

## CHAPTER 1.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

### 1.1 Introduction

On August 3, 2011, the County of San Diego Board of Supervisors (BOS) adopted the County of San Diego General Plan (General Plan Update or 2011 General Plan or General Plan (2011)) and certified the corresponding Final Program Environmental Impact Report (General Plan Update PEIR) (County of San Diego 2011a, 2011b). The land use map changes that occurred under General Plan Update excluded approximately 71,300 acres of private lands within the Cleveland National Forest (CNF) in the unincorporated County that were formerly designated as Forest Conservation Initiative lands (the FCI lands) under the Forest Conservation Initiative (Figure 1-1 Proposed Project Areas). The Forest Conservation Initiative (FCI) was a voter-approved initiative in 1993 that required a minimum lot size of 40 acres for these lands. The FCI expired on December 31, 2010. With its expiration, the former FCI lands reverted to the land use designations of the previous General Plan (1978) in effect before the FCI was enacted. As a result, the land use designations associated with the FCI lands are not consistent with the 2011 General Plan land use designations. In addition, the land use mapping for the former FCI lands is not consistent with the General Plan Goals and Policies, and Guiding Principles.

The proposed Project involves a General Plan Amendment (GPA) to designate former FCI lands with land use categories consistent with the Guiding Principles, and Goals and Policies of the adopted 2011 General Plan. In addition, the proposed Project involves changes in land use designations for approximately 400 acres of private lands adjacent to former FCI lands to ensure that the land use designations for these additional 400 acres are consistent with the changes proposed for the former FCI lands and vice versa. The former FCI lands and the additional 400 acres collectively form the Project areas. Refer to Figures 1-2 through 1-14 for maps of the proposed land use designation changes that occur within each of the effected Community Plan and/or Subregional Plan Areas.

The proposed GPA changes are summarized below, with the full details of the changes provided in Section 1.2.1.

- Land Use Element revisions to remove references to the FCI and update the Regional Categories Map to reflect the proposed Project land use map changes.
- Revisions to the Mobility Element and road network based on changes to the proposed Project land use map.
- Removal of the FCI Appendix from the General Plan.
- Amendments to the Alpine Community Plan to recognize the proposed Village densities and associated expansions to:
  - 1) Water and sewer service boundaries, and
  - 2) Village boundary.

---

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

---

- Amendments to the Central Mountain & Jamul/Dulzura Subregional Plans to remove references to FCI and update land use designation allocations contained in the plan.
- Amendments to the North Mountain Subregional Plan to add a map and a description of a Multi-Use Communication Facilities Overlay (within former FCI lands) and to add a Palomar Mountain Rural Village map.
- Amendments to the Zoning Ordinance to ensure zoning designations are consistent with the GPA.

It should be noted that the overall objectives identified for the General Plan are applicable to the proposed Project for purposes of consistency with the intent and anticipated future buildout of the General Plan. For this reason, those objectives are incorporated herein and restated in Section 1.3 below. In addition, the following FCI GPA proposed Project-specific objectives are also provided below.

- Assign land use designations in a manner consistent with the Guiding Principles, Goals, and Policies of the San Diego County General Plan.
- Assign land use designations that minimize conflicts with the Cleveland National Forest Land Management Plan.

In compliance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (according to the CEQA Guidelines at 14 CCR 15162–15163), this EIR tiers from and supplements the previously certified General Plan Update PEIR and evaluates the environmental impacts associated with the proposed Project as more fully described in Section 1.5, Technical, Economic, and Environmental Characteristics below.

### 1.1.1 Purpose and Use of this EIR

The County of San Diego is lead agency for the proposed Project and will therefore have the responsibility for approving the Project. Pursuant to the CEQA Section 21067, the County will consider the information disclosed in this EIR, in combination with other applicable and available data, in determining whether or not the Project should be approved.

This EIR is an “informational document that will inform public agency decision makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effects of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15121(a)), Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15163 (a)(2), this EIR has been prepared as a Supplemental EIR (SEIR) because “Only minor additions or changes would be necessary to make the previous EIR adequately apply to the project in the changed situation.” Section 15163 also states:

- (b) The supplement to the EIR need contain only the information necessary to make the previous EIR adequate for the project as revised.

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

---

- (c) A supplement to an EIR shall be given the same kind of notice and public review as is given to a draft EIR under Section 15087.
- (d) A supplement to an EIR may be circulated by itself without recirculating the previous draft or final EIR.
- (e) When the agency decides whether to approve the project, the decision-making body shall consider the previous EIR as revised by the supplemental EIR. A finding under Section 15091 shall be made for each significant effect shown in the previous EIR as revised.

The General Plan Update PEIR provided an analysis of potential future development of the County's unincorporated areas, with the general development assumption of 40-acres per dwelling unit (Rural Lands (RL-40)) throughout most of the FCI lands, but some more remote FCI lands with very large parcel sizes were assumed to be developed at 80-acres per dwelling unit (Rural Lands (RL-80)). Therefore, land use designations for the former FCI lands addressed in the General Plan Update PEIR were different than the proposed land use designations applied to the Project areas as part of this proposed Project (FCI Lands GPA). The land use designations for the FCI lands were not a part of the direct effects analysis of the General Plan Update PEIR except within the analysis of the Transportation and Traffic section. In order to complete the forecast modeling of future transportation and traffic conditions at buildout of the General Plan, a General Plan land use designation of RL-40 was assumed. However, the assumed land use designations (primarily RL-40 and intermittently RL-80) applied to the FCI lands were analyzed within the cumulative analysis portions throughout the General Plan Update PEIR. That is, the General Plan Update PEIR evaluated impacts from the adoption of the goals and policies of the General Plan countywide, including the Project areas. However, the General Plan PEIR evaluated buildout of the land use designations applied throughout the unincorporated area with the exception of former FCI lands.

The General Plan Update PEIR considered the impacts of adoption of the General Plan countywide, including impacts of the General Plan Land Use Element and General Plan goals and policies in all communities in which the former FCI lands are located. The adopted General Plan Goals and Policies are considered in the environmental analysis for the proposed Project.

In accordance with Section 15150 of the CEQA Guidelines, information from the General Plan Update PEIR is hereby incorporated by reference into this recirculated SEIR. The General Plan Update PEIR can be accessed online at: <http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/gpupdate/environmental.html>. This SEIR is intended for use by the County of San Diego in streamlining environmental documentation for future development projects that tier from this document.

Throughout Chapter 2 (Significant Environmental Effects of the Proposed Project) in this SEIR, the sections rely on pertinent information that is provided in the General Plan Update PEIR, such as the Existing Conditions and Regulatory Framework discussions, and where necessary this information is updated to bring it current with any changes that have occurred since the adoption

---

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

---

of the General Plan in August 2011. In addition, the following list shows how the environmental topics within this SEIR correspond to the environmental topics within Volume I of the General Plan Update Program EIR.

<b><u>FCI Lands GPA SEIR</u></b>	<b><u>Volume I of General Plan Update PEIR</u></b>
2.1 Aesthetics	2.1 Aesthetics
2.2 Agricultural and Forestry Resources	2.2 Agricultural Resources
2.3 Air Quality	2.3 Air Quality
2.4 Biological Resources	2.4 Biological Resources
2.5 Cultural and Paleontological Resources	2.5 Cultural and Paleontological Resources
Geology and Soils - N/A	2.6 Geology and Soils
2.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials	2.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials
2.7 Hydrology and Water Quality	2.8 Hydrology and Water Quality
2.8 Land Use	2.9 Land Use
2.9 Mineral Resources	2.10 Mineral Resources
2.10 Noise	2.11 Noise
Population and Housing - N/A	2.12 Population and Housing
2.11 Public Services	2.13 Public Services
2.12 Recreation	2.14 Recreation
2.13 Transportation and Traffic	2.15 Transportation and Traffic
2.14 Utilities and Service Systems	2.16 Utilities and Service Systems
2.15 Climate Change	2.17 Global Climate Change

It should be noted that Section 3.2 of this SEIR includes discussions of Geology/Soils and Population/Housing considering that the proposed Project would not result in significant impacts related to these topics, and the General Plan Update Program EIR also concluded no impacts related to these topics. In addition, Volume IV of the General Plan Update PEIR describes the reduced alternative that was ultimately approved by the BOS, which is now the current General Plan. Where applicable, the environmental analysis in Chapter 2 of this SEIR incorporates by reference the relevant information from Volume IV of the General Plan Update PEIR. For example, the total acres of impact to vegetation communities associated with the proposed Project would be in addition to the 150,642 acres of impacts that was estimated for buildout under the General Plan Update per Volume IV of the PEIR.

Incorporation of the General Plan Update PEIR is appropriate for the following reasons:

- The General Plan Update PEIR provided an analysis of potential future development of the County’s unincorporated areas, with general development assumptions provided for the former FCI lands based on anticipated build-out of the General Plan and other relevant plans, programs, and policies. However, the land use designations on the former FCI lands addressed in the General Plan Update PEIR are different than the land use designations applied to the FCI Lands as a part of this proposed Project (FCI Lands GPA). The FCI Condition land use designations addressed in the direct effects analysis in the General Plan Update PEIR consisted primarily of RL-40 and RL-80 land use designations.
- The proposed Project will assign land use designations on Project areas (former FCI lands and 400 acres of non-FCI lands) to provide consistency with the surrounding land use designations applied with the General Plan.
- The General Plan goals and polices discussed in the General Plan Update PEIR will be the same as those applied to the Project areas addressed in this SEIR.
- The Mitigation Measures/General Plan Implementation Policies discussed and included in the General Plan Update PEIR will be the same as those applied to the Project areas addressed in this SEIR.

## **1.1.2 SEIR Review Process**

### **1.1.2.1 Public and Agency Review**

In compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15082, a Notice of Preparation for this SEIR was distributed to the California State Clearinghouse; relevant responsible and trustee agencies; other local, State, and federal agencies; and interested individuals and organizations. The 30-day public comment period for the NOP began on August 30, 2012 and ended on September 28, 2012. The NOP was published in the San Diego Union-Tribune newspaper and posted on the County’s website. A scoping meeting was held on September 17, 2012 to allow for input from the public, affected agencies, and interested organizations. Appendix B of this SEIR includes the NOP and subsequent public comments received following publication of the NOP and during the public scoping meeting.

A Draft SEIR that addressed the proposed FCI Lands GPA was made available for review and comment for a 45-day period from February 1, 2013 to March 18, 2013. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, the County decided to recirculate this Draft SEIR because extensive revisions were made in response to public comments. In summary, the County modified the project description to better address the project objectives, and updated the alternative descriptions to provide clarity and allow for distinction between alternatives and the proposed Project. Therefore, due to these revisions, the entire Draft SEIR is being recirculated for public review and comment.

---

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

---

The proposed Project Land Use Map contains modifications to the land use designations for Project areas from the land use maps proposed in 2013 and analyzed in the previous SEIR. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines at §15888.5 (a), a lead agency is required to recirculate an EIR when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the draft EIR for public review under Section 15087 but before certification. The term “information” in CEQA Guidelines at §15888.5 (a), can include changes in the project description.

This Draft Recirculated SEIR is available for review and comment by the public and public agencies for a 45-day period from January 14 through February 29, 2016. Comments on this Draft SEIR should be sent to [Peter.Eichar@sdcountry.ca.gov](mailto:Peter.Eichar@sdcountry.ca.gov) or at the following address:

County of San Diego  
ATTN: FCI General Plan Amendment SEIR  
Planning & Development Services  
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 110  
San Diego, California 92123

Reviewers of this SEIR are encouraged to submit new comments regarding the adequacy of the impact analysis and proposed mitigation measures and General Plan Implementing Policies. The proposed Project description has sufficiently changed to cause the recirculation of the SEIR. Previously submitted comments may or may not be relevant to the proposed Project as now described. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(f) (1), reviewers should submit new comments on the recirculated Draft SEIR; new comments must be submitted for the revised EIR.

Although a part of the Administrative Record, the previous comments submitted during the February 1 through March 18, 2013 circulation period do not require a written response in the final EIR; however, draft County Response to Comments are located in Volume II of this Draft SEIR.

This Draft SEIR is available for public review at:

- County of San Diego Planning & Development Services (PDS), Zoning Counter, 5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 110, San Diego, California 92123 (8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday).
- Public Library Branches:
  - 1) Alpine, 2130 Arnold Way, (619) 445-4221
  - 2) Campo-Morena Village, 31356 Highway 94, (619) 478-5945
  - 3) Descanso, 9545 River Road, (619) 445-5279
  - 4) Fallbrook, 124 South Mission Road, (760) 788-5270
  - 5) Julian, 1850 Highway 78, (760) 765-0370
  - 6) Pine Valley, 28804 Old Highway 80, (619) 473-8022
  - 7) Ramona, 1275 Main Street, (760) 731-4650
  - 8) Valley Center, 29200 Cole Grade Road, (760) 749-1305

- Online at [http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/ceqa\\_public\\_review.html](http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/ceqa_public_review.html)
- A compact disc (CD) containing this Draft SEIR can also be obtained by contacting Robert Citrano at (858) 694-3229 or [Robert.Citrano@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:Robert.Citrano@sdcounty.ca.gov).

### **1.1.2.2 SEIR Approvals**

Following the close of the 45-day review period, written comments received on this Draft SEIR will be responded to in writing in a Response to Comments document. The Response to Comments document together with the Draft SEIR will constitute the Final SEIR. If any text changes are identified to address public comments received during the public review period for the Draft SEIR, such changes will be reflected in the Final SEIR.

The County of San Diego BOS will review and consider the Final SEIR for the proposed Project and will make a determination as to whether the Final SEIR is consistent with the requirements of CEQA, and conclude whether or not to certify the document.

### **1.1.2.3 CEQA Findings, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and Statement of Overriding Conditions**

Following certification of an EIR, CEQA requires that a lead agency make written findings for each of the potentially significant environmental impacts associated with the Project.

In addition, Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21081.6 requires that lead agencies adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for any project with significant environmental impacts. An MMRP is required for this Project and will be prepared as part of the Final SEIR. The MMRP will provide a list of all proposed Project mitigation measures/General Plan Implementation Policies; define the parties responsible for implementation and review/approval; and, identify the timing for implementation of each measure.

For significant unavoidable impacts, a Statement of Overriding Considerations will be included in the Administrative Record for the Project which will provide reasoning as to why the significant unavoidable environmental impacts are outweighed by the benefits that would result with implementation of the Project.

### **1.1.3 SEIR Organization**

This Draft SEIR addresses the potential environmental effects of the proposed Project on the following resources:

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural and Forestry Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural/Paleontological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic

- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Global Climate Change

### **1.1.3.1 Required SEIR Content and Organization**

The content and organization of this Draft SEIR are designed to meet the requirements of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the *County of San Diego Environmental Impact Report Format and General Content Requirements*, as well as to present issues, analysis, mitigation, and other information in a logical and understandable way. This Draft SEIR is organized into and includes the following sections:

- “*Executive Summary*,” provides a proposed Project description and a summary of the environmental impacts that would result with Project implementation, proposed mitigation measures, and the level of significance of impacts prior to and after mitigation. The Summary also identifies areas of controversy; issues to be resolved by the decision-making body; and a summary of the Project alternatives.
- Chapter 1, “*Project Description, Location, and Environmental Setting*,” provides CEQA compliance information; an overview of the environmental review and decision-making process; purpose of the proposed Project; a list of responsible and trustee agencies; a summary of relevant documents incorporated by reference; a description of the regional Project location (Project areas), characteristics, and objectives; the relationship of the proposed Project to other plans and policies; and the existing regional environmental setting.
- Chapter 2, “*Significant Environmental Effects of the Proposed Project*,” contains a detailed analysis of the existing conditions; regulatory framework; direct, indirect, and cumulative Project impacts; and mitigation measures/General Plan Implementation Policies for each relevant environmental issue area.
- Chapter 3, “*Other CEQA Considerations*,” discusses effects found not to be significant including growth-inducing impacts and irreversible commitment of resources.
- Chapter 4, “*Alternatives*,” evaluates the range of alternatives to the proposed Project in effort to reduce significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided. The environmentally superior alternative is identified.
- Chapter 5, “*References*,” identifies reference sources for the Draft SEIR.
- Chapter 6, “*Preparers and Persons Contacted*,” lists the organizations and persons contacted during preparation of the Draft SEIR.
- The appendices provide information and technical studies that support the environmental analysis contained within the Draft SEIR.

The analysis of each environmental category in Chapter 2 is organized as follows:

- The introduction provides a brief overview on the purpose of the section being analyzed with regard to the proposed Project.
- “*Existing Conditions*” describes the physical conditions that exist at this time and that may influence or affect the topic being analyzed.
- “*Regulatory Framework*” provides State and federal laws, the San Diego County General Plan goals, policies, and General Plan Implementation Policies that apply to the topic being analyzed.
- “*Analysis of Project Effects and Cumulative Impacts*” discusses the impacts of the proposed Project in each category, including direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts and presents the determination of the level of significance; and provides a discussion of feasible mitigation measures/General Plan Implementation Policies to reduce any impacts.
- “*Mitigation*” provides a discussion of feasible mitigation measures and/or adopted General Plan Implementation Policies to reduce any impacts.

The Draft SEIR also includes the following appendices:

- **Appendix A.** Generation of Alternatives
- **Appendix B.** Notice of Preparation / Public Comments Received on the NOP
- **Appendix C.** Air Quality / Global Climate Change Analysis
- **Appendix D.** Traffic Impact Assessment
- **Appendix E.** Technical Memorandum Traffic Impacts: Comparison of SEIR Alternatives
- **Appendix F.** Greenhouse Gas Emissions Calculations

## **1.2 Project Background**

In August 2011, the County BOS adopted the County of San Diego General Plan and, acting as the Lead Agency, certified the Program-level Final EIR. The update to the General Plan represented the first comprehensive update since 1978 and provides a framework for the future growth and development of the unincorporated areas of the County except the former FCI lands. The updated General Plan provides “a set of guiding principles designed to protect the County’s unique and diverse natural resources and maintain the character of its rural and semi-rural communities,” while reflecting “an environmentally sustainable approach to planning that balances the need for adequate infrastructure, housing, and economic vitality,” and maintaining and preserving the County’s unique communities, agricultural lands, and open space (County of San Diego 2013a).

In 2013 County staff coordinated with Community Planning Groups to develop a Draft Land Use Map that was the preference of community planning and sponsor groups (2012 Initial Draft Map). The 2012 Initial Draft Map identified land use designations for former FCI lands that

were recommended by the Community Planning Groups. The Draft Map was the proposed Project for the Draft SEIR circulated for public review in 2013. In an effort to address the concerns raised during public review, staff has revised the proposed Project to better reflect the General Plan goals and policies and the Community Development Model. This revised proposed Project Land Use Map is a reflection of that effort.

In June 2014, the County Board of Supervisors considered the land use designations presented in the *Mid-density Alternative* and the *Modified FCI Condition*. After consideration of both land use maps and a *Planning Commission Recommendation*, which is similar but more intense than the *Mid-density Alternative*, along with public testimony and written correspondence, the BOS provided specific direction to prepare a new a land use map. In areas where the BOS did not provide specific direction, the most intensive land use designations that are consistent with the General Plan policies and planning principles were assigned. The resulting land use map is the proposed Project addressed in this SEIR.

### **1.2.1 Project Scope**

The General Plan provides a plan for future growth within the unincorporated County that would allow for a projected capacity of approximately 232,300 existing and future dwelling units (DUs), and relocates 20% of potential future development from the County’s eastern backcountry lands to the western portion of the County where a higher level of development is already present. This approach is intended to create a more sustainable growth pattern that “facilitates efficient development near infrastructure and services, while respecting sensitive natural resources and protection of existing community character in its extensive rural and semi-rural communities.” Additionally, the General Plan “provides a renewed basis for the County’s diverse communities to develop Community Plans that are specific to and reflective of their unique character and environment consistent with the County’s vision for its future” (County of San Diego 2013a)

The FCI was a voter-approved initiative requiring private lands within the CNF in San Diego County to have a minimum lot size of 40 acres. The FCI was originally approved on November 2, 1993 and expired on December 31, 2010. Upon the expiration of the FCI, land in the affected areas reverted to the land use designations under the previous General Plan (previously updated in 1978). However, the antiquated land use designations applied to the former FCI lands are not necessarily consistent with the current General Plan (adopted in 2011) planning principles and the land use designations applied for the rest of the unincorporated County, especially immediately adjacent properties.

The General Plan Update PEIR included a number of assumptions for the former FCI lands for assessing potential impacts. For example, the traffic impact analysis generally assumed a density of one dwelling unit per 40 acres (1 DU/40 AC) for a majority of the affected parcels, consistent with the restrictions imposed by the previous FCI; however, some parcels were analyzed at a density of 1 DU/80 AC due to readily identifiable resource constraints such as slope or remote location without

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

available services. Additionally, for purposes of the cumulative analysis in the General Plan Update PEIR, the same development assumptions were made for the former FCI lands.

The residential yields assumed in the General Plan Update PEIR for the former FCI lands (by community and subregional plan area) under the buildout scenario are shown in Table 1-1A below, and total 4,287 DUs. With the proposed Project and the assignment of appropriate land use designations over the Project areas (former FCI lands plus an additional 400 acres of adjacent land), estimated 6,245 DUs could potentially be constructed under the buildout scenario of the proposed Project. Therefore, the buildout scenario for the proposed Project would result in an increase in residential yield (approximately 1,958 additional DUs) over that assumed with the General Plan Update PEIR. The forecasted dwelling unit totals under a buildout scenario are presented here as information, they do not forecast dwelling unit totals relative to the SEIR baseline condition. A breakdown of the proposed land use designations for the Project areas within each of the affected communities is provided in Table 1-1B, Proposed Project Land Use Scenario for the Project Areas.

**TABLE 1-1A. GENERAL PLAN BUILDOUT SCENARIOS FOR PROJECT AREAS**

<b>Communities</b>	<b>Dwelling Units</b>		
	<b>Current Land Uses (1978 General Plan)</b>	<b>General Plan (2011)</b>	<b>Proposed Project *</b>
<b>Alpine</b>	<b>2,329</b>	<b>1,400</b>	<b>3,561</b>
<b>Central Mountain</b>	<b>5,618</b>	<b>1,202</b>	<b>1,082</b>
<i>Cuyamaca</i>	<i>289</i>	<i>109</i>	<i>107</i>
<i>Descanso</i>	<i>1,340</i>	<i>605</i>	<i>615</i>
<i>Pine Valley</i>	<i>2,862</i>	<i>354</i>	<i>255</i>
<i>Unrepresented</i>	<i>1,127</i>	<i>134</i>	<i>105</i>
<b>Desert</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Jamul-Dulzura</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>Julian</b>	<b>2,489</b>	<b>381</b>	<b>384</b>
<b>Mountain Empire</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>52</b>
<i>Campo/Lake Morena</i>	<i>331</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>49</i>
<i>Unrepresented</i>	<i>54</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>3</i>
<b>North Mountain</b>	<b>3,611</b>	<b>1,003</b>	<b>907</b>
<i>Palomar Mountain</i>	<i>3,021</i>	<i>868</i>	<i>806</i>
<i>Unrepresented</i>	<i>590</i>	<i>135</i>	<i>101</i>
<b>Pendleton/DeLuz</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Ramona</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>180</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>15,093</b>	<b>4,287</b>	<b>6,245</b>

Source: County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services, 2015.

\*The forecasted dwelling unit totals are presented here as information, they do not forecast dwelling unit totals relative to the SEIR baseline condition.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

**TABLE 1-1B. PROPOSED PROJECT LAND USE SCENARIO FOR THE PROJECT AREAS (IN ACRES)**

<b>CPA or Subregion</b>	<b>Village Residential</b>	<b>Semi-rural Residential</b>	<b>Rural Lands</b>	<b>Specific Planning Area</b>	<b>Rural Commercial</b>	<b>Village Core Mixed Use</b>	<b>Public/ Semi-Public Facilities<sup>(4)</sup></b>	<b>Public Agency Lands<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Tribal Lands</b>	<b>Open Space</b>	<b>Total<sup>2</sup></b>
Alpine CPA	257.5	4,204.8	8,897.1		146.1	152.2			90.0		<b>13,748</b>
Central Mountain Subregion											<b>26,970</b>
<i>Cuyamaca</i>		11.8	2,953.4								2,965
<i>Descanso</i>	7.1	1,899.7	3,674.0		4.6			159.1			5,744
<i>Pine Valley</i>			12,382.4		4.4			527.3			12,914
<i>Unrepresented</i>			4,921.5					163.2		262.0	5,347
Desert Subregion			166.3					3.7			<b>170</b>
Jamul/Dulzura Subregion		241.7	1,004.0								<b>1,246</b>
Julian CPA		952.6	7,425.2				48.5			40.4	<b>8,467</b>
Mountain Empire Subregion											<b>2,052</b>
<i>Campo/Lake Morena</i>		58.1	1,232.3				0.1	271.3			1,562
<i>Unrepresented</i>			129.7					360.0			490
North Mountain Subregion											<b>17,221</b>
<i>Palomar Mountain</i>		301.8	11,741.1		32.0		6.4	4.0	8.0		12,093
<i>Unrepresented</i>			5,005.8	21.7			82.4			18.3	5,128
Pendleton/De Luz CPA			1,010.9								<b>1,011</b>
Ramona CPA	43.6	681.7					89.1			16.1	<b>830</b>
<b>Unincorporated County Total<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>308.2</b>	<b>8,352.2</b>	<b>60,543.9</b>	<b>21.7</b>	<b>187.1</b>	<b>152.2</b>	<b>144.1</b>	<b>1,571.0</b>	<b>98.0</b>	<b>336.8</b>	<b>71,715</b>

Source: County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services, 2015.

1 Includes federal and State lands.

2 Total acreage rounded to the nearest whole number. Differences in total are attributed to rounding

3 Includes 381.8 acres of Non-FCI lands.

4 Includes Open Space (Recreation).

For a complete description of the land use designations of Table 1-1B, please refer to the San Diego County General Plan, Chapter 3, Land Use Element. Briefly however, the residential land use designations include the following categories. Village Residential encompasses nine residential land use designations applied within the Village regional category with densities ranging from two to 30 dwelling units per gross acre. Semi-rural Residential contains five residential land use designations applied within the Semi-Rural regional category with densities ranging from one dwelling unit per 0.5 acre to one dwelling unit per ten gross acres. Rural Lands have four residential land use designations within the Rural Lands regional category with the lowest density regulations ranging from one dwelling unit per 20 gross acres, to one dwelling unit per 80 gross acres.

Brief descriptions for the other land use designations include Specific Plan Area which is applied to areas where a Specific Plan was adopted by the County prior to the adoption of the 2011 General Plan. Specific Plans may contain residential, commercial, industrial, public, institutional, and/or open space uses wherein the detailed land use regulations are contained within each adopted specific plan document. The Rural Commercial designation provides for small-scale commercial and civic development. Village Core Mixed-uses is a designation intended for pedestrian-scaled town center development; a variety of commercial, civic and residential uses are encouraged. Public/Semi-public Facilities land use designation identifies major facilities built and maintained for public use. Examples include institutional uses, academic facilities, governmental complexes, and community service facilities. Public Agency Lands comprise over 50 percent of the unincorporated County lands and are administered by California State Parks, the U.S. Forest Service, or other public agency non-conservation lands. The Open Space land use designation is primarily applied to large tracts of land, undeveloped and usually dedicated to open space that are owned by a jurisdiction, public agency, or conservation group. Tribal lands, which are primarily located in rural areas, comprise about 126,000 acres on 18 federally recognized reservations or Indian villages.

### **1.3 Project Objectives**

The General Plan and the General Plan Update PEIR identifies 10 fundamental principles or objectives that are intended to guide future growth within the County while “retaining and enhancing the County’s rural character, economy, and unique communities, as well as minimizing the environmental impacts of future development.” These objectives, which are listed below, are also applicable to the proposed Project for purposes of consistency with the overall intent and anticipated future buildout of the General Plan.

- Support a reasonable share of projected regional population growth;
- Promote sustainability by locating new development near existing infrastructure, services, and jobs;
- Reinforce the vitality, local economy, and individual character of existing communities while balancing housing, employment, and recreational opportunities;
- Promote environmental stewardship that protects the range of natural resources and habitats that uniquely define the County’s character and ecological importance;

---

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

---

- Ensure that development accounts for physical constraints and the natural hazards of the land;
- Provide and support a multi-modal transportation network that enhances connectivity and supports community development patterns;
- Maintain environmentally sustainable communities and reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that contribute to climate change;
- Preserve agriculture as an integral component of the region's economy, character, and open space network;
- Minimize public costs of infrastructure and services and correlate their timing with new development; and
- Recognize community and stakeholder interests while striving for consensus.

It should be noted that the overall objectives identified in the General Plan are applicable to the proposed Project for purposes of consistency with the intent and anticipated future buildout of the General Plan. For this reason, those objectives are incorporated herein. In addition, the following Project-specific objectives are also provided below.

- Assign land use designations in a manner consistent with the Guiding Principles, Goals, and Policies of the adopted County General Plan.
- Assign land use designations that minimize conflicts with the U.S. Forest Cleveland National Forest Management Plan.

### **1.4 Regional Project Location**

The County of San Diego is located in southwestern California and has a total land area of approximately 2.9 million acres. Eighteen incorporated cities are located within the County, with the remainder of lands being unincorporated, and totaling approximately 2.3 million acres (County of San Diego 2011b).

The County of San Diego is bordered by Riverside County and Orange County to the north; Imperial County to the east; Mexico to the south; and the Pacific Ocean to the west.

The unincorporated County lands are divided into 24 planning areas. Fifteen of the planning areas are identified as Community Planning Areas (CPAs); the remaining nine are identified as Subregional Planning Areas (Subregions) (County of San Diego 2011b). The northwest and southwest portions of the unincorporated county generally support a greater level of development than locations further to the east. In the northwest, the planning areas include Pala/Pauma Valley, Fallbrook, Rainbow, Pendleton/De Luz, Valley Center, North County Metro, Bonsall, and San Dieguito. In the southwest, planning areas include Ramona, Lakeside, Spring Valley, Sweetwater, Valle de Oro, Alpine, Crest/Dehesa/Harbison Canyon/Granite Hills, Jamul/Dulzura, Otay Subregion, and County Islands. In the east, referred to as the "backcountry," which is largely undeveloped and supports lands that are generally more environmentally constrained, the planning areas include Central Mountain, Desert, Mountain Empire, North Mountain, and Julian.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

The proposed Project affects approximately 71,715 acres within nine CPAs or Subregions, located in and around the CNF within unincorporated San Diego County. Table 1-2, Proposed Project Acreage in Relation to CPA Acreage identifies the acreage within each CPA that would be affected by the proposed Project. The General Plan Update PEIR analyzed land use designation changes within each of these communities including the aforementioned 400 acres, with the exception of the former FCI lands. Figures 1-1 through 1-14 show the location of the Project areas and proposed land use designations for each CPA or Subregion.

**TABLE 1-2. PROPOSED PROJECT ACREAGE IN RELATION TO CPA ACREAGE**

CPA or Subregion	Proposed Project Acreage	CPA Acreage	Proposed Project Acreage as % of CPA Acreage
Alpine	13,748	68,156	20%
Central Mountain Subregion (including Cuyamaca, Descanso and Pine Valley)	26,970	203,308	13%
Desert Subregion	170	599,145	0%
Jamul-Dulzura Subregion	1,246	107,364	1%
Julian CPA	8,467	33,338	25%
Mountain Empire Subregion (including the community of Campo/Lake Morena)	2,052	304,249	1%
North Mountain Subregion (including Palomar Mountain)	17,221	311,735	6%
Pendleton-De Luz CPA	1,011	163,303	1%
Ramona CPA	831	89,292	1%
Unincorporated County Total	71,715	2,279,083	3%

Source: County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services, 2015

**1.5 Technical, Economic, and Environmental Characteristics**

The proposed Project represents a revision in the General Plan land use designations for approximately 71,715 acres of privately owned former FCI lands and certain adjacent lands which are being redesignated so that the designations are consistent with adjacent FCI lands. Specifically, the proposed Project involves a GPA to re-designate these lands to be consistent with the Guiding Principles and Policies of the adopted General Plan. Included within the 71,715 acres, the Project involves proposed changes in land use designation for approximately 400 acres of private lands adjacent to former FCI lands to ensure that the uses proposed for these lands consider any changed circumstances and are consistent with the changes proposed for the former FCI lands. Finally, the Project involves amendments to the Alpine Community Plan and the Central Mountain, Jamul/Dulzura and North Mountain Subregional Plans.

As the proposed Project affects an expansive area within the county, a range of environmental characteristics were considered in preparation of this SEIR. As stated in the General Plan Update PEIR, “Central to the land use concept for unincorporated San Diego County is a development pattern that balances the land requirements of residential growth with those of commerce, agriculture, recreation, and wildlife habitats. This development pattern concept directs future growth to areas where existing or planned infrastructure and services can support growth and to locations within or adjacent to existing communities” (County of San Diego 2011b) This SEIR considers this fundamental concept in evaluating the potential effects of the Project on the environment.

### **1.5.1 Environmental Setting**

Per Section 15125 of the CEQA Guidelines, a description of the existing physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of a proposed project must be included in an EIR in order to provide a “baseline condition.” The baseline condition is typically established as the physical setting at the time the NOP is published. The NOP for this SEIR was published on August 30, 2012. However, the environmental baseline may be different depending upon the environmental issue being considered and the extent to which any relevant events or changes in the physical or regulatory settings may have occurred that would require consideration in, or influence the formation of, an accurate baseline condition. The baseline conditions for the proposed Project are the same as those discussed in the General Plan Update PEIR and are incorporated here by reference. Refer to page 1-59 of Chapter 1 of the General Plan Update PEIR, Table 1-13 Environmental Baselines used in the General Plan Update PEIR. This SEIR tiers from the General Plan Update PEIR due to the fact that the General Plan Update PEIR fully analyzed the adopted General Plan Goals and Policies countywide. The proposed Project is implementing the General Plan goals and policies by applying land use designations on former FCI lands that were not designated as part of the General Plan update. The baseline conditions for the various environmental issues analyzed are further discussed in each respective subject area chapter and are generally consistent with the baselines established for the General Plan Update PEIR. In addition, no relevant changes have occurred in the physical or regulatory settings which would otherwise require reestablishment of new baseline conditions in this SEIR. The baseline conditions in this SEIR vary, as appropriate, and mirror the baseline conditions used for the various environmental issues analyzed in the General Plan Update PEIR, pursuant to Table 1-13 in the General Plan Update PEIR.

In general, the environmental setting and physical character of the former FCI lands within the County varies widely. Within San Diego County, three well-defined geographic regions occur, with the low-lying Coastal Plains to the west, the mountainous Peninsular Range lying inland, and the desert Salton (Imperial) Basin further to the east. Climate associated with these regions ranges from semi-arid (Mediterranean) to arid (desert). In turn, the varied climate influences a range of biologically diverse habitats, supporting unique flora and fauna within each.

Such topographical and biological characteristics largely influence the type of development patterns that occur within the Project areas. The availability of infrastructure to support such

development further influences development within the Project areas. As such, the character and type of development that occurs may vary.

The Project areas provide a greater number of natural, physical, and environmental constraints than urbanized areas in the County, a higher occurrence of sensitive plant or animal species, and limitations in adequate provision of infrastructure and utilities or public services (e.g., fire protection, law enforcement). Within the Project areas, the majority of land is undeveloped or consists of rural residential development.

The natural resources and unique physical characteristics, along with land uses and community character, of the areas affected by the proposed Project, are described for each of the environmental issues discussed in Chapter 2.0, Environmental Effects of the Proposed Project.

### **1.5.2 Proposed Project**

The proposed Project is a General Plan Amendment (GPA) to the current San Diego County General Plan, adopted on August 3, 2011. The proposed Project GPA includes revisions to the General Plan Land Use Map, Zoning Ordinance, Land Use Element, Mobility Element, and four community and subregional plans, along with removal of the General Plan's FCI Appendix. The specific proposed Project elements are described below. In compliance with CEQA, this SEIR evaluates potential environmental impacts resulting from build-out of the proposed Project, considering the prior environmental analysis provided in the General Plan Update PEIR. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15163(b), this SEIR provides additional information and analyses, as applicable, to ensure that the previous General Plan Update PEIR remains adequate for the proposed Project.

#### **1.5.2.1 Changes to Land Use Designations**

##### **1.5.2.1.a Forest Conservation Initiative Lands**

Primarily, the proposed Project would change the land use designations for approximately 71,715 acres of lands that were directly or indirectly affected by the former FCI in and around the CNF within the community and subregional planning areas of Alpine, Central Mountain, Desert, Jamul/Dulzura, Julian, Mountain Empire, North Mountain, Pendleton/De Luz, and Ramona. The proposed land use designations for the Project areas in each CPA or Subregion are detailed in Table 1-1b. The proposed land use designation changes are shown for each community and subregional planning area in Figures 1-1 through 1-14. The areas proposed for re-designation are outlined in blue (FCI lands) and maroon (private lands adjacent to former FCI lands). These changes would apply land use designations from the 2011 General Plan update, replacing the designations of the former General Plan that currently apply to the FCI lands.

---

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

---

Community/Subregion	Description of Primary Changes
Alpine	<p>An eastern expansion of the Alpine linear village is proposed along Alpine Boulevard and Willows Road east of Viejas from Semi-rural densities to Village Residential 2 (VR-2), Village Core Mixed Use (VCMU), and Rural Commercial.</p> <p>Remote areas outside of the village currently designated Multiple Rural Use (MRU), with a density of one dwelling unit per 4, 8, or 20 acres or General Agriculture (GA) with a density of one dwelling unit per 40 acres, would be re-designated based on existing parcel sizes as either Semi-rural 10 (SR-10), Rural Lands 20 (RL-20), and Rural Lands 40 (RL-40), with densities of one dwelling unit per 10, 20, or 40 acres, respectively.</p>
Central Mountain	<p>Remote areas within and adjacent to the CNF are proposed to be re-designated from National Forest &amp; State Parks (NFSP), with a density of one dwelling unit per 4, 8, or 20 acres to Rural Lands 80 (RL-80) with a density of one dwelling unit per 80 acres.</p>
Cuyamaca	<p>Remote areas within and adjacent to the CNF would be re-designated from NFSP to RL-40 and RL-80.</p>
Descanso	<p>Community is currently primarily designated as NFSP and MRU and would be re-designated to SR-10, RL-40, and RL-80.</p>
Desert	<p>Three parcels in western portion would be re-designated from NFSP to RL-80.</p>
Jamul-Dulzura	<p>Three non-contiguous areas would be re-designated from NFSP to SR-10, RL-40, and RL-80 based on existing parcel sizes.</p>
Julian	<p>Community is currently designated either NFSP or MRU, which would change to SR-4, SR-10, or RL-40 based on existing parcel sizes.</p>
Lake Morena/Campo	<p>Community is currently designated MRU near the Lake Morena Rural Village and NFSP is more remote areas, which would change to SR-4 north of the Rural Village, SR-10 and RL-20 south of the Rural Village and RL-40 in the more remote areas.</p>
Mountain Empire	<p>Five non-contiguous areas in the unrepresented portion of the Subregion would be re-designated from NFSP to either RL-40, RL-80, or Public Agency Lands (PAL).</p>
North Mountain/ Palomar Mountain	<p>Lands within Palomar Mountain would be re-designated from NFSP and MRU to SR-4 and Rural Commercial within the Rural Village and RL-20, RL-40, and RL-80 outside the Village.</p> <p>North Mountain is generally proposed to be re-designated from NFSP to RL-80</p>
Pendleton-De Luz	<p>Areas surrounded by the CNF would be re-designated from NFSP to RL-80, while an area with better road access and adjacent to Riverside County would be re-designated to RL-40.</p>

Community/Subregion	Description of Primary Changes
Pine Valley	Pine Valley is generally proposed to be re-designated from NFSP to RL-80, with a few exceptions proposed for a RL-40 designation.
Ramona	Two non-contiguous areas in the northwestern portion would be re-designated from Intensive Agriculture, with a density from one dwelling unit per two or four acres, to SR-4.  Two non-contiguous areas in the eastern portion would be re-designated from NFSP to either VR-2 or SR-10 based on existing parcel sizes.

As previously stated, although the General Plan Update PEIR evaluated implementation of General Plan goals and policies countywide, the Land Use Distribution Map revisions excluded the former FCI lands. When the FCI expired, these lands reverted to the land use designations in effect before the FCI was enacted which are not consistent with current General Plan goals and policies, land use designations and Guiding Principles. To correct these inconsistencies, the County PDS is preparing a GPA to appropriately re-designate these lands to be consistent with the Guiding Principles and Policies of the adopted General Plan. The Guiding Principles are described in Chapter 2 of the General Plan (beginning on page 2-6) at [http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/gpupdate/docs/GP/Cover\\_Intro\\_Vision.pdf](http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/gpupdate/docs/GP/Cover_Intro_Vision.pdf)

### **1.5.2.1.b Additional Land Use Designation Changes**

In addition to the former FCI lands, the proposed Project would revise the land use designations for individual parcels totaling approximately 400 acres of the 71,715 acres in the communities of Alpine, Central Mountain, Julian, and Lake Morena/Campo that are adjacent to the former FCI lands to ensure that these parcels are designated in a consistent manner with the changes proposed for the former FCI lands. Figure 1-1, along with Figure 1-2 through 1-14 when applicable, show the Project areas outlined by a heavy maroon line that are not former FCI lands but are included as part of the proposed Project.

### **1.5.2.2 Land Use Element Changes**

This project includes revisions to two sections of the General Plan Land Use Element: (1) Land Use Designations; and (2) Regional Categories Map.

#### **Land Use Designations**

The *Other Land Use Designations* section of the Land Use Element includes a discussion of FCI Lands. The proposed project would remove this discussion and associated text from the General Plan. The text proposed to be removed from page 3-18 of the Land Use Element is shown in ~~strikeout~~ below.

~~Forest Conservation Initiative Lands. This designation applies to lands affected by the Forest Conservation Initiative (FCI) of 1993. This initiative mandated specific land use designations, goals, and policies (provided in the Forest Conservation Initiative~~

~~Appendix), which are in effect through December 31, 2010. Upon expiration of the FCI, the General Plan must be amended to remap the lands in conformance with this General Plan.~~

### Regional Categories Map

The land use map changes would also require revisions to Figure LU-1, Regional Categories Map, shown on page 3-19 of the Land Use Element. The proposed changes would remove the Forest Conservation Initiative overlay and replace those areas with the regional categories that reflect the land use designations ultimately adopted by the Board of Supervisors.

#### **1.5.2.3 Community Plan and Subregional Plan Updates**

As a result of the proposed Project, the County will prepare updates to the Alpine, Central Mountain, Jamul/Dulzura, and North Mountain community and subregional plans based on the proposed land use changes described in Section 1.5.2. The proposed changes would include removal of any references to the former FCI from community and subregional plan text, goals, policies, or objectives that address future development. Specific changes proposed to the community and subregional plans are identified below.

#### North Mountain Subregional Plan

The project will add a section at the end of Chapter 2, Land Use in the North Mountain Subregional Plan, concerning multi-use communications structures. This amendment is to account for the removal of the Telecommunication Site Overlay Designation under the General Plan and promote coordinated communication facilities within this portion of the Project areas. The following text will be added:

#### MULTI-USE COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES OVERLAY

An overlay, shown on Figure 1, identifies Palomar Mountain Multi-use Communications Facilities Overlay. The purpose of this overlay is to specify areas that are preferred locations for the operation of communications facilities and to promote co-location of communications facilities within those areas. Communications facilities include antennas and/or microwave dishes that send and/or receive radio frequency signals. These facilities may include structures, towers or accessory buildings. This overlay does not pertain to camouflaged cell towers; however, antennas and equipment for cellular communications would be appropriate for co-location on communications facilities allowed by the overlay.

*Note: "Camouflaged" Refers to any telecommunications facility designed to blend into the surrounding environment, such as architecturally screened roof-mounted antennas, building-mounted antennas painted to match the existing structure, antennas integrated into architectural elements, or towers made to look like trees or light poles.*

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

This overlay does not provide exemptions from any of the requirements of the County's Wireless Telecommunications Facilities Ordinance. State and local government emergency services and essential services are exempt from co-locating their communications facilities with commercial communication facilities and from siting their communication facilities within the overlay area as required for public safety. The objective of this overlay is to promote the effective, efficient and coordinated activities of the broadcasting and communications industry and to encourage the sharing of such areas by multiple operators.





**Exhibit 1: Acceptable sites (yellow outline) for communications facilities on Palomar Mountain.**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

**North Mountain Subregional Plan (continued)**


Additional revisions, shown below, include the addition of a Rural Village boundary in the Palomar Mountain Subregional Group Area.

<b>North Mountain Subregional Plan</b>			
<b>Page</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Revision</b>	<b>Rationale for Change</b>
8	<b>RESIDENTIAL GOAL Findings</b>	<i>Revise the last sentence as follows:</i> (Refer to Figures 2 and 3 on the pages 9 and 10 for North Mountain and Palomar Mountain Rural Village Boundaries).	Revised to reflect the expansion of the Village at East Willows Road.
9	Figure 2 North Mountain Rural Village Boundary	 <p><b>NORTH MOUNTAIN RURAL VILLAGE BOUNDARY</b> San Diego County General Plan Figure 2</p>	Figure revised to remove the Forest Conservation Initiative land use designation from the legend
NEW	Figure 3 Palomar Mountain Rural Village Boundary	 <p><b>PALOMAR MOUNTAIN RURAL VILLAGE BOUNDARY</b> San Diego County General Plan Figure 3</p>	New figure added to show Palomar Mountain as a Rural Village. (Note: Since this area was within the FCI lands, Palomar Mountain was not considered for designation as a rural village during the 2011 comprehensive General Plan Update.

**Alpine Community Plan**

Community Plan revisions are proposed to reflect higher density land use designations assigned to extend the Alpine Village to the eastern end of Willows Road and expand the existing village boundary. In addition, the proposed Community Plan changes recognize an expansion of the water and sewer service areas is required to serve the land use intensities proposed for the eastern portion of the planning area.

<b>Alpine Community Plan</b>			
<b>Page</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Revision</b>	<b>Rationale for Change</b>
5	2 Community Character Findings	Revise the last paragraph on the page as follows: The community character of Alpine will be best maintained by a gradual decrease in density from the <del>Country Town Village</del> and a centralized industrial and commercial area. It is the intent of the community to keep residential and agricultural areas of Alpine free from industrial and major commercial encroachments.	Revised to reflect the expansion of the Village at East Willows Road.
6	2 Community Character Findings	Revise the first paragraph on the page as follows: Within the <del>Rural</del> Village boundary (Refer to Figure 3 on page 9), the design guidelines contained in the Alpine Design Manual will ensure that development is consistent with Alpine's village character.	Same as above.
6	2 Community Character Findings	Add the following paragraph at the end of the Findings section: <u>Expansion of imported water and sanitary sewer services are necessary to accommodate the increased land use intensities identified on the Alpine General Plan land use map. More specifically, both imported water and sewer services are necessary to fully realize the land use intensities allowed by the Village land use designated areas along Willows Road east of Viejas and residential densities south of Alpine Boulevard between the Interstate 8 interchanges at West Willows Road and at the eastern end of Willows Road.</u>	Added to identify where expansions to imported water and sanitary sewer services are necessary to serve increased densities proposed.



Alpine Community Plan			
Page	Section	Revision	Rationale for Change
9	1 Community Character Figure 3 Alpine Village Boundary	 <p>ALPINE VILLAGE BOUNDARY San Diego County General Plan Figure 3</p>	Figure revised to show an expanded village area
11	2 Land Use General Findings	<p><i>Revise the second paragraph under Findings as follows:</i></p> <p>The pattern for community development presented in the Alpine Community Plan accommodates growth in and surrounding the existing town; designating the agricultural areas and the remote, more mountainous areas for low density rural uses. Residential development ranging from single-family houses on half acre or <del>less-smaller</del> lots to multi-family units is contained <u>within</u> the Village boundary. Major commercial development is generally restricted to properties along Alpine Boulevard, Arnold Way, <u>Willows Road</u>, and to the Tavern Road-Interstate 8 Interchange area.</p>	Added to reflect the proposed land use map changes.
11	2 Land Use General	<p><i>Revise Policy 2 as follows:</i></p> <p>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.</p>	Added to reflect the proposed land use map which assigns land use intensities requiring urban services to the north and south of Interstate 8 east of the Alpine Village.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

<b>Alpine Community Plan</b>			
<b>Page</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Revision</b>	<b>Rationale for Change</b>
12	2 Land Use Residential	<i>Revise Policy 2 as follows:</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 area within the eastern extension of the Village boundary.</u>	Added to reflect the proposed land use map which would assign a Village Core Mixed Use designation east of the Viejas Casino complex.
27	7 Public Facilities and Services <u>Water - Findings</u>	Most of the central area of Alpine is serviced by Padre Dam Municipal Water District. There is sufficient water to serve the existing population. <u>The General Plan land use map assigns densities that cannot be fully developed without expanding the Water District east to areas within the expanded Alpine Village boundary.</u>	Added to reflect that the proposed land use map which will require an expansion of the water services area in Alpine.
28	7 Public Facilities and Services <u>Sewer - Findings</u>	<i>Revise the last paragraph as follows:</i> Major annexations and extensions of service areas have been granted over the past several years by the Alpine Sanitation District and LAFCO. <u>The General Plan land use map assigns densities that cannot be fully developed without further expansion of the Sanitation District to the east along Interstate 8.</u>	Added to reflect that the proposed land use map which will require an expansion of the sewer services area in Alpine.

Central Mountain Subregional Plan

The proposed Subregional Plan revisions remove a reference to the expired FCI and revise the allocation of land use designations in Descanso to reflect the proposed Land Use Map revisions.

Central Mountain Subregional Plan			
Page	Section	Revision	Rationale for Change
57	Figure 7 Descanso Rural Village Boundary	 <p>The map shows the Descanso Rural Village Boundary with various land use designations. The legend includes categories such as Rural Village Boundaries, Special Study Area, Village Boundaries, and various Rural Land Use designations (e.g., Rural Land Use (R-1), Rural Land Use (R-2), etc.). The map also shows other land use designations like High-Speed Industrial, Office Professional, and Agricultural Conservation. The title is 'DESCANSO RURAL VILLAGE BOUNDARY' and it is part of the 'San Diego County General Plan'.</p>	This figure is being replaced with one that shows land use designations for the former FCI lands, rather than the green hatch currently shown on the figure in the Subregional Plan.
57	Figure 8 Pine Valley Rural Village Boundary	 <p>The map shows the Pine Valley Rural Village Boundary with various land use designations. The legend is similar to Figure 7, including Rural Village Boundaries, Special Study Area, Village Boundaries, and various Rural Land Use designations. The map also shows other land use designations like High-Speed Industrial, Office Professional, and Agricultural Conservation. The title is 'PINE VALLEY RURAL VILLAGE BOUNDARY' and it is part of the 'San Diego County General Plan'.</p>	Same as rationale for Figure 7 above.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

<b>Central Mountain Subregional Plan</b>					
<b>Page</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Revision</b>			<b>Rationale for Change</b>
62	Land Use Designation by Ownership and Plan Designation <u>Descanso Subregional Group Area</u>	PLAN DESIGNATION	OWNERSHIP	PERCENTAGES	Revised allocation of land use designations to reflect the proposed Project land use map.
		VILLAGE RESIDENTIAL 2	PRIVATE	<del>4</del> 0.5%	
		<del>VILLAGE RESIDENTIAL 2.9</del>	<del>PRIVATE</del>	<del>1</del> %	
		VILLAGE RESIDENTIAL 4.3	PRIVATE	<del>1</del> 0.2%	
		SEMI-RURAL RESIDENTIAL 1	PRIVATE	<del>1</del> 0.4%	
		SEMI-RURAL RESIDENTIAL 2	PRIVATE	<del>1</del> 0.5%	
		SEMI-RURAL RESIDENTIAL 4	PRIVATE	<del>1</del> 2.2%	
		SEMI-RURAL RESIDENTIAL 10	PRIVATE	<del>1</del> 8.6%	
		RURAL COMMERCIAL	PRIVATE	<u>0</u> .1%	
		<del>OPEN SPACE (CONSERVATION)</del>	<del>PUBLIC/PRIVATE</del>	<del>2</del> %	
		RURAL LANDS 40*	PRIVATE	<del>27</del> 18.4%	
		RURAL LANDS 80	PRIVATE	<del>4</del> 3.9%	
		PUBLIC/SEMI-PUBLIC	PUBLIC	<u>2</u> .4%	
		<del>FEDERAL AND STATE LANDS</del>		<del>5</del> 8%	
		<u>PUBLIC AGENCY LANDS</u>	PUBLIC	<u>60</u> .6%	
		NO PLAN	INDIAN RESERVATION	<u>2</u> .2%	
			TOTAL ACRES	20,9 <u>41</u> <del>38</del>	
		<del>* Includes Lands within the Forest Conservation Initiative</del>			

**Jamul/Dulzura Subregional Plan**

The proposed Subregional Plan revisions remove a portion of a policy and text that reference the now expired FCI.

<b>Jamul/Dulzura Subregional Plan</b>			
<b>Page</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Revision</b>	<b>Rationale for Change</b>
9	<b>Chapter 2 Land Use</b> <u>Rural Residential</u> Policy 4	<i>Delete the entire paragraph after subparagraph (f) as follows:</i> <del>Clustering of residential development, however, is prohibited on FCI-affected lands as stipulated in the Forest Conservation Initiative Overlay Land Use Designation in the County General Plan Land Use Element.</del>	Deleted the reference to the FCI.
9	<b>Chapter 2 Land Use</b> <u>Rural Residential</u> Policy 5	<i>Delete Policy 5 as follows:</i> Residential development outside the County Water Authority boundary should be limited to densities consistent with the County Groundwater Ordinance. The clustering of dwelling units is acceptable in areas that use groundwater, as long as they meet the provisions of the County Groundwater Ordinance. <del>Clustering of residential development, however, is prohibited on FCI-affected lands as stipulated in the Forest Conservation Initiative Overlay Land Use Designation in the County General Plan Land Use Element</del>	Deleted the reference to the FCI.

**1.5.2.4 Mobility Element Road Network Changes**

The proposed Project land use map changes would result in impacts to Mobility Element road segments in the Alpine CPA. The proposed Project includes one Mobility Element classification change to a segment of Willows Road. The classification for the segment of Willows Road from Viejas Casino Road east to the Interstate 8 westbound on-ramp would change from a two-lane 2.2E Light Collector to a four-lane 4.2B Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes; however, even with this classification change the segment is forecast to operate at LOS F.

The Mobility Element classifications of the General Plan, along with the proposed Project Mobility Element reclassification identified above, would mitigate some of the roadway impacts identified in the Alpine community. However, even with buildout of certain roadways, based on the Mobility Element classifications, there would be failing roadway segments in Alpine as a result of the proposed Project. Table 1-3 identifies the road segments that would operate at level of service (LOS) D or better under buildout of the adopted General Plan land use map, but would operate at LOS E or F with buildout of the proposed Project land use map. As part of this proposed Project, the affected roadway segments were analyzed to determine whether a LOS E/F should be accepted based on the criteria established in the General Plan Update PEIR, discussed in Chapter 2.15, Transportation and Traffic. Detailed justification for accepting the road segments shown in Table 1-3 as failing is provided as Attachment C to Appendix D, Traffic Impact Assessment Technical Memorandum. Table 1-3 identifies the road segments in Alpine that would fail as a result of the proposed land use map changes and would need to be added to Mobility Element Table M-4, Road Segments Where Adding Travel Lanes is Not Justified.

**TABLE 1-3. NEW FAILING ROAD SEGMENTS IN THE ALPINE CPA**

<b>New Road Segments to be Accepted as Failing and added to Mobility Element Table M-4</b>	
<u>Road Segment</u>	<u>Classification</u>
Alpine Boulevard from Tavern Road to South Grade Road <sup>1</sup>	2.2A Light Collector w/ Raised Median
Alpine Boulevard from South Grade Road to West Willows Road	2.1D Community Collector w/ Improvement Options
Alpine Boulevard from West Willows Road to eastern end of Willows Road	2.1C Community Collector w/ Intermittent Turn Lanes
South Grade Road from Eltinge Drive to Olive View Road	2.2C Light Collector w/ Intermittent Turn Lanes
Willows Road from Viejas Grade Road to Viejas Casino Road	2.2E Light Collector
Willows Road from Viejas Casino Road east to Interstate 8 on-ramp	4.2B Boulevard w/ Intermittent Turn Lanes

Source: County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services, 2015

<sup>1</sup> The segment from Boulder Road to Louise Drive was already failing and included in Table M-4.

## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

---

The proposed changes to the Mobility Element are shown on the following pages in strikeout-underline format. The updated Mobility Element network map for Alpine is provided as Figure 1-15. Table 1-4, Mobility Element Network Alpine Community Plan Area Matrix Changes provides detailed revisions to the Mobility Element that will be required in the Alpine CPA. Changes to the Mobility Element, Table M-4, Road Segments Where Adding Travel Lanes is Not Justified, will also be amended to add new road segments in Alpine that will operate at LOS E or F at buildout and where the addition of travel lanes is not justified.

TABLE 1-4. MOBILITY ELEMENT NETWORK ALPINE COMMUNITY PLAN AREA MATRIX CHANGES

Mobility Element Network—Alpine Community Planning Area Matrix			
ID	Road Segment	Designation/Improvement #.#X = [# of lanes].[roadway classification][improvement]	Special Circumstances
3	Alpine Boulevard (SF 1402) / (SC 1883) Segment: Dunbar Lane to East Willows Road	<p><b>4.1B Major Road</b> Intermittent Turn Lanes—Dunbar Lane to Arnold Way</p> <p><b>2.1D Community Collector</b> Improvement Options [Raised Median]—Arnold Way to Tavern Road</p> <p><b>2.2A Light Collector</b> Raised Median/Continuous Turn Lane—Tavern Road to South Grade Road</p> <p><b>2.1D Community Collector</b> Improvement Options [Intermittent Turn Lanes]—South Grade Road to West Willows Road</p> <p><b>2.1C Community Collector</b> West Willows Road to East Willows Road</p>	<p><b>Accepted at LOS E/F</b> Segment: <del>Boulder Tavern</del> Road to <del>Louise Drive</del> eastern end of <del>Willows Road</del></p> <p><b>Shoulder as Parking Lane</b> Separate Bike Lane required—Tavern Road to South Grade Road</p>
8	Tavern Road (SA 380) Segment: <del>Tavern Lane</del> <u>New Road 11</u> to Japatul Road	<p><b>4.1A Major Road</b> <u>Continuous Turn Lane – New Road 11</u> <del>Raised Median Tavern Lane to Alpine Boulevard</del> <u>Arnold Way</u></p> <p><b>2.2D Light Collector</b> Improvement Options [Raised Median]—Arnold Way to South Grade Road</p> <p><b>2.2E Light Collector</b> South Grade Road to Japatul Road</p>	<p>None</p> <p><b>Caltrans Facilities Programming</b> Improvements (widening) of the Interstate 8 overpass are not programmed in the 2030 RTP (Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario)</p>
<del>12</del>	<del>Tavern Lane</del> Segment: <del>New Road 11 to Tavern Road</del>	<del>4.1A Major Road</del> <del>Median [Continuous Left Turn Lane]</del>	<del>None</del> Note: This road segment is considered part of Tavern Road. As such, a separate ID is not necessary. See Tavern Road for designations and improvements.
12	<u>West Willows Road</u> Segment: <u>Otto Avenue/Willows Road to Alpine Boulevard</u>	<u>2.2C Light Collector</u> <u>Intermittent Turn Lanes—Entire Segment</u>	<u>Accepted at LOS E/F</u>

TABLE 1-4, CONTINUED

<b>Mobility Element Network—Alpine Community Planning Area Matrix</b>			
<b>ID</b>	<b>Road Segment</b>	<b>Designation/Improvement #.#X = [# of lanes].[roadway classification][improvement]</b>	<b>Special Circumstances</b>
19	<b>Willows Road (SC 2000)</b> Segment: Otto Avenue/ <u>West Willows Road east</u> to Alpine Boulevard	<b>2.2E Light Collector</b> Otto Avenue/ <u>West Willows Road east</u> to Viejas Casino Road <b>4.2B Boulevard</b> Intermittent Turn Lanes—Viejas Casino Road <u>east to I-8 westbound on-ramp (Exit 36)</u> <del>2.2E Light Collector</del> <del>Viejas Casino area to I-8 westbound on-ramp at East Willows Road</del> <b>4.1A Major Road</b> Raised Median—I-8 westbound on-ramp at <del>East</del> Willows Road <u>south</u> to Alpine Boulevard	<b>Accepted at LOS F</b> Segment: Alpine Boulevard to Viejas <u>Casino</u> <del>Grade</del> Road <u>and Viejas Casino Road east to the I-8 westbound on-ramp</u>
24	<b><u>El Monte Road (SC 1920)</u></b> Segment: <u>Lakeside community boundary to El Capitan Reservoir</u>	<b><u>2.3C Minor Collector</u></b>	<u>None</u>

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

<b>Table M-4 Road Segments Where Adding Travel Lanes is Not Justified</b>			
<b>Road</b>	<b>Classification</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>To</b>
<b>State Highways<sup>a</sup></b>			
SR 67	4.1B Major Road with Intermittent Turn Lanes	Poway city limits	Scripps Poway Pkwy. (Lakeside)
	4.1A Major Road with Raised Median	Scripps Poway Pkwy. (Lakeside)	Sycamore Park Dr. (Lakeside)
	4.1A Major Road with Raised Median	Johnson Lake Rd. (Lakeside)	Posthill Rd. (Lakeside)
	4.1B Major Road with Intermittent Turn Lanes	11 <sup>th</sup> Street (Ramona)	Pine Street/SR-78 (Ramona)
SR-76/Pala Rd. <sup>b</sup>	4.1A: 4-Ln Major Road w/ Raised Median	Old Hwy 395 (Fallbrook)	I-15 SB Ramps (Fallbrook)
	2.1D Community Collector w/ Improvement Options	Pala Del Norte Rd. (Pala Pauma)	Sixth St (Pala Pauma)
Main Street/SR-78	4.2B: 4-Ln Boulevard w/ Intermittent Turn Lanes	9th St (Ramona)	Pine St (Ramona)
<b>County Mobility Element Roads</b>			
Alpine Blvd.	2.2A Light Collector w/ Raised Median	<a href="#">Tavern Boulder Rd.</a> (Alpine)	<a href="#">South Grade Rd.</a> <del><a href="#">Louise Dr.</a></del> (Alpine)
	<a href="#">2.1D Community Collector w/ Improvement Options</a>	<a href="#">South Grade Rd. (Alpine)</a>	<a href="#">West Willows Rd. (Alpine)</a>
	<a href="#">2.1C Community Collector w/ Intermittent Turn Lanes</a>	<a href="#">West Willows Rd. (Alpine)</a>	<a href="#">Willows Rd.(East) (Alpine)</a>
Bancroft Dr.	2.2D Light Collector w/ Improvement Options	Troy St (Spring Valley)	SR-94 EB Ramps (Spring Valley)
Briarwood Rd.	2.1D Community Collector w/ Improvement Options	SR-54 WB Ramps (Sweetwater)	Robinwood Rd (Sweetwater)
Campo Rd.	4.2B Boulevard w/ Intermittent Turn Lanes	Kenwood Dr (Valle de Oro)	Conrad Dr (Valle de Oro)
Central Ave.	2.2B Light Collector w/ Continuous Turn Lane	Sweetwater Rd. (Sweetwater)	Bonita Rd. (Sweetwater)
	2.2C Light Collector w/ Intermittent Turn Lanes	Bonita Rd. (Sweetwater)	Frisbee St. (Sweetwater)
De Luz Rd.	2.2C Light Collector w/ Intermittent Turn Lanes	Dougherty St. (Fallbrook)	W. Mission Rd. (Fallbrook)
Deer Springs Rd.	4.1B Major Road w/ Intermittent Turn Lanes	I-15 NB Ramps (NC Metro)	N Centre City Pkwy (NC Metro)
Del Dios Hwy.	2.1D Community Collector w/ Improvement Options	El Camino Del Norte (San Dieguito)	Via Rancho Pkwy (North County Metro)
E. Mission Rd.	4.2B Boulevard w/ Intermittent Turn Lanes	Live Oak Park Rd. (Fallbrook)	I-15 SB Ramps (Fallbrook)
El Apajo	2.1A Community Collector w/ Raised Median	Villa De La Valle (San Dieguito)	Via De Santa Fe (San Dieguito)

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

<b>Table M-4 Road Segments Where Adding Travel Lanes is Not Justified</b>			
<b>Road</b>	<b>Classification</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>To</b>
El Camino del Norte	2.2F Light Collector w/ Reduced Shoulder	Aliso Canyon Rd. (San Dieguito)	Del Dios Hwy./Paseo Delicias (San Dieguito)
Fuerte Dr.	2.2E Light Collector	Bancroft Dr. (Valle de Oro)	Avacado Blvd. (Valle de Oro)
Jamacha Rd.	6.2 Prime Arterial	Campo Rd/SR-94 (Valle de Oro)	Fury Ln. (Valle de Oro)
	4.1B Major Road w/ Intermittent Turn Lanes	SR-125 SB Ramps (Spring Valley)	Sweetwater Rd (Spring Valley)
La Bajada/ La Granada	2.2F Light Collector w/ Reduced Shoulder	Rancho Santa Fe Rd. (San Dieguito)	Paseo Delicias (San Dieguito)
Lake Jennings Park Rd.	4.1B Major Road w/ Intermittent Turn Lanes	I-8 Business Route (Lakeside)	I-8 WB Off-Ramp (Lakeside)
Lilac Rd.	4.2B Boulevard w/ Intermittent Turn Lanes	New Road 19 (Valley Center)	Valley Center Rd. (Valley Center)
Linea del Cielo	2.2F Light Collector w/ Reduced Shoulder	El Camino Real (San Dieguito)	Rambla de las Flores (San Dieguito)
Los Coches Rd.	2.1D Community Collector w/ Improvement Options	Woodside Ave (Lakeside)	I-8 Business Route (Lakeside)
Lyons Valley Rd.	2.2B Light Collector w/ Continuous Turn Lane	Campo Rd. (Jamul)	Skyline Truck Trail (Jamul)
Maine Ave.	2.2E Light Collector	Mapleview St (Lakeside)	Woodside Ave (Lakeside)
Mapleview St.	4.1A Major Road w/ Raised Median	Maine Ave. (Lakeside)	Ashwood St (Lakeside)
Mountain Meadow Rd./ Mirar de Valle	2.1D Community Collector w/ Improvement Options	North Broadway (NC Metro)	New Road 19 (Valley Center)
New Road 19	4.2B Boulevard w/ Intermittent Turn Lanes	Mirar de Valle Road (Valley Center)	Lilac Road (Valley Center)
Old Hwy 395	2.1D Community Collector w/ Improvement Options	5th St. (Rainbow)	Interstate 15 NB ramp (Fallbrook)
Old Hwy 395	2.1A Community Collector w/ Raised Median	Interstate 15 SB ramp (Fallbrook)	Stewart Canyon Dr. (Fallbrook)
	2.1D Community Collector w/ Improvement Options	Pala Rd. (Fallbrook)	Dublin (W) Rd. (Fallbrook)
Paradise Valley Rd.	4.1B Major Road w/ Intermittent Turn Lanes	Elkelton Blvd (Spring Valley)	Sweetwater Rd (Spring Valley)
Paseo Delicias	2.2A Light Collector w/ Raised Median	Via De La Valle (San Dieguito)	El Camino Del Norte (San Dieguito)
Pomerado Rd.	4.1A Major Road w/ Raised Median	I-15 NB Ramps (County Islands)	Willow Creek Rd. (County Islands)
Rainbow Valley Blvd. West	2.2D Light Collector	I-15 NB Ramps (Rainbow)	Old Hwy. 395 (Rainbow)
Rancho Santa Fe Road	2.2F Light Collector w/ Reduced Shoulder	Encinitas city limits	La Bajada (San Dieguito)

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

<b>Table M-4 Road Segments Where Adding Travel Lanes is Not Justified</b>			
<b>Road</b>	<b>Classification</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>To</b>
San Dieguito Rd.	2.1A Community Collector w/ Raised Median	El Apajo Rd. (San Dieguito)	San Diego city limits
7 <sup>th</sup> St.	2.2E Light Collector	Elm St. (Ramona)	A St. (Ramona)
		Main St. (Ramona)	D St. (Ramona)
<a href="#">South Grade Rd.</a>	<a href="#">2.2C Light Collector w/ Intermittent Turn Lanes</a>	<a href="#">Eltinge Drive (Alpine)</a>	<a href="#">Olive View Road (Alpine)</a>
Valley Center Rd.	4.2A Boulevard w/ Raised Median	Miller Rd (Valley Center)	Indian Creek Rd (Valley Center)
Via de la Valle	2.1B Community Collector w/ Continuous Turn Lane	San Diego city limits (San Dieguito)	Las Planideras (San Dieguito)
	2.1E Community Collector	Las Planideras (San Dieguito)	Paseo Delicias (San Dieguito)
West Willows Rd.	2.2E Light Collector	Alpine Blvd (Alpine)	<del>Viejas Grade Rd.</del> <a href="#">Otto Ave / Willows Road.</a> (Alpine)
Wildcat Canyon Rd.	2.1D Community Collector w/ Improvement Options	Willow Rd. (Lakeside)	Barona Casino (Ramona)
<a href="#">Willows Road (west of Viejas Casino Road)</a>	<a href="#">2.2E Light Collector</a>	<a href="#">Otto Ave./West Willows Road (Alpine)</a>	<a href="#">Viejas Casino Rd. (Alpine)</a>
<a href="#">Willows Road (east of Viejas Casino Road)</a>	<a href="#">4.2B Boulevard w/ Intermittent Turn Lanes</a>	<a href="#">Viejas Casino Rd. (Alpine)</a>	<a href="#">Interstate 8 on-ramp</a>
Woods Valley Rd.	2.2C Light Collector w/ Intermittent Turn Lanes	Oakmont Rd (Valley Center)	Karibu Ln. (Valley Center)
Woodside Ave.	4.2A Boulevard w/ Raised Median	SR-67 NB Off Ramp (Lakeside)	Riverford Rd. (Lakeside)

- a. The cross-sections for State Highway reflect the design in the Project Authorization/Environmental Document (PA/ED), which are different from those of the County Mobility Element road classifications.
- b. Roads noted are on the Congestion Management Program (CMP). Acceptable LOS for roads on the CMP is LOS E or better.

### 1.5.2.6 San Diego County Zoning Ordinance Amendments

The proposed Project includes minor changes to the Zoning Ordinance use regulations and development regulations, including density, lot size, building type, setback and special area regulations on specific properties. Most of the redesignated Project areas require no changes to zoning as part of the proposed Project because a large portion of the Project area is assigned rural densities, where the existing zoning is compatible and appropriate. However, in the areas where land use designation changes result in incompatible zoning, the proposed Project includes changes in zoning to correspond with the changes in the General Plan land use designation. For example, when land use designations change from residential to commercial, the zoning regulations must also change to remain compatible. Approximately 200 of the more than 4,000 parcels that are part of the GPA require changes to their zoning regulations to maintain consistency between the General Plan land use designations and Zoning Ordinance.

The proposed changes in zoning regulations comply with the Compatibility Matrix, Section 2050 of the Zoning Ordinance by making the zoning regulations consistent with the land use designations. In the cases where density and lot size are affected, zoning is being changed to match the General Plan land use designation, allowing for potential development that would be expected under the General Plan. For example, where densities are increasing, a corresponding reduction in lot size is proposed. In the cases where building type and setbacks are affected, the zoning is changed to the typical similar zone that would be found in the same areas with similar use regulations. For example, building types and setbacks found in other commercial zones in the same area would be matched to allow for similar commercial development. Compatible zoning changes must be adopted with General Plan land use designation changes as part of this proposed Project to assure proper implementation of the General Plan in the Project areas.

### 1.5.2.7 Removal of Forest Conservation Initiative Appendix

The text of the Forest Conservation Initiative is currently included as an appendix to the County General Plan. Since the FCI has expired and the purpose of the Project is to re-designate lands that were subject to the FCI, the FCI Appendix is proposed to be removed from the General Plan. The text that is proposed to be removed is shown in ~~strikeout~~ below.

## ~~FOREST CONSERVATION INITIATIVE~~

~~The People of San Diego County Do Hereby Ordain as Follows:~~

### ~~Section One—Findings And Purpose~~

- ~~A. Tremendous development pressures in San Diego County are resulting in the rapid fragmentation and destruction of the Cleveland National Forest. Approximately 55,000 acres of land within the Cleveland National Forest are privately owned and, under existing plans, will inevitably be developed. Sustaining and protecting the wildlife resources of the Cleveland National Forest is highly dependent upon limiting urban encroachment on these private lands. Yet, as with the case of the recent adoption of the Central Mountain Subregional Plan update, extensive development has continued on these biologically~~

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

---

- ~~sensitive land holdings. This initiative measure creates new policies to limit the conversion of privately owned lands within the Cleveland National Forest to urban uses.~~
- ~~B. The Cleveland National Forest is one of the largest expanses of undisturbed, natural open space in Southern California and as such is valuable as a watershed, agricultural area, and recreational area for the citizens of San Diego County. The area is also home to a number of threatened or endangered animal and plant species including, but not limited to, Mountain Lion, Bald Eagle, Golden Eagle, Least Bell's Vireo, Orange Throated Whiptail, Yellow Warbler, Coast Horned Lizard, Englemann Oak, Tecate Cypress, Parish's Meadowfoam, and San Diego Thornmint. Parish's Meadowfoam and San Diego Thornmint are listed as endangered by the California Department of Fish and Game. The Golden Eagle and the Least Bell's Vireo are on the Federal lists of sensitive and endangered species, respectively.~~
- ~~C. The unique resources of the Cleveland National Forest are of such significance that development on parcels within the Forest must be restricted. The San Diego County Planning Commission indicated that a parcel size of greater than 20 acres was necessary to preserve those pristine areas, and to minimize the impact of development on public lands. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the California Department of Parks and Recreation, and numerous wildlife biologists have determined that an 80 acre minimum parcel size is required to protect the resources of the Cleveland National Forest. This initiative amends the San Diego County General Plan to impose a minimum parcel size of 40 acres on all privately owned lands within the boundaries of the Cleveland National Forest and outside Country Towns, through December 31, 2010. The initiative also amends the San Diego County General Plan to provide that all such privately owned lands within the boundaries of the Cleveland National Forest and outside Country Towns, through December 31, 2010. The initiative also amends the San Diego County General Plan to provide that all such privately owned lands fall within the "Environmentally Constrained Area" regional category; except for the amendment relating to such private land holdings, the General Plan provisions governing the "Environmentally Constrained Area" regional category remain unchanged by the initiative through December 31, 2010.~~
- ~~D. Recognizing the need for continued growth and adequate housing in the County, this initiative measure's primary restrictions apply only to the private land holdings located within the boundaries of the Cleveland National Forest as delineated on the San Diego County General Plan Land Use Map. This initiative measure this does not apply to land located within County Towns. County Towns are historically established retail/residential areas serving surrounding low density rural areas. Attached to this initiative are (1) a map of the Cleveland National Forest illustrating the boundaries of the Cleveland National Forest, and (2) Community and Subregional Plan maps showing the locations of Country Towns. There is abundant land within unincorporated San Diego County, within Country Towns and outside the boundaries of the Cleveland National Forest, available to meet the expected housing needs identified by the San Diego County General Plan Housing Element. This initiative measure will allow the County to continue to bear its fair share of~~

~~regional growth, and to provide an adequate range of housing for all sectors of the community, while assuring the protection of the Cleveland National Forest.~~

~~E. The Land Use Element of the San Diego County General Plan adopted January 3, 1979, as amended through April 20, 1992 sets forth several goals essential to protecting the County's environmental resources which this initiative reaffirms and readopts to remain in effect through December 31, 2010; these goals are:~~

~~Goal 1.1: Urban Growth be directed to areas within or adjacent to existing urban areas, and that the rural setting and lifestyle of the remaining areas of the County be retained.~~

~~Goal 2.6: Insure preservation of contiguous regionally significant open space corridors.~~

~~Goal 3.1: Protect lands needed for preservation of natural and cultural resources; managed production of resources; and recreational, educational, and scientific activities.~~

~~F. The Open Space Element adopted December 20, 1973, as amended through April 20, 1992 sets forth several goals essential to protecting the County's environmental resources which this initiative reaffirms and readopts to remain in effect through December 31, 2010; these goals are:~~

~~Goal 2: Conserve scarce natural resources and lands needed for vital natural processes and the managed production of resources.~~

~~Goal 3: Conserve open spaces needed for recreation, educational and scientific activities.~~

~~Goal 4: Encourage and preserve those open space uses that distinguish and separate communities.~~

~~Goal II-4: Encourage the conservation of vegetation and trees needed to prevent erosion, siltation, flood, and drought, and to protect air and water quality.~~

~~Goal II-5: Encourage the conservation of the habitats of rare or unique plants and wildlife.~~

~~Goal II-8: Encourage the preservation of significant natural features of the County, including the beaches, lagoons, shoreline, canyons, bluffs, mountain peaks, and major rock outcroppings.~~

~~G. The Conservation Element adopted December 10, 1975, as amended through April 20, 1992 sets forth several policies essential to protecting the County's environmental resources which this initiative reaffirms and adopts to remain in effect through December 31, 2010; these policies are:~~

~~Policy 2: San Diego County shall coordinate with appropriate federal, state and local agencies to conserve areas of rare, endangered, or threatened species.~~

~~Policy 7: The County shall establish procedures for acquiring significant wildlife habitats in areas of rapid urban development and areas of projected urban development.~~

### **Section Two—General Plan Amendment**

~~The San Diego County General Plan, including its Community and Subregional Plans, as amended through April 20, 1992 (hereinafter the "San Diego County General Plan") is hereby amended as follows, through December 31, 2010:~~

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

---

- ~~A. The following resource protection goals and policies (set forth in their entirety in findings E, F, and G of section One of the Forest Conservation Initiative) are hereby reaffirmed and readopted: goals 1.1, 2.6, and 3.1 of the San Diego County General Plan Land Use Element; goals 2, 3, 4, II-4, II-5, and II-8 of the San Diego County General Plan Open Space Element; and, policies 2 and 7 of the San Diego County General Plan Conservation Element.~~
- ~~B. The National Forest and State Parks (23) land use designation as set forth beginning on page II-25 of the San Diego County General Plan Land Use Element is hereby amended through December 31, 2010 as follows:~~
- ~~1. The existing first sentence of this designation is deleted and the following sentence is added commencing a new subsection (a):  
“(a) The National Forest and State Parks (23) designation indicates the planned boundaries and major land holdings of the Cuyamaca Rancho State Park and Anza-Borrego State Park.”~~
  - ~~2. The following is added as new subsection (b) on page II-26 following the provisions of subsection (a) regarding clustering:  
“(b) The National Forest and State Parks (23) designation also applies to all private landholdings lying within the boundaries of the Cleveland National Forest and outside of Country Towns. For purposes of this subsection, “private landholdings” means lands held in fee title by any person or entity other than the federal, state, county or local government. A map of the Cleveland National Forest is attached to the Forest Conservation Initiative and incorporated herein for purposes of showing the outer boundaries of the Cleveland National Forest. For all parcels identified above, a forty (40) acre minimum parcel size and a maximum residential building intensity of one dwelling unit per parcel shall apply. The provisions described in subsection (a) above concerning lot sizes and clustering on lands within Cuyamaca Rancho State Park and Anza-Borrego State Park shall not apply to private landholdings within the Cleveland National Forest.  
“Except as provided hereinafter, until December 31, 2010, private landholdings inside the boundaries of the Cleveland National Forest and outside Country Towns which are designated National Forest and State Parks (23) in the San Diego County General Plan shall remain so designated unless the County redesignates said land pursuant to the procedures set forth below in paragraphs (1) or (2) of this subsection.  
“(1) Private landholdings inside the boundaries of the Cleveland National Forest and outside Country Towns which are designated National Forest and State Parks (23) may be removed from this designation if all of the follow findings (a-f) are made:  
“(a) That the approval will not constitute part of, or encourage, a piece-meal conversion of a larger Cleveland National Forest area to residential or other non-open space uses;~~

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

---

~~“(b) Adequate public services and facilities are available and have the capability to accommodate the proposed use by virtue of the property being within or annexed to appropriate service districts;~~

~~“(c) The land proposed for redesignation is contiguous to a Country Town;~~

~~“(d) The proposed use and density are compatible with the environmental resources of the Cleveland National Forest and will not adversely affect the stability of land use patterns in the area;~~

~~“(e) Incorporation or annexation to a city is not appropriate or possible within the next five years, based on the following factors: nearby cities’ designated sphere of influence boundaries, city general plan limits and projections, and comprehensive annexation plans; and,~~

~~“(f) The land proposed for redesignation does not exceed 40 acres for any one landowner in any calendar year. One landowner may not redesignate lands designated National Forest and State Parks (23) more often than once every year. Landowners with any unity of interest are considered one landowner for purposes of this limitation.~~

~~“(2) Lands designated National Forest and State Parks (23) may be removed from this designation if the County, after challenge by an affected landowner, and after considering all facts and applicable legislative and judicial authority in support of this designation finds that denial of a redesignation would constitute an unconstitutional taking of the landowner’s property or would deprive the landowner of a vested right. In permitting a redesignation pursuant to this paragraph, the redesignation will be granted only after public notice and hearing and only to the minimum extent necessary to avoid said unconstitutional taking or deprivation of vested right.~~

~~“The General Plan maps listed below are amended by the Forest Conservation Initiative to provide that all private land holdings are defined in this subsection lying within the boundaries of the Cleveland National Forest and outside of Country Towns are designated National Forest and State Parks (23). To the extent that the maps listed below depict such private land holdings as subject to a designation other than National Forest and State Parks (23), those portions of the maps are repeated. Reduced copies of the maps, including text thereon indicating these amendments, are attached to the Forest Conservation Initiative. The maps as amended are incorporated into the San Diego County General Plan.~~

- ~~1. Alpine Community Plan dated July 2, 1990;~~
- ~~2. Ramona Community Planning Area dated January 9, 1989;~~
- ~~3. Julian Community Plan dated September 29, 1989;~~
- ~~4. Desert Subregional Area dated September 28, 1987;~~
- ~~5. Mountain Empire Subregional Area dated September 28, 1987;~~
- ~~6. North Mountain Subregional Area dated September 29, 1989;~~
- ~~7. Central Mountain Subregional Area dated October 6, 1988;~~
- ~~8. Pendleton-De Luz Subregional Area dated February 7, 1986; and,~~
- ~~9. Jamul-Dulzura Subregional Area dated February 13, 1992.~~

~~“The County may amend these maps as necessary to reflect:~~

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

---

~~Redesignations of land pursuant to subsection (b), paragraphs (1) or (2), of designation (23);~~

~~General Plan amendments relating to land other than private land holdings lying within the Cleveland National Forest and outside Country Towns;~~

~~The terms and purpose of the Forest Conservation Initiative.”~~

~~C. The Environmentally Constrained Area (1.6) regional category as set forth on page II-11 of the San Diego County General Plan Land Use Element is hereby deleted and replaced with the following to remain in effect through December 31, 2010:~~

~~“Environmentally Constrained Areas include floodplains, lagoons, areas with construction quality sand deposits, rock quarries, agricultural preserves, area containing rare and endangered plant and animal species, and all private land holdings as defined in subsection (b) of designation (23) as amended by the Forest Conservation Initiative within the Cleveland National Forest outside Country Towns. Development in these areas, while guided by the County General Plan, should be preceded by through environmental review and implementation of appropriate measures to mitigate adverse impacts.~~

~~“Uses and densities will be those permitted by the applicable community and subregional plan map; the County Zoning Ordinance; the Groundwater Policy; and, for private landholdings in the Cleveland National Forest and outside of Country Towns designated National Forest and State Parks (23) a forty acre minimum parcel size shall apply and a one (1) unit per parcel maximum density.~~

~~“The resource responsible for the designation of an ECA shall be identified and appropriate mitigation measures included in any project approval.~~

~~“Flood prone areas which are not planned for stabilization will be retained in natural, open and other non-urban uses.~~

~~“Areas designated Agricultural Preserve shall be designated ‘Environmentally Constrained Areas’.~~

~~“The General Plan Regional Land Use Element Map dated August 26, 1991, as amended through April 20, 1992, is amended by the Forest Conservation Initiative to provide that all private land holdings as defined in subsection (b) of designation (23) lying within the boundaries of the Cleveland National Forest and outside of Country Towns are included within the Environmentally Constrained Area regional category. To the extent that said map depicts such private landholdings as within a regional category other than Environmentally Constrained Area, those portions of the map are repealed. A reduced copy of the map, including text thereon indicating this amendment, is attached to the Forest Conservation Initiative. The map as amended is incorporated into the San Diego County General Plan.~~

~~“The County may amend this map as necessary to reflect:~~

~~Redesignations of land pursuant to subsection (b), paragraphs (1) or (2), of designation (23);~~

~~General Plan amendments relating to land other than private land holdings lying within the Cleveland National Forest and outside Country Towns;~~

~~The terms and purpose of the Forest Conservation Initiative.”~~

~~D. The Special Purpose Designations and Use Regulations Table on page II-24 of the San Diego County General Plan Land Use Element is hereby amended to add a notation to follow the use regulations listed for the National Forest and State Parks (23) designation through December 31, 2010 as follows:~~

~~“On private land holdings as defined in subsection (b) of designation (23) as amended by the Forest Conservation Initiative within the Cleveland National Forest, and outside Country Towns, the maximum residential density is one unit per 40 acres.”~~

~~Section Three—Implementation~~

~~Upon the effective date of this initiative, the provisions of Section Two of this initiative amending the General Plan are inserted into the San Diego County General Plan, except that if in the year the initiative becomes effective, the four amendments permitted by State law for that year have already been utilized, this General Plan amendment shall be the first inserted into the San Diego County General Plan on January 1 of the following year.~~

~~Section Four—Exemptions For Certain Projects~~

~~This initiative shall not apply to any development project which has obtained as of the effective date of the initiative a vested right. The provisions of this initiative shall not apply to the extent that they would violate federal or state laws.~~

~~Section Five—Severability~~

~~If any portion of this initiative is declared invalid by a court, the remaining portions are to be considered valid.~~

~~Section Six—Duration~~

~~This initiative shall remain in effect until December 31, 2010.~~

### **1.5.3 General Plan Implementation Plan**

The County’s General Plan Implementation Plan establishes the actions and procedures required to achieve the Goals and Policies identified in the General Plan. The Implementation Plan describes the combination of activities, processes, reports, assessments, plans, and programs that came into effect upon adoption of the General Plan in August 2011. The County actively maintains the Implementation Plan and may revise it when necessary to ensure it remains accurate and effective, as buildout of the General Plan occurs over future years, and to ensure that the Goals and Policies in the General Plan continue to be achieved.

As required by State law, the Implementation Plan identifies specific actions required by the County which include, but are not limited to:

- Preparation of an annual report on the implementation status of the General Plan and the County’s progress in meeting its regional housing needs allocation.
- Preparation of an annual capital improvement program for scheduling and financing major public works projects consistent with the General Plan.
- Preparation of an updated zoning code to ensure consistency between the County’s zoning and development standards and the updated General Plan’s land use designations and policies.

**1.6 Discretionary Actions, Decisions, Approvals**

The discretionary actions associated with the proposed Project are listed in Table 1-6, Project Approvals/Permits.

**TABLE 1-5. PROJECT APPROVALS/PERMITS**

<b>Project Approval/Permit</b>	<b>Approving Authority</b>
General Plan Amendment	County BOS
Zoning Ordinance Amendment	County BOS

**1.6.1 Additional Review and Consultation Requirements**

The proposed Project is subject to review and consultation requirements in addition to the discretionary approvals identified in Table 1-6, Project Approvals/Permits. To date, the County has engaged in consultation with the following entities with regard to the proposed Project:

- **Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC).** The County has contacted the NAHC to ensure that the appropriate Native American tribes are consulted for their knowledge of potential known resources and history of the areas affected by the proposed Project.
- **Tribal Governments.** Subsequent to the NAHC consultation, and consistent with the requirements of Senate Bill (SB) 18, the County has consulted with the Inter-Tribal Cultural Resource Protection Council (ICRPC), Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee (KCRC), Kumeyaay Diegueno Land Conservancy (KDLC), and the following Native American tribes to gain information about the protection of known tribal resources as pertains to the proposed Project: Ewiiapaay, Pala, Pechanga, Soboba, Sycuan, Viejas, and Kwaaymii Laguna Band of Indians.
- **Planning and Sponsor Groups.** The County has engaged the affected community planning and sponsor groups to obtain input on the proposed Project.
- **Federal Agencies and Environmental Groups.** The County has engaged the following agencies and environmental groups to obtain input on the proposed Project: United States Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, Cleveland National Forest Foundation; Environmental Health Coalition (EHC); Endangered Habitats League (EHL); and Save Our Forest and Ranchlands (SOFAR).

In addition, a public scoping meeting was held on September 17, 2012 to gain public input and to document concerns with regard to the proposed Project. Information obtained during the scoping meeting, during the NOP public review period and during the initial 2012 SEIR public review comment period, has been considered and included in the SEIR analysis, as appropriate.

**1.6.2 Pipeline Policies**

Any project applications for properties within the former FCI lands are required to be processed based on the land use designations in effect at the time of application, which would potentially

be inconsistent with the current General Plan as the pre-FCI land use designations (under the previous General Plan) are currently in effect for these lands. To address this issue, on December 8, 2010, the County BOS adopted a “pipeline policy” (Minute Order No.8) which established the following action as pertains to the former FCI lands, among others: “Directed the Chief Administrative Officer to design an acknowledgement for property owners wishing to file subdivision that states they are informed and understand that they are proceeding at their own risk and that the project must be consistent with the General Plan in effect at the time of the project approval.” Therefore, this policy is intended to allow for the submittal and processing of development applications for the former FCI lands during this GPA process.

### **1.7 SEIR Impact Analysis Methodology**

The methodology for analysis of potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed Project is similar to that performed in the General Plan Update PEIR. Specifically, the programmatic-level analysis contained in this SEIR does not, and cannot, speculate on the individual environmental impacts of specific future development projects on lands affected by the proposed Project. As with the General Plan Update PEIR, the buildout scenario as pertains to the Project areas is based on the maximum development potential of the land use designation assigned to the Land Use Map. SANDAG maintains a population model for the San Diego region, used for regional planning in conjunction with the Regional Comprehensive and Transportation Plans. Based on the SANDAG 2015 Regional Growth Forecast (adopted October 2011) and the forecasted number of future dwelling units, buildout of the General Plan (including the proposed Project) is sufficient to meet SANDAG forecasts through the year 2050<sup>1</sup>.

It is acknowledged herein that SANDAG adopted its 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) on October 28, 2011, which provides a vision for the region’s transportation system over the next 40 years; however, to ensure consistency between the analysis provided in the General Plan Update PEIR and the proposed Project, the traffic analysis for the proposed Project was prepared based upon SANDAG’s 2030 population forecast model. The primary difference between the two models is how traffic is forecast for the incorporated jurisdictions in San Diego County. This difference will have little to no impact on the proposed Project since the former FCI lands are not adjacent to the incorporated cities.

The potential for significant impacts to occur on lands affected by implementation of the proposed Project is based upon specific technical analyses and GIS data. Additionally, federal, State, and local regulations were considered for their applicability in reducing the effects of development under the General Plan and the proposed Project. The same existing regulations addressed in the General Plan PEIR to reduce potential impacts for each environmental issue are also incorporated into this SEIR. Where no applicable regulations exist, this SEIR incorporates the mitigation measures and General Plan Implementation Policies as addressed in the General Plan PEIR to reduce such impacts to a less than significant level. See Chapter seven (7) of this

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.sandag.org/index.asp?classid=26&fuseaction=home.classhome> accessed March 18, 2015

SEIR for a complete roster of General Plan policies and mitigation measures applicable to this proposed Project. Note that most but not all Implementation Policies and Mitigation Measures identified in the General Plan Update PEIR are applicable to the proposed Project. Further, this SEIR has identified the need for additional mitigation measures than were identified in the General Plan Update PEIR, specifically the need to mitigate for the impacts of Climate Change and the implementation of a climate action plan.

Finally, the same issue areas found to have less than significant impacts in the General Plan Update PEIR are addressed in Chapter 3.0 of this SEIR as Effects Found Not to be Significant. For issue areas where changes in the environmental baseline (e.g. a change in physical or regulatory conditions) may have occurred since certification of the General Plan Update PEIR, or where potential impacts for the proposed Project vary from those of the General Plan Update PEIR, additional analysis or a clarified baseline condition is provided in the resource chapters of this SEIR to expand on or amend what was published in the General Plan Update PEIR.

### **1.8 Project Consistency with Applicable Plans**

As stated in the General Plan Update PEIR, San Diego County supports 19 jurisdictions, including the unincorporated County. Each of these jurisdictions has been given local land use authority and has a responsibility to prepare and adopt their own general plan. The proposed Project is required to demonstrate consistency with those plans; Refer to Section 2.8, Land Use, of this SEIR for a detailed analysis of proposed Project consistency with the General Plans of the incorporated cities, as appropriate.

### **1.9 Cumulative Project Assessment Overview**

CEQA requires that an EIR evaluate a project's cumulative impacts. Cumulative impacts are considered to be a project's impacts combined with the impacts of other related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects. As set forth in the CEQA Guidelines, the discussion of cumulative impacts must reflect the severity of the impacts, as well as the likelihood of their occurrence; however, the discussion need not be as detailed as the discussion of environmental impacts attributable to the project alone. As stated in CEQA, Public Resources Code, Section 21083(b) (2), "a project may have a significant effect on the environment if the possible effects of a project are individually limited but cumulatively considerable."

According to Section 15355 of the CEQA Guidelines, "Cumulative impacts refer to two or more individual effects, which, when considered together, are considerable and which compound or increase other environmental impacts.

- a) The individual effects may be changes resulting from a single project or a number of separate projects.
- b) The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment, which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonable foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

---

individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time (California Code of Regulations [CCR], Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, §15355).”

In addition, as stated in the CEQA Guidelines, “The mere existence of significant cumulative impacts caused by other projects alone shall not constitute substantial evidence that the proposed project’s incremental effects are “cumulatively considerable” (CCR, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Section 15064[h][4]). As defined in Section 15065(a)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines, cumulatively considerable indicates “that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.” If an incremental effect is not cumulatively considerable, such an effect is not required to be considered significant; however, the reasoning for a determination of why such effects are not significant shall be provided by the lead agency. In addition, implementation of appropriate mitigation measures can reduce a project’s contribution to impacts to less than cumulatively considerable, as allowed by CEQA.

Additionally, the geographic scope considered for the cumulative analysis may vary relative to individual environmental issue areas. Therefore, a description of the geographic scope for each environmental issue analyzed in this SEIR is provided within individual sections within Chapter 2.0, Environmental Effects of the Proposed Project.

As stated in CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(b), two methods for considering cumulative effects may be used:

- “A list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency; or,
- A summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document, or in a prior environmental document which has been adopted or certified, which described or evaluated regional or area-wide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact.”

This SEIR incorporates the approach and methodology used in the General Plan Update PEIR for the identification of present and probable future cumulative projects. This SEIR cumulative analysis includes a list of private projects identified in the General Plan Update PEIR and has been updated to include private projects initiated since the General Plan Update PEIR was completed that require GPAs, Specific Plans and Specific Plan Amendments, TMs/TPMs and major use permits (MUP), (See Table 1-8). The cumulative analysis includes projections based on adopted general or regional plans; projects that were in process or under construction in the County outside the General Plan Update process; planned development on tribal lands; utility improvements; transportation improvements; and development projects proposed on lands under the governance of the National Park Service (NPS), U.S. Forest Service, FCI lands, and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). Any newly proposed or anticipated projects since the adoption of the General Plan in August 2011 that may be pertinent to this cumulative analysis are also addressed herein. Cumulative impact discussions for each environmental topic area are

provided as part of the technical analysis contained within Chapter 2.0, Environmental Effects of the Proposed Project.

## **1.9.1 Cumulative Projects**

### **1.9.1.1 *Regional Land Use Planning and Projected Growth***

The General Plan Update PEIR evaluated regional growth and employment projections for areas that would be directly and/or indirectly impacted by implementation of the General Plan (under all of the alternatives considered). Such projections were based upon data maintained by SANDAG and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) for the San Diego County region to the year 2030, and are applicable for the proposed Project. SANDAG is largely responsible for maintenance of economic, demographic, land use, and transportation data projections for both the County and the incorporated cities. Therefore, the cumulative analysis in this SEIR utilizes the same population and employment projections as presented in the General Plan Update PEIR from the following sources.

#### **Incorporated City General Plans**

Within the County of San Diego, there are 18 incorporated cities which include: Carlsbad, Chula Vista, Coronado, Del Mar, El Cajon, Encinitas, Escondido, Imperial Beach, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, National City, Oceanside, Poway, San Diego, San Marcos, Santee, Solana Beach and Vista.

#### **Surrounding County General Plans**

Consistent with that analyzed in the General Plan Update PEIR, the cumulative analysis for the proposed Project considers the adopted general plans of the adjacent counties of Orange, Riverside, and Imperial.

#### **Baja California, Mexico**

San Diego County is bordered to the south by Baja California, Mexico. The border communities of northern Baja California include the cities of Tijuana, Tecate, and Mexicali. Table 1-7 in the General Plan Update PEIR identifies major development projects and probable future projects within Baja California, Mexico that would have the potential to contribute to cumulative impacts in the region, in combination with the proposed Project.

### **1.9.1.2 *County-Initiated General Plan Amendments***

GPA's that were not included in the General Plan Update PEIR cumulative analysis that have been approved or are currently being processed by the County are identified below.

#### **San Dieguito Specific Plan Area and Community Plan Amendment (GPA 12-008)**

On April 10, 2013 the Board of Supervisors adopted a GPA to correct inconsistencies with the General Plan Land Use Map, the San Dieguito Community Plan, and approved specific plans.

This GPA addressed errors and inconsistencies relative to the San Dieguito Community Plan and four associated specific plans, including the El Apajo, Fairbanks Ranch, Santa Fe Valley, and 4S Ranch Specific Plans. The GPA eliminated confusion regarding land use designations and density calculations in these areas. This allowed for an active development project in the Santa Fe Valley Specific Plan Area to proceed.

**Housing Element Update GPA (GPA 12-009)**

In accordance with California Government Code 65588(e)(1)(E), San Diego County BOS updated the Housing Element on April 24, 2013 and the State Department of Housing and Community Development found the element in compliance with state law. Minor updates were incorporated to comply with State law, primarily changes to the Sites Inventory to meet the fifth cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) goals and to update information related to the latest census. The Housing Element GPA also included a review of the success of each implementing program with input from County Housing and Community Development and analysis of how the County can make housing policy and programs more effective, and prepare appropriate environmental review. The Housing Element Update did not include any changes to the General Plan land use map.

**Boulevard and Borrego Springs Community Plan Amendments (GPA 12-003B)**

On May 15, 2013 the Board adopted amendments to the Boulevard and Borrego Springs Community Plans as part of the Wind Ordinance amendment.

- The Boulevard Community Plan was amended to remove and revise policy language to allow increased opportunities for large turbine development subject to the approval of a Major Use Permit.
- The Borrego Springs Community Plan was amended to allow more flexibility for small turbine projects.

**General Plan Clean-Up GPA (GPA 12-007)**

The General Plan Clean-Up was approved by the County BOS on June 18, 2014. This Clean-Up GPA was prepared based on BOS direction to prepare GPA “clean ups” every two years. During the course of the General Plan Update hearings, interest was expressed in developing a mechanism for property owners to raise issues regarding the General Plan Update.

The General Plan Clean-up contains the following:

- Land Use Map — changes to land use designations of specific properties to ensure consistency with the goals and policies of the General Plan and to correct mapping errors. The Clean-up GPA changes the land use designations for 98 parcels totaling 2,782 acres in 12 subregions/communities. These changes reduced the buildout potential by 390 DUs, increased the commercial land uses by 9 acres, and increased the industrial land uses by 11 acres.

- Policy Document — changes to the General Plan Introduction, the Land Use, Conservation and Open Space, and Safety elements, and the Glossary to correct errors and omissions, provide clarification, and ensure internal consistency.
- Mobility Element Network — corrections and minor planning group requests affecting the Mobility Element Network Appendix which identifies the classifications of each Mobility Element road according to segment.
- Community Plans — minor clarifications, revisions, and edits to community and subregional plans based on specific direction from the BOS or to ensure internal consistency.

**The Property Specific Requests (NM16, RM15, SD2, and SV17) General Plan Amendment (GPA12-012)**

The Property Specific Requests (NM16, RM15, SD2, and SV17) GPA was approved by the County BOS on June 18, 2014.. This GPA included land use map changes in the subregion/communities of North Mountain, Ramona, San Dieguito, and Spring Valley. The land use changes totaled 1,005 acres and increased total buildout potential of these areas by 49 DUs.

**Property Specific Requests GPA (GPA 12-005)**

A General Plan Amendment is being prepared that includes proposed land use changes for 44 Property Specific Requests (PSRs) totaling approximately 13,120 acres throughout nine CPAs. A PSR is a petition by a property owner or other entity for the County BOS to consider a change in land use designation on a specific property. This GPA is estimated to be taken to the BOS for consideration in 2017. Adoption of these 44 PSRs would result in approximately an additional 2,600 DUs. The 44 PSRs are located in the communities of Bonsall, Crest/Dehesa, Desert, Fallbrook, Mountain Empire, North County Metro, Pala/Pauma Valley, San Dieguito, and Valley Center.

**1.9.1.3 Ordinance Amendments**

Three County-wide ordinances are currently being prepared or have been approved by the County. They are identified below.

**Wind Energy Ordinance (POD 10-007 and GPA 12-003)**

The Wind Energy Ordinance project included amendments to the County’s Zoning Ordinance related to wind turbines and meteorological (MET) facilities. The amendments consisted of clarifications, deletions, and revisions to provide an updated set of definitions, procedures, and standards for review and permitting of wind turbines and MET facilities. The project also included a GPA intended to modify the Boulevard chapter of the Mountain Empire Subregional Plan (Boulevard Community Plan) to allow large wind turbine projects through the Major Use Permit process; and to allow small wind turbine projects in the Borrego Springs Community Plan but continue to prohibit large wind turbines in areas where

viewsheds would be adversely impacted. The Wind Energy Ordinance and GPA were approved by the County BOS on May 15, 2013.

**Equine Ordinance (POD 11-011)**

The Equine Ordinance included amendments to the County’s Zoning Ordinance for equine uses. The amendments consisted of clarifications, deletions, and revisions to provide an updated set of definitions, procedures and standards for review and permitting of equine uses, specifically for commercial horse stables. The amendments implement a new tiered system of permitting for a horse stable with both ministerial and discretionary tiers of permitting. The ordinance was approved by the County BOS on September 11, 2013.

**Groundwater Ordinance Amendment (POD 11-006)**

The amendments required applicable future projects to offset their proposed groundwater demand by requiring elimination of existing water uses elsewhere in Borrego Valley and creating a “tool-box” to implement the water offset measures. Additionally, the amendment recognizes water credits created through the Borrego Water District. Amendments to the Groundwater Ordinance provisions related to Borrego Valley were approved by the County BOS in January 2013

**Zoning Ordinance Amendment to Improve the County’s Off-Street Parking Regulations (POD 11-005)**

The Off-street Parking Regulations were updated to be consistent with contemporary requirements for parking area design and address a broader range of land uses. The revised parking regulations provide reasonable parking requirements for the various land use types that exist throughout the unincorporated county. Further, the parking standards are better organized to make them easier to read, understand, and enforce; while helping to implement General Plan goals and policies by incorporating new standards for parking design and sustainability, such as required electric vehicle parking. The amendment to the Zoning Ordinance regarding off-street parking regulations was approved by the County BOS in February 2013

**Design Review Checklist (POD 11-005)**

This project introduced a new exemption to the “B” Community Design Review Site Plan Permit process as well as new design review checklists for several communities. Projects complying with a design review checklist are exempted from the discretionary Site Plan Permit process. The amendment streamlines the community design review process while ensuring community design guidelines are appropriately applied and community character is maintained. Zoning Ordinance amendment implementing a Design Review Checklist was adopted by the County BOS in October 2013. General Plan Implementation Zoning Clean-up 2014 (POD 13-014) This clean-up project addressed zoning inconsistencies identified by staff and property owners since late 2012, when the original zoning cleanup was approved. The zoning changes ensured that zoning

inconsistencies are updated to be compatible and consistent with surrounding zoning and the goals and policies of the General Plan.

#### **1.9.1.4 Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs)**

Within the San Diego region, SANDAG and SCAG act as the major regional transportation planning agencies. Therefore, the cumulative analysis in this SEIR utilizes the same future transportation projects as presented in the General Plan Update PEIR from the following sources.

##### **2050 San Diego RTP**

The 2050 San Diego Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) prepared by SANDAG and approved October 2011 lays out a plan for investing an estimated \$214 billion in transportation funds expected to come into the region over the next 40 years.

The SANDAG Board adopted the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) as is required by Senate Bill 375, which details how the region will reduce greenhouse gas emissions to state-mandated levels over time. Shortly after SANDAG's 2050 RTP/SCS was adopted, a lawsuit was filed by the Cleveland National Forest Foundation and others. After recirculation of the project's Draft EIR, Division One of the Fourth District Court of Appeal issued its decision in Cleveland National Forest Foundation vs. SANDAG, Case No. D063288. In its decision, the Fourth District held that SANDAG had failed to complete the environmental review required by CEQA; however, the RTP/SCS itself was not set aside. Subsequently, SANDAG filed a petition for review of the Fourth District's decision with the California Supreme Court (Case No. S223603). The California Supreme has granted the petition for review, however, it is unknown when a decision will be rendered.

In April 2015, SANDAG released the *Draft San Diego Forward, The Regional Plan* which combines the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), and the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) into one planning document for the region's future growth and development. The Plan will have an associated EIR planned to be released for public review and comment in May 2015. Similar to the plan described above, *San Diego Forward, The Regional Plan* includes housing forecasts, establishes targets for GHG emission reduction, and plans capital and operational expenditures for transit programs and operations and transportation related infrastructure. The investment plan forecasts \$204 billion in expenditures with 50% (\$102 billion) going toward public transit, both capital and operations; 15% for managed lanes and connectors; 13% for improvements to local streets, road and rail road crossings; eight-percent (8%) is for rehabilitating highways; six-percent (6%) is for other highway lanes and connector improvements; four percent (4%) is for debt service; three percent (3%) is for projects that promote walking and bicycling; and, one percent (1%) is for managing the overall transportation network. In sum, more than a third of expenditures are designated for the operation, maintenance and rehabilitation of transit, highways and local streets and roads.

### 2012-2035 SCAG RTP

The 2012-2035 Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) RTP/SCS was adopted in April 2012. The 2012-2035 SCAG, amended on June 6, 2013 and again on September 11, 2014, identifies transportation projects planned within the counties of Orange, Riverside, and Imperial, which lie adjacent to the County of San Diego, for consideration in the cumulative analysis for the proposed Project.

Amendment #1 included modifications or additions to 43 projects, with a majority of the changes being minor in nature, including changes to completion years, as well as minor modifications to project scopes, costs, and funding.

Amendment #2 was developed as a response to project changes in the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS; however, the changes made are generally minor in nature and include changes to completion years, as well as minor modifications to project scopes, costs, and funding.

#### **1.9.1.5 *Regional Energy and Utility Projects***

The General Plan Update PEIR identified a number of existing and planned energy and utility projects to serve the forecasted population within San Diego County to the year 2030 and beyond, including improvements to meet energy demands, telecommunications, and railroads, provision of water and wastewater services, and desalination projects to meet potable water demands. Since adoption of the General Plan in August 2011, the following additional projects, shown in Table 1-6, Regional Energy and Utility Projects, have been identified for consideration in the cumulative analysis for the proposed Project:

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

**TABLE 1-6. REGIONAL ENERGY AND UTILITY PROJECTS**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Status</b>
Campo Verde Solar Project	Imperial County	139 Megawatt (MW) capacity	Under construction
Centinela Solar Energy	Imperial County	275 MW solar energy facility with electrical transmission lines that connect new facility to the existing Imperial Valley substation	Under construction
Imperial Solar Energy Center (CSolar) West	Imperial County	250 MW solar energy facility with electrical transmission lines that connect new facility to the existing Imperial Valley substation	Approved in 2011
Imperial Solar Energy Center (CSolar) South	Imperial County	200 MW solar energy facility with electrical transmission lines that connect new facility to the existing Imperial Valley substation and widen existing access road	Project Constructed
Ocotillo Wind Energy Facility	Imperial County	Wind turbines produce up to 315 MW and connect to SDG&E Powerlink	Approved and constructed in 2012
Tule Wind Energy Project	San Diego County	186 MW wind turbine facility with electrical transmission lines that connect new facility to the existing SDG&E Boulevard substation	Approved in 2012
SDG&E East County (ECO) Substation Project	San Diego County	500/230/138 kilovolt (kV) substation with transmission line between the proposed ECO Substation and the rebuilt Boulevard Substation	Approved in 2011
Truckhaven Geothermal Leasing Area	Imperial County	Leasing of approximately 14,731 acres of BLM-managed public lands for geothermal exploration and development in the Truckhaven area	2008 Record of Decision
Desert Harvest Solar Farm	Riverside County	150 MW solar energy facility with electrical transmission lines	2013 Record of Decision
McCoy Solar Energy Project	Riverside County	750 MW solar energy facility with 16-mile electrical transmission lines connecting to Southern California Edison's Colorado River Substation	2013 Record of Decision
Palen Solar Power Project	Riverside County	500 MW solar energy facility with 4.5-mile electrical transmission lines connecting to Red Bluff Substation	Final EIS Prepared. Project sold to BrightSource Energy.
Palen Solar Electric Generating System	Riverside County	500 MW solar energy facility with 4.5-mile electrical transmission lines connecting to Red Bluff Substation	In environmental review
Rio Mesa Solar	Riverside County	500 MW solar energy facility with electrical transmission lines connecting to Colorado River substation	In environmental review

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

**TABLE 1-6, CONTINUED**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Status</b>
Blythe Solar Power Project	Riverside County	1000 MW solar energy facility with five miles of electrical transmission lines connecting to Colorado River substation	Draft EIR released for public review in February 2014
Blythe Mesa Solar Power Project	Riverside County	485 MW solar energy facility with electrical transmission lines connecting to the Colorado River Substation	In environmental review
Desert Sunlight Solar Farm Project	Riverside County	550 MW solar energy facility with five miles of electrical transmission lines connecting to Red Bluff Substation	Under construction
Genesis Solar Power Project	Riverside County	Two independent 125 MW solar electric generating facilities	Under construction
Rice Solar Energy Project	Riverside County	150 MW solar-powered electrical generation facility with a new transmission line, new electrical substation, and an access road	Record of Decision Issued/Right-of-way granted
Devers - Palo Verde No. 2 Transmission Line	Riverside County and Arizona	500 kV No. 2 (DPV2) 160-mile Transmission Line Project	Under construction
Sunrise Powerlink Project	San Diego and Imperial Counties	Construction of a new 90-mile, 500kV line from Imperial Valley Substation to Central East Substation and construction of 60 miles of new transmission lines from Central East Substation to Penasquitos Substation	Project Constructed

Source: County of San Diego 2014; BLM: <http://www.blm.gov/ca/st/en/prog/energy.html> Accessed July 22, 2015

**1.9.1.6 Private Projects**

The General Plan Update PEIR identified 148 development projects that were in the approval process, or that had recently been approved and were under construction, but not included in the General Plan Update. These projects largely consist of private development proposals that require approvals such as GPAs, rezones (REZ), specific plans and specific plan amendments (SPAs), Tentative Maps/Tentative Parcel Maps (TMs/TPMs), and major use permits (MUPs). Since adoption of the General Plan in August 2011, the additional projects shown below have been identified for consideration in the cumulative analysis for the proposed Project. These projects are included for evaluation in this SEIR for consistency with the proposed Project; refer to Table 1-7, Private Projects.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

**TABLE 1-7. PRIVATE PROJECTS**

<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Required Approvals</b>	<b>Community</b>	<b>DUs</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b>Status</b>
Ocean Breeze Ranch	TM, MUP	Bonsall	392	1,403	In review
Jacumba Solar	MUP	Jamul/Dulzura	N/A Industrial		In review
Otay Ranch Village 14	GPA/SP/TM/Rezone	Otay/Jamul	1560	1,035	Pre-Application
Otay Ranch Resort Village 13 (GPA 04-003)	GPA/SP/TM/Rezone	Otay	1,938	1,292	In review
Otay Business Park	GPA/SP/ Revised TM	Otay	N/A Comm./Ind.	162	Approved
Otay 250	SPA	Otay	3,158 Commercial	239	In review
Lake Jennings Marketplace	GPA	Lakeside	N/A Commercial	12	In review
Tule Wind Farm (GPA 12-002)	GPA, Rezone, MUP	Mountain Empire (Boulevard)	N/A (Energy Project)	765	Approved
Soitec Solar	Rezone/MUP	Mountain Empire (Boulevard)	N/A (Energy Project)	420	Approved
Newland Sierra	GPA/SP/Rezone/TM	North County Metro/Bonsall	2,135 Commercial	2,058	In review
Warner Springs Ranch Resort	GPA/SPA	North Mountain	692	2,900	In review
Valiano	GPA/SP/Rezone/TM	San Dieguito	362	259	In review
Rancho Librado	GPA/TM/MUP	San Dieguito	56	28	In review
Harmony Grove Village South	GPA, MUP, TM, Rezone, SP, STP	San Dieguito	453	112	In review
Chinese Bible Church of San Diego	REZ/MUP/SPA	San Dieguito	N/A (Public Assembly)	9	In review
Sweetwater Vistas	GPA/TM/Rezone	Spring Valley	122	18	In review
Sweetwater Place	GPA	Spring Valley	255	42	In review
Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community (GPA 12-001)	GPA/SP/TM/Rezone/ MUP/VAC	Valley Center	1,746	608	Hearings
Lilac Plaza	GPA, REZ	Valley Center	36 Commercial	7	In review

Source: County of San Diego, Department of Planning & Development Services, 2015

**1.9.1.7 Projects on Tribal Lands**

The County has consulted with the Native American tribes listed in Section 1.6.1. The General Plan Update PEIR identified 33 projects that were proposed for planning and development (e.g. casino and resort construction) on reservation lands within the County. Since adoption of the General Plan in August 2011, the additional projects shown below have been identified for

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

consideration in the cumulative analysis for the proposed Project; refer to Table 1-9, Projects on Tribal Lands.

**TABLE 1-8. PROJECTS ON TRIBAL LANDS**

<b>Project</b>	<b>Size</b>
<b>Jamul Indian Village</b>	
Gaming Facility	70,000 SF
<b>Rincon Reservation</b>	
Travel Plaza:	
Convenience Store	3,000 SF
Convenience Restaurant	1,000 SF
Self Service Carwash	1 facility
Gas Station	16 vehicle fueling stations
Restaurants	500 SF
Casino Expansion	15,000 SF
Hotel (21 stories)	402 rooms
Multi-Purpose Room	23,300 SF
Night Club	10,000 SF
<b>Sycuan Hotel and Casino Expansion Project</b>	
Casino Gaming Floor Expansion	52,000 SF
Hotel (two towers)	600 rooms
Food/beverage venues, multipurpose conference center & concert venue, spa/fitness center, outdoor pool & garden area, family/kid-friendly entertainment area, expanded support infrastructure (water & wastewater facilities)	Not available
Parking Garage	2,200 spaces
<b>Viejas Hotel South Tower</b>	
Hotel (6 stories)	128 rooms
Gaming Space	16,500 SF
Kitchen, ballroom, meeting rooms, bar and retail	(In hotel space)

Sources: County of San Diego 2014a, 2014b; Jamul Indian Village 2013; Sycuan Hotel/Casino Expansion NOP 2015

**1.9.1.8 BLM, NPS and USFS Projects**


The General Plan Update PEIR identified a number of existing and planned projects on BLM and USFS lands, but no major projects were proposed or foreseen on NPS lands. Since adoption of the General Plan in August 2011, the following additional projects have been identified for consideration in the cumulative analysis for the proposed Project:

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

---

- All of the regional energy projects identified in Section 1.9.1.5 above are located on BLM lands.
- An amendment to the CNF Land Management Plan is being proposed. This amendment would modify the existing land use zones (LUZ) allocations in selected Inventoried Roadless Areas of the CNF to include more Backcountry Non-Motorized (BCNM) and Recommended Wilderness (RW) areas.
- Alpine Community Defense. The Descanso Ranger District proposes fuel treatments within and in the vicinity of the Alpine CPA to reduce vegetation levels and mitigate the potential effects of wildfire. This project was expanded beyond its original focus on the Sweetwater and Viejas Creek area.
- Forest-Wide Unauthorized Route Decommissioning. The CNF received funding from the California Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) Grants Program to decommission unauthorized routes, as defined by the 2008 Motorized Travel Management decision, that have the greatest resource impacts.
- Greater Alpine Community Defense Fuels Treatment on Non-Federal Lands. The project involves constructing fuel breaks on private lands to reduce the risk to life, property, and resource values from an unusually severe wildland fire event in the greater Alpine area and improve fire suppression effectiveness and safety.
- San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E) Master Special Use Permit. The CNF is proposing to develop a "master" permit to consolidate and reissue over 70 permits presently issued to SDG&E, which also proposes to "fire-harden" some of the electric lines to improve system safety and reliability.

**This Page Intentionally Left Blank**




Source: SanGIS, County of San Diego, 2014

Proposed Project Areas

Figure 1-1

THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.



Source: SanGIS, County of San Diego, 2014














Alpine Land Use Map



Figure 1-2A

THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.


COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO  
 FOREST CONSERVATION INITIATIVE LANDS  
 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT  
*Alpine*  
 Community Planning Area

Proposed Project  
 Land Use Map  
 June 25, 2014

-  Lands Included in FCI GPA
-  Areas Changed Outside FCI
-  Village Residential (VR-2)
-  Semi-Rural Residential (SR-1)
-  Semi-Rural Residential (SR-2)
-  Semi-Rural Residential (SR-4)
-  Semi-Rural Residential (SR-10)
-  Rural Lands (RL-40)
-  Rural Commercial
-  Village Core Mixed Use
-  Public/Semi-Public Facilities
-  Public Agency Lands
-  Tribal Lands



THIS MAP/DATA IS PROVIDED WITHOUT WARRANTY OF ANY KIND, EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THE IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE. Note: This product may contain information from the SANDAG Regional Information System which cannot be reproduced without the written permission of SANDAG.  
 Copyright SanGIS 2012 - All Rights Reserved. Full text of this legal notice can be found at: [http://www.sangis.org/Legal\\_Notice.htm](http://www.sangis.org/Legal_Notice.htm)  
 Projection: State Plane, Zone VI, Datum NAD 83, Units Feet.  
 Path: S:\land\_use\lgupdate\maps\arcmap\fc\_l\_workshops\mxd\20110915\hatch\ER\PRO\_PRCO\_ER\alpine2.mxd  
 County of San Diego, LUEG GIS 6/17/2015




Source: SanGIS, County of San Diego, 2014

Alpine Village Area Land Use Map

Figure 1-2B

THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.




Source: SanGIS, County of San Diego, 2014

Central Mountain Land Use Map

Figure 1-3

THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.



Source: SanGIS, County of San Diego, 2014

Cuyamaca Land Use Map



Figure 1-4

**THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.**


COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO  
 FOREST CONSERVATION INITIATIVE LANDS  
 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT  
*Descanso*  
 Sponsor Group

Proposed Project  
 Land Use Map  
 June 25, 2014

- Lands Included in FCI GPA
- Areas Changed Outside FCI
- Village Residential (VR-4.3)
- Village Residential (VR-2)
- Semi-Rural Residential (SR-1)
- Semi-Rural Residential (SR-2)
- Semi-Rural Residential (SR-4)
- Semi-Rural Residential (SR-10)
- Rural Lands (RL-20)
- Rural Lands (RL-40)
- Rural Lands (RL-80)
- Rural Commercial
- Public/Semi-Public Facilities
- Public Agency Lands
- Tribal Lands
- Open Space (Conservation)



THIS MAP/DATA IS PROVIDED WITHOUT WARRANTY OF ANY KIND, EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THE IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE. Note: This product may contain information from the SANDAG Regional Information System which cannot be reproduced without the written permission of SANDAG.  
 Copyright SanGIS 2012 - All Rights Reserved. Full text of this legal notice can be found at: [http://www.sangis.org/Legal\\_Notice.htm](http://www.sangis.org/Legal_Notice.htm)  
 Projection: State Plane, Zone VI, Datum NAD 83, Units Feet.  
 Path: S:\land\_use\lgupdate\maps\arcmap\fc\_l\_workshops\mxd\20110915\hatch\ERVPRO\_PRCO\_ERVdescanso.mxd  
 County of San Diego, LUEGIS 2/18/2015




Source: SanGIS, County of San Diego, 2014

Descanso Land Use Map

Figure 1-5

THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.



Source: SanGIS, County of San Diego, 2014











Desert Land Use Map



Figure 1-6

THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.


COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO  
 FOREST CONSERVATION INITIATIVE LANDS  
 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT  
*Jamul - Dulzura*  
 Community Planning Area

Proposed Project  
 Land Use Map  
 June 25, 2014

-  Lands Included in FCI GPA
-  Areas Changed Outside FCI
-  Semi-Rural Residential (SR-10)
-  Rural Lands (RL-20)
-  Rural Lands (RL-40)
-  Rural Lands (RL-80)
-  Rural Commercial
-  Public/Semi-Public Facilities
-  Public Agency Lands
-  Open Space (Conservation)



THIS MAP/DATA IS PROVIDED WITHOUT WARRANTY OF ANY KIND, EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THE IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE. Note: This product may contain information from the SANDAG Regional Information System which cannot be reproduced without the written permission of SANDAG.  
 Copyright SanGIS 2012 - All Rights Reserved. Full text of this legal notice can be found at: [http://www.sangis.org/Legal\\_Notice.htm](http://www.sangis.org/Legal_Notice.htm)  
 Projection: State Plane, Zone VI, Datum NAD 83, Units Feet.  
 Path: S:\land\_use\gpadate\_maps\arcmap\fc\_i\_workshops\mxd\20110915\hatch\ERVPRO\_PRCO\_ERVjamul.mxd  
 County of San Diego, LUEGGIS 2/18/2015




Source: SanGIS, County of San Diego, 2014

THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.


COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO  
 FOREST CONSERVATION INITIATIVE LANDS  
 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT  
*Julian*  
 Community Planning Area

Proposed Project  
 Land Use Map  
 June 25, 2014

- Lands Included in FCI GPA
- Areas Changed Outside FCI
- Village Residential (VR-7.3)
- Village Residential (VR-2.9)
- Semi-Rural Residential (SR-1)
- Semi-Rural Residential (SR-2)
- Semi-Rural Residential (SR-4)
- Semi-Rural Residential (SR-10)
- Rural Lands (RL-40)
- Rural Lands (RL-80)
- Rural Commercial
- Public/Semi-Public Facilities
- Public Agency Lands
- Tribal Lands
- Open Space (Recreation)
- Open Space (Conservation)



THIS MAP/DATA IS PROVIDED WITHOUT WARRANTY OF ANY KIND, EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THE IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE. Note: This product may contain information from the SANDAG Regional Information System which cannot be reproduced without the written permission of SANDAG.  
 Copyright SanGIS 2012 - All Rights Reserved. Full text of this legal notice can be found at: [http://www.sangis.org/Legal\\_Notice.htm](http://www.sangis.org/Legal_Notice.htm)  
 Projection: State Plane, Zone VI, Datum NAD 83, Units Feet.  
 Path: S:\land\_use\gpadate\_maps\sanag\fc\_i\_workshops\mxd\20110915\hatch\EIR\PROJ\_ER\Julian.mxd  
 County of San Diego, LUEG GIS 2/18/2015



Source: SanGIS, County of San Diego, 2014

Julian Land Use Map



Figure 1-8

THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.


COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO  
 FOREST CONSERVATION INITIATIVE LANDS  
 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT  
*Lake Morena/Campo*  
 Community Planning Area

Proposed Project  
 Land Use Map  
 June, 2014

- Lands Included in FCI GPA
- Areas Changed Outside FCI
- Village Residential (VR-7.3)
- Semi-Rural Residential (SR-4)
- Semi-Rural Residential (SR-10)
- Rural Lands (RL-20)
- Rural Lands (RL-40)
- Rural Lands (RL-80)
- Rural Commercial
- Public/Semi-Public Facilities
- Public Agency Lands
- Tribal Lands
- Open Space (Conservation)



THIS MAP/DATA IS PROVIDED WITHOUT WARRANTY OF ANY KIND, EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THE IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE. Note: This product may contain information from the SANDAG Regional Information System which cannot be reproduced without the written permission of SANDAG.  
 Copyright SanGIS 2012 - All Rights Reserved. Full text of this legal notice can be found at: [http://www.sangis.org/Legal\\_Notice.htm](http://www.sangis.org/Legal_Notice.htm)  
 Projection: State Plane, Zone VI, Datum NAD 83, Units Feet.  
 Path: S:\land\_use\gpadate\_maps\arcmap\fc\_i\_workshops\mxd\20110915\hatch\ER\PRO\_PRCO\_ER\lake\_morena.mxd  
 County of San Diego, LUEG GIS 2/18/2015




Source: SanGIS, County of San Diego, 2014

Lake Morena/Campo Land Use Map

Figure 1-9

THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.



Source: SanGIS, County of San Diego, 2014














Mountain Empire Land Use Map



Figure 1-10

THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.


COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO  
 FOREST CONSERVATION INITIATIVE LANDS  
 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT  
*North Mountain*  
 Subregional Planning Area

Proposed Project  
 Land Use Map  
 June 25, 2014

-  Lands Included in FCI GPA
-  Areas Changed Outside FCI
-  Semi-Rural Residential (SR-4)
-  Semi-Rural Residential (SR-10)
-  Rural Lands (RL-20)
-  Rural Lands (RL-40)
-  Rural Lands (RL-80)
-  Specific Plan Area
-  Rural Commercial
-  Public/Semi-Public Facilities
-  Public Agency Lands
-  Tribal Lands
-  Open Space (Conservation)



THIS MAP/DATA IS PROVIDED WITHOUT WARRANTY OF ANY KIND, EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THE IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE. Note: This product may contain information from the SANDAG Regional Information System which cannot be reproduced without the written permission of SANDAG.  
 Copyright SanGIS 2012 - All Rights Reserved. Full text of this legal notice can be found at: [http://www.sangis.org/Legal\\_Notice.htm](http://www.sangis.org/Legal_Notice.htm)  
 Projection: State Plane, Zone VI, Datum NAD 83, Units Feet.  
 Path: S:\land\_use\gpadate\_maps\arcmapping\workshops\mxd\20110915\hatch\EIR\PROJ\_EIR\erth\_mtn.mxd  
 County of San Diego, LUEGGIS 2/12/2014



Source: SanGIS, County of San Diego, 2014

North Mountain Land Use Map




Figure 1-11

THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO  
 FOREST CONSERVATION INITIATIVE LANDS  
 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT  
*Pendleton - DeLuz*  
 Plan Area

Proposed Project  
 Land Use Map  
 June 25, 2014

- Lands Included in FCI GPA
- Areas Changed Outside FCI
- Semi-Rural Residential (SR-10)
- Rural Lands (RL-40)
- Rural Lands (RL-80)
- Public/Semi-Public Facilities
- Public Agency Lands



THIS MAP/DATA IS PROVIDED WITHOUT WARRANTY OF ANY KIND, EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THE IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE. Note: This product may contain information from the SANDAG Regional Information System which cannot be reproduced without the written permission of SANDAG.  
 Copyright SanGIS 2012 - All Rights Reserved. Full text of this legal notice can be found at: [http://www.sangis.org/Legal\\_Notice.htm](http://www.sangis.org/Legal_Notice.htm)  
 Projection: State Plane, Zone VI, Datum NAD 83, Units Feet.  
 Path: S:\land\_use\lgupdate\_maps\arcmap\fc\_i\_workshops\mxd\20110915\hatch\ERVPRO\_PRCO\_ERVpendleton.mxd  
 County of San Diego, LUEG GIS 2/18/2015

**LUEGGIS**  
 Land Use & Environment Group  
 Geographic Information Services

Source: SanGIS, County of San Diego, 2014

Pendleton - De Luz Land Use Map



Figure 1-12

THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.


COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO  
 FOREST CONSERVATION INITIATIVE LANDS  
 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT  
*Pine Valley*  
 Sponsor Group

Proposed Project  
 Land Use Map  
 June 25, 2014

- Lands Included in FCI GPA
- Areas Changed Outside FCI
- Village Residential (VR-2.9)
- Village Residential (VR-2)
- Semi-Rural Residential (SR-1)
- Semi-Rural Residential (SR-2)
- Semi-Rural Residential (SR-4)
- Semi-Rural Residential (SR-10)
- Rural Lands (RL-20)
- Rural Lands (RL-40)
- Rural Lands (RL-80)
- Rural Commercial
- Public/Semi-Public Facilities
- Public Agency Lands
- Tribal Lands
- Open Space (Recreation)
- Open Space (Conservation)



THIS MAP/DATA IS PROVIDED WITHOUT WARRANTY OF ANY KIND, EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THE IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE. Note: This product may contain information from the SANDAG Regional Information System which cannot be reproduced without the written permission of SANDAG.  
 Copyright SanGIS 2012 - All Rights Reserved. Full text of this legal notice can be found at: [http://www.sangis.org/Legal\\_Notice.htm](http://www.sangis.org/Legal_Notice.htm)  
 Projection: State Plane, Zone VI, Datum NAD 83, Units Feet.  
 Path: S:\land\_use\lgupdate\maps\aromg\fc1\_workshops\mxd\20110915\hatch\ER\PRO\_PRCO\_ER\pine\_valley.mxd  
 County of San Diego, LUEG GIS 2/18/2015




Source: SanGIS, County of San Diego, 2014

Pine Valley Land Use Map

Figure 1-13

THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.




Source: SanGIS, County of San Diego, 2014

Ramona Land Use Map

Figure 1-14

THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.



THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK