

## **CHAPTER 3 ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT**

### **3.1 Effects Found Not Significant as Part of the SEIR Process**

Section 15128 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines requires that an EIR “contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various potentially significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and were, therefore, not discussed in detail in the EIR.”

The County reviewed environmental impacts and mitigation measures for each issue area addressed in the 2011 General Plan Update (GPU) Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) to determine if the General Plan Amendment (GPA), Climate Action Plan (CAP), Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Threshold, and the Guidelines for Determining Significance for Climate Change Guidelines (Guidelines) (collectively referred to as the project), would result in significant changes and/or new impacts not previously addressed. This section summarizes the subject areas and impacts discussed in the 2011 GPU PEIR that were not discussed in detail in this Draft SEIR because no new or more significant impacts than previously identified in the 2011 GPU PEIR would occur. The following environmental topics are addressed briefly below: Geology and Soils, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, and Utilities and Services.

#### **3.1.1 Geology and Soils**

In Chapter 2.6, Geology and Soils, the 2011 GPU PEIR did not identify potentially significant impacts related to geology and soils. Therefore, no mitigation measures were required. As described therein, development as a matter of standard process and conditions of approval would be required to comply with all relevant federal, state, and local regulations and building standards, including the California Building Code (CBC) and County-required geotechnical reconnaissance reports and investigations which would minimize the risk of seismic, soil stability, and expansive soils hazards. Compliance with National Pollution Discharge Elimination System, CBC, and the County Grading Ordinance, would prevent potential impacts to soil erosion. Development would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state and local regulations related to septic tanks and wastewater disposal, including County Department of Environmental Health (DEH) standards to prevent water quality issues because of ineffective septic and wastewater systems. Development would also be required to follow all applicable regulatory processes, including compliance with the Guidelines, which could require the completion of a geological reconnaissance report to evaluate the significance of unique geologic features on a given project site which would preserve unique geologic features. Therefore, potential impacts related to geology and soils would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures were required.

Existing conditions related to geology and soils have not changed substantially since approval of the 2011 GPU PEIR. Implementation of the project would require that development projects be consistent with the CAP and its GHG reduction measures and supporting efforts. Implementation of the CAP is intended to reduce GHG emissions by

improving multimodal transportation and ridesharing options and fuel efficiency; increasing building energy efficiency, renewable energy use and access, waste diversion, and water conservation; and reducing emissions from agriculture. Implementation of the project would not expose people or structures to adverse effects resulting from geologic hazards because the CAP's GHG reduction measures and supporting efforts would not amend, revise, or be inconsistent with any existing regulations related to geology and soils for development projects.

Any development or expansion of facilities associated with subsequent projects implemented under the project would be required to comply with existing regulations intended to protect people and structures from seismic hazards, soil instability and expansive soils, and would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving risks related to these hazards. The project would also not amend or revise any regulations in place to prevent soil erosion, water quality impacts from septic tanks and wastewater disposal, or impacts to unique geologic features or expose more people and structures to these hazards. Therefore, implementation of the project would not result in new or more significant impacts to geology and soils beyond what was identified in the 2011 GPU PEIR.

### **3.1.2 Mineral Resources**

In Chapter 2.10, Mineral Resources, the 2011 GPU PEIR identified potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts related to mineral resources due to the loss of availability of mineral resources that would be valuable to local and state entities.

The 2011 GPU Policies COS-10.1 through COS-10.4, COS-10.6, COS-10.8, and COS-10.9 and 2011 GPU PEIR Mitigation Measures MIN 1.1 through 1.3 facilitate protection of mineral resource areas from incompatible land uses, require that road access to mining facilities be maintained, and provide for streamlined permitting of mining operations. The policies and measures were identified to reduce impacts but not below significance. Therefore, development associated with the General Plan was identified to result in direct and cumulative significant impacts related to mineral resources availability and impacts to mineral recovery sites.

Existing conditions related to mineral resources have not changed substantially since approval of the 2011 GPU PEIR. Implementation of the project is intended to reduce GHG emissions by improving multimodal transportation and ridesharing options, improving fuel efficiency, increasing building energy efficiency, increasing renewable energy use and access, increasing waste diversion, increasing water conservation, and reducing emissions from agriculture. Potential impacts to mineral resources generally occur when a development project permanently precludes the potential to mine the resource located within a site. The County's 2012 Wind Energy Ordinance EIR (2012 Wind Energy EIR) evaluated impacts related to the development of small and large-scale wind turbines and that analysis is summarized below and hereby incorporated by reference (San Diego County, 2012). Regarding subsequent projects implemented under the CAP, renewable energy projects would have the potential to preclude the extraction of mineral resources. However, similar to what was detailed in the 2012 Wind Energy EIR, smaller renewable

energy projects would not involve major grading or dredging activities that would result in the loss of a significant mineral resource. Some smaller projects would be roof mounted and would not result in any ground disturbance. Other smaller facilities may require earthwork activities consisting of minor grading at ground surface for the construction of towers and concrete foundations, which would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource of value to the region.

Similar to what was detailed in the 2012 Wind Energy EIR, all future large-scale renewable energy projects implemented under the CAP would be subject to discretionary review and required to obtain a Major Use Permit (MUP). As part of the County's discretionary review process, all future projects would be evaluated under CEQA and would be required to implement measures to minimize impacts to mineral resources, as necessary. Additionally, if a future large-scale renewable energy project is located near or within an area that contains mineral resources, a mineral resources technical report may be required at the discretion of the County. The technical report would assess the site-specific conditions and include mitigation measures, as necessary. Furthermore, large-scale renewable energy projects would not permanently preclude the loss of mining potential resources, as they would eventually be decommissioned. Therefore, because the MUP discretionary review process would be required for all future large-scale renewable energy projects, the project would not result in new or more significant impacts related to mineral resources beyond that which was identified in the 2011 GPU PEIR.

### **3.1.3 Population and Housing**

In Chapter 2.12, Population and Housing, the 2011 GPU PEIR did not identify any potentially significant direct or cumulative impacts related to population growth, displacement of housing, or displacement of people. Therefore, no mitigation measures were required. While implementation of the land use plans adopted as part of the 2011 GPU would result in population growth, the 2011 GPU included a framework for land use and development that is intended to discourage unanticipated and inappropriate growth within the unincorporated County. Similarly, the 2011 GPU complies with state policies regarding the provision of housing and does not displace substantial numbers of people. Therefore, impacts related to population and housing were identified as less than significant.

Existing conditions related to population and housing have not changed substantially since approval of the 2011 GPU PEIR. Implementation of the project is intended to reduce GHG emissions by improving multimodal transportation and ridesharing options, improving fuel efficiency, increasing building energy efficiency, increasing renewable energy use and access, increasing waste diversion, increasing water conservation, and reducing emissions from agriculture.

Implementation of the project could result in the expansion of the PACE program (GHG Reduction Measure T-1.2) which could result in additional land being permanently set aside for agriculture, consistent with goals and policies of the 2011 GPU. This could result in a small decrease in the amount of existing acreage designated for residential land use. However, it is not likely that land which is developed with existing housing, or designated

for higher densities would be converted because the land value for property that is designated for residential is higher than property designated for agricultural. Therefore, the potential loss of existing/future residential units would be nominal. Similarly, potential large-scale renewable energy projects would not induce substantial unplanned population growth or displace a substantial number of housing units or people. Typically, large-scale renewable energy development occurs outside of areas designated or zoned as residential and would not employ substantial numbers of people. Implementation of the project would not displace residents or induce population growth in the County. Therefore, implementation of the project would not result in new or more significant impacts to population and housing beyond what was identified in the 2011 GPU PEIR.

### **3.1.4 Public Services**

In Chapter 2.13, Public Services, the 2011 GPU PEIR identified potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts related to the provision of fire, police, school, and other public services because of growth accommodated by build-out of the 2011 GPU.

The 2011 GPU Policies LU-1.4, LU-6.4, LU-6.11, LU-12.3, LU-12.4, S-3.4, S-5.1, S-5.2, and S-6.1 through S-6.5, and 2011 GPU PEIR Mitigation Measures PUB 1.1 through 1.9 as well as other measures listed in Sections 2.1 through 2.17 of the EIR related to specific resources were identified to reduce direct and cumulative impacts related to the construction of new fire protection facilities to less than significant.

The 2011 GPU Policies LU-1.4, LU-12.3, and LU-12.4, and 2011 GPU PEIR Mitigation Measures PUB 1.1 through PUB 1.3 as well as other measures listed in Sections 2.1 through 2.17 of the EIR related to specific resources were identified to reduce direct and cumulative impacts related to the construction of new police protection facilities to less than significant.

The 2011 GPU Policies LU-1.4, LU-9.7, LU-12.3, LU-12.4, LU-17.1 through LU-17.4, and LU-18.2, and 2011 GPU PEIR Mitigation Measures PUB 1.1 through PUB 1.3, PUB 3.1, and PUB 3.2 were identified to minimize impacts related to the construction/expansion of new school facilities. The construction of these facilities would have the potential to result in significant environmental impacts. However, the planning, design, approval and construction of school facilities is not within the County's jurisdiction; it is the responsibility of the individual school districts. Therefore, although the individual school districts are required to prepare plans for the accommodation of future growth in their district service areas, the County cannot guarantee that impacts associated with the development of new school facilities would not have a significant impact on the environment. Therefore, the 2011 GPU PEIR concluded that direct and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable because of the County's limited authority to control the construction of facilities, which could result in significant construction and operational impacts.

The 2011 GPU Policies LU-1.4, LU-9.4, LU-9.7, LU-12.3, LU-12.4, LU-18.1, and LU-18.2, and 2011 GPU PEIR Mitigation Measures PUB 1.1 through PUB 1.3, as well as other measures listed in Sections 2.1 through 2.17 of the EIR related to specific resources were

identified to reduce direct and cumulative impacts related to the construction/expansion of public libraries facilities to less than significant.

Existing conditions related to the provision of public services have not changed substantially since approval of the 2011 GPU PEIR. Implementation of the project would require that development projects be consistent with the CAP and its GHG reduction measures. Implementation of the project is intended to reduce GHG emissions by improving multimodal transportation and ridesharing options, improving fuel efficiency, increasing building energy efficiency, increasing renewable energy use and access, increasing waste diversion, increasing water conservation, and reducing emissions from agriculture. Implementation of subsequent projects, such as traffic-calming measures, small-scale renewable energy projects, or direct investments in local carbon offset projects, would not directly affect the provision of public services, nor contribute to population growth that could result in an increase for demand for public services. These types of projects would not have a population-generating component and, therefore, no increase in demand on public services is expected.

Similar to what was detailed in the 2012 Wind Energy EIR, all future large-scale renewable energy projects implemented under the CAP would be subject to discretionary review and required to obtain a MUP. As part of the County's discretionary review process, all future projects would be evaluated under CEQA and would be required to implement measures to minimize impacts to public services, as necessary. Similar to smaller renewable energy projects, future large-scale renewable energy projects would not involve any uses that would result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. If a future large-scale renewable energy project resulted in the need for new services or facilities, service availability forms would be provided as part of the permitting process, which would indicate services are available to the project. Therefore, implementation of the project would not result in new or more significant impacts to public services beyond what was identified in the 2011 GPU PEIR.

### **3.1.5 Recreation**

In Chapter 2.14, Recreation, the 2011 GPU PEIR identified potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts related to the provision of parks and recreation facilities because of the growth accommodated by the build-out of the 2011 GPU.

The 2011 GPU Policies LU 12.1, LU 12.2, M 12.1 through M 12.8, M 12.10, H 2.2, COS 21.1, COS 21.2, COS 22.1, COS 23.1, COS 23.2, COS 24.1, and COS 24.2, and 2011 GPU PEIR Mitigation Measures REC 1.1 through REC 1.12 were identified to reduce impacts associated with increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would not occur or be accelerated. The 2011 GPU PEIR determined that adherence to these policies and implementation of identified mitigation measures would reduce direct and cumulative impacts to less than significant.

The 2011 GPU Policies LU 6.4, LU 9.7, LU 18.2, M 12.5, M 12.9, M 12.10, H 2.2, COS 21.2, COS 21.3, COS 21.4, COS 23.1, and COS 23.3, and 2011 GPU PEIR Mitigation

Measures REC 1.1 through REC 1.4, REC 1.8, REC 1.9, REC 1.11, and REC 2.1 through REC 2.6 were identified to reduce impacts associated with the construction and operation of new parks and recreation facilities. The 2011 GPU PEIR determined that adherence to these policies and implementation of identified mitigation measures would reduce direct and cumulative impacts to less than significant.

Existing conditions related to the provision of recreational facilities have not changed substantially since approval of the 2011 GPU PEIR. Implementation of the project is intended to reduce GHG emissions by improving multimodal transportation and ridesharing options, improving fuel efficiency, increasing building energy efficiency, increasing renewable energy use and access, increasing waste diversion, increasing water conservation, and reducing emissions from agriculture. Implementation of subsequent projects implemented under the project, such as traffic-calming measures, small-scale renewable energy projects, or direct investments in local carbon offset projects, would not directly affect the provision of recreational facilities, nor contribute to population growth that could result in an increase for demand for recreational facilities. Similarly, large-scale renewable energy projects would not induce the development of residential uses, including but not limited to a residential subdivision, mobile home park, or construction of a single-family residence, which would in turn increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks, or other recreational facilities in the vicinity, or require the construction of additional facilities. Therefore, implementation of the project would not result in new or more significant impacts to recreation beyond what was identified in the 2011 GPU PEIR.

### **3.1.6 Utilities and Services**

In Chapter 2.16, Utilities and Service Systems, the 2011 GPU PEIR identified potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts related to the construction/expansion of water, wastewater, stormwater, and landfill facilities because of the growth accommodated by the build-out of the 2011 GPU.

The 2011 GPU policies LU 9.4, LU 12.1, LU 12.2, and LU 14.1 through LU 14.4, and 2011 GPU PEIR Mitigation Measures USS 1.1 through USS 1.3 would minimize impacts related to the potential for exceedance of Regional Water Quality Control Board wastewater treatment requirements. The 2011 GPU PEIR determined that adherence to these policies and implementation of mitigation measures would reduce direct and cumulative wastewater quality impacts to less than significant.

The 2011 GPU Policies LU 1.2, LU 4.3, and H 1.3, and 2011 GPU PEIR Mitigation Measures USS 2.1 through USS 2.3 were identified to minimize impacts associated with new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. The 2011 GPU PEIR determined that adherence to these policies and implementation of mitigation measures would reduce direct and cumulative wastewater facility impacts to less than significant.

The 2011 GPU Policies LU 6.5, LU 6.9, and COS 4.3, and 2011 GPU PEIR Mitigation Measures USS 3.1 through USS 3.5 were identified to minimize impacts associated with

new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. The 2011 GPU PEIR determined that adherence to these policies and implementation of mitigation measures would reduce direct and cumulative stormwater impacts to less than significant.

The 2011 GPU LU 8.1, LU 8.2, LU 13.1, LU 13.2, COS 4.1 through COS 4.4, COS 5.2, and COS 5.5, and 2011 GPU PEIR Mitigation Measures USS 4.1 through USS 4.7 were identified to minimize impacts associated with (1) a demand for water that exceeds existing entitlements and resources, or necessitates new or expanded entitlements; and (2) substantial depletion of groundwater supplies or interference with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. The 2011 GPU PEIR determined that adherence to these policies and implementation of mitigation measures would reduce impacts; however, direct and cumulative water demand and groundwater supply impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

The 2011 GPU Policy LU 4.3, and 2011 GPU PEIR Mitigation Measures USS 1.1 through USS 1.3 were identified to minimize impacts associated with the provision of adequate wastewater capacity to service projected demand in addition to a provider's existing commitments. The 2011 GPU PEIR determined that adherence to this policy and implementation of mitigation measures would reduce direct and cumulative wastewater capacity impacts to less than significant.

The 2011 GPU Policies LU 12.1, LU 12.2, LU 16.1, LU 16.2, LU 16.3, and COS 17.1 through COS 17.4, COS 17.6, COS 17.7 and COS 17.8, and 2011 GPU PEIR Mitigation Measures USS 6.1 through USS 6.8 were identified to minimize impacts associated with the provision of sufficient permitted landfill capacity to accommodate the solid waste disposal needs. The 2011 GPU PEIR determined that adherence to these policies and implementation of mitigation measures would reduce direct and cumulative impacts; however, direct and cumulative solid waste disposal impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

The 2011 GPU PEIR did not identify any 2011 GPU Policies or 2011 GPU PEIR Mitigation Measures related to solid waste regulations because development associated with the 2011 GPU would be required to comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, direct and cumulative impacts associated with solid waste regulations were determined to be less than significant.

Existing conditions related to utilities have not changed substantially since approval of the 2011 GPU PEIR. Implementation of the project would require that development projects be consistent with the CAP and its GHG reduction measures and supporting efforts. Implementation of the project may have a positive impact on utilities because of implementation of measures to enhance the County's diversion rate and integrate organics into the collection process (GHG Reduction Measure SW-1.1).

GHG Reduction Measure SW-1.1 would result in enhanced diversion of waste, including a predicted increase in the collection of solid waste, recyclables, and organics because of

the implementation of an enhanced zoning ordinance that would seek to meet a waste diversion target of 75% by 2030. This would result in enhanced pickup services, establishment of organics processing facilities, development of commercial food scraps programs, and the development of minimum diversion requirements for haulers, among others. However, this would not result in the need for any new or expanded landfill capacity. Additionally, the project would benefit the County by aiding in the achievement of state diversion targets. Any new facilities or programs would be required to comply with existing federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste permitting.

All future large-scale renewable energy projects would be subject to discretionary review and required to obtain a MUP. As part of the County's discretionary review process, all future projects would be evaluated under CEQA and would be required to implement measures to minimize impacts to utilities, as necessary. Similar to smaller renewable energy projects, future large-scale renewable energy projects would require minimal water and would not generate solid waste. Some larger renewable energy projects may require the expansion of storm drain facilities, which would be analyzed under the MUP discretionary review process for environmental impacts. Therefore, because all future large-scale renewable energy projects would undergo discretionary review through MUP process, the project would not result in new or more significant impacts related to utilities beyond that which was identified in the 2011 GPU PEIR.