
SUMMARY

This chapter is a summary of the Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) for the Property Specific Requests General Plan Amendment (Proposed Project) prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This SEIR tiers from the previously certified 2011 General Plan Update Program EIR (2011 PEIR). During the San Diego County Board of Supervisors (BOS) hearings for the 2011 General Plan Update conducted between October 2010 and August 2011, a number of individual property owners petitioned the County BOS to consider changes to the proposed General Plan land use designations for their properties. Following public testimony, the County BOS directed staff to review the property specific requests (PSRs) made during the hearings. Some requests were incorporated into the General Plan that was ultimately adopted on August 3, 2011; however, many could not be accommodated in the adopted General Plan Update. The BOS held a series of hearings in 2012 to accept testimony and receive preliminary staff input on PSRs. The 2012 hearings resulted in the initiation of this General Plan Amendment (GPA)/Rezone and another GPA/Rezone that was completed in 2014 (see Section 1.11.2).

This chapter highlights the proposed actions and consequences in the environmental analysis for the Proposed Project, as required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15123. It also provides a brief description of the General Plan Update, project objectives, alternatives to the General Plan Update, areas of controversy, and issues to be resolved. In addition, Table S-1 at the end of this chapter provides the following information: (1) the direct and cumulative impacts that would occur from implementation of the General Plan Update; (2) the significance of the impact before mitigation; (3) the recommended mitigation measures that would avoid or reduce significant environmental impacts; and (4) the significance of impacts after mitigation measures are implemented. Finally, Table S-2 compares the anticipated impacts of the General Plan Update with those of each project alternative.

Overview

The County is the “lead agency” and has the principal responsibility for certifying the SEIR and approving the Proposed Project. This SEIR 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 15162 (a)(3), this document has been prepared as an SEIR to the 2011 PEIR. The Draft SEIR appendices provide information and technical studies that support the environmental analysis contained within the Draft SEIR.

Project Description

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. 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 referred to as Community Planning Areas (CPAs); the remaining nine are identified as Subregions. The 15 CPAs are Alpine, Bonsall, County Islands, Fallbrook, Julian, Lakeside,

Pendleton/De Luz, Pepper Drive/Bostonia, Rainbow, Ramona, San Dieguito, Spring Valley, Sweetwater, Valle de Oro, and Valley Center. The nine Subregions are Central Mountain, Crest/Dehesa/Harbison Canyon/Granite Hills, Desert, Jamul/Dulzura, Mountain Empire, North County Metropolitan, North Mountain, Otay, and Pala-Pauma Valley.

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 and Zoning for applicable CPAs and Subregions. In compliance with CEQA, this SEIR evaluates potential environmental impacts resulting from buildout of the Proposed Project as compared to existing baseline conditions, with consideration of the prior environmental analysis provided in the 2011 GPU PEIR.

The proposed project would include a GPA (GPA-12-005) and a Rezone (REZ-14-006) for the following three Project components:

- **PSR Analysis Areas.** Revisions to the land use and zoning use regulations (when necessary for consistency with the proposed General Plan land use designations) of the 21 PSR Analysis Areas, which would require a GPA and Rezone.
- **Former Champagne Gardens Specific Plan (CGSP) Area.** Revisions to the land use and zoning designations of the CGSP Area (comprised of eight CGSP Subareas), which would require a General Plan Amendment and Rezone.
- **Valley Center Community Plan Residential Policy 8 Revision.** Revision to Residential Policy 8 of the Valley Center Community Plan, which would require a GPA (but not a Rezone).

The Proposed Project would affect approximately 9,336 acres and 882 parcels of unincorporated County lands within nine communities. The land use changes would increase residential densities as compared to the General Plan resulting in the addition of approximately 1,826 dwelling units. Additionally, the Proposed Project includes an update to the land use designations and zoning for properties within the area of the expired CGSP to ensure consistency with the General Plan. Lastly, revisions to Residential Policy 8 of the Valley Center Community Plan are proposed that would change the minimum lot sizes allowed in the SR-2 designation, from one acre to one-half acre and change the minimum lot size allowed in the SR-4 designation from two acres to one acre. It is noted that this revision would not result in an increase in potential dwelling units, because the number of lots would not be affected (only the size). The purpose of the policy revision is to allow future subdivisions to utilize a more clustered design on subject properties to avoid sensitive environmental resources in the area.

Project Objectives

The General Plan and the 2011 PEIR identified ten fundamental principles or objectives that are intended to guide future growth within the County. These General Plan Guiding Principles remain as the project objectives for the Proposed Project, and are listed below.

1. Support a reasonable share of projected regional population growth.
2. Promote sustainability by locating new development near existing infrastructure, services, and jobs.
3. Reinforce the vitality, local economy, and individual character of existing communities while balancing housing, employment, and recreational opportunities.

4. Promote environmental stewardship that protects the range of natural resources and habitats that uniquely define the County's character and ecological importance.
5. Ensure that development accounts for physical constraints and the natural hazards of the land.
6. Provide and support a multi-modal transportation network that enhances connectivity and supports community development patterns.
7. Maintain environmentally sustainable communities and reduce greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to climate change.
8. Preserve agriculture as an integral component of the region's economy, character, and open space network.
9. Minimize public costs of infrastructure and services and correlate their timing with new development.
10. Recognize community and stakeholder interests while striving for consensus.

Impact Summary

The SEIR examines the potential environmental effects from implementation of the Proposed Project, including information related to existing site conditions, analyses of the types and magnitude of individual and cumulative environmental impacts, and feasible mitigation measures that could reduce or avoid environmental impacts, on the following resources.

- | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Aesthetics | 10. Mineral Resources |
| 2. Agricultural and Forestry Resources | 11. Noise |
| 3. Air Quality | 12. Population and Housing |
| 4. Biological Resources | 13. Public Services |
| 5. Cultural and Paleontological Resources | 14. Recreation |
| 6. Geology and Soils | 15. Transportation and Traffic |
| 7. Hazards and Hazardous Materials | 16. Utilities and Service Systems |
| 8. Hydrology and Water Quality | 17. Global Climate Change |
| 9. Land Use | |

Table S-1, presented at the end of this chapter, provides a summary of the environmental impacts that could result from implementation of the Proposed Project and feasible mitigation measures that could reduce or avoid environmental impacts. For each impact, Table S-1 identifies the significance of the impact before mitigation, applicable mitigation measures, and the level of significance of the impact after the implementation of the mitigation measures.

Alternatives

The following alternatives were analyzed in this SEIR and compared to the Proposed Project. The objective of the alternatives analysis is to consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives to foster informed decision making and public participation. The alternatives include:

- **Reduced Density Alternative for the PSR Analysis Areas.** It includes a comparison of the existing land use designations and maximum dwelling units with the Proposed Project and Reduced Density Alternatives.

- **Former Champagne Gardens Specific Plan (CGSP) Area Project Alternatives.** Two options have been identified through coordination efforts between County staff and applicable property owners, community planning groups and other stakeholders as the two potential alternatives to the CGSP Area: the Preliminary Staff Recommendation Map Alternative and the Environmentally Superior Map Alternative. The Preliminary Staff Recommendation Map is one component of the overall Reduced Density Alternative to the Proposed Project. The Environmentally Superior Map Alternative was developed as a separate, less intensive alternative to reflect known environmental constraints. Both of these project alternatives (the Preliminary Staff Recommendation Map and the Environmentally Superior Map) would accommodate less development than the Proposed Project, thus decreasing environmental impacts.
- **No Project Alternative.** The No Project Alternative assumes the continuation of the existing General Plan (adopted in 2011, with the most recent update in 2016). It assumes the existing General Plan and Zoning Ordinance would continue to guide development in unincorporated areas of the County through the forecasted buildout year of 2050.

Detailed descriptions and an analysis of the potential impacts of each alternative are presented in Chapter 4, Project Alternatives, of this SEIR. Table S-2 presents the significant environmental impacts of these alternatives compared to those of the Proposed Project. For the PSR Analysis Areas, the Reduced Density Alternative would result in a reduction of environmental impacts when compared to the Proposed Project and, therefore, would be the Environmentally Superior Alternative; except for FB19+ and ME26 which do not have a Reduced Density Alternative. For the FB19+ Analysis Area and ME26 Analysis Area, the No Project Alternative would remain the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

For the former CGSP Area, the Environmentally Superior Map Alternative would result in the greatest reduction in impacts to the environment, and therefore, would be the Environmentally Superior Alternative for the former CGSP Area.

No feasible alternatives were identified for the Valley Center Community Plan Residential Policy 8 Revision. The Proposed Project option for this policy revision would be the Environmentally Superior Alternative, as it would reduce impacts in comparison to the No Project Alternative.

Areas of Controversy and Issues to be Resolved by the Decision Making Body

Areas of Controversy Known to the Lead Agency

CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(b)(2) requires that an EIR identify areas of controversy, including issues raised by other agencies and the public. Areas of known controversy associated with the PSR Analysis Areas and the former CGSP Area that are relevant to the SEIR are listed below:

- Location and intensity of planned land uses and residential densities
- Impacts to roads
- Availability of infrastructure and services
- Fire risk and availability of fire protection infrastructure
- Consistency with General Plan and community plan policies

- Feasibility of proposed densities
- Agricultural preservation
- Compatibility with conservation plans
- GHG emissions
- Sensitive habitats

Issues to be Resolved by the Decision Making Body

The following is a description of issues related to the Proposed Project that must be resolved by the County BOS prior to or at the time of project approval and EIR certification. Prior to the County BOS taking final action on these issues, recommendations will be developed by the Planning and Development Services Department and the Planning Commission. In developing these recommendations and rendering a decision, the County will consider input provided by the public, other agencies, other stakeholders, and the community planning groups. Additionally, the recommendations of the Planning Commission and decisions of the County BOS will be made in public hearings at which public comment is invited.

- **Final Composition of the PSR GPA Update Land Use Map.** The BOS must decide on the final composition of the PSR General Plan Amendment land use map, specifically addressing which land use designations will be assigned to specific properties. This EIR evaluates a separate reduced density alternative and the No Project Alternative for the PSR Analysis Areas. For the former CGSP Area, the County BOS will consider three options: the Referral Map, which is evaluated in this SEIR as a component of the Proposed Project, along with two map alternatives: the Preliminary Staff Recommendation Map Alternative (evaluated in this SEIR as a component of the Reduced Density Alternative) and the Environmentally Superior Map Alternative. The Proposed Project and alternatives represent a range of development intensities with similar types of environmental effects but with differing degrees of impact. Detailed evaluations of the differences between the Proposed Project and the alternatives are included in Section 4.0 Alternatives of the EIR, to inform the BOS. It is likely that the BOS will approve a land use map that represents a combination of the alternatives that are evaluated in the SEIR.
- **Proposed Mitigation.** The BOS will evaluate the full array of mitigation measures described in this SEIR and determine whether they represent all feasible measures to substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in this SEIR. The BOS may decide to add or alter measures to improve effectiveness in lessening significant environmental effects. Additionally, the BOS may decide that certain measures are inappropriate or infeasible. The BOS would prepare and adopt detailed findings on the feasibility of mitigation measures to substantially lessen or avoid the significant effects on the environment.
- **Consideration of Project Alternatives.** The BOS will evaluate the alternatives discussed in Chapter 4 of this SEIR. As discussed above, the BOS may decide to adopt an alternative for some Analysis Areas and the Proposed Project map for other Analysis Areas.
- **Benefits of the Project Compared to Environmental Risk.** This EIR has identified adverse environmental effects that are unavoidable. The BOS must determine if the adverse environmental effects are considered acceptable with consideration of economic, legal, social, technological, and other relevant benefits of the PSR GPA. In making this determination, it is relevant for the BOS to consider the existing General Plan in comparison

to the Proposed Project. The BOS would prepare a statement of overriding considerations, as described in CEQA Section 15093 to reflect the ultimate balancing of competing public objectives, if the BOS decides to approve the Proposed Project or alternatives, which have the potential to cause significant effects on the environment.

- **Project Approval.** Ultimately, the BOS must decide whether or how to approve or carry out the proposed land use changes to any of the PSR Analysis Areas, CGSP Area, or the Valley Center Community Plan Residential Policy 8 Revision.

Table S-1 Summary of Project Impacts

| Issue Topic | Potential Direct Impact | Potential Cumulative Impact | General Plan Policies | Mitigation Measure(s) | Impact After Mitigation |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|
| 2.1 Aesthetics | | | | | |
| 1. Scenic Vistas | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | COS-11.1 through COS-11.7, LU-6.3, LU-6.4, LU-6.6, LU-6.7, LU-6.9, LU-10.1, LU-10.2, M-2.3 | Aes-1.1 through Aes-1.11 | Less than significant |
| 2. Scenic Resources: | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | COS-11.1 through COS-11.7, LU-6.3, LU-6.4, LU-6.6, LU-6.7, LU-6.9, LU-10.1, LU-10.2, M-2.3 | Aes-1.1 through Aes-1.10 | Less than significant |
| 3. Visual Character or Quality | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | H-2.1, LU-1.4, LU-2.1, LU-2.3, LU-2.5, LU-4.1, LU-4.2, LU-4.3, LU-4.4, LU-11.2, LU-12.4, M-10.6 | Aes-1.10 through Aes-1.10, Aes-3.1, Aes-3.2 | Significant and Unavoidable |
| 4. Light or Glare | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | COS-13.1, COS-13.2, COS-13.3 | Aes-4.1 through Aes-4.3 | Significant and Unavoidable |
| 2.2 Agricultural Resources | | | | | |
| 1. Conversion of Agricultural Resources | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | COS-6.4, LU-6.4, LU-7.1, LU-7.2 | Agr-1.1 through Agr-1.5 | Significant and Unavoidable |
| 2. Land Use Conflicts | Less than significant | Less than significant | None However, the following policies are applicable to this issue: COS-6.3, LU-7.1 | None However, the following mitigation measures are applicable to this issue: Agr-2.1 | Less than significant |
| 3. Indirect Conversion of Agricultural Resources | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | COS-6.2, COS-6.3 | Agr-1.1 through Agr-1.5 | Significant and Unavoidable |
| 4. Conversion of Forestry Land | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | COS-2.1, COS-2.2, COS-3.1, LU-5.3, LU-6.1, LU-6.4, LU-6.6, LU-10.2 | Bio-1.1, Bio-1.3, Bio-1.5, Bio-1.6, Bio-1.7 | Less than significant |
| 2.3 Air Quality | | | | | |
| 1. Air Quality Plans | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | COS-14.1, COS-14.2, COS-14.8, COS-14.9, COS-14.10, COS-15.1, COS-15.4, COS-15.5, COS-16.2, COS-16.3, COS-20.3 | Air 2.6, Air 2.7, Air 2.9, M-Air-1.1, M-Air-1.2 | Significant and unavoidable |
| 2. Air Quality Violations | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | COS-14.1, COS-14.2, COS-14.8, COS-14.9, COS-14.10, COS-15.1, COS-15.4, COS-15.5, COS-16.2, COS-16.3, COS-20.3 | Air-2.5, Air-2.6, Air-2.7, Air-2.9, M-Air-1.2 | Significant and Unavoidable |
| 3. Non-Attainment Criteria Pollutants | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | COS-14.1, COS-14.2, COS-14.8, COS-14.9, COS-14.10, COS-15.1, COS-15.4, COS-15.5, COS-16.2, COS-16.3, COS-20.3 | Air-2.5, Air-2.6, Air-2.7, Air-2.9, M-Air-1.2 | Significant and Unavoidable |

Table S-1 Summary of Project Impacts

| Issue Topic | Potential Direct Impact | Potential Cumulative Impact | General Plan Policies | Mitigation Measure(s) | Impact After Mitigation |
|--|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------|
| 4. Sensitive Receptors | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | None | Air-4.1 | Significant and Unavoidable |
| 5. Objectionable Odors | Less than significant | Less than significant | None | None Required | Less than significant |
| 2.4 Biological Resources | | | | | |
| 1. Special Status Species | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | COS-1.3, COS-1.6 through COS-1.11, COS-2.1, COS-2.2, LU-6.1, LU-6.2, LU-6.3, LU-6.4, LU-6.6, LU-6.7, LU-10.2 | Bio-1.1 through Bio-1.7 | Significant and unavoidable |
| 2. Riparian Habitat and Other Sensitive Natural Communities | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | COS-3.1 | Bio-1.1 through Bio-1.7, Bio-2.1 through Bio-2.4 | Significant and unavoidable |
| 3. Federally Protected Wetlands | Potentially significant | Less than significant | COS-3.1, COS-3.2 | Bio-1.1, Bio-1.5, Bio-1.6, Bio-1.7, Bio-2.2, Bio-2.3, Bio-2.4 | Less than significant |
| 4. Wildlife Movement Corridors and Nursery Sites | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | COS-1.1 through COS-1.5, LU-6.1, LU-6.7 | Bio-1.1, Bio-1.2, Bio-1.3, Bio-1.4, Bio-1.5, Bio-1.6, Bio-1.7, Bio-2.3 | Significant and unavoidable |
| 5. Local Policies and Ordinances | Less than significant | Less than significant | None | None Required | Less than significant |
| 6. Habitat Conservation Plans and Natural Community Conservation Plans | Less than significant | Less than significant | COS-1.1 through COS-1.6, COS-1.8, COS-2.1, COS-2.2, LU-6.1, LU-6.7 | None Required | Less than significant |
| 2.5 Cultural and Paleontological Resources | | | | | |
| 1. Historical Resources | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | COS-8.1 | Cul-1.1 through Cul-1.8 | Less than significant |
| 2. Archaeological Resources | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | COS-7.1 through COS-7.4 | Cul-2.1 through Cul-2.6 | Less than significant |
| 3. Paleontological Resources | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | COS-9.1 | Cul-3.1, Cul-3.2 | Less than significant |
| 4. Human Remains | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | COS-7.5 | Cul-4.1 | Less than significant |
| 5. Tribal Cultural Resources | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | None | M-Cul-5.1, M-Cul-5.2, M-Cul-5.3, M-Cul-5.4 | Less than significant |

Table S-1 Summary of Project Impacts

| Issue Topic | Potential Direct Impact | Potential Cumulative Impact | General Plan Policies | Mitigation Measure(s) | Impact After Mitigation |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| 2.6 Geology and Soils | | | | | |
| 1. Exposure to Seismic Related Hazards | Less than significant | Less than significant | None However, the following policies are applicable to this issue: S-7.1, S-7.2, S-7.3, S-7.4, S-8.1, S-8.2 | None Required | Less than significant |
| 2. Soil Erosion or Top Soil Loss | Less than significant | Less than significant | None However, the following policy is applicable to this issue: LU-6.5 | None Required | Less than significant |
| 3. Soil Stability | Less than significant | Less than significant | None However, the following policies are applicable to this issue: S-8.1 | None Required | Less than significant |
| 4. Expansive Soils | Less than significant | Less than significant | None However, the following policy is applicable to this issue: S-7.2 | None Required | Less than significant |
| 5. Waste Water Disposal Systems | Less than significant | Less than significant | None | None Required | Less than significant |
| 6. Unique Geologic Features | Less than significant | Less than significant | None However, the following policy is applicable to this issue: COS-9.2 | None Required | Less than significant |
| 2.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials | | | | | |
| 1. Transport, Use, and Disposal of Hazardous Materials | Less than significant | Less than significant | None However, the following policies are applicable to this issue: S-1.1, S-1.2, S-11.1, S-11.2 | None Required | Less than significant |
| 2. Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials | Less than significant | Less than significant | None However, the following policies are applicable to this issue: LU-11.9, LU-11.11, S-1.1, S-1.2, S-11.1, S-11.2 | None Required | Less than significant |
| 3. Hazardous to Schools | Less than significant | Less than significant | None However, the following policies are applicable to this issue: LU-11.10, S-11.3 | None Required | Less than significant |

Table S-1 Summary of Project Impacts

| Issue Topic | Potential Direct Impact | Potential Cumulative Impact | General Plan Policies | Mitigation Measure(s) | Impact After Mitigation |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------------|---|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 4. Existing Hazardous Materials Sites | Less than significant | Less than significant | None However, the following policies are applicable to this issue: S-1.1, S-1.2, S-11.4, S-11.5 | None Required | Less than significant |
| 5. Public Airports | Less than significant | Less than significant | None However, the following policies are applicable to this issue: LU-4.7, M-7.1, S-15.1, S-15.2, S-15.3 | None Required | Less than significant |
| 6. Private Airports | Less than significant | Less than significant | None However, the following policies are applicable to this issue: S-15.1, S-15.2, S-15.3, S-15.4 | None Required | Less than significant |
| 7. Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans | Potentially significant | Less than significant | M-1.2, M-3.3, M-4.3, S-1.3 | Haz-3.1 through Haz-3.3 | Less than significant |
| 8. Wildland Fires | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | COS-18.3, LU-6.11, LU-10.2, S-3.1, S-3.2, S-3.3, S-3.4, S-3.6, S-4.1 | Haz-4.1 through Haz-4.4 | Significant and unavoidable |
| 9. Vectors | Less than significant | Less than significant | None However, the following policies are applicable to this issue: COS-3.1, COS-4.3, COS-5.2, COS-6.2, COS-6.3 | None Required | Less than significant |

2.8 Hydrology and Water Quality

| | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|
| 1. Water Quality Standards and Requirements | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | COS-4.2, COS-4.3, COS-4.4, COS-5.2, COS-5.3, COS-5.5, LU-6.5, LU-6.9, LU-14.1, LU-14.2, LU-14.3, LU-14.4 | Hyd-1.1 through Hyd-1.10 | Significant and unavoidable |
| 2. Groundwater Supplies and Recharge | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | COS-4.1, LU-8.1, LU-8.2, LU-13.1, LU-13.2 | Hyd-1.1 through Hyd-1.5, and Hyd-2.1 through Hyd-2.5 | Significant and unavoidable |
| 3. Erosion or Siltation | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | COS-5.3, LU-6.5, LU-6.9 | Hyd-1.2, Hyd-1.3, Hyd-1.5, Hyd-3.1 through Hyd-3.3 | Less than significant |
| 4. Flooding | Potentially significant | Less than significant | LU-6.5, LU-6.10, S-9.2, S-10.2, S-10.3, S-10.4, S-10.6 | Hyd-1.1 through Hyd-1.5, Hyd-2.5, Hyd-4.1 through Hyd-4.3 | Less than significant |
| 5. Exceed Capacity of Stormwater Systems | Potentially significant | Less than significant | COS-4.2, COS-4.3, COS-4.4, COS-5.2, COS-5.3, COS-5.5, LU-6.5, LU-6.9, LU-6.10, LU-14.1, LU-14.2, LU-14.3, LU-14.4, S-9.2, S-10.2 through S-10.6 | Hyd-1.1 through Hyd-1.5, Hyd-2.5, Hyd-3.1, Hyd-4.1, Hyd-4.2, Hyd-4.3 | Less than significant |

Table S-1 Summary of Project Impacts

| Issue Topic | Potential Direct Impact | Potential Cumulative Impact | General Plan Policies | Mitigation Measure(s) | Impact After Mitigation |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------------|---|---|-------------------------|
| 6. Housing within a 100-year Flood Hazard Area | Potentially significant | Less than significant | COS-5.1, LU-6.12, S-9.1 through S-9.5, S-10.1 | Hyd-1.2, Hyd-1.5, Hyd-2.5, Hyd-4.1, Hyd-4.2, Hyd-6.1 | Less than significant |
| 7. Impeding or Redirecting Flood Flows | Potentially significant | Less than significant | COS-5.1, LU-6.12, S-9.1 through S-9.5, S-10.1 | Hyd-1.2, Hyd-1.5, Hyd-2.5, Hyd-4.1, Hyd-4.2, Hyd-4.3, Hyd-6.1 | Less than significant |
| 8. Dam Inundation and Flood Hazards | Potentially significant | Less than significant | COS-5.1, LU-6.12, S-9.1 through S-9.6, S-10.1 | Hyd-1.2, Hyd-1.5, Hyd-2.5, Hyd-4.1, Hyd-4.2, Hyd-4.3, Hyd-6.1, Hyd-8.1, Hyd-8.2 | Less than significant |
| 9. Seiche, Tsunami, and Mudflow Hazards | Potentially significant | Less than significant | COS-5.1, S-8.1, S-8.2, S-9.3, S-9.6 | Hyd-3.1, Hyd-3.2, and Hyd-3.3 | Less than significant |

2.9 Land Use

| | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. Physical Division of an Established Community | Less than significant | Less than significant | None However, the following policies are applicable to this issue: H-2.1, LU-1.4, LU-2.1, LU-2.3, LU-2.5, LU-4.1, LU-4.2, LU-4.3, LU-4.4, LU-11.2, LU-12.4, M-10.6 | None Required | Less than significant |
| 2. Conflicts with Land Use Plans, Policies, and Regulations | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | LU-1.1, LU-1.2, LU-1.3, LU-1.7, LU-4.1, LU-5.3 | M-Air-1.1, M-Air-1.2, M-Pop-1.1, Air-2.5 through Air-2.9, USS-2.1 through USS-2.3, USS-4.1 through USS-4.7, Aes-1.1 through Aes-1.11, Aes-3.1, Aes-3.2, Bio-1.1 through Bio-1.7, Haz-4.1 through Haz-4.4, Pub-1.1 through Pub-1.9, Agr-1.1 through Agr-1.5, Agr-2.1, Hyd-1.1 through Hyd-1.5, Hyd-2.1 through Hyd-2.5, Hyd-4.1 through Hyd-4.3, Hyd-6.1, Hyd-8.1, Hyd-8.2 | Significant and unavoidable |
| 3. Conflicts with HCPs or NCCPs | Less than significant | Less than significant | None | None Required | Less than significant |

2.10 Mineral Resources

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. Mineral Resource Availability | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | COS-10.1 through COS-10.4, COS-10.6, COS-10.8, COS-10.9 | Min-1.1 through Min-1.3 | Significant and unavoidable |
| 2. Mineral Resources Recovery Sites | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | COS-10.1 through COS-10.4, COS-10.6, COS-10.8, COS-10.9 | Min-1.1 through Min-13, same as for Issue 1 | Significant and unavoidable |

Table S-1 Summary of Project Impacts

| Issue Topic | Potential Direct Impact | Potential Cumulative Impact | General Plan Policies | Mitigation Measure(s) | Impact After Mitigation |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|
| 2.11 Noise | | | | | |
| 1. Excessive Noise Levels | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | LU-2.8, M-1.3, M-2.4, N-1.4, N-1.5, N-2.1, N-2.2, N-4.2, N-4.3, N-4.6, N-4.7, N-4.8, N-5.1, N-5.2 | Noi-1.1 through Noi-1.9 | Less than significant |
| 2. Excessive Groundborne Vibration | Potentially significant | Less than significant | N-3.1, N-4.7, N-5.2, N-6.3, N-6.4 | Noi-2.1 through Noi-2.4 | Less than significant |
| 3. Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Level | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | LU-2.8, M-1.3, M-2.4, N-1.5, N-4.1, N-4.2, N-5.1, N-5.2, N-6.1, N-6.2, N-6.3, N-6.4, N-6.6 | Noi-1.3, Noi-1.4, Noi-1.5, Noi-1.8, Noi-2.3, Noi-2.4, Noi-3.1, Noi-3.2 | Significant and unavoidable |
| 4. Temporary Increase in Ambient Noise Level | Potentially significant | Less than significant | N-6.1, N-6.2, N-6.3, N-6.4, N-6.6 | Noi-4.1 and Noi-4.2 | Less than significant |
| 5. Excessive Noise Exposure from a Public or Private Airport | Less than significant | Less than significant | None However, the following policies are applicable to this issue: N-4.9, S-15.1, S-15.4 | None Required | Less than significant |
| 2.12 Population and Housing | | | | | |
| 1. Population Growth | Less than significant | Potentially significant | LU-1.4, LU-9.4, LU-14.4 | M-Pop-1.1 | Significant and unavoidable |
| 2. Displacement of Housing | Less than significant | Less than significant | None However, the following policy is applicable to this issue: H-4.1, H-4.2 | None Required | Less than significant |
| 3. Displacement of People | Less than significant | Less than significant | None | None Required | Less than significant |
| 2.13 Public Services | | | | | |
| 1. Fire Protection Services | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | LU-1.4, LU-6.4, LU-6.11, LU-12.3, LU-12.4, S-3.4, S-5.1, S-5.2, S-6.1 through S-6.5 | Pub-1.1 through Pub-1.9 | Less than significant |
| 2. Police Protection Services | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | LU-1.4, LU-12.3, LU-12.4 | Pub-1.1, Pub-1.2, and Pub-1.3 | Less than significant |
| 3. School Services | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | LU-1.4, LU-9.7, LU-12.3, LU-12.4, LU-17.1 through LU-17.4, LU-18.2 | Pub-1.1, Pub-1.2, Pub-1.3, Pub-3.1, Pub-3.2 | Significant and unavoidable |
| 4. Other Public Services | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | LU-1.4, LU-9.4, LU-9.7, LU-12.3, LU-12.4, LU-18.1, LU-18.2 | Pub-1.1, Pub-1.2, Pub-1.3 | Less than significant |

Table S-1 Summary of Project Impacts

| Issue Topic | Potential Direct Impact | Potential Cumulative Impact | General Plan Policies | Mitigation Measure(s) | Impact After Mitigation |
|---|-------------------------|-----------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|
| 2.14 Recreation | | | | | |
| 1. Deterioration of Parks and Recreational Facilities | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | COS-21.1, COS-21.2, COS-22.1, COS-23.1, COS-23.2, COS-24.1, COS-24.2, H-2.2, LU-12.1, LU-12.2, M-12.1 through M-12.8, M-12.10 | Rec-1.1 through Rec-1.11 | Less than significant |
| 2. Construction of New Recreational Facilities | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | COS-21.2, COS-21.3, COS-21.4, COS-23.1, COS-23.3, H-2.2, LU-6.4, LU-9.7, LU-18.2, M-12.5, M-12.9, M-12.10 | Rec-1.1, Rec-1.2, Rec-1.3, Rec-1.4, Rec-1.8, Rec-1.9, Rec-1.11, Rec-2.1 through Rec-2.6 | Less than significant |
| 2.15 Transportation and Traffic | | | | | |
| 1. Unincorporated County Traffic and Level of Service Standards | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | LU-5.1, LU-10.4, LU-11.8, LU-12.2, M-1.1, M-1.2, M-1.3, M-2.1, M-2.2, M-2.3, M-3.1, M-3.2, M-4.2, M-5.1, M-5.2, M-9.1, M-9.2 | Tra-1.1, Tra-1.3 through Tra-1.7 | Significant and unavoidable |
| 2. Road Safety | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | LU-2.8, LU-6.10, M-4.3, M-4.4, M-4.5, M-9.1 | Tra-1.2, Tra-1.3, Tra-1.4, Tra-1.7 | Significant and unavoidable |
| 3. Emergency Access | Potentially significant | Less than significant | LU-2.8, LU-6.10, LU-12.2, M-1.2, M-3.3, M-4.4, S-3.4, S-3.5, S-14.1 | Tra-1.3, Tra-1.4, Tra-1.6, Tra-4.1 through Tra-4.4 | Less than significant |
| 4. Alternative Transportation | Potentially significant | Less than significant | LU-5.1, LU-5.4, LU-5.5, LU-9.8, LU-11.6, M-3.1, M-3.2, M-4.3, M-8.1 through M-8.7, M-9.2, M-9.4, M-11.1 through M-11.7 | Tra-4.1, Tra-4.2, Tra-6.1 through Tra-6.9 | Less than significant |
| 2.16 Utilities and Service Systems | | | | | |
| 1. Wastewater Treatment Requirements | Potentially significant | Less than significant | LU-9.4, LU-12.1, LU-12.2, LU-14.1 through LU-14.4 | USS-1.1 through USS-1.3 | Less than significant |
| 2. New Water or Wastewater Treatment Facilities | Potentially significant | Less than significant | H-1.3, LU-1.2, LU-4.3 | USS-2.1 through USS-2.3 | Less than significant |
| 3. Sufficient Stormwater Drainage Facilities | Potentially significant | Less than significant | COS-4.3, LU-6.5, LU-6.9 | USS-3.1 through USS-3.5 | Less than significant |
| 4. Adequate Water Supplies | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | COS-4.1 through COS-4.4, COS-5.2, COS-5.5, LU-8.1, LU-8.2, LU-13.1, LU-13.2 | USS-4.1 through USS-4.7 | Significant and unavoidable |
| 5. Adequate Wastewater Facilities | Potentially significant | Less Than significant | LU-9.4, LU-12.1, LU-12.2, LU-14.1 through LU-14.4 | USS-1.1 through USS-1.3 | Less than significant |

Table S-1 Summary of Project Impacts

| Issue Topic | Potential Direct Impact | Potential Cumulative Impact | General Plan Policies | Mitigation Measure(s) | Impact After Mitigation |
|---|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|
| 6. Sufficient Landfill Capacity | Less than significant | Less than significant | None However, the following policies are applicable to this issue: COS-17.1 through COS-17.4, COS-17.6, COS-17.7, COS-17.8, LU-12.1, LU-12.2, LU-16.1, LU-16.2, LU-16.3 | None Required | Less than significant |
| 7. Solid Waste Regulations | Less than significant | Less than significant | None However, the following policies are applicable to this issue: COS-17.1 through COS-17.4, COS-17.7, COS-17.8, LU-12.1, LU-12.2, LU-16.1, LU-16.2, LU-16.3 | None Required | Less than significant |
| 8. Energy Conservation | Less than significant | Less than significant | COS-14.3, COS-14.7, COS-14.9, COS-15.1, COS-15.2, COS-15.4 | None Required | Less than significant |
| 2.17 Global Climate Change | | | | | |
| 1. Generation of Greenhouse Gas Emissions | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | COS-15.1, COS-17.1 | CC-1.1 through CC-1.6 and CC-1.9 through CC-1.18; M-GHG-1 | Less than significant |
| 2. Conflict with Applicable Plan, Policy, or Regulation | Potentially significant | Potentially significant | COS-15.1, COS-17.1 | CC-1.1 through CC-1.6 and CC-1.9 through CC-1.18; M-GHG-1 | Less than significant |

Table S-2 Summary of Analysis for Alternatives

| Issue Areas | Proposed Project Without Mitigation | Proposed Project With Mitigation | Reduced Density Alternatives | No Project Alternative |
|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|
| 2.1 Aesthetics | | | | |
| Scenic Vistas | PS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| Scenic Resources | PS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| Visual Character or Quality | PS | SU | ▼ | ▼ |
| Lighting and Glare | PS | SU | ▼ | ▼ |
| 2.2 Agricultural Resources | | | | |
| Conversion of Agricultural Resources | PS | SU | ▼ | ▼ |
| Land Use Conflicts | LS | LS | — | — |
| Indirect Conversion of Agricultural Resources | PS | SU | ▼ | ▼ |
| Conversion of Forestry Land | PS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| 2.3 Air Quality | | | | |
| Air Quality Plans | PS | SU | ▼ | ▼ |
| Air Quality Violations | PS | SU | ▼ | ▼ |
| Non-attainment of Criteria Pollutants | PS | SU | ▼ | ▼ |
| Sensitive Receptors | PS | SU | ▼ | ▼ |
| Objectionable Odors | LS | LS | — | — |
| 2.4 Biological Resources | | | | |
| Special Status Plant and Wildlife Species | PS | SU | ▼ | ▼ |
| Riparian Habitat and Other Sensitive Natural Communities | PS | SU | ▼ | ▼ |
| Federally Protected Wetlands | PS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| Wildlife Movement Corridors and Nursery Sites | PS | SU | ▼ | ▼ |
| Local Policies and Ordinances | LS | LS | — | — |
| Habitat Conservation Plans and Natural Community Conservation Plans | LS | LS | — | — |
| 2.5 Cultural and Paleontological Resources | | | | |
| Historical Resources | PS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| Archaeological Resources | PS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| Paleontological Resources | PS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| Human Remains | PS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| Tribal Cultural Resources | PS | LS | — | ▼ |
| 2.6 Geology and Soils | | | | |
| Exposure to Seismic Related Hazards | LS | LS | — | — |
| Soil Erosion or Topsoil Loss | LS | LS | — | — |
| Soil Stability | LS | LS | — | — |
| Expansive Soils | LS | LS | — | — |
| Waste Water Disposal Systems | LS | LS | — | — |
| Unique Geologic Features | LS | LS | — | — |

Table S-2 Summary of Analysis for Alternatives

| Issue Areas | Proposed Project Without Mitigation | Proposed Project With Mitigation | Reduced Density Alternatives | No Project Alternative |
|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|
| 2.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials | | | | |
| Transport, Use, and Disposal of Hazardous Materials | LS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials | LS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| Hazards to Schools | LS | LS | — | — |
| Existing Hazardous Materials Sites | LS | LS | — | — |
| Public Airports | LS | LS | ▼ | — |
| Private Airports | LS | LS | ▼ | — |
| Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans | PS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| Wildland Fires | PS | SU | ▼ | ▼ |
| Vectors | LS | LS | — | — |
| 2.8 Hydrology and Water Quality | | | | |
| Water Quality Standards and Requirements | PS | SU | ▼ | ▼ |
| Groundwater Supplies and Recharge | PS | SU | ▼ | ▼ |
| Erosion or Siltation | PS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| Flooding | PS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| Exceed Capacity of Stormwater Systems | PS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| Housing within a 100-year Flood Hazard Area | PS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| Impeding or Redirecting Flood Flows | PS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| Dam Inundation and Flood Hazards | PS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| Seiche, Tsunami, and Mudflow Hazards | PS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| 2.9 Land Use | | | | |
| Physical Division of an Established Community | LS | LS | — | — |
| Conflicts with Land Use Plans, Policies, and Regulations | PS | SU | ▼ | ▼ |
| Conflicts with HCPs or NCCPs | LS | LS | — | — |
| 2.10 Mineral Resources | | | | |
| Mineral Resource Availability | PS | SU | ▼ | ▼ |
| Mineral Resource Recovery Sites | PS | SU | ▼ | ▼ |
| 2.11 Noise | | | | |
| Excessive Noise Levels | PS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| Excessive Groundborne Vibration | PS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels | PS | SU | ▼ | ▼ |
| Temporary Increase in Ambient Noise Levels | PS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| Excessive Noise Exposure from a Public or Private Airport | LS | LS | ▼ | — |
| 2.12 Population and Housing | | | | |
| Population Growth | PS | SU | ▼ | ▼ |
| Displacement of Housing | LS | LS | — | — |
| Displacement of People | LS | LS | — | — |

Table S-2 Summary of Analysis for Alternatives

| Issue Areas | Proposed Project Without Mitigation | Proposed Project With Mitigation | Reduced Density Alternatives | No Project Alternative |
|--|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|
| 2.13 Public Services | | | | |
| Fire Protection Services | PS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| Police Protection Services | PS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| School Services | PS | SU | ▼ | ▼ |
| Other Public Services | PS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| 2.14 Recreation | | | | |
| Deterioration of Parks and Recreational Facilities | PS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| Construction of New Recreational Facilities | PS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| 2.15 Transportation and Traffic | | | | |
| Unincorporated County Traffic and Level of Service Standards | PS | SU | ▼ | ▼ |
| Road Safety | PS | SU | ▼ | ▼ |
| Emergency Access | PS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| Alternative Transportation | PS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| 2.16 Utilities and Service Systems | | | | |
| Wastewater Treatment Requirements | PS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| New Water or Wastewater Treatment Facilities | PS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| Sufficient Stormwater Drainage Facilities | PS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| Adequate Water Supplies | PS | SU | ▼ | ▼ |
| Adequate Wastewater Facilities | PS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| Sufficient Landfill Capacity | LS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| Solid Waste Regulations | LS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| Energy | LS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| 2.17 Global Climate Change | | | | |
| Generation of Greenhouse Gas Emissions | PS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |
| Conflict with Applicable Plan, Policy, or Regulation | PS | LS | ▼ | ▼ |

— Alternative is likely to result in a similar impact to issue when compared to proposed project

▼ Alternative is likely to result in less impacts to issue when compared to proposed project.

PS Potentially significant impact

LS Less than significant impact

SU Potentially significant and unavoidable impact

Note: See Section 4.2.1 for discussion of the 2012 Board Letter Alternative for SD15 (generally greater impacts), Section 4.2.3 for the Environmentally Superior Map Alternative for Champagne Gardens (less impacts than the Referral Map (Proposed Project) and Preliminary Staff Recommendation Map (Reduced Project Alternative) for Champagne Gardens), and Table 4-2.

This page intentionally left blank.