, and community plan policies. The changes proposed to the Mobility Element Network are mostly clarifications in text to correspond with approved maps, and minor changes would result in an overall reduction in planned roadway widths, thus reducing potential impacts to cultural resources, archaeological resources, historical resources, paleontological resources, or human remains, compared to planned roadways analyzed in the General Plan EIR. There are no proposed changes to the policy documents of the General Plan or to the policies of the community plans that would result in new impacts to cultural resources, archaeological resources, historical resources, paleontological resources, or human remains.

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

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

YES

NO

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

As noted previously, when compared to the existing General Plan Land Use Map, the Land Use Map changes proposed with the project would reduce overall densities and intensity of allowed uses, resulting in less development and reduced impacts to geology and soils. The project proposes to add 2,346 acres of Open Space-Conservation lands in areas that would have allowed 375 dwelling units under the existing General Plan, because of the proposed removal of residential Land Use designations for these properties. In addition, the total potential dwelling units associated with the properties in the project would be reduced by almost 400 units under the new designations proposed.

Five of the proposed Land Use Map changes would result in additional development potential, compared to the existing designation. JD101 involves the proposed conversion from Public/Semi-Public to SR-2 for an eight-acre lot in Jamul, because the parcel was transferred from Otay Water District ownership to private ownership. These changes could result in the potential subdivision of this lot into three or more separate lots. However, the impacts associated with the potential subdivision of this lot into three lots would be more than offset by the proposed removal of almost 400 units from the overall General Plan density, associated with the entire project. LS102 and SV101 involve conversions to commercial designations to reflect a change in ownership and a mapping error, respectively. Both of these items are located in extensively developed commercial areas, and the associated parcels are fully developed. RB4 involves adding additional commercial area to a large parcel in Rainbow that already has approximately three acres of commercial. The proposed additional six acres of commercial was fully analyzed in the General Plan EIR, as part of the Referral Map. The six-acre area was not included in the commercially-designated area, due to a mapping error. Finally, the AL101 proposal calls for the conversion of two parcels in Alpine (totaling 1.5 acres), from Limited Impact Industrial to Rural Commercial.

Any new development in accordance with the land use designations proposed in the project would be subject to regulations in place to reduce erosion, septic system failure, and hazards associated with seismic activity, soil stability, and expansive soils. With the exception of AL101, each of the properties described above have some level of landslide susceptibility. In addition, LS102 is located in a potential liquefaction area and both LS102 and SV101 are located in areas with expansive soils. Similar to other areas of the County with potential geologic hazards, all future development associated with the land uses designated under the project would be required to comply with federal, state, and local building standards and regulations, including the CBC and County-required geotechnical reconnaissance reports and investigations. In order to minimize potential impacts from erosion, future development would be required to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program, which requires stormwater pollution prevention plans (SWPPPs) to be prepared and best management practices (BMPs) to be identified for construction sites greater than one acre. All construction activities occurring under the project designations would be required to comply with the CBC and the County Grading Ordinance, both of which would ensure implementation of appropriate measures during grading and construction activities to reduce soil erosion. The County's Grading Ordinance also requires all clearing and grading to be carried out with dust control measures. In addition, all future development projects under the project designations would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations related to septic tanks and waste water disposal, including County Department of Environmental Health standards, to ensure that soils are capable of supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems.

As discussed in the project description, non-Land Use Map changes proposed in the project include changes to the Mobility Element Network, policy documents, and community plan policies. The changes proposed to the Mobility Element Network are mostly clarifications in text to correspond with approved maps, and minor changes would result in an overall reduction in planned roadway widths,

thus reducing potential impacts related to geology and soils, compared to planned roadways analyzed in the General Plan EIR. There are no proposed changes to the policy documents of the General Plan or to the policies of the community plans that would result in new significant impacts to geology and soils.

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

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

YES

NO

As noted previously, when compared to the existing General Plan Land Use Map, the Land Use Map changes proposed with the project would reduce overall densities and intensity of allowed uses, resulting in less development and reduced impacts associated with greenhouse gas emissions. The project proposes to add 2,346 acres of Open Space-Conservation lands in areas that would have allowed 375 dwelling units under the residential Land Use designations of the existing General Plan. In addition, the total potential dwelling units associated with the properties in the project would be reduced by almost 400 units under the new designations proposed.

As discussed in the project description, non-Land Use Map changes proposed in the project include changes to the Mobility Element Network, policy documents, and community plan policies. The changes proposed to the Mobility Element Network are mostly clarifications in text to correspond with approved maps, and minor changes would result in an overall reduction in planned roadway widths, thus the project would not increase potential impacts associated with greenhouse gas emissions, compared to planned roadways analyzed in the General Plan EIR. There are no proposed changes to the policy documents of the General Plan or to the policies of the community plans that would result in new impacts associated with greenhouse gas emissions.

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

**VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS** -- Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that result in one or more effects from hazards and hazardous materials including: creation of a significant hazard to the

public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes; creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment; production of hazardous emissions or handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; location on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 creating a hazard to the public or the environment; location within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport; within the vicinity of a private airstrip resulting in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; and/or exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

YES

NO

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

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

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

Public and Private Airports

Under the existing General Plan, some public airports would have the potential to be located adjacent to land uses, such as village residential, which would maintain higher density populations and therefore be considered potentially incompatible. Although any development under the existing General Plan would be required to comply with any applicable Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans, development within the Airport Influence Area (AIA) of a public airport would have the potential to increase the risk of people living or working in these areas to hazards associated with

airport operations. In addition, the existing General Plan would allow development within two miles of a private airport. When compared to the existing General Plan, the project would not allow any increased development potential within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, within an Airport Influence Area, or within two miles of a public or private airport. When compared to the existing General Plan Land Use Map, the Land Use Map changes proposed with the project would reduce overall densities and intensity of allowed uses. Therefore, impacts associated with airport hazards would be lessened by the project, as compared to the existing General Plan. However, impacts would still be significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 of the EIR would be required.

#### Emergency Response, Evacuation Plans, and Wildland Fires

When compared to the existing General Plan Land Use Map, the Land Use Map changes proposed with the project would reduce overall densities and intensity of allowed uses, resulting in less development and reduced impacts associated with existing emergency response operations, evacuation plans, and wildland fire hazards. The project proposes to add 2,346 acres of Open Space-Conservation lands in areas that would have allowed 375 dwelling units under the existing General Plan. The properties converting to open space are mostly in high to very high fire hazard areas, with limited access. As such, these changes would result in reduced impacts to emergency response and evacuation in backcountry areas. In addition, the total potential dwelling units associated with the properties in the project would be reduced by almost 400 units under the new designations proposed, thus reducing the need for improved access and emergency response. When compared to the existing General Plan, the project reduces land use densities in areas that are served by fire agencies with greater distance to cover and in areas which have difficulty meeting fire code requirements due to limited access. Therefore, impacts would be lessened as compared to the existing General Plan. However, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 of the EIR would be required. Regarding impacts associated with wildland fire hazards, impacts would not be reduced to below a level of significance; thus, the overall impacts to wildland fire hazards would remain significant and unavoidable.

#### Vectors

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

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

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

YES

NO

Similar to the existing General Plan, the project would have the potential to result in polluted runoff, flooding, erosion, and/or siltation, due to an increase in impervious surfaces, alteration of drainage patterns, non-point source pollution, and construction activities. The addition of impervious surfaces could contribute to runoff in a manner that could exceed existing stormwater drainage facilities. As noted previously, when compared to the existing General Plan Land Use Map, the Land Use Map changes proposed with the project would reduce overall densities and intensity of allowed uses, resulting in less development and reduced impacts to water quality and erosion. The project proposes to add 2,346 acres of Open Space-Conservation lands in areas that would have allowed 375 dwelling units under the residential Land Use designations of the existing General Plan. This entails a substantial reduction in the potential expansion of impervious surfaces and potential drainage pattern alterations. In addition, the total potential dwelling units associated with the properties in the project would be reduced by almost 400 units under the new designations proposed. As discussed in the Project Description, non-Land Use Map changes proposed in the project include changes to the Mobility Element Network, policy documents, and community plan policies. The changes proposed to the Mobility Element Network are mostly clarifications in text to correspond with approved maps, and minor changes would result in an overall reduction in planned roadway widths, thus reducing potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality, compared to planned roadways analyzed in the General Plan EIR. There are no proposed changes to the policy documents of the General Plan or to the policies of the community plans that would result in new impacts to hydrology and water quality. Therefore, impacts would be lessened as compared to those analyzed in the General Plan EIR. However, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 of the EIR would be required.

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

The project does not propose any additional development potential within 100-year floodplains. As such, there will not be increased impacts associated with development within 100-year flood hazard areas, and impeding or redirecting flood flows. Item LS102 in the project would change a parcel in Lakeside within a dam inundation area, from Public/Semi-Public to General Commercial. The underlying zoning of C36 (General Commercial) would not change and the site is currently fully developed. Due to setbacks, parking, and landscaping requirements, the development footprint could not be substantially increased from existing conditions. Overall development potential associated with the project represents a substantial decrease from that allowed under the existing General Plan. Although impacts would be lessened as compared to the existing General Plan, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 of the EIR would be required.

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

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

YES

NO

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

The project would not conflict with the following planning documents: Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), 2030 RTP, Congestion Management Program (CMP), San Diego Basin Plan (Basin Plan), airport land use compatibility plans (ALUCPs), RAQS, County Trails Program (CTP), spheres of influence (SOI), community plans, the County Zoning Ordinance, specific plans, and the goals and policies of the County General Plan. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant impact associated with conflicts with land use plans, policies, and regulations.

Similar to the existing General Plan, future development under the project would be required to demonstrate compliance with any HCP or NCCP adopted for the project area, including the MSCP in areas located within the adopted South County MSCP Subarea Plan, or the Coastal Sage Scrub NCCP Process Guidelines for projects located outside of the adopted MSCP boundary. Therefore, similar to the existing General Plan, the project would not result in a significant impact associated with conflicts with HCPs or NCCPs.

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

YES

NO

As with the existing General Plan, the project could result in the loss of mineral resources availability. When compared to the existing General Plan Land Use Map, the Land Use Map changes proposed

with the project would reduce overall densities and intensity of allowed uses, resulting in less development and reduced impacts to potential extraction of mineral resources. The project proposes to add 2,346 acres of Open Space-Conservation lands in areas that would have allowed 375 dwelling units under the residential Land Use designations of the existing General Plan. In addition, the total potential dwelling units associated with the properties in the project would be reduced by almost 400 units under the new designations proposed. Therefore, the project would result in reduced impacts to mineral resources availability, compared to the existing General Plan. However, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 of the EIR would be required.

The project proposes a correction to General Plan Policy COS-10.9. This policy calls for zoning overlays for MRZ-2 designated lands and a buffer area adjacent to these lands. MRZ-2 are areas underlain by mineral deposits where geologic data shows that significant measured or indicated resources are present. Within these overlays, the potential effects of proposed land use actions on potential future extraction of mineral resources will be considered by the decision-makers. In the existing General Plan policy, the aforementioned buffer width was incorrectly noted as 1,500 feet, when it should have been 1,300 feet. 1,300 feet is the correct distance noted in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance – Mineral Resources. 1,300 feet is the setback typically required to achieve acceptable noise levels from a mining or quarry operation to offsite noise sensitive land uses. Therefore, the correction of this policy would not result in additional significant impacts to mineral resource recovery sites. There are no additional proposed policy changes in the project that would affect mineral resource recovery sites. The changes proposed for the Mobility Element Network would result in an overall reduction in planned roadway widths and would not increase roadway widths in areas designated MRZ-2, or within 1,300 feet of MRZ-2 areas.

The existing General Plan allows land uses that would be incompatible with mining and resource recovery operations in areas designated MRZ-2, MRZ-3, underlain by Quaternary alluvium or that contain or potentially contain important aggregate resources. Incompatible land uses include semi-rural residential and village residential land uses. Therefore, the existing General Plan would allow the development of incompatible land uses in areas that potentially contain mineral resources which would result in the loss of availability of recovery sites. The project would reduce development potential in MRZ-2 and MRZ-3 areas, compared to the existing General Plan. Although the proposed Land Use Map changes would result in reduced impacts to mineral resource recovery sites, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 of the EIR would be required. Impacts would not be reduced to below a level of significance; thus, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

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

YES

NO

As with the existing General Plan, the Land Use designations proposed with the project would have the potential to expose people to excessive ground borne vibration, increases in ambient noise levels, and noise levels in excess of County Noise Element and Noise Ordinance regulations. When compared to the existing General Plan Land Use Map, the Land Use Map changes proposed with the project would reduce overall densities and intensity of allowed uses, resulting in less development and reduced impacts associated with excessive noise levels, excessive ground borne vibration, permanent and temporary increases in ambient noise levels, and excessive noise exposure from airports. The project proposes to add 2,346 acres of Open Space-Conservation lands in areas that would have allowed 375 dwelling units under the residential Land Use designations of the existing General Plan. This substantial addition of open space acreage would reduce potential noise impacts on adjacent residential uses and reduce potential increases in ambient noise levels, analyzed in the General Plan EIR. In addition, the total potential dwelling units associated with the properties in the project would be reduced by almost 400 units under the proposed designations, which would further reduce ambient noise levels associated with human activity. In addition to reduced impacts from future developed properties, this overall reduction in potential density also would result in less potential impacts from construction noise. The project would not allow any increased development potential within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, within an Airport Influence Area, or within two miles of a public or private airport. In addition, the lower overall density associated with the project would correspond with a reduced likelihood of noise sensitive land uses being exposed to excessive aircraft noise. The proposed Mobility Element Network revisions would entail an overall reduction in planned roadway widths, thus reducing noise impacts on adjacent land uses. The project would result in an overall reduction in noise impacts compared to the existing General Plan. However, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 of the EIR would be required. Regarding permanent increases in ambient noise levels, impacts would not be reduced to below a level of significance; thus, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

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

YES

NO

The housing accommodated with the existing General Plan is consistent with regional growth forecasts. Future development under the project would be required to comply with the land use plan adopted as part of the General Plan, which includes a land use framework and policies for growth that would avoid unplanned growth beyond regional growth forecasts. Only two of the Land Use Map changes in the current plan entail a switch from a residential designation to a non-residential designation. These are the small areas of change associated with RB4 in Rainbow and SV101 in Spring Valley. Neither of these areas currently contains residential units, and the SV101 area is currently zoned commercial. The proposed policy changes in the project would not induce substantial population growth either directly, or indirectly, through the expansion of infrastructure. As stated previously, the proposed Mobility Element Network revisions would result in an overall reduction in planned roadway widths. Therefore, the project would not involve new significant impacts or substantially more severe environmental effects to population and housing.

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

YES

NO

When compared to the existing General Plan Land Use Map, the Land Use Map changes proposed with the project would reduce overall densities and intensity of allowed uses, resulting in less development and reduced impacts to public services. The project proposes to add 2,346 acres of Open Space-Conservation lands in areas that would have allowed 375 dwelling units under the residential Land Use designations of the existing General Plan. The properties converting to open space are mostly in very high fire hazard areas, with limited access. As such, these changes would result in reduced impacts to fire protection and police protection in backcountry areas, and diminished need for new or expanded facilities. In addition, the total potential dwelling units associated with the properties in the project would be reduced by almost 400 units under the new designations proposed. None of the proposed policy changes or Mobility Element Network changes would result in increased demand for public services. Therefore, impacts would be lessened as compared to the existing General Plan. However, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 of the EIR would be required. After mitigation, impacts related to school facilities would remain significant and unavoidable due to the fact that the planning, approval, and construction of such facilities is not within the County's jurisdiction.

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

YES

NO

The projected population growth under the land use designations of the existing General Plan would result in an increase in the number of persons that utilize recreational facilities in the unincorporated County, particularly in areas within the Village regional category, where most of the increases in planned density occurred. The project would not add any additional density in the Village regional category, and therefore, would not exacerbate the need for new or expanded recreation facilities in these areas. As discussed earlier, the project would result in a reduction of almost 400 dwelling units, when compared to the existing General Plan. Due to this substantial reduction in potential density, the project would not lead to increased impacts related to the deterioration of parks and recreation facilities or requiring the construction of new recreational facilities. The project proposes to add 2,346 acres of Open Space-Conservation lands. Some of the new open space areas will include new hiking, biking, and/or equestrian trails, to help improve recreational opportunities in the respective communities. The property associated with LS105 would convert to Open Space-Recreation for a County Parks acquisition and proposed equestrian facility, thus improving recreational opportunities for the many

equestrian enthusiasts of Lakeside. None of the proposed policy changes or Mobility Element Network changes would result in increased impacts related to deterioration of parks and recreational facilities or necessitating the construction of new recreational facilities. The project includes revised and added language to biological mitigation policies in the communities of Rainbow and San Dieguito that would encourage biological mitigation within the community for open space and trails.

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

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

YES

NO

Similar to the existing General Plan, the project would have the potential to affect projected road network performance, add trips to deficient facilities, adjacent cities' traffic standards, rural road safety, and emergency access. As discussed previously, the total potential dwelling units associated with the properties in the project would be reduced by almost 400 units under the new designations proposed. As a result of the reduction in overall development potential, there would be a reduced impact on transportation and traffic, when compared to the existing General Plan.

Five of the proposed Land Use Map changes would result in additional development potential, compared to the existing designation. JD101 involves the proposed conversion from Public/Semi-Public to SR-2 for an eight-acre lot in Jamul, because the parcel was transferred from Otay Water District ownership to private ownership. This proposed change could result in the potential subdivision of this lot into three or more separate lots. However, the impacts associated with the potential subdivision of this lot into three lots would be more than offset by the proposed removal of almost 400 units from the overall General Plan density, associated with the entire project. The SR-2 designation would be consistent with the surrounding designations. Though additional units would add trips to a nearby deficient segment of Lyons Valley Road (at LOS E), the additional trips would not result in a lower LOS classification, and the community preference is to maintain the rural character of the road and accept the current LOS. Design improvements include a continuous turn lane for a portion of the deficient segment and a reduced shoulder width through another portion, for adding a bike lane. The project will not have a direct impact related to a conflict with any performance measures establishing measures of effectiveness of the circulation system because the project trips do not exceed any of the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for direct impacts related to Traffic and Transportation. LS102 and SV101 involve conversions to commercial designations to reflect a change in ownership and a mapping error, respectively. Both of these items are located in extensively developed commercial areas, with existing commercial zoning. RB4 involves adding additional commercial area to a large parcel in Rainbow that already has approximately three acres of

commercial. The proposed additional six acres of commercial was fully analyzed in the General Plan EIR, including analysis of transportation and traffic impacts, as part of the Referral Map. The six-acre area was not included in the commercially-designated area, due to a mapping error. Finally, the AL101 proposal calls for the conversion of two parcels in Alpine (totaling 1.5 acres), from Limited Impact Industrial to Rural Commercial. There are no deficient road segments adjacent to these parcels, and impacts to deficiently operating Alpine Boulevard (across Interstate 8) would not exceed the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance standards.

With the project, revisions are proposed to the Mobility Element Network Appendix. Almost all of the proposed changes serve the purpose of providing text and numbering clarifications for the Mobility Element Network table, to provide consistency with approved segment designations shown on the Mobility Element Network map. There are just four Mobility Element Network revisions in the project that would revise the classification/improvements for particular roads. In Alpine, the segment of Tavern Road, from New Road 11 to Arnold Way is proposed to change from a 4.1A Major Road with raised median, to a 4.1B Major Road with a continuous turn lane. This is necessary, due to the industrial zoning along with western portion of the segment, and the need for access for large trucks. A segment of Osborne Street in Bonsall is proposed for a change from a 2.2A Light Collector with raised median, to a 2.2C Light Collector with intermittent turn lanes. In coordination with community stakeholders, staff finds the change would better fit the desired community character, and the raised median was not necessary for this street. A similar change is proposed for a segment of Highland Valley Road in Ramona, which is proposed to switch from a 2.2A Light Collector with raised median, to a 2.2C Light Collector with intermittent turn lanes. Due to the winding nature of this segment of road, the community did not support the raised median and staff concurs. Finally, a segment of Austin Drive in Spring Valley would also change from a 2.2A Light Collector with raised median to a 2.2B Light Collector with continuous turn lane. This correction is required because the intent for this segment was to reflect the existing conditions, and the existing condition was mistakenly noted as the 2.2A with raised median.

None of the proposed policy revisions would result in new impacts to transportation and traffic. A proposed parking policy revision in Spring Valley would allow the same accommodations that are encouraged in General Plan Policy M-10.5, for potential reductions in parking requirements. As such, there would be no new impacts associated with this revised policy, beyond the impacts analyzed in the General Plan EIR.

The project proposes to add 2,346 acres of Open Space-Conservation lands in areas that would have allowed 375 dwelling units under the existing General Plan. The properties converting to open space are mostly in high to very high fire hazard areas, with limited access. As such, these changes would help to reduce potential impacts from inadequate emergency access in planned residential areas, along with improving rural road safety. Impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 of the General Plan EIR would still be required.

The County of San Diego has developed an overall programmatic solution that addresses existing and projected future road deficiencies in the unincorporated portion of San Diego County. This program includes the adoption of a Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program to fund improvements to roadways necessary to mitigate potential cumulative impacts caused by traffic from future development. This program is based on a summary of projections method contained in an adopted planning document, as referenced in the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15130 (b)(1)(B), which evaluates regional or area wide conditions contributing to cumulative transportation impacts. Based on SANDAG regional growth and land use forecasts, the SANDAG Regional Transportation Model was utilized to analyze projected build-out (year 2030) development conditions on the existing Mobility Element roadway network throughout the unincorporated area of the County. Based on the results of the traffic modeling, funding necessary to construct transportation facilities that will

mitigate cumulative impacts from new development was identified. Existing roadway deficiencies will be corrected through improvement projects funded by other public funding sources, such as TransNet, gas tax, and grants. Potential cumulative impacts to the region's freeways have been addressed in SANDAG's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This plan, which considers freeway buildout over the next 30 years, will use funds from TransNet, state, and federal funding to improve freeways to projected level of service objectives in the RTP.

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

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

YES

NO

When compared to the existing General Plan Land Use Map, the Land Use Map changes proposed with the project would reduce overall densities and intensity of allowed uses, resulting in less development and reduced impacts to utilities and service systems. The project proposes to add 2,346 acres of Open Space-Conservation lands in areas that would have allowed 375 dwelling units under the residential Land Use designations of the existing General Plan. Most of the properties converting to open space are in areas that would require septic systems for wastewater treatment. With the conversion to open space, the potential for future septic system failures and new growth inducing sewer connections is reduced. Two of the proposed Land Use Map changes would have the potential to require new septic systems. RB4 involves adding additional commercial area to a large parcel in Rainbow that already has approximately three acres of commercial. The additional acreage is necessary for the provision of adequate leach field area for the restrooms associated with commercial use. This proposed change was fully analyzed in the General Plan EIR. JD101 involves the proposed conversion from Public/Semi-Public to SR-2 for an eight-acre lot in Jamul, because the parcel was transferred from Otay Water District ownership to private ownership. The new designation would result in the potential for subdividing the lot into 3 lots, which would presently require new septic systems. Discharged wastewater must conform to the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code. California Water Code Section 13282 allows RWQCBs to authorize a local public agency to issue permits for on-site wastewater systems (OSWS) "to ensure that systems are adequately designed, located, sized, spaced, constructed and maintained." The RWQCBs with jurisdiction over San Diego County have authorized the County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health (DEH) to issue certain OSWS permits throughout the County and within the incorporated cities. DEH review would

be required for any new septic systems, pursuant to DEH, Land and Water Quality Division's, "On-site Wastewater Systems: Permitting Process and Design Criteria."

There is one proposed policy change in the project that could lead to additional development potential, under unique circumstances. The proposed revision to General Plan Table LU-1 would add the provision of underground parking as a circumstance that would allow for an increase in floor area ratio (FAR) in the Village Core Mixed Use designation, from 0.7 to 1.3 FAR. Currently the policy allows this increase only for offsite parking. Though providing underground parking is rarely proposed in projects within the unincorporated County, this change could lead to additional need for utilities, with additional allowed floor area. However, this provision only applies to the Village Core Mixed Used designation, which is located in areas planned for high density with available utilities for the allowed intensity of development. The remainder of the proposed policy revisions would not allow for additional development potential.

The total potential dwelling units associated with the properties in the project would be reduced by almost 400 units under the new designations proposed. The proposed Mobility Element Network revisions would result in an overall reduction in planned roadway widths. Considering the reduced development potential associated with the project, as compared to the existing General Plan, potential impacts to wastewater facilities, stormwater drainage facilities, water supplies, landfill capacity, and energy consumption would be reduced. However, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 of the EIR would be required. In the areas of adequate water supplies and sufficient landfill capacity, impacts would not be reduced to below a level of significance; thus, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable, as noted in the General Plan EIR.

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

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

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

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

YES

NO

As discussed previously, the project would entail a substantial reduction in development potential, compared to the existing General Plan. Potential overall density would be reduced by almost 400 units, compared to current designations. All of the effects associated with mandatory findings of significance have been adequately addressed in the General Plan, including cumulative effects. All applicable mitigation from the General Plan EIR shall be carried forward with the project, and the project will also

rely on statements of overriding consideration adopted with the General Plan EIR, for significant and unavoidable impacts discussed above. The project would not introduce new significant effects, beyond those analyzed in the General Plan EIR.

- Link to previous environmental review – County of San Diego General Plan EIR – <http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/gpupdate/environmental.html>

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

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

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines

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

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

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

California Public Resources Code, CPRC, Sections 40000-41956

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

County of San Diego General Plan

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance

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

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

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

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

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

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

Public Resources Code Sections 4290 and 4291

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

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

The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), 1976

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

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