

S.1 Overview

As required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), this Environmental Impact Report (EIR): (1) assesses the potentially significant direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental effects of the proposed project; (2) identifies potential feasible means of avoiding or substantially lessening significant adverse impacts; and (3) evaluates a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project, including the required No Project Alternative. The County is the “lead agency” for the proposed project evaluated in this EIR, and has the principal responsibility for certifying the EIR and approving the proposed project. Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines, this EIR consists of an evaluation of the effects of the entire proposed project. This EIR will be used by the County to evaluate the environmental implications of adopting the proposed Zoning Ordinance amendments.

S.2 Project Synopsis

S.2.1 Project Description

The project proposes amending the County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance to provide an update set of definitions, procedures, and standards for review and permitting of agriculture-related accessory uses throughout the unincorporated County. Adoption of the proposed project would revise permitting requirements for uses currently allowed in agricultural areas and introduce a permitting process for uses not currently addressed or included in the zoning ordinance. Such revisions would promote the development of uses that are accessory to agricultural uses, such as microbreweries, cheese-making and dairy operations, on-site food production, mobile butchering, packing and processing, on-site retail horticulture sales, animal raising, roadside sales of agricultural products, agricultural tourism, and agricultural homestays on agricultural lands consistent with the County’s General Plan. The project would apply primarily to properties that are zoned *Agriculture (A70 and A72)*, *Specific Plan (S88)*, *Holding Area (S90)*, and *General Rural (S92)*; however, other zones with agricultural uses would also be affected.¹ Amendments to the Animal Regulations would apply to the keeping of animals in all zones with the affected designators. Lastly, adoption of the proposed project would allow small, boutique, and wholesale limited winery uses in the S92 zone. The project also proposes an amendment to the County of San Diego General Plan Mobility Element Table M-4, “Road Segments Where Adding Travel Lanes is Not Justified.” This amendment would modify existing road segments or add new road segments that as a result of the proposed project may function at a Level of Service E or F.

S.2.2 Project Objectives

During the County Board of Supervisors Hearing on August 6, 2014, the Board directed the Chief Administrative Officer to develop the Agriculture Promotion Program that would streamline

¹ Some of the proposed changes would affect or change the currently permitted agricultural uses within industrial, commercial, and special use zones.

regulations for agriculture-related ventures throughout the County and winery uses in S92 zones. Agricultural operation in the County of San Diego is a significant component of the local industry and is facing challenges to its continued viability. To address these challenges, many agricultural operators are seeking opportunities to diversify their businesses. Additionally, there is increasing interest among the general public to get closer to the source of their agricultural products, and many agricultural operators are interested in accommodating this interest. In response, the County is developing the Agriculture Promotion Program to provide increased opportunities for agricultural ventures and tourism that are accessory to existing agricultural operations.

The portion of the project related to wineries in the S92 General Rural Zone is an expansion of a prior effort that affected the A70 and A72 zones. The 2010 Tiered Winery Zoning Ordinance Amendment Project (State Clearinghouse No. 2008101047) modified the Zoning Ordinance for the A70 and A72 zones to increase opportunities for wineries and tasting rooms. This proposed project would extend those same ordinance amendments to the S92 zone.

A statement of project objectives is required by State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15124 (b)). Under CEQA, a clear statement of project objectives is necessary because alternatives evaluated in an EIR must achieve, in whole or in part, the underlying objectives. Specific objectives for the proposed project are as follows.

1. Encourage the growth of the local agriculture industry throughout the County of San Diego.
2. Streamline and clarify the approval/permitting process for accessory agricultural operations (see Section 1.4.1) in order to better facilitate the development of such uses within the County, while ensuring compliance with local, state, and federal regulations where appropriate and utilizing sound management practices.
3. Encourage property owners in the County to maintain agricultural lands in production and support farming.
4. Minimize the potential for land use conflicts that may arise through the development and operation of accessory agricultural operations.
5. Update regulations for accessory agricultural operations to be consistent with public interest, emerging practices, and current technology and design.
6. Assist property owners in pursuing compliance with local County requirements related to accessory agriculture operations.
7. Update the County's Zoning Ordinance to incorporate the Tiered Winery Zoning Ordinance Amendment Project for all S92 General Rural zones.

S.2.3 Project Location

The project covers all of the unincorporated areas of the County, which is in Southern California and bound by the counties of Orange and Riverside to the north, the County of Imperial to the east, the United States–Mexico international border to the south, and the Pacific Ocean and various incorporated cities to the west. The proposed project would apply only to properties located in the unincorporated portions of the County over which the County has land use jurisdiction. Therefore, it would not apply to state, federal, or tribal lands. More specifically, the proposed project would apply to those properties that support agricultural operations. Agricultural operations occur throughout

the unincorporated area, with higher concentrations in specific communities and in a variety of zones, including some industrial and commercially zoned areas.

Regional access throughout the affected area is provided by interstates, local state routes, and County roads. Primary north-south transportation facilities in the County include Interstates 5, 15, and 805, all of which are focused in the western part of the County. Other north-south State Highways include 67, 79, 125, and 163. Major east-west corridors include Interstate 8 and State Highways 54, 76, 78, and 94 and are dispersed throughout the County.

S.2.4 Environmental Setting

San Diego County is a generally semi-arid environment and supports habitats and vegetation communities which range from grasslands to shrublands to coniferous forests. Additionally, these habitats and communities vary greatly depending on the ecoregion, soils and substrate, and elevation and topography. The project area encompasses the unincorporated areas of the County, which is geographically the largest area in the County. Terrain within the project area varies from west to east, sloping up from the ocean, transitioning to rolling hills, and then steep mountains that finally give way to flat to gently sloping deserts. The urban portions of the project area are predominantly in the west, either surrounding the City of San Diego or interspersed between the City of San Diego and other incorporated areas. Farther east, the land is less developed, with the largest developed area in the eastern portion of the project area being the community of Borrego Springs. The areas that have been developed in the eastern portion of the County have been predominantly developed in a rural fashion, with large lot sizes, agricultural or related uses, and limited infrastructure and service availability.

S.3 Summary of Significant Effects and Mitigation Measures that Reduce or Avoid the Significant Effects

Table S-1 summarizes the results of the environmental analysis completed for the project in Chapter 2.0. Mitigation measures that have been identified to reduce environmental impacts associated with air quality, biology, cultural resources, hazards, hydrology and water quality, noise, transportation and traffic, and water supply are included in Table S-1. The mitigation measures would reduce potentially significant impacts, but not below a significant level. Additional “infeasible” mitigation measures were considered in attempting to reduce impacts to below a level of significance. A detailed analysis of significant environmental effects, mitigation measures, and infeasible measures is discussed in Chapter 2.0 of this EIR.

S.4 Areas of Controversy

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(b)(2) requires that an EIR identify areas of controversy, including issues raised by other agencies and the public. No areas of controversy have been identified for the proposed project but some comments received during the 30-day scoping period did raise specific issues such as:

- Development of accessory agriculture uses that could affect water quality, groundwater, Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) cornerstone lands, and traffic
- Effects of intensified land uses on the Cleveland National Forest as related to aesthetics, biological resources, cultural resources, hydrology and water quality, noise, and hazards and hazardous materials, and the potential risk of wildfire
- Effects on utilities and service systems due to increased water demand with zone changes
- Aesthetic impacts on the Cleveland National Forest
- Potential for agricultural expansion to affect the County's adopted South County MSCP and the in-progress North County MSCP and East County MSCP

S.5 Issues to Be Resolved by the Decision-Making Body

The County Board of Supervisors (BOS) serves as the decision making body for the proposed project. Issues to be resolved by the BOS include: (i) whether or how to mitigate the significant effects of the project. (ii) whether to reject or approve one of the alternatives to the proposed project and other environmental findings, and (iii) whether to reject or approve the proposed project. As part of the proposed Zoning Ordinance amendments, certain accessory agricultural uses that meet the zoning verification requirements would be developed without discretionary review, as long as specific "Permitted" use limitations are not exceeded. Thus, there would be no means to ensure mitigation of significant effects because no discretionary permits would be required. However, while the use may be allowed by right, activities associated with the use such as clearing vegetation, grading, or building a structure may require other permits and approvals from the County or other agencies that may require CEQA compliance. Under the proposed project, by-right uses would be extended to the S88 zone for Agricultural Stands and Agricultural Tourism and by-right uses for Wholesale and Limited Wineries and Boutique Wineries would be extended to the S92 zone. With adoption of the proposed project, three additional uses would be permitted by-right in the certain circumstances described above: (1) Fishermen's Markets; (2) Creamery/Dairy; and (3) Mobile Butchering. Larger uses would be subject to discretionary approvals (such as Administrative, Minor Use, or Major Use Permits) and will require separate project-specific environmental review. However, it cannot be concluded at this stage that impacts related to future accessory uses developed pursuant to the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment would be avoided or mitigated to a level below significant. The BOS will decide if the significant and unmitigated effects associated with air quality, biology, cultural resources, hazards, hydrology and water quality, noise, transportation and traffic, and water supply can be reduced.

Mitigation measures, as listed in Table S-1, will reduce direct and cumulative impacts associated with accessory agricultural uses, but not to a level below significant. Other mitigation measures, as described in Chapter 2.0, would reduce impacts to less than significant; however, they were determined to be infeasible. For example, one infeasible mitigation measure would consist of prohibiting accessory agriculture uses in High and Very High fire hazard severity zones. Because the vast majority of unincorporated San Diego County is ranked as having High or Very High fire hazard severity, this measure is considered infeasible mitigation for the proposed project. However, it is ultimately the decision of the BOS to determine if mitigation measures, such as these, are feasible or

infeasible. In determining how to mitigate significant effects, the BOS may decide that some infeasible mitigation measures, such as the one previously described would still meet project objectives and would otherwise be feasible to reduce significant impacts to a level less than significant. The BOS will adopt detailed findings on the feasibility of mitigation measures to substantially lessen or avoid the significant effects on the environment. The BOS will also decide whether to adopt feasible mitigation measures, such as those presented in Table S-1.

In addition to mitigation measures, the BOS will decide whether or not to adopt the proposed project or any of the project alternatives that would reduce significant impacts while still meeting the project objectives. Regarding those alternatives that would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in this EIR, the BOS must either adopt the alternative or find it to be infeasible. The BOS may also want to consider whether to adopt specific components or a combination of the proposed project and project alternatives.

Because this EIR has identified adverse environmental effects that are unavoidable, the BOS must also determine if the adverse environmental effects are considered acceptable with consideration of economic, social, technological, and other relevant benefits of the proposed project. In making this determination, it is relevant for the BOS to consider the existing Zoning ordinance in comparison to the proposed Zoning Ordinance amendment. The BOS would prepare a statement of overriding considerations as described in CEQA Section 15093 to reflect the ultimate balancing of competing public objectives if the BOS decides to approve the proposed project, project alternatives, or components of either, which have the potential to cause one or more significant effects on the environment.

S.6 Project Alternatives

CEQA requires, in Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines, that an EIR describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project or to the proposed project location that would feasibly attain most of the project objectives but would avoid or lessen any significant environmental impacts. An EIR should evaluate the environmental impacts of the alternatives compared to the proposed project. Chapter 4.0, *Project Alternatives*, of the EIR describes and evaluates project alternatives and is intended to implement the requirements set forth in the State CEQA Guidelines. Chapter 4.0 also identifies the Environmentally Superior Project Alternative as required by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2).

S.6.1 Reduced Project Area Alternative

The Reduced Project Area Alternative would reduce the area of application of the amendments to the County's Zoning Ordinance, and the Agricultural Promotion Program would apply only to those areas that are within the San Diego County Water Authority boundary, which makes them likely to be served by existing municipal water resources. This accounts for approximately 25% of the project area, or approximately 538 square miles. As a result, properties that are dependent on groundwater for their water supply would be excluded from the proposed Zoning Ordinance changes. These areas total approximately 1,387 square miles. This alternative serves to avoid significant groundwater impacts and also reduce other significant impacts associated with the project by geographically constraining the project area.

S.6.2 Lot Size Use Restriction Alternative

The Lot Size Use Restriction Alternative would allow the changes proposed as part of the Agricultural Promotion Program to apply only to those properties within the unincorporated County that are 4 acres or larger. The purpose of this alternative would be to reduce the overall significant impacts that would result from the project. It would ~~also~~ more directly reduce potential impacts related to adjacency with other land uses (such as the nuisance impact from odors and localized groundwater availability). Because most communities have a high volume of smaller lot sizes near their town centers, it could also avoid some traffic impacts within the centers.

S.6.3 No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, the Zoning Ordinance related to accessory agricultural uses and approval and permitting requirements would remain as it is today. The No Project Alternative would maintain the existing regulations and permitting requirements for uses currently allowed in agricultural zones and continue the permitting process for uses not currently addressed or included in the zoning code. The amendment would not result in the revision of the permitting requirements for agriculture-related accessory uses including microbreweries, cheese-making and dairy operations, on-site food production, mobile butchering, packing and processing, on-site retail horticulture sales, animal raising, roadside sales of agricultural products, agricultural tourism, and agricultural homestays, on agriculturally zoned lands throughout the County. The No Project Alternative would not include amendments to the Animal Regulations that would apply to the keeping of animals in all zones with the affected designators. Additionally, this alternative would not allow by right small, boutique, and wholesale limited winery uses in the S92 zone. Under the No Project Alternative, definitions and development parameters for review and permitting of accessory agricultural uses contained in the Zoning Ordinance would remain the same.

S.6.4 Environmentally Superior Alternative

As compared to the proposed project, the Reduced Project Area Alternative, Lot Size Use Restriction Alternative, and No Project Alternative would result in reduced environmental impacts, as provided in Table 4-1. Significant impacts relative to the proposed project were identified for air quality and greenhouse gas emissions, biological resources, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, transportation/traffic, and water and groundwater supply for which measures were not available to avoid adverse effects. Because there would be no discretionary review of future by-right development and operation of future accessory agricultural uses under the proposed project, significant impacts were identified as there is no guarantee on a project-specific level that mitigation measures would reduce impacts to a level below significant.

The No Project Alternative would decrease environmental impacts to less than significant levels by continuing to require discretionary review for accessory agricultural uses within the project area and allowing the County to evaluate and mitigate any known impacts; however, this alternative would not meet any of the project objectives. None of the remaining alternatives would reduce all significant impacts of the proposed project to less than significant. Although the Reduced Project Area Alternative and Lot Size Use Restriction Alternative would lessen environmental impacts as compared to the proposed project, many of the same impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. The Lot Size Use Restriction Alternative would apply only to those properties within the unincorporated County that are 4 acres or larger. The purpose of this alternative would directly

reduce potential impacts related to adjacency with other land uses (such as the nuisance impact from odors and localized groundwater availability) and avoid some traffic impacts. The Reduced Project Area Alternative would apply only to those areas that are within the San Diego County Water Authority boundary and likely to be served by existing municipal water resources. This accounts for approximately 25% of the project area. Water districts within the San Diego County Water Authority boundary distribute water from surface reservoirs or other imported water sources subject to existing agreements with providers. The Reduced Project Area Alternative reduced and avoided significant groundwater impacts and also reduced other significant impacts associated with the project by geographically constraining the development potential by 75% of the total proposed project area, even though some of these impacts could still be significant. As indicated in Table 4-1, the Reduced Project Area Alternative would lessen one more impact as compared to the Lot Size Use Restriction Alternative (related to groundwater supply); therefore, this is the environmentally preferred alternative.

Table S-1. Environmental Issue Areas Analyzed in Chapter 2

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
<i>2.1 Air Quality</i>				
<p>1. Air Quality Plan: The proposed project would not conflict or obstruct the implementation of the applicable air quality plans, and therefore would not result in any potential significant impacts.</p>	Less than significant	Less than significant	No mitigation required.	Less than significant
<p>2. Violate Air Quality Standards (Construction and Operation): Given the number of projects potentially promoted by the permitting revisions, simultaneous construction emissions may exceed SDAPCD thresholds.</p>	(AQ-1, AQ-2) Potentially Significant	(AQ-6) Potentially Significant	<p>M-AQ-1: During the environmental review process for future discretionary permits, the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Air Quality will be applied. When impacts are determined to be significant, feasible and appropriate project-specific mitigation measures will be incorporated. Grading can generate fugitive dust, including PM10 and PM2.5. Projects that involve site grading, excavation, or substantial material movement will implement the following dust control measures during construction, as applicable, in compliance with SDAPCD Rule 55.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water the grading areas a minimum of twice daily to minimize fugitive dust. • Stabilize graded areas as quickly as possible to minimize fugitive dust. 	Significant and Unavoidable

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply chemical stabilizer or pave the last 100 feet of internal travel path within the construction site prior to public road entry. • Install wheel washers adjacent to a paved apron prior to vehicle entry on public roads. • Remove any visible track-out into traveled public streets within 30 minutes of occurrence. • Wet wash the construction access point at the end of each workday if any vehicle travel on unpaved surfaces has occurred. • Provide sufficient perimeter erosion control to prevent washout of silty material onto public roads. • Cover haul trucks or maintain at least 12 inches of freeboard to reduce blow-off during hauling. • Suspend all soil disturbance and travel on unpaved surfaces if winds exceed 25 mph. • Cover/water onsite stockpiles of excavated material. • Enforce a 15 mph speed limit on unpaved surfaces. • On dry days, sweep up any dirt and debris spilled onto paved 	

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
			<p>surfaces immediately to reduce re-suspension of particulate matter caused by vehicle movement. Clean approach routes to construction sites daily for construction-related dirt in dry weather.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hydroseed, landscape, or develop as quickly as possible all disturbed areas and as directed by the County and/or SDAPCD to reduce dust generation. • Limit the daily grading volumes/area. <p>M-AQ-2: During the environmental review process for future discretionary permits, the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Air Quality will be applied. When impacts are determined to be significant, feasible and appropriate project-specific mitigation measures will be incorporated. Construction projects typically require equipment such as bulldozers, graders, loaders, scrapers, backhoes, and heavy trucks. Project applicants will utilize clean-diesel, alternative fuel, or other engine controls to reduce equipment and vehicle exhaust emissions during construction. Project applicants will implement</p>	

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
			<p>the following control measures, as applicable, to reduce equipment and exhaust related emissions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require equipment to be maintained in good tune and to reduce excessive idling time. • Utilize alternative fuels, such as compressed natural gas, renewable diesel, and diesel. • Require the use of equipment that meets EPA Tier 4 or higher (as promulgated) emission standards. • Require older equipment be retrofitted with advanced engine controls, such as diesel particulate filters, selective catalytic reduction (SCR), or cooled exhaust gas recirculation. <p>M-AQ-3: During the environmental review process for future discretionary permits, the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Air Quality will be applied. When impacts are determined to be significant, feasible and appropriate project-specific mitigation measures will be incorporated. Building construction may result in off-gassing of ROG from architectural coatings and paints that exceed the County's threshold. Project</p>	

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
			<p>applicants will reduce ROG emissions related to architectural coatings through the use of low Volatile Organic Compound (VOC) coatings (VOC content less than or equal to 50 grams per liter).</p> <p>M-AQ-4. During the environmental review process for future discretionary permits, the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Air Quality will be applied. When impacts are determined to be significant, feasible and appropriate project-specific mitigation measures will be incorporated. Project applicants will implement the following control measures, as applicable, to reduce operational related criteria pollutant and GHG emissions.</p> <p><i>General Strategies</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase energy efficiency by at least 10 percent beyond the Title 24 standard in place at the time of construction, unless demonstrated to be infeasible. • Utilize low VOC coatings (VOC content less than or equal to 50 grams per liter) for periodic painting and facility upkeep. • Plant shade trees within 40 feet of the south side or within 	

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
			<p>60 feet of the west side of properties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilize cool roof materials (albedo greater than or equal to 30) or install green roofs. • Install solar water heaters. • Maximize interior day light and utilize high efficiency lighting. • Increase roof/ceiling insulation beyond the American Society of Heating, Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Engineers Standard 90.1-2010. • Install low-water use appliances and fixtures to reduce indoor water consumption by a minimum of 10 percent relative to the 2008 Plumbing Code baseline. • Design and install a backbone recycled water system to supply to landscaped spaces. • Install weather-based irrigation controllers to reduce outdoor water consumption. • Compost food waste and other forms of organic waste, as feasible. • Provide easily accessible and well-maintained recycling bins for visitor use. 	

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide shuttles for visitors and employees from the nearest town. • Incorporate onsite renewable energy production, including installation of photovoltaic cells or other options. <p><i>Additional Strategies for Microbreweries</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare and implement an energy management system (EMS) to improve process- and facility energy-efficiency and reduce overall energy consumption. Table 2.1-16 lists potential measures that may be incorporated into the EMS. Please refer to the <i>General Strategies</i> section for potential measures to reduce water consumption and waste generation. <p><i>Additional Strategies for Wineries, and Dairies</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare and implement an EMS to improve process- and facility energy-efficiency and reduce overall energy consumption. Table 2.1-17 lists potential measures that may be incorporated into the EMS. Please refer to the <i>General Strategies</i> section for potential measures to reduce 	

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
			water consumption and waste generation. <i>Additional Strategies for Dairies</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepare and implement an EMS to improve process- and facility energy-efficiency and reduce overall energy consumption. Table 2.1-18 lists potential measures that may be incorporated into the EMS. Please refer to the <i>General Strategies</i> section for potential measures to reduce water consumption and waste generation. 	
3. Substantial Pollutant Concentrations: The project is not anticipated to expose sensitive receptors to substantial DPM or CO concentrations.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less than Significant
4. Objectionable Odors: The project would promote agricultural activities that are considered by the County and ARB (2005) as having a high potential to generate nuisance odors.	(AQ-3) Potentially significant	(AQ-7) Potentially significant	M-AQ-5: During the environmental review process for future discretionary permits, the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Air Quality shall be applied. When impacts are determined to be significant, feasible and appropriate project-specific mitigation measures shall be incorporated. Creameries/ dairies and animal raising may generate odors from animal waste. Microbreweries and wineries may also result in temporary odors during fermenter venting. Project applicants will implement best	Significant and Unavoidable

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
			<p>management practices to control odors.</p> <p><i>Animal-Related Operations</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Animal stalls will be cleaned at least once per day including the removal of animal waste and soiled bedding. • Animal waste will be stockpiled in an enclosed, covered containment vessel to ensure anaerobic off-gassing and associated odor generation is minimized. The containment vessel will protect animal waste stockpiles from heavy weather conditions, including wind and rain which may cause siltation and accelerate anaerobic decomposition of the waste. • If a project site is located within 1 mile of residents and/or sensitive receptors, containment vessels storing animal waste will be located at the furthest feasible distance from nearby residents and/or sensitive receptors. <p><i>Microbreweries and Wineries</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If a project site is located within 1 mile of residents and/or sensitive receptors, chemical neutralizers (e.g., chlorination, hydrogen peroxide) will be used to 	

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
			control odors associated with malting and fermentation.	
<p>6. Generation of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions: Simultaneous construction and operation of agricultural uses promoted by the project would exceed the County’s GHG thresholds.</p>	(AQ-4) Potentially significant	(AQ-8) Potentially significant	M-AQ-4	Significant and Unavoidable
<p>7. Conformance to Applicable GHG Plan, Policy or Regulation: Simultaneous construction and operation of agricultural uses promoted by the project would not impede progress toward 2020 targets but would impede progress toward long-term post-2020 targets.</p>	(AQ-5) Potentially significant	(AQ-9) Potentially significant	M-AQ-4	Significant and Unavoidable
<i>2.2 Biological Resources</i>				
<p>1. Candidate, Sensitive, or Special-Status Species: The proposed project would promote the development of accessory agriculture uses that would have the potential to result in direct and cumulative impacts to candidate, sensitive or special-status species due to removal of areas of sensitive habitat.</p>	(BI-1) Potentially Significant	(BI-5) Potentially Significant	<p>M-BIO-1: During the environmental review process for future discretionary permits for accessory agricultural uses, the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biological Resources shall be applied. When impacts on biological resources are determined to be significant, feasible and appropriate project-specific mitigation measures shall be incorporated pursuant to CEQA and RPO, BMO, and HLP Ordinance requirements, as applicable. Examples of standard mitigation measures within the County Guidelines include: avoidance of sensitive resources; preservation of habitat; revegetation; resource management; and restrictions on</p>	Significant and Unavoidable

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
			lighting, runoff, access, and/or noise.	
<p>2. Riparian Habitat or Sensitive Natural Community: The proposed project would promote the development of accessory agricultural uses that would have the potential to result in direct and cumulative impacts to riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities in the County.</p>	(BI-2) Potentially Significant	(BI-6) Potentially Significant	<p>M-BIO-1 M-BIO-2: Require that development projects obtain CWA Section 401/404 permits issued by the California RWQCB and USACE for applicable discretionary project-related disturbances of waters of the U.S. and/or associated wetlands. Also continue to require that discretionary projects obtain Fish and Game Code Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreements from CDFW for applicable project-related disturbances of streambeds.</p>	Significant and Unavoidable
<p>3. Federally Protected Wetlands: The proposed project would promote the development of accessory agricultural uses that would have the potential to result in direct and cumulative impacts to federally protected wetlands.</p>	(BI-3) Potentially Significant	(BI-7) Potentially Significant	M-BIO-1 and M-BIO-2	Significant and Unavoidable
<p>4. Wildlife Movement: The proposed project would promote the development of accessory agricultural uses that would have the potential to result in direct and cumulative impacts due to the introduction of new structures, or due to ground disturbance that could interfere with wildlife movement or impede the use of nursery sites.</p>	(BI-4) Potentially Significant	(BI-8) Potentially Significant	M-BIO-1 and M-BIO-2	Significant and Unavoidable

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
<p>5. Habitat Conservation Plans While the proposed project could result in some additional clearing beyond 3,000 acres, this is not considered a conflict with the South County MSCP Subarea Plan, because additional clearing would be required to comply with the BMO. Some clearing will be not be subject to County review and for the purpose of that discussion, impacts were considered potentially significant because there is no certainty of the outcome of specific individual projects promoted by the proposed project. Such potential individual impacts are not considered to represent a conflict between the proposed project and the South County MSCP Subarea Plan. Additionally, no cumulative projects were identified that, when considered in combination with the proposed project, would result in conflict.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p><i>2.3 Cultural Resources</i></p>				
<p>1. Historic Resources Development of accessory agriculture uses would have the potential to result in direct and cumulative impacts to a historical resource because it could potentially result in the physical demolition, destruction, or alteration of the historical resource through ground disturbance, or it could alter the setting of the resource when the setting contributes to the resource’s significance by introducing new structures.</p>	<p>(CR-1) Potentially Significant</p>	<p>(CR-6) Potentially Significant</p>	<p>M-CR-1: The County will provide incentives through the Mills Act to encourage the restoration, renovation, or adaptive reuse of historic resources. This will be done by reaching out to property owners with identified historic resources to participate. Known historic resources will also be designated as such by the County and subject to review by the Historic Site Board to ensure that significant impacts are avoided.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
			<p>M-CR-2: During the environmental review process for future Administrative, Minor Use, and Major Use Permits for agricultural accessory uses, proposed projects under the Agriculture Promotion Project will complete a full records search with the South Coastal Information Center. The result of the search will be used by a qualified archaeologist to provide a recommendation regarding potential cultural resources, methods for avoidance, and appropriate mitigation should impacts be anticipated. Consultations with Tribes will be conducted as appropriate pursuant to Senate Bill 18 and AB 52 to identify resources and implement feasible mitigation if impacts would occur.</p> <p>M-CR-3: The County will proactively work with the Tribes to identify tribal cultural resources and areas that require Tribal notification pursuant to AB 52.</p>	
<p>2. Archaeological Resources Development of accessory agricultural uses would have the potential to result in direct and cumulative impacts to an archaeological resource because it could potentially result in excavation and grading activities, which have the potential to damage or destroy</p>	<p>(CR-2) Potentially Significant</p>	<p>(CR-7) Potentially Significant</p>	<p>See M-CR-1 through M-CR-3</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
archaeological resources that may be present on or below the ground surface.				
<p>3. Tribal Cultural Resources Development of accessory agricultural uses would have the potential to result in direct and cumulative impacts to a tribal cultural resource because it could potentially result in excavation and grading activities, which have the potential to damage or destroy tribal cultural resources that may be present on or below the ground surface.</p>	(CR-3) Potentially Significant	(CR-8) Potentially Significant	See M-CR-1 through M-CR-3	Significant and Unavoidable
<p>4. Paleontological Resources Development of accessory agricultural uses would have the potential to result in direct and cumulative impacts to a paleontological resource because it could potentially result in excavation and grading activities, which have the potential to damage or destroy fossils in the underlying rock units.</p>	(CR-4) Potentially Significant	(CR-9) Potentially Significant	See M-CR-1 through M-CR-3	Significant and Unavoidable
<p>5. Human Remains Development of accessory agricultural uses would have the potential to result in direct and cumulative impacts to human remains because it could potentially result in excavation and grading activities, which have the potential to damage or destroy human remains that may be present below the ground surface.</p>	(CR-5) Potentially Significant	(CR-10) Potentially Significant	See M-CR-1 through M-CR-3	Significant and Unavoidable
<i>2.4 Hazards</i>				
<p>1. Hazardous Substance Handling The proposed project would not result in any potentially significant impacts related to the transportation, use, and disposal of hazardous materials.</p>	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less than Significant

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
<p>2. Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials The proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to the accidental release of hazardous materials.</p>	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less than Significant
<p>3. Hazards to Schools The proposed project would not result in significant adverse effect on hazardous emissions or involve hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.</p>	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less than Significant
<p>4. Existing Onsite Contamination Projects that require discretionary approvals will be reviewed against known sites and may also be required to prepare a Phase I Site Assessment. Projects that do not require discretionary approvals will still be regulated by applicable laws that place responsibility on construction contractors and property owners to address suspected contamination.</p>	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less than Significant
<p>5. Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans The proposed project would not result in significant adverse effects on emergency response and evacuation plans.</p>	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less than Significant
<p>6. Wildland Fires Implementation of the proposed project could result in potentially significant impacts involving wildland fires.</p>	(HZ-1) Potentially Significant	(HZ-2) Potentially Significant	M-HZ-1: The County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Wildland Fire and Fire Protection will be applied during the environmental review process for future projects under the Agriculture Promotion Program requiring discretionary permits.	Significant and Unavoidable

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
			Feasible and project-specific mitigation contained within the County Guidelines will be applied as appropriate. When impacts are determined to be significant, feasible, and appropriate, project-specific mitigation measures will be implemented. Examples of standard mitigation measures within the County Guidelines include installation of fire suppression systems; maintaining sufficient onsite water storage; inclusion of fire management zones; and implementing funded agreements with fire protection districts.	
7. Vectors The proposed project would not result in significant adverse effects related to vector sources.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less than Significant
8. Airport-Related Hazards The proposed project would not result in significant adverse effects on an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less than Significant
<i>2.5 Hydrology and Water Quality</i>				
1. Water Quality Development of accessory agricultural uses would have the potential to result in direct and cumulative water quality impacts.	(HY-1) Potentially Significant	(HY-3) Potentially Significant	M-HY-1: During the environmental review process for future discretionary permits for accessory agricultural uses, the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Hydrology and Water Quality Resources shall be	Significant and Unavoidable

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
			applied. When impacts on hydrology are determined to be significant, feasible and appropriate project-specific mitigation measures shall be incorporated. M-HY-2: Comply with the NPDES, RWQCB's Conditional Waivers, County of San Diego WPO, and the County Grading Ordinance, require preparation of storm water management plans as applicable, and implement BMPs.	
2. Soil Erosion Development of accessory agricultural uses would have the potential to result in direct and cumulative impacts associate with soil erosion.	(HY-2) Potentially Significant	(HY-4) Potentially Significant	See M-HY-1 and M-HY-2	Significant and Unavoidable
3. Drainage The proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to exceeding the capacity of stormwater systems.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less than Significant
<i>2.6 Noise</i>				
1. Excessive Noise Levels Development of accessory agricultural uses would result in significant direct and cumulative noise impacts related to offsite noise generated from vehicular traffic and trucks.	(N-1) Potentially Significant	(N-4) Potentially Significant	No mitigation proposed.	Significant and Unavoidable
2. Excessive Groundborne Vibration The proposed project would not result in significant adverse effects due to exposing people to or generating excessive	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less than Significant

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.				
<p>3. Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels Development of accessory agricultural uses would may result in significant direct and cumulative noise impacts related a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels generated from vehicular traffic and trucks.</p>	(N-2, N-3) Potentially Significant	(N-5) Potentially Significant	No mitigation proposed.	Significant and Unavoidable
<p>4. Temporary or Periodic Increase in Ambient Noise Levels The proposed project would not result in significant adverse effects due to temporary or periodic increases in noise levels.</p>	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less than Significant
<p>5. Airport-Related Noise Exposure Potential noise issues would be addressed through the County’s review and application of the ALUCP noise compatibility policies.</p>	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less than Significant
<i>2.7 Transportation and Traffic</i>				
<p>1. Conflict with a Plan, Policy, or Ordinance Impacts on County roadway segments and State Highways associated with full build-out of the proposed project are considered to be potentially significant.</p>	(T-1, T-2) Potentially Significant	(T-3) Potentially Significant	<p>M-T-1: During the environmental review process for future discretionary approval for accessory agricultural uses, the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Transportation and Traffic shall be applied. M-T-2: Implement the County Public Road Standards during review of new development projects. M-T-3: Implement the San Diego County TIF Ordinance, which defrays the costs of constructing</p>	Significant and Unavoidable

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
			planned transportation facilities necessary to accommodate increased traffic generated by future development.	
<p>2. Conflict with a Congestion Management Program The proposed project would not conflict with <i>The Regional Plan</i> as it is a regional planning document that is focused on general land use policy and regional transportation projects.</p>	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less than Significant
<i>2.8 Water Supply</i>				
<p>1. Water Supply The proposed project would promote the development of accessory agriculture facilities, some of which may increase the overall demand on imported water supply necessitating the development of new water supplies that have significant environmental impacts.</p>	(WS-1) Potentially Significant	(WS-3) Potentially Significant	<p>M-WS-1: Implement Policy I-84 requiring discretionary projects obtain water district commitment that water services are available. Prohibit the conversion of any dryland agricultural or non-irrigated lands to crop production.</p> <p>M-WS-2: Coordinate with the San Diego County Water Authority and other water agencies to coordinate land use planning with water supply planning and support continued implementation and enhancement of water conservation programs.</p>	Significant and Unavoidable
<p>2. Groundwater Supply The proposed project would promote the development of accessory agriculture facilities, some of which may rely on groundwater supplies in a manner that may significantly impact the sustainability of the aquifer or adjacent users.</p>	(WS-2) Potentially Significant	(WS-4) Potentially Significant	<p>M-WS-3: Use the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Groundwater Resources, Surface Water Quality, and Hydrology to identify and minimize adverse environmental effects on groundwater resources. Implement the Groundwater</p>	Significant and Unavoidable

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
			Ordinance through a Groundwater Investigation in order to ensure that groundwater resources are adequate to meet the groundwater demands of the project.	

