



# Planning Commission Hearing Report

---

<b>Date:</b>	October 18, 2013	<b>Case/File No.:</b>	Forest Conservation Initiative Lands GPA; GPA 12-004; 3800 12-004
<b>Place:</b>	County Conference Center 5520 Overland Avenue San Diego, CA 92123	<b>Project:</b>	Forest Conservation Initiative (FCI) Lands General Plan Amendment
<b>Time:</b>	9:00 am	<b>Location:</b>	Districts All
<b>Agenda Item:</b>	#1	<b>General Plan:</b>	Various
<b>Appeal Status:</b>	Board of Supervisors is the final decision-maker	<b>Zoning:</b>	Various
<b>Applicant/Owner:</b>	County of San Diego	<b>Communities:</b>	Alpine, Central Mountain, Desert, Jamul/Dulzura, Julian, Mountain Empire, North Mountain, Pendleton-DeLuz, Ramona
<b>Environmental:</b>	Supplemental EIR	<b>APN'S:</b>	Various

## **A. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **1. Requested Actions**

This is a request for the Planning Commission to evaluate this proposed General Plan Amendment (GPA) and make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors. The GPA, directed by the Board of Supervisors in December 2010, proposes land use changes to approximately 71,600 acres of the former Forest Conservation Initiative (FCI) lands. In addition, the GPA proposes changes to zoning when necessary for consistency with a change in General Plan designation and minor FCI associated changes to the General Plan Land Use and Mobility Elements, Central Mountain, Jamul/Dulzura, North Mountain Subregional Plans, and the Alpine Community Plan. Finally, the Forest Conservation Initiative Appendix would be removed from the General Plan.

If the required findings can be made, the Department recommends that the Planning Commission take the following actions:

- A. Find that it has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR), dated August 3, 2011 on file with Planning & Development Services (PDS) as Environmental Review Number 02-ZA-001, and the Draft Supplemental EIR thereto, dated October 2013 on file with PDS as GPA 12-004, prior to making its recommendation on the GPA.
- B. Recommend that the Board of Supervisors adopt the Resolution (Attachment A) to amend the County of San Diego General Plan.

- 
- C. Recommend that the Board of Supervisors adopt the attached Form of Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE CHANGING THE ZONING CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY WITHIN THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO RELATED TO THE FOREST CONSERVATION INITIATIVE LANDS GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT [GPA 12-004] (Attachment C)

**2. Required Findings to Support Requested Actions**

- A. Is the proposed GPA in compliance with the California Government Code? (Pages 8,12, 13)
- B. Is the proposed GPA consistent with the vision, goals, and policies of the General Plan and its community and subregional plans? (Pages 7-9)
- C. Does the GPA comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)? (Pages 9-10)

**B. PROPOSAL**

**1. Background**

- A. In 1993, San Diego County voters passed the Forest Conservation Initiative (FCI), which required 40-acre minimum lot sizes on approximately 71,600 acres of private lands within the Cleveland National Forest (CNF). Voters endorsed the FCI to prevent further encroachment by development into the CNF, which once was nearly two million contiguous acres. Today the CNF is 424,000 acres; 286,000 acres of which are in San Diego County<sup>1</sup>.
- B. The FCI expired on December 31, 2010. Upon expiration, the General Plan land use designations for FCI lands reverted back to the land use designations in place prior to 1993. Due to the timing of the FCI expiration, FCI lands were not included in the 2011 General Plan Update. The current mapping of the FCI lands is therefore not consistent with the General Plan planning objectives; in particular, the General Plan Community Development Model, which seeks to located low and very low densities around a compact central village core.

On December 8, 2010, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to prepare a GPA for the FCI lands consistent with the appropriate General Plan Update land use designations. On March 16, 2011, staff also confirmed to the Board that land use changes would be considered on adjacent parcels when changes in circumstances would warrant new land use designations.

Two other County-initiated GPAs: General Plan Clean-up (GPA 12-007) and Property Specific Requests (PSRs) GPA (GPAs 12-005 and 12-012) are also currently being processed. The Clean-up is anticipated for Planning Commission consideration in late 2013 and the PSRs in 2016.

**2. GPA Description**

**A. Scope**

This GPA includes proposed revisions to the General Plan land use map, Zoning Ordinance, Land Use and Mobility Elements, and four community and five subregional plans, along with removal of the Forest Conservation Initiative Appendix to the General Plan. The proposed revisions are shown in Attachment B and briefly described below.

- i. Land Use Map — This GPA proposes to redesignate former FCI lands within the CNF with land use designations that are consistent with the guiding principles and policies of the adopted General Plan. In addition, the GPA proposes changes to approximately 400 acres

---

<sup>1</sup> Union Tribune, Cleveland National Forest Needs Protection, Art Madrid & Duncan McFetridge, May 17, 2013

---

of adjacent private lands based on a change in circumstances, such as a new high school that is now planned for the Alpine Community. Changes to non-FCI lands will ensure that the anticipated uses consider any changed circumstances and are consistent with the changes being proposed for the former FCI lands.

Land use map revisions are proposed for the Alpine, Julian, Pendleton-DeLuz, and Ramona Community Planning Areas, and the Central Mountain, Desert, Jamul/Dulzura, Mountain Empire, and North Mountain Subregions. Land use maps are provided as Appendix 1 to Attachment B.

- ii. Zoning — A total of 329 of the more than 4,000 parcels require changes to zoning to maintain consistency between the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. The changes correspond to land use designation changes. Attachment C includes proposed changes to the Zoning Ordinance.
- iii. Land Use Element — Proposed changes to the Land Use Element are described in Attachment B, Chapter III, and include.
  - a) Land Use Designations — Remove the “*Forest Conservation Initiative Lands*” designation included under the *Other Land Use Designations* section.
  - b) Regional Categories Map — Revise Figure LU-1, Regional Categories Map, to assign a Regional Category to the former FCI lands, which are currently shown as “Forest Conservation Initiative Overlay”.
- iv. Mobility Element — The Traffic Impact Assessment Analysis (TIAA) prepared as part of the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) determined that this GPA would only have a significant impact on roads in the Alpine community where road segments are forecast to change from a level of service (LOS) D or better to LOS E or F with buildout of the Land Use Map (Draft SEIR is provided as Attachment D). The proposed changes to the Mobility Element are provided in Attachment B, Chapter IV and are based on the recommendations of the Alpine CPG.

This GPA proposes to change the classification of a segment of Willows Road in Alpine from a two-lane 2.2E Light Collector to a four-lane 4.2B Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes. In addition, this GPA would add the following road segments to Mobility Element Table M-4, Road Segments Where Adding Travel Lanes is not Justified.

- a) Alpine Boulevard
    - Tavern Road to Boulder Road.
    - Louise Drive to South Grade Road.
    - South Grade Road to West Willows Road.
    - West Willows Road to Willows Road at I-8 exit 36.
  - b) South Grade Road (Eltinge Drive to Olive View Road).
- v. Community and Subregional Plans — This GPA includes minor amendments to the Alpine Community Plan as well as the Central Mountain, Jamul/Dulzura and North Mountain Subregional Plans. The proposed amendments to community and subregional plans are briefly described below and shown in strikeout-underline in Attachment B, Chapter V.
  - a) *Alpine Community Plan*
    - Village boundary map revisions to reflect new Village Regional Category land use map changes.
    - Text and policy revisions to recognize the requirement to expand water and sewer service areas.

- b) *Central Mountain Subregional Plan*
  - Descanso and Pine Valley Rural Village boundary map revisions to replace FCI land use designations.
  - Allocation of land use designations table revisions to remove references to FCI.
- c) *Jamul/Dulzura Subregional Plan* — Revisions for two policies to remove the reference to FCI.
- d) *North Mountain Subregional Plan* — A new overlay for multi-use communication structures.
- vi. Forest Conservation Initiative Appendix — The GPA will also remove the FCI Appendix from the General Plan, (see Attachment B, Chapter VII).

## B. GPA Alternatives

Five land use map alternatives developed through the planning process for this GPA. The Planning Commission can recommend one, or any combination of, these alternatives. Table B-1 compares the residential buildout potential for the five different alternatives described below.

**Table B-1: GPA Alternatives Buildout Scenarios**<sup>NOTE</sup>

Communities	FCI Condition <sup>1</sup>	No Project	Draft Map	Modified Project	Staff Recommendation
<b>Alpine</b>	<b>1,382</b>	<b>2,721</b>	<b>3,830</b>	<b>2,087</b>	<b>2,893</b>
<b>Central Mountain</b>	<b>1,178</b>	<b>5,604</b>	<b>1,065</b>	<b>1,032</b>	<b>1,051</b>
Cuyamaca	110	274	110	88	98
Descanso	606	1,376	618	609	618
Pine Valley	324	2,813	227	227	227
Unrepresented	138	1,141	110	108	108
<b>Desert</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Jamul-Dulzura</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>Julian</b>	<b>386</b>	<b>2,547</b>	<b>389</b>	<b>389</b>	<b>389</b>
<b>Mountain Empire</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>51</b>
Campo/Lake Morena	46	291	55	42	48
Unrepresented	3	20	3	3	3
<b>North Mountain</b>	<b>991</b>	<b>4,148</b>	<b>900</b>	<b>899</b>	<b>894</b>
Palomar Mountain	855	3,024	798	797	792
Unrepresented	136	1,124	102	102	102
<b>De Luz</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Ramona</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>181</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>4,238</b>	<b>15,994</b>	<b>6,516</b>	<b>4,710</b>	<b>5,537</b>

NOTE: The dwelling unit totals for FCI Condition, No Project, and Draft Map are slightly different than the totals reported in the Draft SEIR. However, this table is intended primarily for comparison purposes to show the differences between these five land use alternatives.

- i. Forest Conservation Initiative Condition — The FCI imposed 40-acre minimum lot size on all parcels within the CNF and outside of county towns. While the FCI expired at the end of 2010, it is an alternative in this staff report as it most closely resembles what was analyzed under the 2011 General Plan Update.
- ii. Existing General Plan — This is the current General Plan land use designations on County lands, and is also the No Project Alternative for the GPA's SEIR. When the FCI expired, the lands that were subject to the FCI reverted back to the land use designations in effect

---

prior to 1993 and In most instances, are not consistent with the land use mapping principles of the 2011 General Plan Update.

- iii. Draft Land Use Map — In the early phases of the planning process, a Draft Land Use Map was prepared through coordination with property owners and community planning and sponsor groups. The Draft Land Use Map recommended by the planning groups was analyzed as the Proposed Project for the Draft SEIR and circulated for public review. Comment letters received from circulating the Draft SEIR for public review are based on the Draft Land Use Map.
- iv. Modified Project Alternative — This alternative is based on comment letters received during the Notice of Preparation public review period for the Draft SEIR. These letters considered the Draft Land Use Map and proposed reduced densities on specific parcels to further reduce the GPA's impacts. This alternative is discussed in SEIR Chapter 4.0, Project Alternatives (see Figures 4-1A through C).
- v. Staff Recommendation — A staff working group identified areas where issues were raised during public review of the Draft Plan and Draft SEIR. These areas are referenced as Areas of Consideration (AOC). In formulating a staff recommendation for each AOC, the working group considered factors such as existing land use and parcel sizes, conformance with the Community Development Model, access to a public road, the extent of physical and environmental constraints, and proximity to environmentally sensitive CNF lands. Appendix 2 to Attachment B provides an analysis of each AOC, along with the rationale for the Staff Recommendation.

#### C. Staff Recommendation and Draft Land Use Map Differences

The Staff Recommendation and Draft Land Use Maps are the primary alternatives provided for consideration because the Draft Map is primarily based on community planning groups' (CPG) recommendations and the Staff Recommendation was developed after considering issues identified in the comment letters received from circulating the Notice of Preparation and Draft SEIR. The Staff Recommendation Land Use Map (Attachment B, Appendix 1) uses a blue hatch to identify areas where the Staff Recommendation differs from the Draft Land Use Map.

##### i. Land Use Designations

Table B-2 below summarizes the differences in assigning land use designations between the "Staff Recommendation" and "Draft Land Use Maps". The Staff Recommendation assigns 25.5 less acres of Rural Commercial and 2,826.4 less acres of Semi-Rural Regional Category designations than the Draft Land Use Map. Otherwise, the Staff Recommendation assigns 165 more acres of Village Regional Category and 1,444 more Rural Lands Regional Category than the Draft Land Use Map.

**Table B-2: Staff Recommendation and Draft Land Use Map Differences  
Assignment of Land Use Designations (Acres)**

<b>CPA or Subregion</b>	<b>Rural Commercial</b>	<b>Village Residential</b>	<b>Semi-rural Residential</b>	<b>Rural Lands</b>	<b>Public/Semi-Public Facilities</b>	<b>Public Agency Lands</b>	<b>Tribal Lands</b>	<b>Open Space (Conservation)</b>
Alpine CPA	(25.5)	165.4	(2,484.5)	2,254.5			90.0	
Central Mountain (unrepresented)				(487.2)				487.2
Cuyamaca				(1.2)				1.2
Julian				(40.4)				40.4
Lake Morena			(134.4)	(100.9)		235.3		
Mountain Empire (unrepresented)				(230.7)		230.7		
Palomar Mountain			(207.5)	50.0	0.9	156.6		
<b>Total</b>	<b>(25.5)</b>	<b>165.4</b>	<b>(2,826.4)</b>	<b>1,444.1</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>622.6</b>	<b>90.0</b>	<b>528.8</b>

Note: Negative numbers are in parentheses ( ) and represent where the Staff Recommendation assigns less acres of a land use designation than the Draft Land Use Map

ii. Dwelling Unit Yield

The Staff Recommendation and Draft Land Use Map are the same for the communities of Descanso, Desert, Julian, Pine Valley, Ramona, and unrepresented communities of Mountain Empire and North Mountain. Differences between the Draft Land Use Map and Staff Recommendation occur in the unrepresented community of Central Mountain along with the communities of Alpine, Cuyamaca, DeLuz, Dulzura, Lake Morena, and Palomar Mountain.

At buildout the Staff Recommendation would also result in fewer potential dwelling units than the Draft Land Use Map for the communities identified below (the reduction in the number of units is shown in parentheses below):

- Alpine (937)
- Central Mountain-unrepresented (2)
- Cuyamaca (12)
- DeLuz (6)
- Dulzura (9)
- Lake Morena (7)
- Palomar Mountain (6)

iii. Areas of Consideration (AOC)

The Staff Recommendation land use map incorporates changes based on issues raised in the Draft SEIR public comment letters. Areas of Consideration are identified and analyzed in Appendix 2 to Attachment B. The analysis for each area of consideration includes a description of the property, context, physical and environmental constraints, and the rationale for staff's recommendation. The primary planning criteria for staff's recommendation is summarized below.

a) *Consistency with the Community Development Model*

- Expansion of Alpine Village is recommended in response to the Alpine CPG's desire for a larger population base to support a new high school. The Staff Recommendation proposes an extension of the existing linear pattern of the

---

Alpine Village. The GPA would extend this linear pattern by applying higher land use intensities along the existing transportation corridors of Interstate 8 and Alpine Boulevard [refer to AL-3, AL-5].

- In most communities, FCI lands are located well outside of villages. Rural Lands 40 or 80 land use designations are assigned in these areas consistent with the Community Development Model so that areas of very low density provide for a separation between communities [refer to AL-7, AL-8, CM-1, CU-1, DE-2, JD-1, NM-1, NM-2, PD-1].
- b) *Consistency with existing parcel size* – Outside of villages and the County Water Authority boundary, Semi-Rural 10 or Rural Lands 20 land use designations are assigned only when the predominant parcel size is similar ( 10 to 20 acres) and would result in little to no additional subdivision potential [refer to AL-1, AL-9, AL-10, DE-1].
- c) *Reduced development adjacent to CNF lands* – Lower land use designations are assigned adjacent to the CNF lands to reduce density in the Wildland/Urban Interface. Additional development in this area increases the likelihood of human-caused wildland fires, requires a greater commitment of resources to manage buffers between the CNF and developed areas, and increases the need for additional infrastructure and services in CNF lands [refer to AL-7, AL-8, AL-9, AL-10, AL-11B, CM-1, CU-1, DE-1, DE-2, JD-1, NM-1, NM-2, PD-1].
- d) *Reduced development in areas with sensitive biological resources* – Lower density residential designations are assigned in areas with high value biological resources to avoid these sensitive resources [refer to AL-2A, AL-5, AL-7, AL-10, AL-11A, CU-1, LM-1, PD-1].
- e) *Reduced development in areas without adequate access* – Lower densities are assigned in areas that are one-half mile or more from public roads [refer to AL-1, AL-5, AL-6, AL-7, AL-8, AL-9, CM-1, CU-1, JD-1, PD-1.]
- f) *Reduced development in areas with physical constraints* – Lower densities are assigned in areas dominated with slopes greater than 25% [refer to AL-7, CM-1, CU-1, NM-1, PD-1].
- g) *Avoid spot designations* – Avoid assigning a single commercial designation outside of villages and away from transportation nodes [refer to AL-2B].

## **C. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION**

### **1. General Plan Consistency**

This GPA will replace the pre-1993 land use designations for FCI lands with designations consistent with the General Plan Update adopted in 2011. Adoption of the proposed GPA provides the following benefits:

- Ensures that the entire land use map for the unincorporated county is consistent with the Community Development Model and other General Plan Guiding Principles, goals and policies
- Provides certainty to property owners of former FCI lands when filing project applications

This GPA proposes to replace the pre-FCI General Plan land use designations with those of the adopted General Plan. Table C-1 below identifies the General Plan policies that form the basis for the mapping principles that apply to assigning land use designations to the General Plan land use map. Policies LU-1.1 and LU-1.9 relate to the overall Staff Recommendation land use map, while Policies LU-1.2, LU-1.3, LU-1.4, and LU-1.5 primarily are related to a proposed new Village in the Alpine Community Planning Area. An analysis of GPA conformance with these policies is provided in the table below.

**Table C-1: General Plan Conformance**

General Plan Component	Explanation of GPA Conformance
<p>1) <b>Policy LU-1.1 – Assigning Land Use Designations.</b> Assign land use designations on the Land Use Map in accordance with the Community Development Model and boundaries established by the Regional Categories Map.</p>	<p>The Community Development Model (CDM) forms the basis for assigning land use designations to the General Plan land use map. The CDM is based on a central core, such as a Village or Rural Village, surrounded by semi-rural areas that reflect the existing patterns of development. Consistent with the policy, the GPA assigns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rural Lands designations in remote lands adjacent to the CNF.</li> <li>• Semi-rural designations consistent with existing semi-rural parcel sizes.</li> <li>• Village designations consistent with existing parcels sizes, adjacent to existing village areas, or as an expansion of the existing linear Alpine Village along major transportation corridors.</li> </ul>
<p>2) <b>Policy LU-1.3 – Development Patterns.</b> Designate land use designations in patterns to create or enhance communities and preserve surrounding rural lands.</p>	<p>The GPA preserves rural lands by assigning only Rural Lands designations, with the exception of certain areas in the communities that are consistent with existing parcel sizes or to enhance existing village areas.</p>
<p>3) <b>Policy LU-1.9 – Achievement of Planned Densities.</b> Recognizing that the General Plan was created with the concept that subdivisions will be able to achieve densities shown on the Land Use Map, planned densities are intended to be achieved through the subdivision process except in cases where regulations or site specific characteristics render such densities infeasible.</p>	<p>This GPA is consistent with this policy because physical and environmental constraints to development are considered when assigning land use designations; along with other constraints such as inadequate road access. Therefore, the densities assigned by the Staff Recommendation Land Use Map are meant to be achievable.</p>
<p>4) <b>Policy M-2.1 – Level of Service Criteria.</b> Require development projects to provide associated road improvements necessary to achieve a level of service of “D” or higher on all Mobility Element roads except for those where a failing level of service has been accepted by the County pursuant to the criteria specifically identified in the accompanying text box (Criteria for Accepting a Road Classification with Level of Service E/F). When development is proposed on roads where a failing level of service has been accepted, require feasible mitigation in the form of road improvements or a fair share contribution to a road improvement program, consistent with the Mobility Element road network.</p>	<p>The GPA is consistent because either change a road segment classification change from two to four lanes is proposed or road segments are identified to accept at a LOS E or F based on the criteria provided in this policy.</p>



---

## 2. Community Plan Consistency

Government Code 65359 dictates that community plans affected by a GPA shall be reviewed and amended as necessary to make the community plan consistent with the General Plan. Staff reviewed community and subregional plans for communities that are a part of this GPA and found that land use designations assigned to the Staff Recommendation are consistent with the applicable community and subregional plans. Because this GPA is proposing higher densities outside the County Water Authority boundary, changes to the Alpine Community Plan are proposed to ensure the Staff Recommendation land use map is consistent with the Community Plan. Proposed changes to make the Community Plan policies consistent with the land use map are discussed in the table below.

**Table C-2: Community Plan Conformance**

<b>Alpine Community Plan Component</b>	<b>Explanation of GPA Conformance</b>
1) Land Use/General Policy 2 – Direct higher density residential development to the existing urban services area; continue existing densities to the imported water service area; and encourage low densities beyond those limits.	<p>This GPA revises this policy to direct higher density residential development to both existing and planned urban services areas. The policy revision is shown below.</p> <p><i>Direct higher density residential development to the existing <u>and planned</u> urban services area; continue existing densities to the imported water service area; and encourage low densities beyond those limits.</i></p>
2) Land Use/Residential Policy 1.b – Higher density development in the existing sanitation district area is encouraged over that in areas requiring major extension of sewer lines.	<p>This GPA revises the policy to encourage higher density mixed use development in the Willows Road area east of the Viejas casino to retain consistency between the land use map and community plan. The policy revision is shown below.</p> <p><i>Higher density development in the existing sanitation district area is encouraged over that in areas requiring major extension of sewer lines, <u>with the exception of the Willows Road area east of the Viejas casino where mixed use development is also encouraged.</u></i></p>

## 3. Zoning Ordinance Consistency

This GPA proposes Zoning use regulation, lot size, and building type changes when the current zoning is no longer consistent with proposed land use designations. Staff reviewed the proposed zoning for the GPA for consistency with the Staff Recommendation Land Use Map designations in accordance with the Compatibility Matrix in Zoning Ordinance Section 2050.

## 4. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Compliance

A Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) to the Program EIR for the General Plan Update certified on August 3, 2011, has been prepared pursuant to CEQA. The former FCI lands were not a part of the General Plan Update and, therefore, analysis of potential impacts from development of these lands could not be analyzed in the General Plan Update Program EIR. A Notice of Preparation (NOP) was issued August 30, 2012, soliciting input on the scope of the SEIR. Twelve comment letters were received and included as part of the Draft SEIR. The Draft Plan was analyzed as the Proposed Project. Other alternatives evaluated by the Draft SEIR are identified below.

- *No New East Willows Village Alternative (Alpine CPA)* – Reduced land use densities within the proposed new Alpine “village core” east of the Viejas Casino.

- 
- *Modified Project Alternative (Environmentally Superior Alternative)* – Based on the recommendations in comment letters received during the NOP public review period that propose reduced densities on specific parcels to further reduce GPA impacts.
  - *No Project Alternative* – Assumes pre-existing General Plan land use densities that currently apply to the former FCI lands would remain in effect.

The Draft SEIR determined that significant impacts will occur under the SEIR topic areas identified below. Generally, the environmental impacts of these changes can be addressed by mitigation measures. However, the SEIR determined that the potential for disturbance from the proposed changes would represent an irreversible change. For all topic areas, either the Draft Land Use Map or Staff Recommendation would result in either similar or less impacts than the No Project Alternative, which would be to retain the current General Plan designations for FCI lands.

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Public Services
- Transportation and Traffic
- Utilities and Service Systems

The Draft SEIR and the Draft Plan were circulated on February 1, 2013 for a 45-day review period. The Draft SEIR is included as Attachment D. Revisions to the Draft SEIR based on public comment letters are shown in strikeout-underline. Staff's responses to public comment letters are included as Volume 2 of Attachment D.

## **5. GPA Issues**

- A. General Plan Conformance of Project Applications — Since expiration at the end of 2010, land use designations are not consistent with the current General Plan, and for many properties, the densities allowed by the former General Plan are not consistent with the General Plan Guiding Principles and Policies. Project applications filed before the FCI GPA is adopted will be required to be processed based on the land use designations in effect at the time of application. The expeditious processing of this amendment will provide more clarity and certainty for property owners and future development applications.
- B. Lack of Consensus — The Draft Land Use Map for this GPA is the Proposed Project for the Draft SEIR. The Draft Map is based on property owner and community planning and sponsor group recommendations. However, comment letters were received during public review of the Draft SEIR that expressed opposition to some land use designations proposed in the Draft Plan for the communities of Alpine, Lake Morena, Cuyamaca, Descanso, Dulzura, Palomar Mountain, and DeLuz.

When developing the Staff Recommendation Land Use Map, staff considered the recommendations of property owners, community planning and sponsor groups, and comment letters received from circulating the Draft SEIR and Land Use Map for public review. Of the over 4,000 parcels included with this GPA, the staff recommendation proposes to change the Draft Land Use Map designation for less than 12 percent of the parcels. That being said, the least consensus was reached in the community of Alpine, where, unlike the other communities, the recommendations for land use designations and density were divided within the community. The

---

primary areas where consensus in Alpine is lacking are described below. Appendix 2 to Attachment B discusses the rationale for staff's recommendations.

1. Willows Road parcels west of Viejas Casino — There are two parcels on Willows Road where the GPA proposes a Rural Commercial designation. Staff recommends a Semi-rural 4 designation because one parcel is nearly entirely constrained by wetlands [refer to AL-2A], and a Commercial designation would be a spot zone as the second parcel is surrounded by semi-rural residential designations [refer to AL-2B].
2. Privately-owned lands south of Interstate 8 — Both the Draft Plan and Staff Recommendation propose increased densities south of Interstate 8 in the vicinity of the Viejas Reservation. The densities proposed require extension of the County Water Authority boundary. Both the United States Forest Service (USFS) and Endangered Habitats League (EHL) oppose the higher densities. The primary differences between the two maps are that the Staff Recommendation proposes higher densities along Alpine Boulevard and lower densities adjacent to the CNF; whereas the Draft Map assigns semi-rural densities consistently throughout, including adjacent to the CNF [refer to AL-5, AL-6, AL-7].
3. Ewiiapaayp-owned parcel south of Interstate 8 — The Ewiiapaayp Tribal Government requests a Rural Commercial designation for a single parcel on the south side of Interstate 8 directly south of the Southern Indian Health Council located on Willows Road. However, both staff and the Alpine CPG recommend a residential designation, consistent with surrounding parcels. This parcel is currently the subject of a fee to trust transfer appealed by the County [refer to AL-4].
4. Privately-owned lands in the Japatul Valley area — The General Plan Update assigned Rural Lands 40 designations to parcels outside the County Water Authority boundary in accordance with the Community Development Model. The Staff Recommendation assigns Rural Lands 40 in the Japatul Valley area, with the exception of areas with smaller parcel sizes. In these instances higher densities are assigned consistent with the predominant parcel sizes. The property owners and Alpine CPG support even higher densities in this area [refer to AL-8, AL-11B].

Other communities where the Draft Land Use and Staff Recommendation Maps are different is discussed below.

5. Cuyamaca — At the request of some property owners, the Community Sponsor Group recommends RL-40 (Draft Plan) for areas in the northwestern portion of the planning area. The Staff Recommendation is Rural Lands 80 because the area is generally undeveloped and the USFS raised issues regarding wildland fire hazards [refer to CU-1].
6. Jamul/Dulzura — The CPG recommends Rural Lands 40 (Draft Plan) for an area in the northeastern portion of the planning area. The Staff Recommendation for Rural Lands 80 is based on the existing large parcel sizes that are surrounded by, and only accessible through, the CNF [refer to JD-1].
7. Lake Morena — EHL raised a concern over the Semi-rural 10 density of parcels to the south of the Lake Morena Village adjacent to the CNF. The Staff Recommendation reduces the density for five parcels from Semi-rural 10 to Rural Lands 20 so that the density is more consistent with the size of the parcels [refer to LM-1].
8. Palomar Mountain — EHL raised a concern over the semi-rural density for large parcels with additional subdivision potential. Staff Recommendation reduces the density for nine parcels

---

from Semi-rural 10 to Rural Lands 40 so that these parcels are more consistent with the density assigned to similar adjacent parcels [refer to NM-1 and NM-2].

9. Pendleton-DeLuz — USFS raised concerns over a Rural Lands 40 designation for parcels surrounded by federally-designated CNF Wilderness lands. The Staff Recommendation reduces the density for this area from one dwelling unit per 40 acres to one dwelling unit per 80 acres. Assigning a RL-80 designation reflects that the only access to most of these parcels is only available through CNF lands [refer to PD-1].
- C. Expansion of County Water Authority (CWA) Boundary — Both the Draft Land Use and Staff Recommendation maps require the extension of the CWA boundary in Alpine, both north and south of Interstate 8. These areas are currently groundwater dependent and require a four- to five-acre minimum lot size. Extending imported water services requires both a per-acre cost to annex into the CWA and Padre Dam Municipal Water District (PDMWD), along with the costs to construct any necessary infrastructure. [A study prepared to extend imported water services along the Willows Road corridor is included as Appendix 3 to Attachment B.]
- D. Requirement to Update the Transportation Impact Fee — The FCI Lands GPA proposes land use map and Mobility Element (ME) road network changes that will warrant a future update to the County's Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) Program (the County TIF Program is available at: <http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/dpw/land/tif.html>). This update would result in new fee rates for future development for primarily the Alpine community and South TIF Region planning areas. The proposed land use changes in the other FCI communities are not significant enough to warrant an update to the Program by themselves, but land use changes would be addressed as part of the next TIF Update. The FCI GPA land use changes would also affect the North and East TIF regions, but the land use changes proposed by this GPA outside of the Alpine community are very minor and would only have a minimal effect on North and East TIF region fee rates. ME road network changes are only proposed within the Alpine community.

This GPA proposes road network and land uses changes identified below that would necessitate updating the TIF Program for the Alpine community and the South TIF Region.

- Road Network: Revise the ME network by reclassifying the eastern end of Willows Road in Alpine from a two-lane to a four-lane road.
- Land Use: Assign land use designations that change the number of potential dwelling units and commercial land uses in Alpine over what was analyzed for the 2012 TIF Update as follows:
  - Increase the number of residential dwelling units at buildout of the land use map by approximately 1,500 units
  - Increase by approximately 140 acres the amount of Rural Commercial land uses and by 150 acres the amount of Village Core Mixed Use land uses

While the changes proposed with the FCI GPA warrant an update to the TIF Program to reflect land use and mobility plans, it should be noted that there are several other private and County-initiated GPA's currently going through the planning review process. An update to the TIF Program will require additional funding and action by the County and a separate Board action. If approved, staff will further assess the FCI changes to the TIF program and propose an appropriate time for a program update.

#### D. PUBLIC INPUT

Changes to an adopted General Plan must follow the process specified in Government Code Section 65350, which includes evaluation and analysis, public and agency review, Planning Commission review, and Board of Supervisors approval. Staff conducted public outreach that included two separate notifications to all property owners in FCI lands, along with staff's attendance at planning and sponsor group meetings.

---

In addition to public outreach, PDS staff coordinated with other County departments, including the Departments of Public Works and General Services, the Sheriff Department, and the Fire Authority.

Below is a summary of outreach efforts.

1. **Special Study of FCI lands in Alpine** — On August 1, 2007, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to begin planning for Phase I of FCI lands in Alpine; approximately 67 acres of non-tribal owned lands north of Interstate 8 and east of the Viejas reservation that are easily accessible from Interstate 8. A stakeholder group was established to facilitate planning for this area. The group consisted of residents along Willows Road, both to the west and east of the Viejas Casino, and a resident south of Viejas and Interstate 8, along with three members of the Alpine CPG, and a representative from Viejas. From 2008 through 2010, preliminary land use plans were prepared and coordinated through the Alpine CPG. Approximately four meetings with the stakeholder group and two meetings with the Alpine CPG were held during this period.
2. **Property Owner Notification (Initial)** — Early in the planning process property owners of affected parcels were mailed a “notification of a proposed property change”. The purpose of this notification was to inform property owners of the proposed GPA, recommend preliminary land use and zoning designations, identify when the GPA would be addressed at the applicable planning or sponsor group meeting, and to encourage property owners to sign up to receive the regular email notifications (discussed below) to keep abreast of the GPA status.
3. **Web Page** — At the initiation of the countywide GPA, a web page was established to provide the most current information on the GPA as it progressed through the planning phases: <http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/pds/advance/FCI.html>.
4. **eBLAST** — Planning & Development Services publishes regular email notifications to provide specific information concerning this GPA, including when the various components of the public outreach program will occur. Property owners affected by this GPA and other interested parties have been encouraged to sign up to receive this email.
5. **Community Planning and Sponsor Group Input** — Staff attended a total of approximately 16 planning and sponsor group meetings for the Alpine, Campo/Lake Morena, Cuyamaca, Descanso, Jamul/Dulzura, Julian, Pine Valley, and Ramona communities, along with a meeting with Palomar Mountain Planning Organization. These meetings were well attended because notices had been mailed to all property owners informing them of the meeting time and date. These planning groups solicited input from property owners and provided staff with a recommended land use map. These recommended maps became the Draft Land Use Map, which was part of the Proposed Project for the Draft SEIR.
6. **Tribal Consultation** — All tribal governments within the San Diego region were notified about the changes proposed by this GPA in accordance with Government Code 65352. As a result of these notifications, consultations were conducted with the following: Ewiiapaayp, Pechanga, Viejas, and the Inter-tribal Cultural Resource Protection Council. Correspondence received from Tribal governments is included as Attachment E.
7. **Public and Agency Review** — In accordance with CEQA, areas of potential controversy for the Proposed Project were identified through written agency and public comments received during the NOP public review period. As a result of these comments, meetings were held with the USFS, CNF Foundation, and EHL. The Draft Plan and Draft SEIR were circulated for a 45-day public review as discussed in Section C.6 above. Staff received 41 comment letters and issues raised in these letters were a major consideration when preparing the Staff Recommendation. The area of consideration analysis (Attachment B, Appendix 2) includes excerpts from these letters, when applicable.

- 
8. **Property Owner Notification (Second)** — Once the Staff Recommendation was developed, a second notice was mailed to every property owner of affected parcels. The purpose of this notification was to inform property owners of the proposed Staff Recommendation land use designation and zoning and to inform them when this GPA would be heard by the Planning Commission.

#### E. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

In addition to the Staff Recommendation developed by the working group, there are several other alternatives available for the Planning Commission to consider, as described in Section B.2.B above. The Planning Commission can select one, or any combination of, these alternatives. Some alternatives are more consistent with General Plan objectives than others, as described in the table below.

**Table E-1: Project Alternative for Planning Commission Consideration**

<b>Alternative</b>	<b>Consistent with General Plan objectives</b>	<b>Requires additional revision of General Plan goals &amp; policies</b>
Staff Recommendation	Yes	No
Draft Plan (SEIR Proposed Project)	Yes	Yes <sup>1</sup>
Modified Project	Yes	No
No Project (existing General Plan)	No <sup>2</sup>	Yes <sup>3</sup>
FCI Condition	Yes	No

Notes:

- 1) Policy LU-1.2, Leapfrog Development, would need to accommodate the Village Core Mixed Use designated area in East Alpine.
- 2) The existing General Plan designations for FCI lands are not consistent with the Community Development Model as they assign semi-rural densities in remote locations away from existing villages where the infrastructure, services and jobs are located.
- 3) Policies LU-1.1 and LU-1.3 would need to be revised because semi-rural densities are assigned in remote locations, as discussed in Note 1 above.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission:

1. Find that it has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final Program Environmental Impact Report, dated August 3, 2011, on file with Planning & Development Services (PDS) as Environmental Review Number 02-ZA-001, and the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report thereto, dated August 2013, on file with PDS as GPA 12-004, prior to making its recommendation on the GPA.
2. Recommend that the Board of Supervisors adopt the Resolution (Attachment A) for Forest Conservation Initiative Lands General Plan Amendment (GPA-12-004).
3. Recommend that the Board of Supervisors adopt the attached Form of Ordinance:  
AN ORDINANCE CHANGING THE ZONING CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY WITHIN THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO RELATED TO THE FOREST CONSERVATION INITIATIVE LANDS GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT [GPA 12-004] (Attachment C)

---

**Report Prepared By:**


Bob Citrano, Project Manager  
858-694-3229  
robert.citrano@sdcounty.ca.gov

**Report Approved By:**

Mark Wardlaw, Director  
858-694-2962  
mark.wardlaw@sdcounty.ca.gov

---

**AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE:**



MARK WARDLAW, DIRECTOR

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- Attachment A – Resolution of the San Diego County Board of Supervisors Adopting Forest Conservation Initiative Lands General Plan Amendment (GPA 12-004)
- Attachment B – Staff Recommendation
- Attachment C – Zoning Ordinance Amendment
- Attachment D – Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report
- Attachment E – Senate Bill 18 Correspondance