

**COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO CLIMATE ACTION PLAN
EIR # PDS2016-ER-16-00-003
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NUMBER 2016101055
ATTACHMENT M-4**

**RENEWABLE ENERGY OPTION (OPTION 1),
JANUARY 2018**

CEQA FINDINGS

- a. Certify that the SEIR dated January 2018 on file with Planning & Development Services as EIR # PDS2016-ER-16-00-003 has been completed in compliance with the CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, that the SEIR was presented to the Board of Supervisors and that the Board of Supervisors reviewed and considered the information contained therein before approving the project, and that the SEIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Board of Supervisors.
- b. Adopt the findings concerning mitigation of significant environmental effects pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15091 (Section II below).
- c. Adopt the Statement of Overriding Considerations pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines section 15093 (Section VIII below).
- d. Adopt the Decision and Explanation Regarding Recirculation of the Draft Environmental Impact Report pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(e) (Section VI below).
- e. Adopt the Mitigation and Monitoring Program pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15091(d).

**FINDINGS PURSUANT TO STATE CEQA GUIDELINES SECTIONS 15088.5, 15090, 15091
AND 15093**

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO CLIMATE ACTION PLAN

JANUARY 2018

ATTACHMENT M-4

RENEWABLE ENERGY OPTION (OPTION 1)

**CEQA FINDINGS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS FOR THE
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO CLIMATE ACTION PLAN
SCH #2016101055**

I. INTRODUCTION

The following Findings are made for the County of San Diego Climate Action Plan, and more specifically, for the Renewable Energy Option (Option 1), which is being considered for approval based on consideration of the alternatives, project objectives, project benefits, environmental impacts, stakeholder input received during public review, Planning Commission informational workshops, and numerous other factors. Option 1 is composed of the following: the Climate Action Plan (CAP), an associated General Plan Amendment (GPA) to the County's General Plan Update (GPU) and corresponding revision to mitigation in the Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) prepared for the 2011 General Plan Update (hereafter these two actions collectively refer to as [GPA]), a threshold of significance for greenhouse gases (GHG), and a revised Guidelines for Determining Significance for Climate Change (Guidelines). Option 1, which is a combination of the 100% Renewable Energy Alternative and the Increased Solid Waste Diversion Alternative as described in detail in the Final SEIR will be presented to the decision makers for adoption. In combining the two alternatives together, the direct investments required under GHG Reduction Measure T-4.1 would be reduced to 100,294 MTCO₂e (instead of 153,511 MTCO₂e). Analysis of the components of this option is included in Final SEIR (see Final SEIR Section 4.3.3.3 and 4.3.3.4)

The environmental impacts of Option 1 are addressed in a Supplemental Program Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) dated August of 2017, which is incorporated by reference herein.

The Final SEIR prepared for Option 1 consists of three components:

- A) Program Final SEIR evaluating the Project and a reasonable range of alternatives
- B) Summary of Changes to the Draft Final SEIR, Comment Letters and Responses to comments on the Draft Final SEIR
- C) Technical Appendices to the Final SEIR

The Final SEIR evaluated potentially significant effects for the following environmental areas of potential concern: 1) Aesthetics; 2) Agricultural and Forestry Resources; 3) Air Quality; 4) Biological Resources; 5) Cultural and Historical Resources; 6) Greenhouse Gas Emissions; 7) Hazards and Hazardous Materials; 8) Hydrology and Water Quality; 9) Land Use and Planning; 10) Noise; 11) Transportation and Traffic; 12) Tribal Cultural Resources. Potential impacts for the issues of Energy, Geology and Soils, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, and Utilities and Services are identified as Effects Found Not to be Significant (and discussed in Section 3.1 of the Final SEIR and Energy is discussed in Section 2.6 of the Final SEIR).

The Final SEIR functions as a supplement to the 2011 GPU PEIR and as such the analysis throughout relies upon pertinent information that is provided in the 2011 GPU PEIR and was adopted with the 2011 GPU. Specifically, as a supplement, the analysis relied upon the adopted 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures and applied those policies and mitigation measures to the project prior to rendering an impact conclusion. Where impacts were concluded to remain significant after application of all relevant policies and mitigation measures of the 2011 GPU, additional mitigation was considered and recommended in the Final SEIR. The

Findings discussed below address the significant impacts of the project after application of relevant 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures. Where 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures were applied to Option 1, those mitigation measures are referenced in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for Option 1.

The County Board of Supervisors concurs with the conclusions in the Final SEIR that Energy, Geology and Soils, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, and Utilities and Services will not result in potentially significant impacts. Moreover, the remaining environmental issues evaluated will include impacts that are significant and unavoidable. For the 12 environmental subject areas in which environmental impacts will remain significant and unavoidable, even with the implementation of mitigation measures, overriding considerations exist that make the impacts acceptable (Section III, below).

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code §21000 *et. seq.* and the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, California Code of Regulations, §15000 *et. seq.*) require that no public agency shall approve or carry out a project which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of a project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale and facts supporting each finding.

The possible findings are:

- (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effects on the environment;
- (2) Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been or can or should be adopted by that other agency; or
- (3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the EIR (CEQA, §21081(a); Guidelines, §15091(a)).

For each significant effect identified for the Climate Action Plan, one of the above three findings applies. Therefore, the discussion of significant impacts, and mitigation measures where possible, are organized below by finding rather than by environmental subject area.

In analyzing potential impacts, the Final SEIR noted that many of the projects that would be implemented under the GHG reduction measures would require further discretionary permits from the County, such as Grading Permits, triggering additional review under CEQA. Under these circumstances, projects will be reviewed under CEQA and 2011 GPU policies, and applicable mitigation measures from the Final SEIR will be incorporated to the extent feasible by future discretionary projects to ensure that significant impacts from the projects are avoided or reduced to a less-than-significant level.

However, the Final SEIR also acknowledged there may be circumstances where further discretionary permits are not required (e.g., small-scale renewable energy projects), and no additional CEQA review would occur. Under these circumstances, Option 1 will allow projects by right provided the projects comply with the requirements set forth in the CAP. In addition, even with implementation of applicable policies and mitigation measures, the locations and details of

many of the projects are currently unknown and it cannot be determined with certainty that impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level because of many influencing variables such as location, size, design, and technology. The Final SEIR concluded there would be no other mechanisms available to review potential significant environmental impacts and impose or implement feasible mitigation measures. Therefore, Option 1 may have significant and unmitigated environmental impacts related to aesthetics, agriculture and forestry resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural and historic resources, GHG, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, transportation and traffic, and tribal cultural resources. Details of these conclusions are provided in the findings below. A Statement of Overriding Considerations is being adopted to address these significant and unmitigated impacts.

II. POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS WHERE MITIGATION IS AVAILABLE TO REDUCE IMPACTS TO LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15091(A)(1))

Pursuant to Section 21081(A) of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091(A)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the County of San Diego Board of Supervisors finds that, for each of the following significant effects identified in the Final SEIR, changes or alternatives have been required in, or incorporated into, Option 1 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant effects on the environment. The potentially significant effects and mitigation measures are stated fully in the Final SEIR. These findings are explained below and are supported by substantial evidence in the record of proceedings.

To the extent these findings conclude that mitigation measures identified in the Final SEIR are feasible, the County hereby binds itself to implement those measures. These findings are not merely informational, but constitute a binding set of obligations upon the County and responsible agencies that take effect upon the County's adoption of the resolutions certifying the Final SEIR and approving Option 1.

In adopting these findings, the County concurrently adopts a Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081.6. This MMRP is designed to ensure Option 1 complies with the feasible mitigation measures identified below during implementation of Option 1 and is incorporated herein by this reference.

A. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- 1. Significant Effect: GHG Emissions:** Implementation of the CAP, in combination with GHG emissions from reasonably foreseeable GPA projects, would result in a considerable contribution such that a new significant cumulative 2030 GHG impact would occur (GHG-2) (Final SEIR p. 2.7-30 to 2.7-31).

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final SEIR.

Mitigation Measures:

CAP Mitigation Measure M-GHG-1: The County shall require in-process and future GPAs to reduce their emissions to ensure that CAP emission forecasts are not substantially altered such that attainment of GHG reduction targets could not be achieved. Project applicants for in-process and future GPAs could accomplish this through two options, as outlined below:

Option 1 (No Net Increase): GPA project applicants shall achieve no net increase in GHG emissions from additional density above the 2011 GPU. Applicants shall be required in their respective CEQA documents to quantify the GHG emissions from their projects that exceed the GHG emissions for the 2011 GPU density or intensity forming the basis of the CAP emission forecasts (i.e., projections). This increase in emissions shall be reduced through on-site design features and mitigation measures and off-site mitigation, including purchase of carbon offset credits by the applicant. Applicants shall demonstrate compliance with relevant CAP measures as identified in the “CAP Consistency Review Checklist” in addition to all feasible on-site design features and mitigation measures. Off-site mitigation, including purchase of carbon offset credits, would be allowed after all feasible on-site design features and mitigation measures have been incorporated.

For example, if 400 residential units were allowed under the 2011 GPU and a GPA proposes 500 residential units, the emissions for the additional 100 units would be calculated and offset through compliance with the CAP Consistency Review Checklist and additional feasible on-site measures and off-site measures, including the use of carbon offsets. The emissions associated with the allowable density of 400 units would be mitigated through compliance with the CAP Consistency Review Checklist.

The County will consider, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning & Development Services (PDS), the following geographic priorities for GHG reduction features, and GHG reduction projects and programs: 1) project design features/on-site reduction measures; 2) off-site within the unincorporated areas of the County of San Diego; 3) off-site within the County of San Diego; 4) off-site within the State of California; 5) off-site within the United States; and 6) off-site internationally.

Geographic priorities would focus first on local reduction features (including projects and programs that would reduce GHG emissions) to ensure that reduction efforts achieved locally would provide co-benefits. Depending on the carbon offset credit utilized, co-benefits may include reductions in criteria air pollutants, toxic air contaminants, energy demand, water consumption, health benefits, social benefits, and economic benefits. The GPA applicant or its designee shall first pursue offset projects and programs locally within unincorporated areas of the County of San Diego to the extent such carbon offset credits are available and are financially feasible, as reasonably determined by the Director of PDS.

If carbon offset credits are provided as mitigation, the GPA applicant, or its designee, shall purchase and retire carbon offsets in a quantity sufficient to offset the net increase from GHG emissions above the density or intensity allowed in the 2011 GPU. This includes all GHG emissions from construction (including sequestration loss from vegetation removal) and operations.

For the net increase of construction and operations GHG emissions, prior to County's issuance of the project's first grading permit (for construction GHG emissions) or first building permit (for operations GHG emissions) the GPA applicant, or its designee, shall provide evidence to the satisfaction of the Director PDS that the project applicant or its designee has purchased and retired carbon offset credits in a quantity sufficient to offset the net increase of construction and operations GHG emissions generated by the project. Operations emissions may be offset in phases, commensurate with the overall phasing of the project.

Carbon offset credits must be purchased through any of the following: (i) a CARB-approved registry, such as the Climate Action Reserve, the American Carbon Registry, and the Verified Carbon Standard, (ii) any registry approved by CARB to act as a registry under the state's cap-and-trade program, (iii) through the CAPCOA GHG Rx and the SDAPCD, or (iv) if no registry is in existence as identified in options (i), (ii), or (iii), above, then any other reputable registry or entity that issues carbon offsets consistent with Cal. Health & Saf. Code section 38562(d)(1)), to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS.

Option 2 (Net Zero): GPA project applicants shall reduce all project GHG emissions to zero to achieve no net increase over baseline conditions (carbon neutrality). Project emissions shall be reduced to zero through on-site design features and mitigation measures and off-site mitigation, including purchase of carbon offset credits by the applicant or its designee. Applicants shall demonstrate compliance with relevant CAP measures as identified in the "CAP Consistency Review Checklist" before considering additional feasible on-site design features and mitigation measures. Off-site mitigation, including purchase of carbon offset credits, would be allowed after all feasible on-site design features and mitigation measures have been incorporated.

The County will consider, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning & Development Services (PDS), the following geographic priorities for GHG reduction features, and GHG reduction projects and programs: 1) project design features/on-site reduction measures; 2) off-site within the unincorporated areas of the County of San Diego; 3) off-site within the County of San Diego; 4) off-site within the State of California; 5) off-site within the United States; and 6) off-site internationally.

Geographic priorities would focus first on local reduction features (including projects and programs that would reduce GHG emissions) to ensure that reduction efforts achieved locally would provide co-benefits. Depending on the carbon offset credit utilized, co-benefits may include reductions in criteria air pollutants, toxic air contaminants, energy demand, water consumption, health benefits, social benefits, and economic benefits. The GPA applicant or its designee shall first pursue offset projects and programs locally within unincorporated areas of the County of San Diego to the extent such carbon offset credits are available and are financially feasible, as reasonably determined by the Director of PDS.

If carbon offset credits are provided as mitigation, the GPA applicant, or its designee, shall purchase and retire carbon offsets in a quantity sufficient to offset all GHG emissions from the project. This includes all GHG emissions from construction (including sequestration loss from vegetation removal) and operations.

Prior to the County's issuance of the project's first grading permit (for construction GHG emissions) or first building permit (for operations GHG emissions) the GPA applicant, or

its designee, shall provide evidence to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS that the project applicant or its designee has purchased and retired carbon offset credits in a quantity sufficient to offset all construction and operations GHG emissions generated by the project. Operations emissions may be offset in phases, commensurate with the overall phasing of the project.

Carbon offset credits must be purchased through any of the following: (i) a CARB-approved registry, such as the Climate Action Reserve, the American Carbon Registry, and the Verified Carbon Standard, (ii) any registry approved by CARB to act as a registry under the state's cap-and-trade program, (iii) through the CAPCOA GHG Rx and the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (APCD), or (iv) if no registry is in existence as identified in options (i), (ii), or (iii), above, then any other reputable registry or entity that issues carbon offsets consistent with Cal. Health & Saf. Code section 38562(d)(1)), to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS (Final SEIR p. 2.7-36 to 2.7-40).

Facts in Supporting Findings: The policies applicable to GHG emissions that were adopted as part of the 2011 GPU and are applicable to the project include Policy COS-10.7, COS-15.1, COS-15.2, COS-15.3, COS-17.1, COS-17.5, COS-18.2, COS-20.1, COS-20.2, and COS-20.4 (Final SEIR pages 2.7-10 to 2.7-11). The mitigation measures applicable to GHG emissions that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include CC-1.1, CC-1.2, CC-1.3, CC-1.4, CC-1.5, CC-1.6, CC-1.7, CC-1.8, CC-1.9, CC-1.10, CC-1.11, CC-1.12, CC-1.13, CC-1.14, CC-1.15, CC-1.16, CC-1.17, CC-1.19, and CC-1.19 (Final SEIR p. 2.7-11 to 2.7-15).

With implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures and CAP Mitigation Measure M-GHG-1, GHG impacts associated with the CAP and GPAs would be reduced to less than significant because the incremental increase in GHG emissions from in-process and future GPAs would be offset such that the CAP emissions forecasts would not be affected (Final SEIR p. 2.7-36 to 2.7-41).

- 2. Significant Effect: GHG Policy Conflicts:** Implementation of the CAP, along with GHG emissions described above, in combination with GHG emissions from reasonably foreseeable GPA projects, would result in a significant cumulative impact (GHG-3) (Final SEIR p. 2.7-31 to 2.7-40).

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final SEIR.

Mitigation Measures:

CAP Mitigation Measure M-GHG-1: See description above (Final SEIR p. 2.7-36 through 40).

Facts in Supporting Findings: The policies applicable to GHG emissions that were adopted as part of the 2011 GPU and are applicable to the project include Policy COS-10.7, COS-15.1, COS-15.2, COS-15.3, COS-17.1, COS-17.5, COS-18.2, COS-20.1, COS-20.2, and COS-20.4 (Final SEIR pages 2.7-10 to 2.7-11). The mitigation measures applicable to GHG emissions that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include CC-1.1, CC-1.2, CC-1.3, CC-1.4, CC-1.5, CC-1.6, CC-1.7, CC-1.8, CC-1.9, CC-1.10, CC-1.11, CC-1.12, CC-1.13, CC-1.14, CC-1.15, CC-1.16, CC-1.17, CC-1.19, and CC-1.19 (Final SEIR p. 2.7-11 to 2.7-15).

With implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures and CAP Mitigation Measure M-GHG-1, GHG policy conflicts associated with the CAP and GPAs would be reduced to less than significant because the incremental increase in GHG emissions from in-process and future GPAs would be offset such that the CAP emissions forecasts would not be affected (Final SEIR p. 2.7-40 to 2.7-41).

III. **CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15091 FINDINGS FOR POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS FOR WHICH FEASIBLE MITIGATION MEASURES OR ALTERNATIVES ARE NOT AVAILABLE (CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15091(A)(3))**

Pursuant to Section 21081(A) of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091(A)(3) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the County of San Diego Board of Supervisors finds that, for each of the following significant effects identified in the Final SEIR, specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the SEIR. These findings are explained below and are supported by substantial evidence in the record of proceedings.

In adopting these findings, the County concurrently adopts a Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081.6. This MMRP is designed to ensure Option 1 complies with the feasible mitigation measures identified below during implementation of Option 1 and is incorporated herein by this reference.

A. **Aesthetics**

1. **Significant Effect: Scenic Vistas / Scenic Resources:** Implementation of GHG Reduction Measures E-1.1, E-2.1 and E-2.4 that would result in the development of small-scale wind turbines would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts to scenic vistas because of the introduction of new vertical elements within the viewshed of a scenic vista, or affect scenic resources through the removal or alteration of a scenic resource during the course of development (Impacts AES-1, AES-2). Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1 that would result in the development of large-scale renewable energy projects would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts to scenic vistas because of the introduction of tall vertical elements into the viewshed, or affect scenic resources by allowing large renewable energy facilities to be constructed near the viewshed of a scenic resource (Impacts AES-3, AES-4) (See Final SEIR p. 2.1-9 through 2.1-21; p. 4-25 and 4-54 through 4-55).

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final SEIR. Effects remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures:

CAP Mitigation Measure M-AES-1: During the environmental review process for future Major Use Permits for all large-scale renewable energy projects, the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Visual Resources and Dark Skies and Glare shall be applied. When aesthetic impacts are determined to be significant, feasible and appropriate project-specific mitigation measures shall be incorporated. Examples of standard mitigation measures within the County Guidelines include: siting/location considerations; minimizing development and grading of steep slopes; natural screening and landscaping; undergrounding utilities; inclusion of buffers; and lighting restrictions (Final SEIR p. 2.1-36 through 38).

Facts in Supporting Findings: The policies applicable to aesthetic and visual resources that were adopted as part of the 2011 GPU and are applicable to the project include Policy LU-6.6, LU-6.9, LU-10.2, LU-11.2, LU-12.4, COS-11.1, COS-11.3, COS-11.5, COS-11.7, COS-12.2, COS-13.1, COS-13.2, and H-2.1 (Final SEIR pages 2.1-2 – 2.1-4). The mitigation measures applicable to aesthetic and visual resources that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include Aes-1.2, Aes-1.6, Aes-1.7, Aes-1.8, Aes-1.9, Aes-4.1, Aes-4.2 (Final SEIR pages 2.1-4 – 2.1-5).

CAP Mitigation Measure M-AES-1 requires that the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Visual Resources and Dark Skies and Glare shall be applied to future Major Use Permits for all large-scale renewable energy projects to minimize visual impacts. However, the development of both small and large-scale renewable energy projects would introduce vertical elements into the viewshed. Even with implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures and CAP Mitigation Measure M-AES-1, because the specific locations for renewable energy projects have not yet been identified and it is unknown how many and what types of projects would be required to meet the GHG reduction goals of the CAP, it is not possible to guarantee that all impacts to scenic vistas and scenic resources would be reduced. No other feasible mitigation is available. For the reasons stated in Section 2.1.5 and 4.3 of the Final SEIR, the direct and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Final SEIR Section 2.1 and 4.3; aesthetic related response to comments in Chapter 8 of the Final SEIR, and all other aesthetic related evidence in the administrative record.

3. **Significant Effect: Visual Character or Quality:** Implementation of GHG Reduction Measures E-1.1, E-2.1, and E-2.4 that would result in the development of small-scale wind turbines would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts to visual character or quality because of the potential for increased visual contrasts, view blockage, or skylining from sensitive viewing locations (AES-5, AES-6). Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1 that would result in the development of large-scale renewable energy projects would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts to visual character or quality because of the allowable height, increased visual contrasts, view blockage, or skylining from sensitive viewing locations (AES-7, AES-8) (See Final SEIR p. 2.1-21 through 2.1-30; p. 4-25 through 4-26 and 4-55 through 4-56).

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final SEIR. Effects remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures:

CAP Mitigation Measure M-AES-1: See description above (Final SEIR p. 2.1-36 through 38).

Facts in Supporting Findings: The policies applicable to aesthetic and visual resources that were adopted as part of the 2011 GPU and are applicable to the project include Policy LU-6.6, LU-6.9, LU-10.2, LU-11.2, LU-12.4, COS-11.1, COS-11.3, COS-11.5, COS-11.7, COS-12.2, COS-13.1, COS-13.2, and H-2.1 (Final SEIR pages 2.1-2 – 2.1-4). The mitigation measures applicable to aesthetic and visual resources that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include Aes-1.2, Aes-1.6, Aes-1.7, Aes-1.8, Aes-1.9, Aes-4.1, Aes-4.2 (Final SEIR pages 2.1-4 – 2.1-5).

Even with implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures and CAP Mitigation Measure M-AES-1, because the specific locations for renewable energy projects have not yet been identified and it is unknown how many and what types of projects would be required to meet the GHG reduction goals of the CAP, it is not possible to guarantee that all impacts to visual character or quality would be reduced. No other feasible mitigation is available. For the reasons stated in Section 2.1.5 and 4.3 of the Final SEIR, the direct and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Final SEIR Section 2.1 and 4.3; aesthetic related response to comments in Chapter 8 of the Final SEIR, and all other aesthetic related evidence in the administrative record.

- 4. Significant Effect: Light and Glare:** Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1 that would result in the development of large scale renewable energy projects would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts to light and glare because of the need for safety lighting and the introduction of infrastructure that may emit some glare (AES-9, AES-10) (See Final SEIR p. 2.1-30 through 2.1-36; p. 4-26 through 4-27 and 4-56).

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final SEIR. Effects remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures:

CAP Mitigation Measure M-AES-2: Require that a Lighting Mitigation Plan be prepared as part of the MUP discretionary review process for all large-scale renewable energy projects. The Lighting Mitigation Plan would demonstrate that the design and installation of all permanent lighting for large wind turbines or large geothermal stacks ancillary facilities is such that light bulbs and reflectors are not visible from public viewing areas; lighting does not cause reflected glare; and illumination of the project facilities, vicinity, and nighttime sky is minimized. The Lighting Mitigation Plan would demonstrate consistency with the Light Pollution Code (Section 59.100 et al.) and Sections 6322 and 6324 of the Zoning Ordinance to ensure outdoor light fixtures emitting light into the night sky do not result in a detrimental effect on astronomical research and to ensure reflected glare and light trespass is minimized. See description above (Final SEIR p. 2.1-39 through 42).

CAP Mitigation Measure M-AES-3: Require that a Shadow Flicker Study be prepared as part of the MUP discretionary review process for all wind turbine projects. The Shadow Flicker Study would utilize a shadow flicker model run to determine the potential shadow flicker that could occur at sensitive receptors within 2,000 meters (6,562 feet) of the proposed turbines. For wind turbine projects, because some receptors may lie within 60° due north of the turbines, outside the sun's path at any given point in the year, these receptors may be excluded from the study. Beyond 2,000 meters, the human eye would not be able to discern a shadow cast from a wind turbine for example. The modeling should utilize many different inputs, including:

1) Real Data

- Actual coordinates of turbines
- Actual coordinates of receptors
- Actual topographic data

2) Conservative Assumptions

- Specifications of the turbines being considered with the highest hub height and longest rotor diameter
- 100% turbine operation
- No vegetative screening
- Receptors can be impacted from all directions (i.e., “greenhouse mode”)

3) Realistic Features

- Actual wind data from a local meteorological tower to account for the percentage of time wind blows from each direction
- National Weather Service sunshine probability data to approximate average cloud cover (Final SEIR p. 2.1-39 through 42).

Facts in Supporting Findings: The policies applicable to aesthetic and visual resources that were adopted as part of the 2011 GPU and are applicable to the project include Policy LU-6.6, LU-6.9, LU-10.2, LU-11.2, LU-12.4, COS-11.1, COS-11.3, COS-11.5, COS-11.7, COS-12.2, COS-13.1, COS-13.2, and H-2.1 (Final SEIR pages 2.1-2 to 2.1-4). The mitigation measures applicable to aesthetic and visual resources that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include Aes-1.2, Aes-1.6, Aes-1.7, Aes-1.8, Aes-1.9, Aes-4.1, Aes-4.2 (Final SEIR pages 2.1-4 to 2.1-5).

Even with implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures and CAP Mitigation Measure M-AES-2 and M-AES-3, because the specific locations for renewable energy projects have not yet been identified and it is unknown how many and what types of projects would be required to meet the GHG reduction goals of the CAP, it is not possible to guarantee that all direct aesthetic and visual resources impacts would be reduced. No other feasible mitigation is available. For the reasons stated in Section 2.1.5 of the Final SEIR, the direct and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Final SEIR Section 2.1 and 4.3; aesthetic related response to comments in Chapter 8 of the Final SEIR, and all other aesthetic related evidence in the administrative record.

B. Agriculture and Forestry Resources

- 5. Significant Effect: Direct or Indirect Conversion of Agricultural Resources:** Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1 that would result in the development of large scale renewable energy projects would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts to direct or indirect conversion or agricultural resources because of the size and magnitude of projects and unknown locations for future projects (AG-1, AG-2) (See Final SEIR p. 2.2-8 through 2.2-13; p. 4-27 through 4-28 and 4-57).

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final SEIR. Effects remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures:

CAP Mitigation Measure M-AGR-1: During the environmental review process for future MUPs for large-scale renewable energy projects, the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Agricultural Resources shall be applied. When impacts to Farmland are determined to be significant, feasible and appropriate project-specific mitigation measures shall be incorporated. Examples of standard mitigation measures within the County

Guidelines include: avoidance of sensitive resources; preservation of habitat; revegetation; and resource management (Final SEIR p. 2.2-21 through 23).

Facts in Supporting Findings: The policies applicable to agricultural and forestry resources that were adopted as part of the 2011 GPU and are applicable to the project include Policy LU-7.1, LU-7.2, COS-6.2, COS-6.4 (Final SEIR pages 2.2-4 to 2.2-3). The mitigation measures applicable to agricultural and forestry resources that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include Agr-1.1, Agr-1.2, Agr-1.3, Agr-1.4, Agr-1.5, Agr-2.1 (Final SEIR p. 2.2-5).

Even with implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures and CAP Mitigation Measure M-AGR-1, because the specific locations for renewable energy projects have not yet been identified and it is unknown how many and what types of projects would be required to meet the GHG reduction goals of the CAP, it is not possible to guarantee that all direct or indirect agricultural conversion impacts would be reduced. No other feasible mitigation is available. For the reasons stated in Section 2.2.5 and 4.3 of the Final SEIR, the direct and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Final SEIR Section 2.2 and 4.3; agriculture and forestry resources related response to comments in Chapter 8 of the Final SEIR, and all other aesthetic and forestry resources related evidence in the administrative record.

- 6. Significant Effect: Conflict with Agricultural or Forest Zoning:** Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1 that would result in the development of large scale renewable energy projects would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts to Williamson Act contracts and agricultural zoning because at a programmatic level it is not possible to ensure that zoning conflicts would not occur (AG-3, AG-4) (See Final SEIR p. 2.2-13 through 2.2-17; p. 4-28 through 4-29 and 4-57 through 4-58).

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final SEIR. Effects remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures:

CAP Mitigation Measure M-AGR-1: See description above (Final SEIR p. 2.2-21 through 23).

Facts in Supporting Findings: The policies applicable to agricultural and forestry resources that were adopted as part of the 2011 GPU and are applicable to the project include Policy LU-7.1, LU-7.2, COS-6.2, COS-6.4 (Final SEIR pages 2.2-4 to 2.2-3). The mitigation measures applicable to agricultural and forestry resources that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include Agr-1.1, Agr-1.2, Agr-1.3, Agr-1.4, Agr-1.5, Agr-2.1 (Final SEIR p. 2.2-5).

Even with implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures and CAP Mitigation Measure M-AGR-1, because the specific locations for renewable energy projects have not yet been identified and it is unknown how many and what types of projects would be required to meet the GHG reduction goals of the CAP, it is not possible to guarantee that all Williamson Act and agricultural zoning conflict impacts would be reduced. No other feasible mitigation is available. For the reasons stated in Section 2.2.5 and 4.3 of the Final SEIR, the direct and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Final SEIR Section 2.2 and 4.3; agriculture and forestry resources related response to comments in Chapter 8 of the Final SEIR, and all other aesthetic and forestry resources related evidence in the administrative record.

- 7. Significant Effect: Direct or Indirect Conversion of Forest Land:** Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1 that would result in the development of large scale renewable energy projects would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts to direct or indirect conversion or loss of forest land because at a programmatic level, it is not possible to ensure that no impacts to forest resources would occur (AG-5, AG-6) (See Final SEIR p. 2.2-17 through 2.2-21; p. 4-58 through 4-59).

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final SEIR. Effects remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures:

CAP Mitigation Measure M-AGR-1: See description above (Final SEIR p. 2.2-23 through 24).

CAP Mitigation Measure M-AGR-2: During the environmental review process for future MUPs for large-scale renewable energy projects, the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Agriculture shall be applied. When impacts to forest land are determined to be significant, feasible and appropriate project-specific mitigation measures shall be incorporated. Examples of standard mitigation measures within the County Guidelines include: avoidance of sensitive resources; preservation of habitat; revegetation; and resource management (Final SEIR p. 2.2-21 through 23).

Facts in Supporting Findings: The policies applicable to agricultural and forestry resources that were adopted as part of the 2011 GPU and are applicable to the project include Policy LU-7.1, LU-7.2, COS-6.2, COS-6.4 (Final SEIR p. 2.2-43 to 2.2-4). The mitigation measures applicable to agricultural and forestry resources that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include Agr-1.1, Agr-1.2, Agr-1.3, Agr-1.4, Agr-1.5, and Agr-2.1 (Final SEIR p. 2.2-5).

Even with implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures and CAP Mitigation Measure M-AGR-1 and M-AGR-2, because the specific locations for renewable energy projects have not yet been identified and it is unknown how many and what types of projects would be required to meet the GHG reduction goals of the CAP, it is not possible to guarantee that direct and indirect forest conversion impacts would not occur. No other feasible mitigation is available. For the reasons stated in Section 2.2.5 and 4.3 of the Final SEIR, the direct and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Final SEIR Section 2.2 and 4.3; agriculture and forestry resources related response to comments in Chapter 8 of the Final SEIR, and all other aesthetic and forestry resources related evidence in the administrative record.

C. Air Quality

- 8. Significant Effect: Conformance to Federal and State Air Quality Standards:** Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure T-2.1 and Supporting Measures that would result in the development of bicycle, pedestrian, and park-and-ride infrastructure improvements

would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts to air quality standards because construction emissions may lead to short-term air emissions such that air quality standards are exceeded (AIR-1, AIR-2). Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure T-4.1 which would result in the development of local direct investment projects would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts to air quality standards because construction emissions may lead to short-term air emissions such that air quality standards are exceeded (AIR-3, AIR-4). Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1 which would result in the development of large-scale renewable energy projects would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts related to air quality standards because construction emissions may lead to short-term air emissions such that air quality standards are exceeded (AIR-5, AIR-6). Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure SW-1.1 which would result in the development of new or expanded waste facilities would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts related to air quality standards because construction emissions may lead to short-term air emissions such that air quality standards are exceeded (AIR-7, AIR-8) (See Final SEIR p. 2.3-21 through 2.3-32; p. 4-29 through 4-30 and 4-59 through 4-60).

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final SEIR. Effects remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures:

CAP Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1: During the environmental review process for future discretionary permits for projects implemented under the CAP, the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Air Quality shall be applied. When impacts are determined to be significant, feasible and appropriate project-specific mitigation measures shall be incorporated. Examples of standard mitigation measures within the County Guidelines include: dust control efforts; grading or fuel use restrictions; use of modified equipment; and restrictions on vehicle idling time (Final SEIR p. 2.3-59 through 61).

Facts in Supporting Findings: The policies applicable to air quality that were adopted as part of the 2011 GPU and are applicable to the project include Policy COS-14.1, COS-14.2, COS-14.8, COS-14.9, COS-14.10, COS-15.1, COS-15.3, COS-15.4, COS-15.5, COS-15.6, COS-16.2, COS-16.3, COS-20.3, and LU-2.8 (Final SEIR p. 2.3-4 to 2.3-5). The mitigation measures applicable to air quality that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include Air-12.1, Air-2.2, Air-2.3, Air-2.4, Air-2.5, Air-2.6, Air-2.7, Air-2.8, Air-2.9, Air-2.10, Air-2.11, Air-2.12, Air-2.13, and Air-4.1 (Final SEIR p.2.3-4 to 2.3-5).

Even with implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures and CAP Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1, because the specific sizes and locations of facilities and projects implemented under GHG Reduction Measures T-2.1, T-4.1, E-2., and SW-1.1 have not yet been identified and it is unknown how many projects would be required to meet the GHG reduction goals of the CAP, it is not possible to guarantee that air quality violations would not occur. No other feasible mitigation beyond existing federal and state permitting requirements is available. For the reasons stated in Section 2.2.5 and 4.3 of the Final SEIR, the direct and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Final SEIR Section 2.3 and 4.3; air quality related response to comments in Chapter 8 of the Final SEIR, and all other air quality related evidence in the administrative record.

- 9. Significant Effect: Non-attainment of Criteria Pollutants:** Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure T-2.1 and Supporting Measures that would result in the development of bicycle, pedestrian, and park-and-ride infrastructure improvements would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts to criteria air pollutants because construction emissions may lead to short-term air emissions such that standards are exceeded (AIR-9, AIR-10). Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure T-4.1 which would result in the development of local direct investment projects would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts to criteria air pollutants because construction emissions may lead to short-term air emissions such that standards are exceeded (AIR-11, AIR-12). Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1 which would result in the development of large-scale renewable energy projects would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts related to criteria air pollutants because construction emissions may lead to short-term air emissions such that standards are exceeded (AIR-13, AIR-14). Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure SW-1.1 which would result in the development of new or expanded waste facilities would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts related to criteria air pollutants because construction emissions may lead to short-term air emissions such that standards are exceeded (AIR-15, AIR-16) (See Final SEIR p. 2.3-32 through 2.3-42; p. 4-30 through 4-31 and 4-60).

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final SEIR. Effects remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures:

CAP Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1 See description above (Final SEIR p. 2.3-59 through 61).

CAP Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2: Coordinate with SDAPCD in implementing pending Rule 67.25 to reduce emissions and odors from composting operations. The rule is expected to establish best management practices for chipping and grinding of green waste to produce materials for composting or other uses, and to better manage stockpile operations to reduce emissions (Final SEIR p. 2.3-61 through 62).

Facts in Supporting Findings: The policies applicable to air quality that were adopted as part of the 2011 GPU and are applicable to the project include Policy COS-14.1, COS-14.2, COS-14.8, COS-14.9, COS-14.10, COS-15.1, COS-15.3, COS-15.4, COS-15.5, COS-15.6, COS-16.2, COS-16.3, COS-20.3, and LU-2.8 (Final SEIR p. 2.3-4 to 2.3-5). The mitigation measures applicable to air quality that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include Air-12.1, Air-2.2, Air-2.3, Air-2.4, Air-2.5, Air-2.6, Air-2.7, Air-2.8, Air-2.9, Air-2.10, Air-2.11, Air-2.12, Air-2.13, and Air-4.1 (Final SEIR p. 2.3-6 to 2.3-7).

Even with implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures and CAP Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1 and M-AQ-2, because the specific sizes and locations of facilities and projects implemented under GHG Reduction Measures T-2.1, T-4.1, E-2.1, and SW-1.1 has not yet been identified and it is unknown how many projects would be required to meet the GHG reduction goals of the CAP, it is not possible to guarantee that significant non-attainment criteria air pollutant emissions would not occur. No other feasible mitigation beyond existing federal and state permitting requirements is available. For the reasons stated in Section 2.2.5 and 4.3 of the Final SEIR, the direct and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Final SEIR Section 2.3 and 4.3; air quality related response to comments in Chapter 8 of the Final SEIR, and all other air quality related evidence in the administrative record.

- 10. Significant Effect: Sensitive Receptors:** Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure T-2.1 and Supporting Measures that would result in the development of bicycle, pedestrian, and park-and-ride infrastructure improvements would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts to sensitive receptors because construction emissions may lead to short-term air emissions such that standards are exceeded (AIR-17, AIR-18). Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure T-4.1 which would result in the development of local direct investment projects would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts to sensitive receptors because construction emissions may lead to short-term air emissions such that standards are exceeded (AIR-19, AIR-20). Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1 which would result in the development of large-scale renewable energy projects would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts related to sensitive receptors because construction emissions may lead to short-term air emissions such that standards are exceeded (AIR-21, AIR-22). Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure SW-1.1 which would result in the development of new or expanded waste facilities would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts related to sensitive receptors because construction emissions may lead to short-term air emissions such that standards are exceeded (AIR-23, AIR-24) (See Final SEIR p. 2.3-42 through 2.3-52; p. 4-31 and 4-60 through 4-61).

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final SEIR. Effects remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures: No feasible mitigation beyond existing federal and state permitting requirements and compliance with the County's adopted 2011 GPU policies or 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures is available and could be applied to individual actions under the project.

Facts in Supporting Findings: The policies applicable to air quality that were adopted as part of the 2011 GPU and are applicable to the project include Policy COS-14.1, COS-14.2, COS-14.8, COS-14.9, COS-14.10, COS-15.1, COS-15.3, COS-15.4, COS-15.5, COS-15.6, COS-16.2, COS-16.3, COS-20.3, and LU-2.8 (Final SEIR p. 2.3-4 to 2.1-5). The mitigation measures applicable to air quality that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include Air-12.1, Air-2.2, Air-2.3, Air-2.4, Air-2.5, Air-2.6, Air-2.7, Air-2.8, Air-2.9, Air-2.10, Air-2.11, Air-2.12, Air-2.13, and Air-4.1 (Final SEIR p. 2.3-6 to 2.3-7).

Even with implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures, because the specific sizes and locations of facilities and projects implemented under GHG Reduction Measures T-2.1, T-4.1, E-2.1, and SW-1.1 have not yet been identified and it is unknown how many projects would be required to meet the GHG reduction goals of the CAP, it is not possible to guarantee that significant sensitive receptor impacts would not occur. No other feasible mitigation beyond existing federal and state permitting requirements is available. For the reasons stated in Section 2.2.5 and 4.3 of the Final SEIR, the direct and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Final SEIR Section 2.3 and 4.3; air quality related response to comments in Chapter 8 of the Final SEIR, and all other air quality related evidence in the administrative record.

- 11. Significant Effect: Odors:** Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure T-4.1 which would result in the development of local direct investment projects would potentially result in direct and cumulative odor impacts because the types of projects that could be considered may include heavy construction equipment and project locations are unknown (AIR-25, AIR-26). Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure SW-1.1 which would result in the development of new or expanded waste facilities would potentially result in direct and cumulative odor impacts from construction and operations of waste facilities (AIR-27, AIR-28) (See Final SEIR p. 2.3-52 through 2.3-59; p. 4-31 and 4-32 and 4-61 through 4-62).

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final SEIR. Effects remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures:

CAP Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1: See description above (Final SEIR p. 2.3-59 through 61).

CAP Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2: See description above (Final SEIR p. 2.3-61 through 62).

CAP Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3: The County shall use the policies set forth in the CARB's Land Use and Air Quality Handbook as a guideline for siting new sources of odor related to solid waste (Final SEIR p. 2.3-63).

CAP Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4: Require project applicants to conduct an odor impact analysis and incorporate control measures including but not limited to rapid incorporation of food waste and biweekly turnover to maintain aerobic conditions for open systems, and wet or dry scrubbers or bioscrubber systems on enclosed structures to reduce impacts (Final SEIR p. 2.3-63).

Facts in Supporting Findings: The policies applicable to air quality that were adopted as part of the 2011 GPU and are applicable to the project include Policy COS-14.1, COS-14.2, COS-14.8, COS-14.9, COS-14.10, COS-15.1, COS-15.3, COS-15.4, COS-15.5, COS-15.6, COS-16.2, COS-16.3, COS-20.3, and LU-2.8 (Final SEIR p. 2.3-4 to 2.1-5). The mitigation measures applicable to air quality that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include Air-12.1, Air-2.2, Air-2.3, Air-2.4, Air-2.5, Air-2.6, Air-2.7, Air-2.8, Air-2.9, Air-2.10, Air-2.11, Air-2.12, Air-2.13, and Air-4.1 (Final SEIR p. 2.1-6 – 2.1-7).

Even with implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures and CAP Mitigation Measures M-AQ-1, M-AQ-2, M-AQ-3 and M-AQ-4, because the specific sizes and locations of facilities and projects implemented under GHG Reduction Measures T-4.1 and SW-1.1 have not yet been identified and it is unknown how many projects would be required to meet the GHG reduction goals of the CAP, it is not possible to guarantee that significant odor impacts would not occur. No other feasible mitigation beyond existing federal and state permitting requirements is available. For the reasons stated in Section 2.2.5 and 4.3 of the Final SEIR, the direct and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Final SEIR Section 2.3 and 4.3; air quality related response to comments in Chapter 8 of the Final SEIR, and all other air quality related evidence in the administrative record.

D. Biological Resources

12. Significant Effect: Special-Status Species: Implementation of GHG Reduction Measures T-2.1, SW-1.1, A-1.2 and their Supporting Efforts, could result in new or expanded park-and-ride facilities, new or expanded pedestrian and bicycle improvements, new or expanded solid waste facilities, and improvements related to agricultural equipment and could result in cumulative impacts to special-status species because projects could contribute to the disturbance or loss of special status species or their habitats (BIO-1). Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure T-4.1 which would result in the development of local direct investment projects would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts to special-status species because the construction of projects could disturb special status species or their habitats (BIO-2, BIO-3). Implementation of GHG Reduction Measures E-1.1, E-2.1, E-2.2, E-2.3, E-2.4, and Supporting Efforts could result in energy efficiency retrofits on existing residential, new non-residential structures, and County facilities including rooftop or ground-mounted photovoltaic solar arrays or small wind turbines, modern mechanical systems, and other similar improvements. These measures could result in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts to special-status species or their habitats because of the construction and operation of small-scale renewable energy projects (BIO-4, BIO-5). Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1 which would result in the development of large-scale renewable energy projects would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts related to special-status species because of the construction and operation of large-scale renewable energy projects (BIO-6, BIO-7) (See Final SEIR p. 2.4-10 through 2.3-20; p. 4-32 through 4-33 and 4-62 through 4-63).

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final SEIR. Effects remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures:

CAP Mitigation Measure M-BIO-1: During the environmental review process for future MUPs for large-scale renewable energy projects, the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biological Resources shall be applied. When impacts to biological resources are determined to be significant, feasible and appropriate project-specific mitigation measures shall be incorporated. Examples of standard mitigation measures within the County Guidelines include: avoidance of sensitive resources; preservation of habitat; revegetation; resource management; and restrictions on lighting, runoff, access, and/or noise (Final SEIR 2.4-39 through 2.4-41).

CAP Mitigation Measure M-BIO-2: Update the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biological Resources to include, or incorporate by reference, recommendations from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Avian Power Line Interaction Committee, the USFWS Draft Guidance, and the California Energy Commission (e.g., California Guidelines for Reducing Impacts to Birds and Bats from Wind Energy Development). Examples of recommended mitigation measures include: site screening; pre-permitting monitoring; acoustic monitoring; buffer zone inclusion; reduction of foraging resources near turbines and transmission lines; specific lighting to reduce bird collisions; post-construction monitoring; and avian protection plans (Final SEIR 2.4-39 through 2.4-41).

Facts in Supporting Findings: The policies applicable to biological resources that were adopted as part of the 2011 GPU and are applicable to the project include Policy COS-1.1,

COS-1.2, COS-1.3, COS-1.6, COS-1.7, COS-1.8, COS-1.9, COS-2.1, COS-2.2, COS-3.1, COS-3.2, LU-6.1, LU-6.2, LU-6.3, LU-6.6, LU-6.7, and LU-10.2 (Final SEIR p. 2.4-3 to 2.4-5). The mitigation measures applicable to biological resources that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include Bio-1.2, Bio-1.3, Bio-1.4, Bio-1.5, Bio-1.6, Bio-1.7, Bio-2.1, Bio-2.2, Bio-2.3, and Bio-2.4 (Final SEIR p. 2.4-5 to 2.4-6).

Even with implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures and CAP Mitigation Measure M-BIO-1 and M-BIO-2, because the specific sizes and locations of facilities and projects implemented under GHG Reduction Measures A-2.1, T-2.1, T-4.1, E-1.1, E-1.2, E-2.1, E-2.2, E-2.3, E-2.4, and SW-1.1 and supporting efforts has not yet been identified and it is unknown how many projects would be required to meet the GHG reduction goals of the CAP, it is not possible to guarantee that significant special-status species impacts would not occur. No other feasible mitigation beyond existing federal and state permitting requirements is available. For the reasons stated in Section 2.4.5 and 4.3 of the Final SEIR, the direct and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Final SEIR Section 2.4 and 4.; biological resources related response to comments in Chapter 8 of the Final SEIR, and all other biological resources related evidence in the administrative record.

- 13. Significant Effect: Riparian Habitat or Sensitive Natural Community:** Implementation of GHG Reduction Measures T-2.1, SW-1.1, A-1.2 and their Supporting Efforts, could result in new or expanded park-and-ride facilities, new or expanded pedestrian and bicycle improvements, new or expanded solid waste facilities, and improvements related to agricultural equipment and could result in cumulative impacts to riparian habitat because projects could contribute to the disturbance or loss of riparian habitats (BIO-8). Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure T-4.1 which would result in the development of local direct investment projects would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts to riparian habitat because the construction of projects could disturb riparian habitat (BIO-9, BIO-10). Implementation of GHG Reduction Measures E-1.1, E-2.1, E-2.2, E-2.3, E-2.4, and Supporting Efforts could result in energy efficiency retrofits on existing residential, new non-residential structures, and County facilities including rooftop or ground-mounted photovoltaic solar arrays or small wind turbines, modern mechanical systems, and other similar improvements. These measures could result in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts to riparian habitat because of the construction of small-scale renewable energy projects (BIO-11, BIO-12). Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1 which would result in the development of large-scale renewable energy projects would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts related to riparian habitat because of the construction of large-scale renewable energy projects (BIO-13, BIO-14) (Final SEIR p. 2.4-20 through 2.4-28; p. 4-33 through 4-34 and 4-63 to 4-64).

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final SEIR. Effects remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures:

CAP Mitigation Measure M-BIO-1: See description above (Final SEIR 2.4-39 through 2.4-41).

CAP Mitigation Measure M-BIO-2: See description above (Final SEIR 2.4-39 through 2.4-41).

Facts in Supporting Findings: The policies applicable to biological resources that were adopted as part of the 2011 GPU and are applicable to the project include Policy COS-1.1, COS-1.2, COS-1.3, COS-1.6, COS-1.7, COS-1.8, COS-1.9, COS-2.1, COS-2.2, COS-3.1, COS-3.2, LU-6.1, LU-6.2, LU-6.3, LU-6.6, LU-6.7, and LU-10.2 (Final SEIR p. 2.4-3 to 2.4-5). The mitigation measures applicable to biological resources that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include Bio-1.2, Bio-1.3, Bio-1.4, Bio-1.5, Bio-1.6, Bio-1.7, Bio-2.1, Bio-2.2, Bio-2.3, and Bio-2.4 (Final SEIR p. 2.4-5 to 2.4-6).

Even with implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures and CAP Mitigation Measure M-BIO-1 and M-BIO-2, because the specific sizes and locations of facilities and projects implemented under GHG Reduction Measures A-2.1, T-2.1, T-4.1, E-1.1, E-1.2, E-2.1, E-2.2, E-2.3, E-2.4, and SW-1.1 and supporting efforts has not yet been identified and it is unknown how many projects would be required to meet the GHG reduction goals of the CAP, it is not possible to guarantee that significant riparian or sensitive natural community impacts would not occur. No other feasible mitigation beyond existing federal and state permitting requirements is available. For the reasons stated in Section 2.4.5 and 4.3 of the Final SEIR, the direct and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Final SEIR Section 2.4 and 4.3; biological resources related response to comments in Chapter 8 of the Final SEIR, and all other biological resources related evidence in the administrative record.

- 14. Significant Effect: Wildlife Movement Corridors and Nursery Sites:** Implementation of GHG Reduction Measures T-2.1, SW-1.1, A-1.2 and their Supporting Efforts, could result in new or expanded park-and-ride facilities, new or expanded pedestrian and bicycle improvements, new or expanded solid waste facilities, and improvements related to agricultural equipment and could result in direct and cumulative impacts to wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites because projects could occur outside of regional conservation plan areas (BIO-15, BIO-16). Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure T-4.1 which would result in the development of local direct investment projects would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts to wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites because the construction of projects could disturb corridors and nurseries where regional conservation plans are not in place (BIO-17, BIO-18). Implementation of GHG Reduction Measures E-1.1, E-2.1, E-2.2, E-2.3, E-2.4, and Supporting Efforts could result in energy efficiency retrofits on existing residential, new non-residential structures, and County facilities including rooftop or ground-mounted photovoltaic solar arrays or small wind turbines, modern mechanical systems, and large-scale renewable energy projects. These measures could result in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts to wildlife movement corridors and nurseries because of the ability to develop outside of regional conservation plans (BIO-19, BIO-20) (Final SEIR p. 2.4-31 through 2.4-37; p. 4-35 through 4-36 and 4-64 to 4-65).

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final SEIR. Effects remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures:

CAP Mitigation Measure M-BIO-1: See description above (Final SEIR 2.4-39 through 2.4-41).

CAP Mitigation Measure M-BIO-2: See description above (Final SEIR 2.4-39 through 2.4-41).

Facts in Supporting Findings: The policies applicable to biological resources that were adopted as part of the 2011 GPU and are applicable to the project include Policy COS-1.1, COS-1.2, COS-1.3, COS-1.6, COS-1.7, COS-1.8, COS-1.9, COS-2.1, COS-2.2, COS-3.1, COS-3.2, LU-6.1, LU-6.2, LU-6.3, LU-6.6, LU-6.7, and LU-10.2 (Final SEIR p. 2.4-3 to 2.4-5). The mitigation measures applicable to biological resources that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include Bio-1.2, Bio-1.3, Bio-1.4, Bio-1.5, Bio-1.6, Bio-1.7, Bio-2.1, Bio-2.2, Bio-2.3, and Bio-2.4 (Final SEIR p. 2.4-5 – 2.4-6).

Even with implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures and CAP Mitigation Measure M-BIO-1 and M-BIO-2, because the specific sizes and locations of facilities and projects implemented under GHG Reduction Measures A-2.1, T-2.1, T-4.1, E-1.1, E-1.2, E-2.1, E-2.2, E-2.3, E-2.4, and SW-1.1 and supporting efforts has not yet been identified, they could occur outside regional conservation plan areas, and it is unknown how many projects would be required to meet the GHG reduction goals of the CAP, it is not possible to guarantee that significant wildlife movement corridors and nursery site impacts would not occur. No other feasible mitigation beyond existing federal and state permitting requirements is available. For the reasons stated in Section 2.4.5 and 4.3 of the Final SEIR, the direct and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Final SEIR Section 2.4 and 4.3; biological resources related response to comments in Chapter 8 of the Final SEIR, and all other biological resources related evidence in the administrative record.

E. Cultural and Historical Resources

15. Significant Effect: Historical Resources: Implementation of GHG Reduction Measures T-2.1, T-4.1, E-1.1, E-2.1, E-2.2, E-2.3, SW-1.1 and Supporting Efforts that would result in bicycle, pedestrian and park-and-ride facilities, direct investment projects, energy efficiency improvements and the introduction of small-scale solar photovoltaic and small wind turbines, or large-scale renewable energy projects, and solid waste facilities could result in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts related to historical resources because of the possibility of implementing retrofits on historic structures, disturbing historic structures, or changing the setting within which an historic structure is located (CULT-1, CULT-2) (Final SEIR p. 2.5-9 through 2.5-13; p. 4-35 through 4-36 and 4-65 to 4-66).

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final SEIR. Effects remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures:

CAP Mitigation Measure M-CUL-1: For all small-scale wind turbine projects, the County shall provide incentives through the Mills Act to encourage the restoration, renovation, or adaptive reuse of historic resources. This will be done by reaching out to property owners with identified historic resources to participate (Final SEIR p. 2.5-31 through 2.5-32).

Facts in Supporting Findings: The policies applicable to cultural and historic resources that were adopted as part of the 2011 GPU and are applicable to the project include Policy COS-7.1, COS-7.2, COS-7.3, COS-7.4, COS-7.5, COS-7.6, COS-8.1, COS-8.2, COS-9.1, and COS-9.2 (Final SEIR p. 2.5-2 to 2.5-3). The mitigation measures applicable to cultural and historic resources that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include Cul-1.1, Cul-1.2, Cul-1.3, Cul-1.4, Cul-1.5, Cul-1.6, Cul-1.7, Cul-1.8, Cul-

2.1, Cul-2.2, Cul-2.3, Cul-2.4, Cul-2.5, Cul-2.6, Cul-3.1, Cul-3.2, and Cul-4.1 (Final SEIR p. 2.5-4 to 2.5-5).

Even with implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures and CAP Mitigation Measure M-CUL-1, because the specific sizes and locations of facilities and projects implemented under GHG Reduction Measures T-2.1, T-4.1, E-1.1, E-2.1, E-2.2, E-2.3, and SW-1.1 and supporting efforts has not yet been identified, they could be located on or near historic structures, could occur without discretionary review, and because it is unknown how many projects would be required to meet the GHG reduction goals of the CAP, it is not possible to guarantee that significant historic resources impacts would not occur. No other feasible mitigation beyond existing federal and state permitting requirements is available. For the reasons stated in Section 2.5.5 and 4.3 of the Final SEIR, the direct and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Final SEIR Section 2.5 and 4.3; cultural and historical resources related response to comments in Chapter 8 of the Final SEIR, and all other cultural and historical resources related evidence in the administrative record.

- 16. Significant Effect: Archaeological Resources:** Implementation of GHG Reduction Measures E-1.1, E-2.1, E-2.2, and E-2.4 which would result in the development of new small-scale wind turbines could potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts related to archaeological resources because they are permitted as an accessory use (if zoning criteria met) and could result in impacts because of ground disturbance (CULT-3, CULT-4) (Final SEIR p. 2.5-13 through 2.5-20; p. 4-36 and 4-67).

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final SEIR. Effects remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures: No feasible mitigation is available because of the lack of discretionary review and ability to mitigate as a condition of a permit.

Facts in Supporting Findings: The policies applicable to cultural and historical resources that were adopted as part of the 2011 GPU and are applicable to the project include Policy COS-7.1, COS-7.2, COS-7.3, COS-7.4, COS-7.5, COS-7.6, COS-8.1, COS-8.2, COS-9.1, and COS-9.2 (Final SEIR p. 2.5-2 to 2.5-3). The mitigation measures applicable to cultural and historical resources that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include Cul-1.1, Cul-1.2, Cul-1.3, Cul-1.4, Cul-1.5, Cul-1.6, Cul-1.7, Cul-1.8, Cul-2.1, Cul-2.2, Cul-2.3, Cul-2.4, Cul-2.5, Cul-2.6, Cul-3.1, Cul-3.2, and Cul-4.1 (Final SEIR p.2.5-4 to 2.5-6).

Even with implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures, because the specific sizes and locations of facilities and projects implemented under GHG Reduction Measures E-1.1, E-2.1, E-2.2, and E-2.4 and supporting efforts has not yet been identified, small-scale wind turbines could be approved without discretionary review and could have the potential to result in significant archaeological impacts that would not be mitigated by County mitigation policies. No other feasible mitigation is available. For the reasons stated in Section 2.5.5 and 4.3 of the Final SEIR, the direct and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Final SEIR Section 2.5 and 4.3; cultural and historical resources related response to comments in Chapter 8 of the Final SEIR, and all other cultural and historical resources related evidence in the administrative record.

- 17. Significant Effect: Paleontological Resources:** Implementation of GHG Reduction Measures E-1.1, E-2.1, E-2.2, and E-2.4 which would result in the development of new small-scale wind turbines could potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts related to paleontological resources because they are permitted as an accessory use (if zoning criteria met) and could result in impacts because of ground disturbance (CULT-5, CULT-6) (Final SEIR p. 2.5-20 through 2.5-25; p. 4-36 through 4-37 and 4-67 to 4-68).

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final SEIR. Effects remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures: No feasible mitigation available because of the lack of discretionary review and ability to mitigate as a condition of a permit.

Facts in Supporting Findings: The policies applicable to cultural and historic resources that were adopted as part of the 2011 GPU and are applicable to the project include Policy COS-7.1, COS-7.2, COS-7.3, COS-7.4, COS-7.5, COS-7.6, COS-8.1, COS-8.2, COS-9.1, and COS-9.2 (Final SEIR p. 2.5-2 to 2.5-3). The mitigation measures applicable to cultural and historic resources that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include Cul-1.1, Cul-1.2, Cul-1.3, Cul-1.4, Cul-1.5, Cul-1.6, Cul-1.7, Cul-1.8, Cul-2.1, Cul-2.2, Cul-2.3, Cul-2.4, Cul-2.5, Cul-2.6, Cul-3.1, Cul-3.2, and Cul-4.1 (Final SEIR p. 2.5-4 to 2.5-5).

Even with implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures, because the specific sizes and locations of facilities and projects implemented under GHG Reduction Measures E-1.1, E-2.1, E-2.2, and E-2.4 and supporting efforts has not yet been identified, small-scale wind turbines could be approved without discretionary review and could have the potential to result in significant paleontological impacts that would not be mitigated by County mitigation policies. No other feasible mitigation is available. For the reasons stated in Section 2.5.5 and 4.3 of the Final SEIR, the direct and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Final SEIR Section 2.5 and 4.3; cultural and historical resources related response to comments in Chapter 8 of the Final SEIR, and all other cultural and historical resources related evidence in the administrative record.

- 18. Significant Effect: Human Remains:** Implementation of GHG Reduction Measures E-1.1, E-2.1, E-2.2, and E-2.4 which would result in the development of new small-scale wind turbines could potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts related to human remains because they are permitted as an accessory use (if zoning criteria met) and could result in impacts because of ground disturbance (CULT-7, CULT-8). (Final SEIR p. 2.5-26 through 2.5-31; p. 4-37 and 4-68 to 4-69).

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final SEIR. Effects remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures: No feasible mitigation available because of the lack of discretionary review and ability to mitigate as a condition of a permit.

Facts in Supporting Findings: The policies applicable to cultural and historic resources that were adopted as part of the 2011 GPU and are applicable to the project include Policy COS-7.1, COS-7.2, COS-7.3, COS-7.4, COS-7.5, COS-7.6, COS-8.1, COS-8.2, COS-9.1, and COS-9.2 (Final SEIR p. 2.5-2 to 2.5-3). The mitigation measures applicable to cultural and historic resources that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include Cul-1.1, Cul-1.2, Cul-1.3, Cul-1.4, Cul-1.5, Cul-1.6, Cul-1.7, Cul-1.8, Cul-2.1, Cul-2.2, Cul-2.3, Cul-2.4, Cul-2.5, Cul-2.6, Cul-3.1, Cul-3.2, and Cul-4.1 (Final SEIR p. 2.5-4 to 2.5-5).

Even with implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures, because the specific sizes and locations of facilities and projects implemented under GHG Reduction Measures E-1.1, E-2.1, E-2.2, and E-2.4 and supporting efforts has not yet been identified, small-scale wind turbines could be approved without discretionary review and could have the potential to result in significant human remains impacts that would not be mitigated by County mitigation policies. No other feasible mitigation is available. For the reasons stated in Section 2.5.5 and 4.3 of the Final SEIR, the direct and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Final SEIR Section 2.5 and 4.3; cultural and historical resources related response to comments in Chapter 8 of the Final SEIR, and all other cultural and historical resources related evidence in the administrative record.

F. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- 19. Significant Effect: GHG Emissions:** Implementation of the CAP would reduce emissions by 2020 and 2030, consistent with legislatively-adopted State targets and would, therefore, not result in a significant impact. However, considering the need for future implementation actions to achieve the emissions reductions necessary to achieve the 2050 goal, the impacts from the CAP are conservatively considered to be significant and unavoidable (GHG-1).

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final SEIR. Effects remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures: No feasible mitigation is available.

Facts in Supporting Findings: The policies applicable to GHG emissions that were adopted as part of the 2011 GPU and are applicable to the project include Policy COS-10.7, COS-15.1, COS-15.2, COS-15.3, COS-17.1, COS-17.5, COS-18.2, COS-20.1, COS-20.2, and COS-20.4 (Final SEIR p. 2.7-10 to 2.7-11). The mitigation measures applicable to GHG emissions that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include CC-1.1, CC-1.2, CC-1.3, CC-1.4, CC-1.5, CC-1.6, CC-1.7, CC-1.8, CC-1.9, CC-1.10, CC-1.11, CC-1.12, CC-1.13, CC-1.14, CC-1.15, CC-1.16, CC-1.17, CC-1.19, and CC-1.19 (Final SEIR p. 2.7-11 to 2.7-15).

Even with implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures and CAP Mitigation Measure M-GHG-1, GHG Reduction Measures and supporting efforts would not achieve the long-term 2050 goal for GHG emissions reductions and it would be speculative to demonstrate achievement of the goal with the information and science available

today. No other feasible mitigation is available. For the reasons stated in Section 2.7.5 and 4.3 of the Final SEIR, the direct and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. (Final SEIR p. 2.7-36 to 2.7-40; p. 4-38 through 4-39 and 4-68 and 4-69).

Reference: Final SEIR Section 2.7 and 4.3; GHG-related response to comments in Chapter 8 of the Final SEIR, and all other GHG-related evidence in the administrative record.

G. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

20. Significant Effect: Wildland Fires: Implementation of GHG Reduction Measures E-1.1, E-2.1, E-2.2, E-2.3, and E-2.4 which would result in the development of new small-scale wind turbines could potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts related to wildland fires because of construction and operational components which include mechanical equipment and electrical components adjacent to vegetation (HAZ-1, HAZ-2). Implementation of GHG Reduction Measures E-2.1 which would result in the development of new large-scale renewable energy projects could potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts related to wildland fires because of construction and operational components which include mechanical equipment and electrical components adjacent to vegetation (HAZ-3, HAZ-4) (Final SEIR 2.8-24 through 2.8-31; p. 4-40 through 4-41 and 4-69).

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final SEIR. Effects remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures:

CAP Mitigation Measure M-HAZ-1: During the environmental review process for future discretionary permits for all renewable energy projects, the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Wildland Fire & Fire Protection shall be applied. When impacts are determined to be significant, feasible and appropriate project-specific mitigation measures shall be incorporated. Examples of standard mitigation measures within the County Guidelines include: installation of fire suppression systems; sufficient on-site water storage; inclusion of fire management zones; and funded agreements with fire protection districts (Final SEIR 2.8-32 to 2.8-33).

Facts in Supporting Findings: The policies applicable to hazards and hazardous materials that were adopted as part of the 2011 GPU and are applicable to the project include Policy LU-6.11, S-1.3, S-3.1, S-3.2, S-3.3, S-3.4, S-3.6, S-4.1, S-15.1, S-15.2, S-15.3, M-1.2, M-3.3, M-7.1 (Final SEIR p. 2.8-3 to 2.8-4). The mitigation measures applicable to hazards and hazardous materials that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include Haz-1.2, Haz-1.3, Haz-1.4, Haz-1.5, Haz-2.1, Haz-3.1, Haz-3.2, Haz-3.3, Haz-4.1, Haz-4.2, Haz-4.3, and Haz-4.4 (Final SEIR p. 2.8-4 to 2.8-6).

Even with implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures and CAP Mitigation Measure M-HAZ-1, because the specific sizes and locations of facilities and projects implemented under GHG Reduction Measures E-1.1, E-2.1, E-2.2, E-2.3, and E-2.4 and supporting efforts has not yet been identified, they could occur adjacent to vegetation and areas susceptible to wildland fires, and it is unknown how many projects would be required to meet the GHG reduction goals of the CAP, it is not possible to guarantee that significant wildfire impacts would not occur. No other feasible mitigation is available. For the reasons stated in Section 2.8.5 and 4.3 of the Final SEIR, the direct and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Final SEIR Section 2.8 and 4.3; hazards and hazardous materials related response to comments in Chapter 8 of the Final SEIR, and all other hazards and hazardous materials related evidence in the administrative record.

H. Hydrology and Water Quality

- 21. Significant Effect: Water Quality Standards:** Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure T-4.1 which would result in the development of local direct investment projects would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts to water quality standards because of construction activities and the uncertainty about the types of projects that would be undertaken (HYD-1, HYD-2) (Final SEIR p. 2.9-16 to 2.9-18; p. 4-41 through 4-42 and 4-71 to 4-72).

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR. Effects remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures: No feasible mitigation available.

Facts in Supporting Findings: The policies applicable to hydrology and water quality that were adopted as part of the 2011 GPU and are applicable to the project include Policy LU-6.5, LU-6.9, LU-6.10, LU-6.12, LU-8.1, LU-8.2, LU-13.1, LU-13.2, LU-14.1, LU-14.2, LU-14.3, LU-14.4, COS-4.1, COS-4.2, COS-4.3, COS-4.4, COS-5.1, COS-5.2, COS-5.3, COS-5.5, S-8.1, S-8.2, S-9.1, S-9.2, S-9.3, S-9.4, S-9.5, S-9.6, S-10.1, S-10.2, S-10.3, S-10.4, S-10.5, and S-10.6 (Final SEIR p. 2.9-2 to 2.9-6). The mitigation measures applicable to hydrology and water quality that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include Hyd-1.1, Hyd-1.2, Hyd-1.3, Hyd-1.4, Hyd-1.5, Hyd-1.6, Hyd-1.7, Hyd-1.8, Hyd-1.9, Hyd-1.10, Hyd-2.1, Hyd-2.2, Hyd-2.3, Hyd-2.4, Hyd-2.5, Hyd-3.1, Hyd-3.2, Hyd-3.3, Hyd-4.1, Hyd-4.2, Hyd-4.3, Hyd-6.1, Hyd-8., and Hyd-8.2 (Final SEIR p. 2.9-6 to 2.1-9).

Even with implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures, because the specific sizes and locations of facilities and projects implemented under GHG Reduction Measure T-4.1 and supporting efforts has not yet been identified, it is not possible to guarantee that significant water quality impacts would not occur. No other feasible mitigation is available. For the reasons stated in Section 2.9.5 and 4.3 of the Final SEIR, the direct and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Final SEIR Section 2.9 and 4.3; hydrology and water quality related response to comments in Chapter 8 of the Final SEIR, and all other hydrology and water quality related evidence in the administrative record.

- 22. Significant Effect: Groundwater Supplies:** Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1 which would result in the development of large-scale renewable energy projects would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts to groundwater resources because of the potential need for additional groundwater resources (HYD-3, HYD-4). Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure T-4.1 which would result in the development of local direct investment projects would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts to groundwater resources because of construction and operational activities and the uncertainty about the types of projects that would be undertaken (HYD-5, HYD-6) (Final SEIR p. 2.9-18 to 2.9-24; p. 4-42 and 4-72).

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR. Effects remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures: No feasible mitigation is available.

Facts in Supporting Findings: The policies applicable to hydrology and water quality that were adopted as part of the 2011 GPU and are applicable to the project include Policy LU-6.5, LU-6.9, LU-6.10, LU-6.12, LU-8.1, LU-8.2, LU-13.1, LU-13.2, LU-14.1, LU-14.2, LU-14.3, LU-14.4, COS-4.1, COS-4.2, COS-4.3, COS-4.4, COS-5.1, COS-5.2, COS-5.3, COS-5.5, S-8.1, S-8.2, S-9.1, S-9.2, S-9.3, S-9.4, S-9.5, S-9.6, S-10.1, S-10.2, S-10.3, S-10.4, S-10.5, and S-10.6 (Final SEIR p. 2.9-2 to 2.9-6). The mitigation measures applicable to hydrology and water quality that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include Hyd-1.1, Hyd-1.2, Hyd-1.3, Hyd-1.4, Hyd-1.5, Hyd-1.6, Hyd-1.7, Hyd-1.8, Hyd-1.9, Hyd-1.10, Hyd-2.1, Hyd-2.2, Hyd-2.3, Hyd-2.4, Hyd-2.5, Hyd-3.1, Hyd-3.2, Hyd-3.3, Hyd-4.1, Hyd-4.2, Hyd-4.3, Hyd-6.1, Hyd-8., and Hyd-8.2 (Final SEIR p. 2.9-6 to 2.1-9).

Even with implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures, because the specific sizes and locations of facilities and projects implemented under GHG Reduction Measures E-2.1 and T-4.1 and supporting efforts has not yet been identified, it is not possible to guarantee that significant groundwater impacts would not occur because of the nature of the projects and the potential demand for large amounts of water. No other feasible mitigation is available. For the reasons stated in Section 2.9.5 and 4.3 of the Final SEIR, the direct and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Final SEIR Section 2.9 and 4.3; hydrology and water quality related response to comments in Chapter 8 of the Final SEIR, and all other hydrology and water quality related evidence in the administrative record.

- 23. Significant Effect: Alter Drainage Pattern of a Site Resulting in Erosion, Siltation, or Flooding:** Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure T-4.1 which would result in the development of local direct investment projects would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts to drainage patterns because of construction and operational activities and the uncertainty about the types of projects that would be undertaken (HYD-7, HYD-8) (Final SEIR p. 2.9-24 to 2.9-29; p. 4-42 through 4-43 and 4-72 to 4-73).

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR. Effects remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures: No feasible mitigation available.

Facts in Supporting Findings: The policies applicable to hydrology and water quality that were adopted as part of the 2011 GPU and are applicable to the project include Policy LU-6.5, LU-6.9, LU-6.10, LU-6.12, LU-8.1, LU-8.2, LU-13.1, LU-13.2, LU-14.1, LU-14.2, LU-14.3, LU-14.4, COS-4.1, COS-4.2, COS-4.3, COS-4.4, COS-5.1, COS-5.2, COS-5.3, COS-5.5, S-8.1, S-8.2, S-9.1, S-9.2, S-9.3, S-9.4, S-9.5, S-9.6, S-10.1, S-10.2, S-10.3, S-10.4, S-10.5, and S-10.6 (Final SEIR p. 2.9-2 to 2.9-6). The mitigation measures applicable to hydrology and water quality that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include Hyd-1.1, Hyd-1.2, Hyd-1.3, Hyd-1.4, Hyd-1.5, Hyd-1.6, Hyd-1.7, Hyd-1.8, Hyd-1.9, Hyd-1.10, Hyd-2.1, Hyd-2.2, Hyd-2.3, Hyd-2.4, Hyd-2.5, Hyd-3.1, Hyd-3.2, Hyd-3.3, Hyd-4.1, Hyd-4.2, Hyd-4.3, Hyd-6.1, Hyd-8., and Hyd-8.2 (Final SEIR p. 2.9-6 to 2.1-9).

Even with implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures, because the specific sizes and locations of facilities and projects implemented under GHG Reduction Measure T-4.1 and supporting efforts has not yet been identified, it is not possible to guarantee that significant drainage impacts would not occur because the design and siting characteristics of these project vary widely. No other feasible mitigation is available. For the reasons stated in Section 2.9.5 and 4.3 of the Final SEIR, the direct and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Final SEIR Section 2.9 and 4.3; hydrology and water quality related response to comments in Chapter 8 of the Final SEIR, and all other hydrology and water quality related evidence in the administrative record.

I. Land Use and Planning

24. Significant Effect: Physically Divide Established Community: Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1 which would result in the development of large-scale renewable energy projects would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts to physical division of communities because of the potential need for road improvements (LU-1, LU-2). Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure T-4.1 which would result in the development of local direct investment projects would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts to physical division of communities because of the uncertainty about the types of projects that would be undertaken and locations of projects (LU-3, LU-4) (Final SEIR p. 2.10-11 to 10-16; p. 4-43 through 4-44 and 4-73 to 4-74).

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR. Effects remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures: No feasible mitigation available.

Facts in Supporting Findings: The policies applicable to land use and planning that were adopted as part of the 2011 GPU and are applicable to the project include Policy LU-2.1, LU-9.3, LU-9/10, LU-11.2, LU-12.4, H-2.1 (Final SEIR p. 2.10-6). The mitigation measures applicable to land use and planning that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include Lan-1.1, Lan-1.2, Lan-1.3 (Final SEIR p. 2.10-6 to 2.10-7).

Even with implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures, because the specific sizes and locations of facilities and projects implemented under GHG Reduction Measures E-2.1 and T-4.1 and supporting efforts has not yet been identified, it is not possible to guarantee that community division impacts would not occur because projects could result in the construction of roads that divide existing communities. No other feasible mitigation is available. For the reasons stated in Section 2.10.5 and 4.3 of the Final SEIR, the direct and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Final SEIR Section 2.10 and 4.3; land use and planning related response to comments in Chapter 8 of the Final SEIR, and all other land use and planning related evidence in the administrative record.

J. Noise

- 25. Significant Effect: Excessive Noise Levels:** Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1 which would result in the development of large-scale renewable energy projects would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts to excessive noise levels because of possible low-frequency noise associated with large wind turbines (NOI-1, NOI-2). Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure T-4.1 which would result in the development of local direct investment projects would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts to excessive noise levels because of construction activities and the uncertainty about the types of projects that would be undertaken and locations of projects (NOI-3, NOI-4) (Final SEIR p. 2.11-9 to 2.11-17; p. 4-44 through 4-45 and 4-74 through 4-75).

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR. Effects remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures: No feasible mitigation available.

Facts in Supporting Findings: The policies applicable to noise that were adopted as part of the 2011 GPU and are applicable to the project include Policy LU-2.8, M-2.4, N-1.4, N-1.5, N-2.1, N-2.2, N-3.1, N-4.1, N-4.2, N-4.3, N-4.5, N-6.1, N-6.2, N-6.3, N-6.4, N-6.5, N-6.6, and S-15.1 (Final SEIR p. 2.11-2 to 2.11-3). The mitigation measures applicable to noise that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include Noi-1.1, Noi-1.2, Noi-1.3, Noi-1.4, Noi-1.5, Noi-1.7, Noi-1.8, Noi-1.9, Noi-2.1, Noi-2.2, Noi-2.4, Noi-3.1, Noi-3.2, Noi-4.1, Noi-4.2, Noi-5.1, Noi-5.2, and Noi-5.3 (Final SEIR p. 2.11-4 to 2.11-6).

Even with implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures, because the specific sizes and locations of facilities and projects implemented under GHG Reduction Measures E-2.1 and T-4.1 and supporting efforts has not yet been identified, and noise waivers could be granted, it is not possible to guarantee that noise impacts would not occur because it cannot be determined with certainty that impacts would be reduced below a level of significance. No other feasible mitigation is available. For the reasons stated in Section 2.11.5 and 4.3 of the Final SEIR, the direct and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Final SEIR Section 2.11 and 4.3; noise related response to comments in Chapter 8 of the Final SEIR, and all other noise related evidence in the administrative record.

- 26. Significant Effect: Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels:** Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1 which would result in the development of large-scale renewable energy projects would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts to permanent increase in ambient noise levels because of possible low-frequency noise associated with large wind turbines (NOI-5, NOI-6). Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure T-4.1 which would result in the development of local direct investment projects would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts to permanent increase in ambient noise levels because of construction activities and the uncertainty about the types of projects that would be undertaken and locations of projects (NOI-7, NOI-8) (Final SEIR p. 2.11-20 to 2.11-24; p. 4-45 and 4-75 to 4-76).

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR. Effects remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures: No feasible mitigation available.

Facts in Supporting Findings: The policies applicable to noise that were adopted as part of the 2011 GPU and are applicable to the project include Policy LU-2.8, M-2.4, N-1.4, N-1.5, N-2.1, N-2.2, N-3.1, N-4.1, N-4.2, N-4.3, N-4.5, N-6.1, N-6.2, N-6.3, N-6.4, N-6.5, N-6.6, and S-15.1 (Final SEIR p. 2.11-2 to 2.11-3). The mitigation measures applicable to noise that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include Noi-1.1, Noi-1.2, Noi-1.3, Noi-1.4, Noi-1.5, Noi-1.7, Noi-1.8, Noi-1.9, Noi-2.1, Noi-2.2, Noi-2.4, Noi-3.1, Noi-3.2, Noi-4.1, Noi-4.2, Noi-5.1, Noi-5.2, and Noi-5.3 (Final SEIR p.2.11-4 to 2.11-6).

Even with implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures, because the specific sizes and locations of facilities and projects implemented under GHG Reduction Measures E-2.1 and T-4.1 and supporting efforts has not yet been identified, and noise waivers could be granted, it is not possible to guarantee that noise impacts would not occur because it cannot be determined with certainty that impacts would be reduced below a level of significance. No other feasible mitigation is available. For the reasons stated in Section 2.11.5 and 4.3 of the Final SEIR, the direct and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Final SEIR Section 2.11 and 4.3; noise related response to comments in Chapter 8 of the Final SEIR, and all other noise related evidence in the administrative record.

27. Significant Effect: Temporary or Periodic Increase in Ambient Noise Levels:

Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1 which would result in the development of large-scale renewable energy projects would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts to periodic increase in ambient noise levels because of possible low-frequency noise associated with large wind turbines (NOI-9, NOI-10). Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure T-4.1 which would result in the development of local direct investment projects would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts to periodic increase in ambient noise levels because of construction activities and the uncertainty about the types of projects that would be undertaken and locations of projects (NOI-11, NOI-12) (Final SEIR p. 2.11-24 to 2.11-30; p. 4-45 through 4-46 and 4-76 to 4-77).

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR. Effects remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures: No feasible mitigation available.

Facts in Supporting Findings: The policies applicable to noise that were adopted as part of the 2011 GPU and are applicable to the project include Policy LU-2.8, M-2.4, N-1.4, N-1.5, N-2.1, N-2.2, N-3.1, N-4.1, N-4.2, N-4.3, N-4.5, N-6.1, N-6.2, N-6.3, N-6.4, N-6.5, N-6.6, and S-15.1 (Final SEIR p. 2.11-2 to 2.11-3). The mitigation measures applicable to noise that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include Noi-1.1, Noi-1.2, Noi-1.3, Noi-1.4, Noi-1.5, Noi-1.7, Noi-1.8, Noi-1.9, Noi-2.1, Noi-2.2, Noi-2.4, Noi-3.1, Noi-3.2, Noi-4.1, Noi-4.2, Noi-5.1, Noi-5.2, and Noi-5.3 (Final SEIR p. 2.11-4 to 2.11-6).

Even with implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures, because the specific sizes and locations of facilities and projects implemented under GHG Reduction Measures E-2.1 and T-4.1 and supporting efforts has not yet been identified, and noise waivers could be granted, it is not possible to guarantee that noise impacts would not occur because it cannot be determined with certainty that impacts would be reduced below a level of significance. No other feasible mitigation is available. For the reasons stated in Section

2.11.5 and 4.3 of the Final SEIR, the direct and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Final SEIR Section 2.11 and 4.3; noise related response to comments in Chapter 8 of the Final SEIR, and all other noise related evidence in the administrative record.

K. Transportation and Traffic

28. Significant Effect: LOS and Conflicts with Plans, Policies, or Ordinances:

Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1 which would result in the development of large-scale renewable energy projects would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts to LOS and conflicts with circulation management because of temporary construction activities (TRA-1, TRA-2) (Final SEIR p. 2.12-14 to 2.12-19; p. 4-46 through 4-47 and 4-77 to 4-78).

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR. Effects remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures:

CAP Mitigation Measure M-TRAF-1: During the environmental review process for future Major Use Permits for all large-scale renewable energy projects, the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Transportation and Traffic shall be applied. When traffic impacts are determined to be significant, feasible and appropriate project-specific mitigation measures shall be incorporated. Examples of standard mitigation measures within the County Guidelines include: traffic signal improvements; physical road improvements; street re-striping and parking prohibitions; fair share contributions toward identified, funded and scheduled projects; and transportation demand management programs (Final SEIR p. 2.12-27 to 2.12-28).

Facts in Supporting Findings: The policies applicable to transportation and traffic that were adopted as part of the 2011 GPU and are applicable to the project include Policy LU-2.8, LU-5.1, LU-5.4, LU-5.5, LU-6.9, LU-6.10, LU-9.8, LU-10.4, LU-11.6, 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-3.3, M-4.2, M-4.3, M-4.4, M-4.5, M-4.6, M-5.1, M-5.2, M-8.1, M-8.2, M-8.3, M-8.4, M-8.5, M-8.6, M-8.7, M-8.8, M-9.1, M-9.2, M-9.3, M-9.4, M-10.1, M-10.2, M-10.3, M-10.4, M-11.1, M-11.2, M-11.3, M-11.4, M-11.5, M-11.6, M-11.7, S-3.4, S-3.5, and S-14.1 (Final SEIR p. 2.12-3 to 2.12-9). The mitigation measures applicable to transportation and traffic that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include Tr-1.1, Tra-1.2, Tra-1.3, Tra-1.4, Tra-1.5, Tra-1.6, Tra-1.7, Tra-2.1, Tra-3.1, Tra-4.1, Tra-4.2, Tra-4.3, Tra-4.4, Tra-5.1, Tra-5.2, Tra-5.3, Tra-6.1, Tra-6.2, Tra-6.3, Tra-6.4, Tra-6.5, Tra-6.6, Tra-6.7, Tra-6.8, and Tra-6.9 (Final SEIR p. 2.12-9 to 2.1-11).

Even with implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures, and CAP Mitigation Measure M-TRAF-1, because the specific sizes and locations of facilities and projects implemented under GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1 has not yet been identified, it is not possible to guarantee that traffic impacts would not occur because it cannot be determined with certainty that impacts would be reduced below a level of significance. No other feasible mitigation is available. For the reasons stated in Section 2.12.5 and 4.3 of the Final SEIR, the direct and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Final SEIR Section 2.9 and 4.3; traffic related response to comments in Chapter 8 of the Final SEIR, and all other traffic related evidence in the administrative record.

L. Tribal Cultural Resources

- 29. Significant Effect: Tribal Cultural Resources:** Implementation of GHG Reduction Measures T-2.1, T-4.1, E-2.1, SW-1.1 and Supporting Efforts which would result in the development of bicycle, pedestrian, park-and-ride facilities, local direct investment projects, large-scale renewable energy projects, and waste facilities would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts related to tribal cultural resources because at a programmatic level it is not possible to ensure that significant impacts can be fully mitigated due to speculation regarding location, size, and magnitude of future projects (TCR-1, TCR-2) (Final SEIR p. 2.13-6 to 2.13-9; p. 4-48 and 4-78 to 4-79).

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR. Effects remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures:

CAP Mitigation Measure M-TCR-1: Facilitate the identification of tribal cultural resources through field studies, collaboration with agencies, tribes, and institutions, such as the South Coastal Information Center, while maintaining the confidentiality of sensitive cultural information (Final SEIR p. 2.13-9).

CAP Mitigation Measure M-TCR-2: Require development to avoid tribal cultural resources, if feasible. If complete avoidance is not possible, require development to mitigate impacts to tribal cultural resources pursuant to Assembly Bill 52 (Final SEIR p. 2.13-9).

CAP Mitigation Measure M-TCR-3: Support the dedication of easements that protect tribal cultural resources (Final SEIR p. 2.13-9).

CAP Mitigation Measure M-TCR-4: Protect significant tribal cultural resources through regional coordination and consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission and local tribal governments, including Senate Bill 18 and Assembly Bill 52 consultation (Final SEIR p. 2.13-9).

Facts in Supporting Findings: The policies applicable to tribal cultural resources that were adopted as part of the 2011 GPU and are applicable to the project include Policy COS-7.4 and COS-7.6 (Final SEIR p. 2.13-2). The mitigation measures applicable to tribal cultural resources that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include Cul-2.1, Cul-2.2, Cul-2.4, and Cul-2.6 (Final SEIR p. 2.13-2 to 2.13-3).

Even with implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures, and CAP Mitigation Measure M-TCR-1, M-TCR-2, M-TCR-3, and M-TCR-4, because the specific sizes and locations of facilities and projects implemented under GHG Reduction Measure T-2.1, T-4.1, E-2.1, and SW-1.1 supporting efforts has not yet been identified, it is not possible to guarantee that tribal cultural resources impacts would not occur. No other feasible mitigation is available. For the reasons stated in Section 2.12.5 and 4.3 of the Final SEIR, the direct and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Final SEIR Section 2.13 and 4.3; tribal cultural resources related response to comments in Chapter 8 of the Final SEIR, and all other hydrology and tribal cultural resources in the administrative record.

IV. FINDINGS REGARDING SPECIFIC MITIGATION MEASURES

The Final SEIR identifies mitigation measures that the County has determined to be infeasible as listed below.

- As discussed in Sections 2.1.5 of the Final SEIR, other mitigation was considered to reduce aesthetic impacts but was ultimately determined to be infeasible (e.g., development cap, Wind Energy Ordinance mitigation).
- As discussed in Sections 2.2.5 of the Final SEIR, other mitigation was considered to reduce agriculture and forestry impacts but was ultimately determined to be infeasible (e.g., development cap, Wind Energy Ordinance mitigation).
- As discussed in Sections 2.3.5 of the Final SEIR, other mitigation was considered to reduce air quality impacts but was ultimately determined to be infeasible (e.g., development cap, Wind Energy Ordinance mitigation).
- As discussed in Sections 2.4.5 of the Final SEIR, other mitigation was considered to reduce biological resources impacts but was ultimately determined to be infeasible (e.g., development cap, Wind Energy Ordinance mitigation).
- As discussed in Sections 2.5.5 of the Final SEIR, other mitigation was considered to reduce cultural and historical resources impacts but was ultimately determined to be infeasible (e.g., development cap, Wind Energy Ordinance mitigation).
- As discussed in Sections 2.8.5 of the Final SEIR, other mitigation was considered to reduce hazards and hazardous material impacts but was ultimately determined to be infeasible (e.g., development cap, Wind Energy Ordinance mitigation).
- As discussed in Sections 2.10.5 of the Final SEIR, other mitigation was considered to reduce land use and planning impacts but was ultimately determined to be infeasible (e.g., development cap, Wind Energy Ordinance mitigation).
- As discussed in Sections 2.11.5 of the Final SEIR, other mitigation was considered to reduce noise impacts but was ultimately determined to be infeasible (e.g., development cap).
- As discussed in Sections 2.12.5 of the Final SEIR, other mitigation was considered to reduce traffic impacts but was ultimately determined to be infeasible (e.g., development cap, Wind Energy Ordinance mitigation).

All the mitigation measures identified in the Final SEIR are feasible and will be adopted. No alternative mitigation measures for impacts identified as significant in the Final SEIR were suggested during public review of the Final SEIR and were determined to be feasible. Except for those mitigation measures set forth in the adopted Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, discussed in the Final SEIR, and explained in these findings, the County of San Diego finds that

there are no feasible mitigation measures that would substantially lessen or avoid any significant effect that the project would have on the environment.

V. FINDINGS REGARDING ALTERNATIVES

Section 15126.6(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires the discussion of “a reasonable range of alternatives to a project, or the location of a project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.” Section 15126.6(f) further states that the “range of alternatives in an EIR is necessary to permit a reasoned choice.” Thus, the following discussion focuses on project alternatives that are capable of eliminating significant environmental impacts or substantially reducing them as compared to Option 1, even if the alternative would impede the attainment of some project objectives, or would be more costly. Consistent with the California Supreme Court Ruling in *In re Bay-Delta Programmatic Environmental Impact Report Coordinated Proceedings*, however, the County’s analysis of alternatives is limited to the consideration of projects that could achieve the Option 1’s fundamental project objectives. (*In re Bay-Delta*, 43 Cal.4th 1143, 1165 “an EIR need not study in detail an alternative that is infeasible or that the lead agency has reasonably determined cannot achieve the project’s underlying fundamental purpose.”]; see also, *Sand Diego Citizenry Group v. County of San Diego* (2013) 219 Cal. App. 4th 1, 14.)

Four alternatives to the Project were analyzed, including the No Project Alternative, Enhanced Direct Investment Alternative, 100% Renewable Energy Alternative, and the Increased Solid Waste Diversion Alternative. A comparison of those alternatives is presented in Table 1 below. Option 1, which is a combination of the 100% Renewable Energy Alternative and the Increased Solid Waste Diversion Alternative will be presented to the decision makers for adoption. In combining the two alternatives together, the direct investments required under GHG Reduction Measure T-4.1 would be reduced to 100,294 MTCO₂e. Analysis of the components of this option is included in the Final SEIR (see Final SEIR Section 4.3.3.3 and 4.3.3.4) and is the project being considered for approval based on a consideration of the alternatives, project objectives, project benefits, environmental impacts, stakeholder input, and numerous other factors. In addition, a number of alternatives were considered and rejected, as described in Section 4.2.1 of the Final SEIR, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c).

These findings contrast and compare the alternatives where appropriate to demonstrate that the selection of Option 1, while still causing certain unavoidable significant environmental impacts, would result in substantial environmental, planning, public safety, economic, and other benefits. In rejecting the balance of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Final SEIR, the County of San Diego has examined the project objectives and weighed the ability of each of the various alternatives to meet the objectives. The County finds that Option 1 best meets the project objectives while balancing the environmental impacts. The objectives that were adopted by the County, and which set the framework for the Project, are as follows:

- 1) reduce community and County operations GHG emissions to meet the County’s GHG reduction targets for 2020 and 2030, and provide a mechanism to meet the County’s projected 2050 goal;
- 2) identify GHG reduction strategies and measures that reduce GHG emissions from activities in the unincorporated areas and address the challenges of a changing climate and improve resilience over the long term;

- 3) update the County's General Plan and General Plan Update PEIR to incorporate and reflect the GHG reduction targets, strategies, and measures of the CAP for the reduction of GHG emissions because of buildout of the General Plan;
- 4) provide Guidelines that include a GHG threshold for determining significance related to GHG emissions and provide guidance to the community on how to achieve consistency with the CAP and utilize CEQA streamlining tools for analysis of GHG emissions pursuant to the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5(b)(2) or as subsequently amended;
- 5) prepare a County baseline GHG emissions inventory, which includes community and County operations emissions, and analyze the potential growth of these emissions over time; and
- 6) establish a comprehensive approach to reduce County GHG emissions by incorporating feasible and effective GHG emission reduction measures.

The following provides a summary of Option 1 and each alternative fully analyzed in Chapter 4.0 of the Final SEIR. The summary includes rationale as to why Option 1 is preferred over each of the other alternatives and why an alternative has been rejected.

No Project Alternative

Description

The No Project Alternative (refer to Section 4.3.1 of the Final SEIR) assumes that the CAP, GPA, GHG Threshold, and Guidelines would not be adopted or implemented. As a result, the County would not adopt strategies, measures, and supporting efforts to reduce GHG emissions in accordance with state-legislated reduction targets.

Finding

The No Project Alternative has been rejected because it fails to meet any of the six project objectives and would result in substantially greater environmental impacts when compared to Option 1. Therefore, the No Project Alternative has been rejected because specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations make the alternative infeasible.

Facts in Support of the Finding

Under the No Project Alternative, none of the GHG reduction measures or supporting efforts set forth by this CAP would be implemented to reduce GHG emissions from buildout of the 2011 GPU. While new development in the County would continue to be reviewed for project consistency with screening levels established by the guidance provided by California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) CEQA and Climate Change White Paper (2008), energy efficiency and GHG reduction measures at the level anticipated under the CAP would likely not be implemented without the CAP requiring them. While individual projects would need to demonstrate compliance with applicable regulations, a mechanism by which the County could enforce reductions (i.e., CAP Consistency Checklist) and ensure communitywide targets could be met, would not be in place. The County also would not have a tracking and monitoring system in place to monitor its progress towards achieving state reduction targets. Without a CAP, individual projects would be responsible for demonstrating GHG reductions on a project-by-project basis through a variety of mechanisms (e.g., design features, offsets, incentives). Also, as stated in the

CAP, Chapter 3, the County is projected to meet the 2020 target as required in the 2011 GPU. Under the No Project Alternative, the County would not have a program in place to meet the legislative reduction targets in SB 32 of 40% below 1990 levels by 2030. In addition, without a CAP in place, the No Project Alternative would not achieve any of the SEIR's project objectives and would not provide a streamlining mechanism for future development projects to evaluate their GHG impacts.

Option 1 would meet the AB 32 and SB 32 reduction targets for 2020 and 2030 and would meet all Project objectives. The No Project Alternative has been rejected because it fails to meet any of the six project objectives and would result in substantially greater environmental impacts when compared to Option 1.

References

Final SEIR Section 4; alternatives related response to comments; and all other alternatives related evidence in the administrative record.

CAP Project

Description

The CAP Project was analyzed as the Proposed Project in the SEIR (Final SEIR Section p. 1-1 to 1-71). The CAP Project consists of the CAP, an associated General Plan Amendment to the County's General Plan and revision to the associated mitigation monitoring and reporting program, a threshold of significance for GHG, and a revised Guidelines for Determining Significance for Climate Change.

Finding

The CAP Project has been rejected because it would not achieve Objective 1 related to achievement of GHG reduction targets to the same degree that would be achieved under Option 1. Further, while environmental tradeoffs would occur for individual resources topics, overall similar types and significance of environmental impacts would occur for all environmental issue areas. Therefore, the CAP Project has been rejected because specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations make the alternative infeasible.

Facts in Support of the Finding

The CAP Project would result in similar types and significance of impacts for all issue areas as Option 1 including for aesthetic resources, agriculture and forestry resources, air quality, cultural resources, hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, and tribal cultural resources. Under Option 1, reliance on direct investment projects would be reduced to 100,294 MTCO₂e because a greater amount of reductions would come from enhanced solid waste facilities and renewable energy facilities. While both the CAP Project and Option 1 would achieve the 2030 reduction target, Option 1 provides a mechanism for additional GHG reductions to better achieve the 2050 GHG reduction goal, because Option 1 would result in a 5% increase in the diversion rate of solid waste in the unincorporated county by 2030 and a 10% increase in renewable energy supplies.

The CAP Project and Option 1 would achieve all six of the project objectives. When compared to the CAP Project, Option 1 would better fulfill the first project objective: reduce community and

County operations GHG emissions to meet the County's GHG reduction targets for 2020 and 2030, and provide a mechanism to meet the County's projected 2050 goal (Objective 1). Option 1 would better fulfill this objective because it provides a mechanism for additional GHG reductions to better achieve the 2050 GHG reduction goal.

Both the CAP Project and Option 1 would equally meet remaining project objectives because both would adopt GHG reduction measures and strategies to improve resilience over the long term (Objective 2); would update the County's General Plan and General Plan Update PEIR to incorporate and reflect the GHG reduction targets, strategies, and measures of the CAP (Objective 3); would provide Guidelines that include a GHG threshold for determining significance related to GHG emissions (Objective 4); would prepare a County baseline GHG emissions inventory, which includes community and County operations emissions, and analyze the potential growth of these emissions over time (Objective 5); and would establish a comprehensive approach to reduce County GHG emissions by incorporating feasible and effective GHG emission reduction measures.

Because Option 1 would better achieve Objective 1 related to achievement of GHG reduction targets and would reduce reliance on local direct investment projects, the CAP Project has been rejected.

References

Final SEIR Section 4; alternatives related response to comments; and all other alternatives related evidence in the administrative record.

Enhanced Direct Investment Alternative

Description

The Enhanced Direct Investment Alternative (see Final SEIR p. 4-13 to 4-19) would result in the adoption of a CAP, GPA, GHG Threshold, and Guidelines, similar to the project. However, this alternative would pursue a greater level of direct investment projects in exchange for eliminating the renewable energy program component of GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1.

Finding

The Enhanced Direct Investment Project has been rejected because it would not achieve Objective 1 related to achievement of GHG reduction targets to the same degree that would be achieved under Option 1. Further, subsequent to publication of the Draft SEIR, the County prepared the "Preliminary Assessment of the Local Direct Investment Program." The preliminary assessment confirms that GHG Reduction Measure T-4.1 can achieve the entire 190,262 MT CO₂e of emission reductions as stated in the Draft CAP and could achieve only up to 198,800 MTCO₂e in the unincorporated county. As a result, because this alternative would rely on greater GHG reductions from local direct investment projects than would be feasible, this alternative would no longer be feasible. Therefore, the Enhanced Direct Investment Alternative has been rejected because specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations make the alternative infeasible.

Facts in Support of the Finding

The Enhanced Direct Investment Alternative would result in similar types and significance of impacts for most issue areas as Option 1 including for aesthetic resources, agriculture and forestry resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, hazardous and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, and tribal cultural resources. Under Option 1, reliance on direct investment projects would be reduced to 100,294 MTCO₂e because a greater amount of reductions would come from enhanced solid waste facilities and renewable energy facilities. In comparison, the Enhanced Direct Investment Alternative would require a total of 405,312 MTCO₂e (i.e., 229,852 MTCO₂e from removal of the large-scale renewable energy component plus 175,460 MTCO₂e from GHG Reduction Measure T-4.1) in GHG reductions from direct investment projects. While both the CAP Project and Option 1 would achieve the 2030 reduction target, Option 1 provides a mechanism for additional GHG reductions to better achieve the 2050 GHG reduction goal, because Option 1 would result in a 5% increase in the diversion rate of solid waste in the unincorporated county by 2030 and a 10% increase in renewable energy supplies.

The Enhanced Direct Investment Alternative and Option 1 would achieve all six of the project objectives. When compared to the Enhanced Direct Investment Alternative, Option 1 would better fulfill the first project objective: reduce community and County operations GHG emissions to meet the County's GHG reduction targets for 2020 and 2030, and provide a mechanism to meet the County's projected 2050 goal (Objective 1).

Both the Enhanced Direct Investment Alternative and Option 1 would equally meet remaining project objectives because both would adopt GHG reduction measures and strategies to improve resilience over the long term (Objective 2); would update the County's General Plan and General Plan Update PEIR to incorporate and reflect the GHG reduction targets, strategies, and measures of the CAP (Objective 3); would provide Guidelines that include a GHG threshold for determining significance related to GHG emissions (Objective 4); would prepare a County baseline GHG emissions inventory, which includes community and County operations emissions, and analyze the potential growth of these emissions over time (Objective 5); and would establish a comprehensive approach to reduce County GHG emissions by incorporating feasible and effective GHG emission reduction measures.

Because Option 1 would better achieve Objective 1 related to achievement of GHG reduction targets and would reduce reliance on local direct investment projects, the Enhanced Direct Investment Alternative has been rejected. Further, subsequent to publication of the Draft SEIR, the County prepared the "Preliminary Assessment of the Local Direct Investment Program." The preliminary assessment confirms that GHG Reduction Measure T-4.1 can achieve the entire 190,262 MT CO₂e of emission reductions as stated in the Draft CAP and could achieve only up to 198,800 MTCO₂e in the unincorporated county. As a result, because this alternative would rely on greater GHG reductions from local direct investment projects than would be feasible, this alternative would no longer be feasible.

References

Final SEIR Section 4; alternatives related response to comments; and all other alternatives related evidence in the administrative record.

100% Renewable Energy Alternative

Description

The 100% Renewable Energy Alternative (see Final SEIR p. 4-19 to 4-23) would result in the adoption of a CAP, GPA, GHG Threshold, and Guidelines, similar to Option 1. Like Option 1, this alternative assumes that 100% of the energy consumed in the unincorporated County would be produced from renewable resources. This would be achieved through increased reliance on large-scale solar photovoltaic, wind, and geothermal facilities, and small-scale residential wind and solar structures. However, this alternative would not include the increased solid waste diversion component included under Option 1.

Finding

The 100% Renewable Energy Alternative has been rejected because it would not achieve Objective 1 related to achievement of GHG reduction targets to the same degree that would be achieved under Option 1. Further, while environmental tradeoffs would occur for individual resources topics, overall similar types and significance of environmental impacts would occur for all environmental issue areas. Therefore, the 100% Renewable Energy Alternative has been rejected because specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations make the alternative infeasible.

Facts in Support of the Finding

The 100% Renewable Energy Alternative would result in similar types and significance of impacts for all issue areas compared to Option 1 including for aesthetics, agriculture and forestry resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, hazardous and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, noise, traffic and transportation, and tribal cultural resources. Like Option 1, the 100% Renewable Energy Alternative would achieve increased GHG reductions through the increase in the amount of renewable energy consumed in the unincorporated county from 90% to 100%. However, Option 1 would also implement the increased solid waste diversion alternative, which would increase the rate of solid waste diversion from 75% to 80%. This would provide an additional 21,950 MTCO_{2e} of GHG reductions and would reduce reliance on direct investment projects by a commensurate amount. While both the 100% Renewable Energy Project and Option 1 would achieve the 2030 reduction target, Option 1 provides a mechanism for additional GHG reductions to better achieve the 2050 GHG reduction goal, because Option 1 would result in a 5% increase in the diversion rate of solid waste in the unincorporated county by 2030 and a 10% increase in renewable energy supplies.

The 100% Renewable Energy Alternative and Option 1 would achieve all six of the project objectives. When compared to the 100% Renewable Energy Alternative, Option 1 would better fulfill the first project objective: reduce community and County operations GHG emissions to meet the County's GHG reduction targets for 2020 and 2030, and provide a mechanism to meet the County's projected 2050 goal (Objective 1).

Both the 100% Renewable Energy Alternative and Option 1 would equally meet remaining project objectives because both would adopt GHG reduction measures and strategies to improve resilience over the long term (Objective 2); would update the County's General Plan and General Plan Update PEIR to incorporate and reflect the GHG reduction targets, strategies, and measures of the CAP (Objective 3); would provide Guidelines that include a GHG threshold for determining significance related to GHG emissions (Objective 4); would prepare a County baseline GHG

emissions inventory, which includes community and County operations emissions, and analyze the potential growth of these emissions over time (Objective 5); and would establish a comprehensive approach to reduce County GHG emissions by incorporating feasible and effective GHG emission reduction measures.

Because Option 1 would better achieve Objective 1 related to achievement of GHG reduction targets, the 100% Renewable Energy Alternative has been rejected.

References

Final SEIR Section 4; alternatives related response to comments; and all other alternatives related evidence in the administrative record.

Increased Solid Waste Diversion Alternative

Description

The Increased Solid Waste Diversion Alternative (see Final SEIR p. 4-48 to 4-79) would result in the adoption of a CAP, GPA, GHG Threshold, and Guidelines, similar to the project. Like the project, this alternative assumes that the County would achieve a 5% increase in the diversion rate of solid waste in the unincorporated areas by 2030. To achieve this increased diversion rate, the County would devote additional resources to expanding the capacity of its solid waste diversion facilities. This could require the expansion of existing facilities or the construction of new facilities to handle the solid waste to meet the increased diversion rate. However, this alternative would not include the increased renewable energy component included under Option 1.

Finding

The Increased Solid Waste Diversion Alternative has been rejected because it would not achieve Objective 1 related to achievement of GHG reduction targets to the same degree that would be achieved under Option 1. Further, while environmental tradeoffs would occur for individual resources topics, overall similar types and significance of environmental impacts would occur for all environmental issue areas. Therefore, the Increased Solid Waste Diversion Alternative has been rejected because specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations make the alternative infeasible.

Facts in Support of the Finding

The Increased Solid Waste Diversion Alternative would result in similar types and significance impacts for all issue areas compared to Option 1 including for aesthetics, agriculture and forestry resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, hazardous and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, noise, traffic and transportation, and tribal cultural resources. Like Option 1, the Increased Solid Waste Alternative would achieve increased GHG reductions through the increase in the amount of solid waste diversion for 75% to 80%. However, Option 1 would also implement the increased 100% Renewable Energy Alternative, which would increase the rate of renewable energy supplies from 90% to 100%. This would provide an additional GHG reductions from renewable energy supplies and would reduce reliance on direct investment projects by a commensurate amount. While both the Increased Solid Waste Diversion Alternative and Option 1 would achieve the 2030 reduction target, Option 1 provides a mechanism for additional GHG reductions to better achieve the 2050 GHG reduction goal, because Option 1 would also result in a 10% increase in renewable energy supplies.

The Increased Solid Waste Diversion Alternative and Option 1 would achieve all six of the project objectives. When compared to the Increased Solid Waste Diversion Alternative, Option 1 would better fulfill the first project objective: reduce community and County operations GHG emissions to meet the County's GHG reduction targets for 2020 and 2030, and provide a mechanism to meet the County's projected 2050 goal (Objective 1).

Both the Increased Solid Waste Diversion Alternative and Option 1 would equally meet remaining project objectives because both would adopt GHG reduction measures and strategies to improve resilience over the long term (Objective 2); would update the County's General Plan and General Plan Update PEIR to incorporate and reflect the GHG reduction targets, strategies, and measures of the CAP (Objective 3); would provide Guidelines that include a GHG threshold for determining significance related to GHG emissions (Objective 4); would prepare a County baseline GHG emissions inventory, which includes community and County operations emissions, and analyze the potential growth of these emissions over time (Objective 5); and would establish a comprehensive approach to reduce County GHG emissions by incorporating feasible and effective GHG emission reduction measures.

Because Option 1 would better achieve Objective 1 related to achievement of GHG reduction targets, the Increased Solid Waste Diversion Alternative has been rejected.

References

Final SEIR Section 4; alternatives related response to comments; and all other alternatives related evidence in the administrative record.

Table 1 CAP Alternatives Comparison of Impacts

Issue Areas of Significance	Option 1	Alternatives to Option 1				
		1	2	3	4	5
		No Project	Enhanced Direct Investment	100% Renewable Energy	Increased Solid Waste Diversion	CAP Project
2.1 Aesthetics	SU	▼	—	▼	▼	▼
2.2 Agricultural Resources	SU	▼	—	—	▼	▼
2.3 Air Quality	SU	▼	—	▲	▼	▼
2.4 Biological Resources	SU	▼	—	—	▼	▼
2.5 Cultural Resources	SU	▼	—	—	▼	▼
2.6 Energy	LTS	▲	—	▲	▲	▲

2.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions	SU	▲	—	▲	▲	▲
2.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials	SU	▼	▼	—	—	—
2.9 Hydrology and Water Quality	SU	▼	—	—	—	—
2.10 Land Use	SU	▼	▼	—	▼	▼
2.11 Noise	SU	▼	▼	—	▼	▼
2.12 Transportation	SU	▼	▼	—	▼	▼
2.13 Tribal Cultural Resources	SU	▼	—	▲	▼	▼

▲ Alternative is likely to result in greater impacts to issue when compared to Option 1.

— Alternative is likely to result in similar impacts to issue when compared to Option 1.

▼ Alternative is likely to result in reduced impacts to issue when compared to Option 1.

LTS Less than Significant with mitigation measures

SU Potentially significant and unavoidable impact

VI. NO RECIRCULATION REQUIRED

The County of San Diego Board of Supervisors hereby finds that the responses to comments made on the Draft SEIR and any revisions reflected in the Final SEIR merely clarify and amplify the analysis presented in the documents and do not trigger the need to recirculate the EIR under CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5(b), which provides that “[r]ecirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR.”

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5(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. . . . New information added to an EIR is not “significant” unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project's proponents have declined to implement. “Significant new information” requiring recirculation include, for example, a disclosure showing that:

- (1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.
- (2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.
- (3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the project, but the project's proponents decline to adopt it.

- (4) The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded. (*Mountain Lion Coalition v. Fish and Game Com.* (1989) 214 Cal.App.3d 1043)

The County recognizes that new information has been added to the SEIR since circulation of the Draft SEIR, but the new information serves simply to clarify or amplify information already found in the Draft SEIR or improve the Project and its protection of the environment. It does not rise to the level of “significant new information”.

None of the new information added to the Final SEIR raises important new issues about significant adverse effects on the environment without providing corresponding mitigation to maintain the proper finding that the impact is below the level of significance. The ultimate conclusions about the project’s significant impacts do not change in light of any new information added to the SEIR. Therefore, any new information in the EIR is insignificant for purposes of recirculation, particularly as set forth in Section 15088.5(b) of the CEQA Guidelines.

The County also finds that the Draft SEIR, which includes analysis supported by numerous technical reports and expert opinion, was not inadequate or conclusory such that the public was deprived of a meaningful opportunity to review and comment on the EIR. Additional analyses are not required to comply with the requirements of CEQA prior to certifying the Final EIR for the Project. Accordingly, the County finds that recirculation is not required pursuant to CEQA.

In support of the foregoing, it is relevant to point out some of the key policies of CEQA set forth by the Legislature:

“To provide more meaningful public disclosure, reduce the time and cost required to prepare an environmental impact report, and focus on potentially significant effects on the environment of a proposed project, lead agencies shall, in accordance with Section 21000, focus the discussion in the environmental impact report on those potential effects on the environment of a proposed project which the lead agency has determined are or may be significant. Lead agencies may limit discussion on other effects to a brief explanation as to why those effects are not potentially significant.” Pub. Res. Code 21002.1(e);

“The legislature further finds and declares that it is the policy of the state that:...(f) All persons and public agencies involved in the environmental review process be responsible for carrying out the process in the most efficient, expeditious manner in order to conserve the available financial, governmental, physical, and social resources with the objective that those resources may be better applied toward mitigation of actual significant effects on the environment.” Pub. Res. Code 21003(f).

The CEQA Guidelines (Section 15003) also expressly summarizes some of the key policies under CEQA as recognized by the Courts

“(g) The purpose of CEQA is not to generate paper, but to compel government at all levels to make decisions with environmental consequences in mind. (*Bozung v. LAFCO* (1975) 13 Cal. 3d 263.)

(i) CEQA does not required technical perfection in an EIR, but rather adequacy, completeness, and a good-faith effort at full disclosure. A court does not pass upon the correctness of an EIR’s environmental conclusions, but only determines if the EIR is sufficient as an informational document. (*Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford*

(1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 692)

(j) CEQA requires that decisions be informed and balanced. It must not be subverted into an instrument for the oppression and delay of social, economic, or recreational development or advancement. (*Laurel Heights Improvement Assoc. v. Regents of U.S.* (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 1112 and *Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors* (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 553) See 15003 ((g), (i) and (j)).

Keeping in mind the policies expressed above, the County has provided a good faith effort to analyze the environmental impacts of the Project using sound methodologies with the assistance of experts in environmental analysis. Having given careful consideration to that process and the requirements of CEQA, the County concludes that public comment through a recirculation is not warranted, but that public comments through the public hearing process will be given due consideration.

Pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15088.5(a), the County of San Diego is required to recirculate a Environmental Impact Report (EIR) when significant new information is added to the EIR after public review, but before certification. Significant new information can include changes in the project or environmental setting, as well as additional data or other information. New information added to an EIR is not significant unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including feasible alternatives) that the project's proponents have declined to implement.

As described above, Option 1 is the Increased Solid Waste Diversion Alternative and the 100% Renewable Energy Alternative combined. The environmental impacts of these alternatives have been evaluated in detail in the Final SEIR. Under Option 1 with the combination of these two alternatives, while there could be a need for the construction of a greater number of renewable energy or solid waste facilities, similar types and significance of impacts would occur under the CAP Project evaluated in the Final SEIR and as a result, no new or substantially more severe environmental impacts would occur and recirculation of the SEIR would not be required.

Changes to the Draft SEIR

A complete presentation of changes made to the Draft SEIR subsequent to the public review period has been prepared and is included within the Final SEIR. While an exhaustive list of changes is not included here, the following provides a table that summarizes where changes were made in the Final SEIR. Revisions to the Final SEIR were made in response to comments made during public review and during the numerous hearings on the project. Option 1 reflects these public comments.

As described above, Option 1 is a combination of the Increased Solid Waste Diversion Alternative and the 100% Renewable Energy Alternative. The environmental impacts of both have been evaluated in detail in the Final SEIR. As combined under Option 1, no new or substantially more severe environmental impacts would occur in comparison to the CAP Project evaluated in the Final SEIR. For the reasons outlined in Master Response 1 in the Final SEIR, information that clarifies or expands on information in the Draft SEIR does not require recirculation. None of the conditions warranting recirculation of the Draft SEIR, as specified in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 and described above, has occurred. The responses to comments and the addition of information do not result in or show any new significant impacts; there is no increase in the severity of a significant impact identified in the Draft SEIR, following application of existing

mitigation; no feasible alternatives have been recommended that would avoid a significant impact, or that the County has refused to adopt; and as to the Draft SEIR adequacy, the County believes the Final SEIR is complete and fully compliant with CEQA.

Section (Page)	Change	Reason for Change
Global Change	A global change was made throughout the Final SEIR to remove references to “north” and “east” as it pertains to the Multi-Species Conservation Plan (MSCP).	Clarification
Global Change	The “Direct Investment Program” has been renamed to the “Local Direct Investment Program” throughout the Final SEIR	Clarification
Summary, S.5.2 (Page 14 through 15)	Updated reduction from large-scale renewable energy projects from 227,423 to <u>229,852</u> .	Update
Summary, Table S-1 (Page 21 through 38)	Revised phrase “local carbon offset projects” to “ <u>local direct investment projects</u> ”	Clarification
Summary, Table S-1 (Page 29)	Corrected Greenhouse Gas Emissions Significance After Mitigation for Issue 1. Revised from Less Than Significant to <u>Significant and Unavoidable</u> to reflect the impact conclusion described on page 2.7-36.	Clarification
Summary, Table S-1 (Page 30)	Clarified naming convention with regard to CAP Mitigation Measure M-GHG-1. Revised reference to “direct investment projects and programs” to “ <u>carbon offset credits</u> ”.	Clarification
Chapter 1 (Page 1-8)	BAU projections without legislative reductions changed to • 3,407,223 <u>3,407,168</u> MTCO₂e by 2020, • 3,723,742 <u>3,723,596</u> MTCO₂e by 2030, and • 3,961,754 <u>4,220,560</u> MTCO₂e by 2050. BAU projections with legislatively-adjusted BAU changed to • 3,018,716 <u>3,018,671</u> MTCO₂e by 2020, • 2,824,140 <u>2,824,049</u> MTCO₂e by 2030, and • 2,871,824 <u>2,991,507</u> MTCO₂e by 2050	Update
Chapter 1 (Page 1-11)	Updated emissions reduction to meet 2050 target to reflect new BAU targets: emissions would need to reduce <u>1,363,147</u> MTCO ₂ e by 2050 as opposed to 1,378,966.	Update
Chapter 1 (Page 1-11)	Updated number of GHG reduction measures from 29 to <u>30</u>	Update

Chapter 1 (Page 1-11)	Revised San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E) to the term <u>“the local utility”</u>	Clarification
Chapter 1 (Page 1-37)	Added reference to chapter 8: <u>“Chapter 8, “Responses to Comments and Master Responses” which includes comment letters received during the public review period and responses to those comments.</u>	Update
Chapter 1 (Page 1-43)	Updated county Measure T-3.1 to require alternative fuel us in <u>25%</u> of construction equipment	Update
Chapter 1 (Page 1-43)	Updated that equipment using alternative fuels for Measure T-3.1 would be <u>heavy-duty</u> equipment. Further clarified that <u>the alternative fuel compliance requirements would be set by 2020 and the anticipated GHG reductions would be achieved by 2030.</u>	Update
Chapter 1 (Page 1-44)	Updated Measure T-3.3, the development of a local vehicle retirement program, to retire <u>1,600</u> late-vehicle models from previously used 800.	Update
Chapter 1 (Page 1-45)	Clarified Measure T-3.4 to include background on County's fleet emissions. Addition includes: <u>“The County of San Diego operates a fleet of approximately 4,200 vehicles and equipment, of which 2,500 vehicles are considered light duty. These assets vary in type and operating requirements greatly. Through implementation of the Green Fleet Action Plan Implementation Strategy, the County will expand use of alternative fuels, encourage vehicle reductions, and make improvements in departmental efficiencies. Of the County's 2,500 light duty vehicles, 1,100 vehicles are eligible to be considered for conversion to PHEV/EV based on current available market technologies. A subset of the eligible vehicles cannot be converted to PHEV/EV due to operational constraints; therefore, to achieve the 2030 target, 23% of the eligible vehicles (or 10% of the entire light duty fleet) will be transitioned to EVs and PHEVs by 2025. In addition, the County will convert 50% of all new vehicle purchases to their target green vehicle replacement standard by 2020 and 75% by 2030; transition from petroleum diesel to renewable diesel; reduce County fleet by 20 vehicles by 2020 and by 40 vehicles by 2025; and implement tools and technologies that assist departments to increase operational efficiency and decrease fuel consumption.”</u>	Clarification
Chapter 1 (Page 1-46)	Added Measure T-3.5, Built Environment: <u>Install Electric Vehicle Charging Stations. Install a total of 2,040 Level 2 electric vehicle charging stations (EVCS) through public-private partnerships at</u>	Update

	<u>priority locations in the unincorporated county by 2030.</u> Updated correlating description, physical changes, and environmental issues.	
Chapter 1 (Page 1-47)	Revised Strategy T-4 to <u>Local</u> Direct Investment Program	Clarification
Chapter 1 (Page 1-47)	Updated GHG emissions from Strategy T-4 target gap to <u>175,460</u> MTCO ₂ e.	Update
Chapter 1 (page 1-47)	Revised phrase “Carbon Offset Program” to <u>“local direct investment program”</u>	Clarification
Chapter 1 (Page 1-49)	Added supporting effort for the built environment and transportation category: <u>“Explore funding opportunities and collaborations to provide information about the impact of food choices through public outreach and education.”</u> Potential physical changes and environmental issues updated as well.	Update
Chapter 1 (Page 1-49)	Added supporting effort for the built environment and transportation category: <u>“Implement and explore funding opportunities and collaborations to track the Eat Well Practices with an emphasis on less carbon-intense foods and more plant-based meals.”</u> Potential physical changes and environmental issues updated as well.	Update
Chapter 1 (Page 1-51)	Clarified how the County can help resident’s better access farmer’s markets through <u>“working with Farmer’s Markets to accept EBT cards to make access for our vulnerable populations available.”</u>	Clarification
Chapter 1 (Page 1-51)	Added supporting effort to the built environment and transportation category <u>“Promote the adoption of the Eat Well Practices by outside organizations to support climate beneficial practices.”</u> Potential physical changes and environmental issues updated as well.	Update
Chapter 1 (Page 1-52)	Added supporting effort to the built environment and transportation category: <u>“Monitor State efforts related to the California Road Charge Pilot Program through the Department of Planning & Development Services”</u>	Update

Chapter 1 (Page 1-53 through 1-54)	Revised San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E) to the term <u>“the local utility”</u>	Clarification
Chapter 1 (Page 1-54)	Added supporting effort to the built environment and transportation category: <u>“Provide education and marketing related to the purchase of electric vehicles (EVs), available charging infrastructure, and existing EV resources and programs”</u> Potential physical changes and environmental issues updated as well.	Update
Chapter 1 (Page 1-54)	Added supporting effort to the built environment and transportation category: <u>“Develop and implement a local EV Incentive Program.”</u> Potential physical changes and environmental issues updated as well.	Update
Chapter 1 (Page 1-54)	Added supporting effort to the built environment and transportation category: <u>“Collaborate with regional partners to encourage installation of EVCS in new residential and non-residential developments.”</u> Potential physical changes and environmental issues updated as well.	Update
Chapter 1 (Page 1-54)	Added supporting effort to the built environment and transportation category: <u>“Promote the State’s Electric Vehicle Climate Credit.”</u> Potential physical changes and environmental issues updated as well.	Update
Chapter 1 (Page 1-54)	Added supporting effort to the built environment and transportation category: <u>“Support programs from the local utility to install EVCS.”</u> Potential physical changes and environmental issues updated as well.	Update
Chapter 1 (Page 1-56)	Revised phrase “carbon offset projects” to projects <u>locally</u> to capture the co-benefits	Clarification
Chapter 1 (Page 1-57)	Revised term “natural gas” to <u>gas</u>	Clarification
Chapter 1 (Page 1-58)	Removed term “and an incentive” from Measure E-1.3 description	Update

Chapter 1 (Page 1-58)	Updated Measure E-1.4 to reduce energy use intensity at County facilities by <u>20%</u> below 2014 levels by 2030 (from 15%)	Update
Chapter 1 (Page 1-61)	Updated County electricity generation from solar PV from 2.6% to <u>2.8%</u>	Correction
Chapter 1 (Page 1-61)	Revised San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E) to the term " <u>the local utility</u> "	Clarification
Chapter 1 (Page 1-62)	Deleted supporting energy measure "continue to provide affordable housing near service areas"	Update
Chapter 1 (Page 1-65 through 1-66)	Clarified measure language to show outdoor water use requires a 40% reduction <u>from 2014 outdoor water use budgets</u> . Further clarifies with addition of " <u>this measure applies only to potable water use in outdoor landscaping and not all outdoor applications.</u> "	Clarification
Chapter 2 Section 1 (Page 2.1-7)	Added <u>Strategy T-3: Decarbonize On-Road and Off-Road Vehicle Fleet</u>	Update
Chapter 2 Section 1 (Page 2.1-7)	Revised Strategy T-4 to <u>Local</u> Direct Investment Program	Clarification
Chapter 2 Section 1 (Page 2.1-7)	Updated GHG emissions from Strategy T-4 target gap to <u>175,460</u> MTCO ₂ e.	Update
Chapter 2 Section 1 (Page 2.1-9)	Updated Measure E-2.4: Increase Use of <u>On-Site Renewable Electricity Generation</u> for County Operations.	Update
Chapter 2 Section 1 (Page 2.1-11 through 2.1-23)	Updated impacts to aesthetics include electric vehicle charging stations (EVCS)	Update
Chapter 2 Section 1 (Page 2.1-12)	Updated cumulative impacts of bicycle, pedestrian, park-and-ride, and solid waste expansion infrastructure improvements to include implementation of <u>GHG Reduction Measure T-3.5</u>	Update
Chapter 2 Section 1 (Page 2.1-37-2.1-41)	Clarification and text edits <u>CAP</u> Mitigation Measure <u>M-AES-1</u>	Clarification
Chapter 2 Section 1 (Page 2.1-41)	Deleted reference to 2012 Wind Energy EIR and qualifier that Mitigation measures are modified for the CAP.	Clarification
Chapter 2 Section 2 (Page 2.2-7)	Revised Measure T-4.1 to establish <u>Local</u> Direct Investment Program	Clarification

Chapter 2 Section 2 (Page 2.2-12 through 2.2-16)	Revised text error Mitigation Measure <u>M-AGR-1</u>	Correction
Chapter 2 Section 2 (Page 2.2-18)	Revised text error Mitigation Measures <u>M-AGR-1</u> and <u>M-AGR-2</u>	Correction
Chapter 2 Section 2 (Page 2.2-22)	Revised text error incorporating Mitigation Measure M-AGR-1 into the 2011 MMRP.	Clarification
Chapter 2 Section 2 (Page 2.2-22)	Revised such that implementation of CAP Mitigation Measure M-AGR-1 is referenced instead of 2012 Wind Energy EIR	Clarification
Chapter 2 Section 2 (Page 2.2-23)	Revised text error incorporating Mitigation Measure M-AGR-1 into the 2011 MMRP.	Clarification
Chapter 2 Section 3 (Page 2.3-10)	Added <u>Strategy T-3 Decarbonize On-Road and Off-Road Vehicle Fleet</u>	Update
Chapter 2 Section 3 (Page 2.3-10)	Updated Strategy T-4: Establish <u>Local</u> Direct Investment Program. Updated 2030 GHG target emissions gap to <u>175,460</u> MTCO ₂ e	Update
Chapter 2 Section 3 (Page 2.3-11)	Updated Measure E-2.4: Increase Use of <u>On-Site</u> Renewable Electricity <u>Generation</u> for County Operations.	Update
Chapter 2 Section 3 (Page 2.3-14-2.3-45)	Updated impacts to air quality to include electric vehicle charging stations (EVCS)	Update
Chapter 2 Section 3 (Page 2.3-16 through 2.3-54)	Revised “Direct Investment Program” to “ <u>Local</u> Direct Investment Program”	Update
Chapter 2 Section 3 (Page 2.3-23)	Updated cumulative impacts of bicycle, pedestrian, park-and-ride, and solid waste expansion infrastructure improvements to include implementation of <u>GHG Reduction Measure T-3.5</u>	Update
Chapter 2 Section 3 (Page 2.3-60)	Added abbreviation for Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)	Clarification
Chapter 2 Section 3 (Page 2.3-61)	Corrected titles of CAP Mitigation Measures <u>M-AQ-1</u> and <u>M-AQ-2</u>	Correction
Chapter 2 Section 3 (Page 2.3-63)	Corrected titles of CAP Mitigation Measures <u>M-AQ-1</u> and <u>M-AQ-2</u> , <u>M-AQ-3</u> , and <u>M-AQ-4</u>	Correction
Chapter 2 Section 4 (Page 2.4-8)	Added <u>Strategy T-3 Decarbonize On-Road and Off-Road Vehicle Fleet</u>	Update

Chapter 2 Section 4 (Page 2.4-8)	Updated Strategy T-4: Establish <u>Local</u> Direct Investment Program. Updated 2030 GHG target emissions gap to <u>175,460</u> MTCO ₂ e	Update
Chapter 2 Section 4 (Page 2.4-10)	Updated Measure E-2.4: Increase Use of <u>On-Site</u> Renewable Electricity <u>Generation</u> for County Operations.	Update
Chapter 2 Section 4 (Page 2.4-12 through 2.4-34)	Revised “Direct Investment Program” to “ <u>Local</u> Direct Investment Program”	Update
Chapter 2 Section 4 (Page 2.4-12)	Updated impacts of bicycle, pedestrian, park-and-ride, and solid waste expansion infrastructure improvements to include implementation of <u>GHG Reduction Measure T-3.5</u>	Update
Chapter 2 Section 4 (Page 2.4-12 through 2.4-38)	Updated impacts to biological resources to include electric vehicle charging stations (EVCS)	Update
Chapter 2 Section 5 (Page 2.5-7)	Added <u>Strategy T-3 Decarbonize On-Road and Off-Road Vehicle Fleet</u>	Update
Chapter 2 Section 5 (Page 2.5-7)	Updated Strategy T-4: Establish <u>Local</u> Direct Investment Program. Updated 2030 GHG target emissions gap to <u>175,460</u> MTCO ₂ e	Update
Chapter 2 Section 5 (Page 2.5-8)	Updated Measure E-2.4: Increase Use of <u>On-Site</u> Renewable Electricity <u>Generation</u> for County Operations.	Update
Chapter 2 Section 5 (Page 2.5-10 through 2.5-31)	Updated impacts to cultural and historical resources to include electric vehicle charging stations (<u>EVCS</u>)	Update
Chapter 2 Section 6 (Page 2.6-14)	Updated Measure T-3.1 to require <u>25%</u> alternative fuel use in new residential and non-residential construction	Update
Chapter 2 Section 6 (Page 2.6-15)	Updated to include Measure T-3.5: Install Electric Vehicle Charging Stations	Update
Chapter 2 Section 6 (Page 2.6-15)	Revised “Direct Investment Program” to “ <u>Local</u> Direct Investment Program”	Update
Chapter 2 Section 6 (Page 2.6-17)	Updated Measure E-2.4: Increase Use of <u>On-Site</u> Renewable Electricity <u>Generation</u> for County Operations.	Update
Chapter 2 Section 6 (Page 2.6-17)	Updated Cap Impact Analysis to include Measure T-3.5	Update

Chapter 2 Section 7 (Page 2.7-17)	Added <u>Strategy T-3 Decarbonize On-Road and Off-Road Vehicle Fleet</u>	Update
Chapter 2 Section 7 (Page 2.7-17)	Updated Strategy T-4: Establish <u>Local</u> Direct Investment Program. Updated 2030 GHG target emissions gap to <u>175,460</u> MTCO ₂ e	Update
Chapter 2 Section 7 (Page 2.7-22 through 2.7-41)	Revised “CAP measures” to read “ <u>GHG reduction</u> measures”	Clarification
Chapter 2 Section 7 (Page 2.7-23 through 2.7-33)	Updated impacts to greenhouse gas emissions to include electric vehicle charging stations (<u>EVCS</u>)	Update
Chapter 2 Section 7 (Page 2.7-26 through 2.7-33)	Updated the emissions reduction from GHG Reduction Measure T-4.1 to <u>167,592</u> MTCO ₂ e	Update
Chapter 2 Section 7 (Page 2.7-26 through 2.7-34)	Revised “Direct Investment Program” to “ <u>Local</u> Direct Investment Program”	Clarification
Chapter 2 Section 7 (Page 2.7-38 through 2.7-40)	Revised phrases “carbon offset project” and “direct investment projects and programs” to read “carbon offset credit”	Clarification
Chapter 2 Section 7 (Page 2.7-41)	Revised “Mitigation Measure” to read “ <u>CAP</u> Mitigation Measure”	Clarification
Chapter 2 Section 7 (Page 2.7-42)	Updated Table 2.7-1: County Greenhouse Gas Emissions by Category (2014)	Update
Chapter 2 Section 7 (Page 2.7-43)	Updated Table 2.72: County Emissions Forecasts, Reduction Targets and CAP Reductions (MTCO ₂ e/year)	Update
Chapter 2 Section 8 (Page 2.8-8)	Added <u>Strategy T-3 Decarbonize On-Road and Off-Road Vehicle Fleet</u>	Update
Chapter 2 Section 8 (Page 2.8-8)	Updated Strategy T-4: Establish <u>Local</u> Direct Investment Program. Updated 2030 GHG target emissions gap to <u>175,460</u> MTCO ₂ e	Update
Chapter 2 Section 8 (Page 2.8-10)	Updated Measure E-2.4: Increase <u>Use of On-Site</u> Renewable Electricity <u>Generation</u> for County Operations.	Update
Chapter 2 Section 8 (Page 2.8-10)	Updated applicable GHG reduction measures to include T-3.5	Update
Chapter 2 Section 8 (Page 2.8-12 through 2.8-15)	Updated impacts to hazards and hazardous materials to include electric vehicle charging stations (<u>EVCS</u>)	Update

Chapter 2 Section 8 (Page 2.8-21)	Corrected reference to title of chapter 2 “Aesthetics and Visual Resources”	Correction
Chapter 2 Section 8 (Page 2.8-22 through 2.8-27)	Revised “Direct Investment Program” to “ <u>Local</u> Direct Investment Program”	Clarification
Chapter 2 Section 9 (Page 2.9-11)	Added <u>Strategy T-3 Decarbonize On-Road and Off-Road Vehicle Fleet</u>	Update
Chapter 2 Section 9 (Page 2.9-11)	Updated Strategy T-4: Establish <u>Local</u> Direct Investment Program. Updated 2030 GHG target emissions gap to <u>175,460</u> MTCO ₂ e	Update
Chapter 2 Section 9 (Page 2.9-15)	Updated applicable GHG reduction measures to include T-3.5	Update
Chapter 2 Section 9 (Page 2.9-15 through 2.9-32)	Updated impacts to hazards and hazardous materials to include electric vehicle charging stations (<u>EVCS</u>)	Update
Chapter 2 Section 9 (Page 2.9-17 through 2.9-34)	Revised “Direct Investment Program” to “ <u>Local</u> Direct Investment Program”	Clarification
Chapter 2 Section 10 (Page 2.10-9)	Updated Strategy T-4: Establish <u>Local</u> Direct Investment Program. Updated 2030 GHG target emissions gap to <u>175,460</u> MTCO ₂ e	Update
Chapter 2 Section 10 (Page 2.10-11)	Updated Measure E-2.4: Increase Use of <u>On-Site</u> Renewable Electricity <u>Generation</u> for County Operations.	Update
Chapter 2 Section 10 (Page 2.10-15 through 2.10-29)	Revised “Direct Investment Program” to “ <u>Local</u> Direct Investment Program”	Clarification
Chapter 2 Section 11 (Page 2.11-8)	Added <u>Strategy T-3 Decarbonize On-Road and Off-Road Vehicle Fleet</u>	Update
Chapter 2 Section 11 (Page 2.11-8)	Updated Strategy T-4: Establish <u>Local</u> Direct Investment Program. Updated 2030 GHG target emissions gap to <u>175,460</u> MTCO ₂ e	Update
Chapter 2 Section 11 (Page 2.11-8 through 2.11-16)	Revised “Direct Investment Program” to “ <u>Local</u> Direct Investment Program”	Update
Chapter 2 Section 11 (Page 2.11-10 through 2.11-31)	Updated impacts to noise to include electric vehicle charging stations (<u>EVCS</u>)	Update
Chapter 2 Section 11 (Page 2.11-12)	Corrected reference to title of chapter 2 “Aesthetics and Visual Resources”	Correction

Chapter 2 Section 12 (Page 2.12-13)	Added <u>Strategy T-3 Decarbonize On-Road and Off-Road Vehicle Fleet</u>	Update
Chapter 2 Section 12 (Page 2.12-15 through 2.12-25)	Updated impacts to transportation and traffic to include electric vehicle charging stations (<u>EVCS</u>)	Update
Chapter 2 Section 12 (Page 2.12-28)	Corrected text “CAP Mitigation Measure <u>M-TRAF-1</u> ”	Correction
Chapter 2 Section 13 (Page 2.13-5)	Added <u>Strategy T-3 Decarbonize On-Road and Off-Road Vehicle Fleet</u>	Update
Chapter 2 Section 13 (Page 2.13-5)	Updated Strategy T-4: Establish <u>Local</u> Direct Investment Program. Updated 2030 GHG target emissions gap to <u>175,460</u> MTCO ₂ e	Update
Chapter 4 (Page 4-9)	Corrected amount of non-residential roof space available in the unincorporated County to <u>18.7</u> million square feet.	Correction
Chapter 4 (Page 4-10)	Clarification of Measure E-2.4: “Measure E-2.4, a Distributed Generation Alternative could also require <u>additional</u> renewable energy generation from County facilities, the feasibility of which is not known and <u>which</u> would require an amendment to the County’s 2015 – 2020 Strategic Energy Plan”	Clarification
Chapter 4 (Page 4-10)	Clarification of the County’s 2015-2020 Strategic Energy Plan: <u>“The County’s 2015-2020 Strategic Energy Plan identifies the feasible actions the County can take to increase renewable energy facilities on its buildings. Currently, 2.8% of the County’s operational electricity is provided by onsite renewable sources. As defined in the County’s 2015-2020 Strategic Energy Plan, increasing onsite renewable generation is one of the County’s top sustainability priorities and efforts are already underway to increase onsite generation to meet both the goals of the 2015-2020 Strategic Energy Plan and the targets in the CAP. Expansion of renewable energy generation at County facilities beyond what is currently identified may not be feasible due to the limited suitability and availability of eligible County sites. The balance of available sites include older facilities that would require significant upgrades to roofing or electrical systems, facilities that are not properly oriented to accommodate solar, buildings that are in locations planned to be redeveloped, or buildings that are in locations where the County cannot confirm its presence onsite for the next 25 years. Therefore, an</u>	Clarification

	<u>alternative that would require expansion of renewable energy generation at County facilities may not be feasible without further study.”</u>	
Chapter 4 (Page 4-11)	Updated number of CAP reduction measures from 29 to <u>30</u>	Update
Chapter 4 (Page 4-15)	Addition of Direct Investment Program mitigation update: <u>“Since the release of the Draft EIR, the “Preliminary Assessment of the County of San Diego Local Direct Investment Program” was completed (see the attachment to the Planning Commission Hearing Report). The report estimates that the County could obtain 50,100 to 198,800 MTCO₂e of reductions via a local direct investment program.”</u>	Update
Chapter 4 (Page 4-23 through 4-48)	Addition of an Expanded Analysis of the 100% Renewable Energy Alternative. This expanded analysis provides the appropriate level of analysis, impact, conclusion, and mitigation that would be necessary should the County decide to take action and approve the 100% Renewable Energy Alternative that was provided in the Draft EIR.	Update
Chapter 4 (Page 4-53 through 4-79)	Addition of an Expanded Analysis of the Increased Solid Waste Diversion Alternative. This expanded analysis provides the appropriate level of analysis, impact, conclusion, and mitigation that would be necessary should the County decide to take action and approve the Increased Solid Waste Diversion Alternative that was provided in the Draft EIR.	Update
Chapter 7 Section 1.7 (Page 7-4 through 7-6)	Revise phrase “carbon offset project” to “carbon offset <u>credit</u> ”	Clarification

VII. CERTIFICATION OF THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, CEQA GUIDELINES § 15090

The Board of Supervisors certifies that the Final EIR, dated January 2018, on file with the Department of Planning & Development Services, as EIR # PDS2016-ER-16-00-003 has been completed in compliance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, that the SEIR was presented to the Board of Supervisors, and that the Board of Supervisors reviewed and considered the information contained therein before approving the Project, and that the SEIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Board of Supervisors. State CEQA Guidelines § 15090.

VIII. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The Findings required under the CEQA (Public Resources Code sections 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code Regulations, title 14, section 15000 et seq.) supporting the approval of the County of San Diego (“County”) Climate Action Plan (CAP) conclude that the County’s approval of the Project would result in significant impacts that cannot be substantially lessened or avoided. Despite these impacts, the County of San Diego Board of Supervisors chooses to approve the CAP because specific economic, social, and environmental benefits of the Project outweigh and override these significant and unavoidable impacts. The County has adopted all feasible mitigation measures with respect to the significant unavoidable environmental impacts listed below. In addition, the County has analyzed a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project. Based on the analysis, the County has determined that Option 1 alternative meets the objectives of the Project and is feasible and environmentally preferable to the proposed project. Therefore, the County is adopting the CAP (Option 1), and sets forth this Statement of Overriding Considerations for its adoption despite the significant and unavoidable environmental impacts identified in the SEIR and noted below:

Significant Unavoidable Environmental Impacts

Final SEIR Section	Subject/Issue
2.1.4.1	Scenic Vistas/Scenic Resources
2.1.4.2	Visual Character or Quality
2.1.4.3	Nighttime Lighting Effects to Dark Skies
2.2.4.1	Direct or Indirect Conversion of Agricultural Resources
2.2.4.2	Conflict with Agricultural or Forest Zoning
2.2.4.3	Direct or Indirect Conversion or Loss of Forest Land
2.3.4.2	Conformance to Federal and State Air Quality Standards
2.3.4.3	Non-Attainment Criteria Pollutants
2.3.4.4	Air Quality Effects to Sensitive Receptors
2.3.4.5	Odors
2.4.4.1	Candidate, Sensitive, or Special-Status Plant and Wildlife Species
2.4.4.2	Riparian Habitat and Other Sensitive Natural Communities
2.4.4.4	Wildlife Movement Corridors
2.5.4.1	Historical Resources
2.5.4.2	Archaeological Resources
2.5.4.3	Paleontological Resources
2.5.4.4	Human Remains
2.7.4.1	2050 GHG Reduction Target
2.8.4.4	Wildland Fires
2.9.4.1	Water Quality Standards
2.9.4.2	Groundwater Supplies
2.9.4.3	Existing Drainage Patterns
2.10.4.1	Physical Division of Existing Communities
2.11.4.1	Excessive Noise Levels
2.11.4.3	Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels
2.11.4.4	Temporary or Periodic Increase in Ambient Noise Levels
2.12.4.1	Level of Service Standards
2.13.4.1	Tribal Cultural Resources

Each of the reasons for approval cited below is a separate and independent basis that justifies approval of the CAP. Thus, even if a court were to set aside any particular reason or reasons, the

Board of Supervisors finds that it would stand by its determination that each reason, or any combinations of reasons, is a sufficient basis for approving the CAP notwithstanding the significant and unavoidable impacts that may occur. The substantial evidence supporting the various benefits can be found in the CEQA Findings Regarding Significant Effects, the Final EIR and in the Record of Proceedings.

Statement of Overriding Considerations

The County finds that Option 1 (hereinafter referred to as the “Project”) would have the following specific economic, social, and environmental benefits:

1. The Project provides a strategic framework—through detailed strategies, measures, and supporting efforts focused on locally-based actions—to reduce the County’s greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in accordance with State-mandated targets and the County’s 2011 General Plan Update (GPU).
2. The Project results in a reduction in GHG emissions throughout the County, thereby leading to overall improved quality of life and health for its residents, workers, and visitors.
3. The Project provides streamlining benefits for future development projects that are consistent with it. In accordance with Section 15183.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, the GHG analyses for these future projects will be simplified by completing the CAP Consistency Review Checklist.
4. The Project supports the Community Development Model concept by minimizing land consumption through the increase in purchase of lands by the County for the use of open space, habitat, and agriculture. This commitment improves air quality and water quality while also providing carbon sequestration.
5. The Project further supports the Community Development Model concept by committing to updating ten community plans by 2030 and nine by 2050 for a total of 19 community plan updates. These updates will emphasize mixed-use and transit-oriented development within village centers, resulting in improved mobility and public health, as well as job generation.
6. The Project progresses State goals for cleaner vehicle emissions and decarbonizing vehicles by providing 2,040 electrical vehicle (EV) charging stations that will enhance charging capabilities for current EV owners while also incentivizing the purchase of non-gasoline-dependent vehicles.
7. The Project further decarbonizes the on-road and off-road vehicle fleet by requiring alternative fuels in construction projects and implementing a local vehicle retirement program. This will improve air quality and public health.
8. The Project improves mobility by improving 700 centerline miles of roadway segments by 2030. This serves to reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and encourage pedestrian and cyclist trips by creating a more comfortable and safer experience when traveling along public roads.

9. The Project further reduces VMT and related GHG emissions through requirements on new non-residential projects through the creation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Ordinance and a shared or reduced parking requirement. It also reduces County employee commute VMT by increasing reliance on alternative modes of transportation and encouraging participation in alternative work schedules or telecommute options.
10. The Project creates a local direct investment program that will retire GHG emissions by investing in local projects. This program will generate jobs, sequester carbon, result in cost savings, and improve the local environment.
11. The Project reduces energy use through requirements on future projects, improvements at existing County facilities, and by improving existing building energy efficiency. This results in improved air quality and cost savings.
12. The Project increases renewable electricity generation by achieving 100% renewable electricity for the unincorporated county by 2030. This will lower GHG emissions by relying on cleaner electricity and will improve air quality and public health. It will also generate jobs through the inducement of additional renewable energy projects.
13. The Project further increases renewable electricity by providing an incentive to install solar photovoltaic (PV) systems in existing homes, requiring new non-residential to include solar PV, and increasing the County's use of renewables through on-site development. These measures will generate jobs and improve air quality and public health.
14. The Project increases solid waste diversion by achieving an 80% solid waste diversion target by 2030. The County will focus on reducing different waste types and sources, such as reducing food and other organic waste generated from residential and commercial uses. This measure will generate jobs, improve public health, and result in cost savings.
15. The Project reduces potable water consumption by requiring increased water efficiency in new residential development, a reduction in outdoor potable water use for all development, and reducing potable water consumption at existing County facilities. These measures result in increased energy and cost savings, improved public health, and lessens the dependence on imported water sources.
16. The Project encourages agriculture by supporting the conversion of agricultural equipment to alternative fuels and increases carbon sequestration through tree planting requirements and a County-initiated tree planting program. These measures serve to reduce noise, improve air quality and public health, and improve visual quality.

For the foregoing reasons, the County finds that the Project's unavoidable potential significant environmental impacts are outweighed by these considerable benefits.

IX. STATEMENT OF LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF DOCUMENTS OR OTHER MATERIALS THAT CONSTITUTE A RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Project Name: County of San Diego Climate Action Plan

Reference Case Numbers: EIR # PDS2016-ER-16-00-003;
SCH No. 2016101055

The CEQA [Section 21081.6(a)(2)] requires that the lead agency (in this case the County of San Diego) specify the location and custodian of the documents or other material that constitute the record of proceedings upon which its decision is based. It is the purpose of this statement to satisfy this requirement.

Location of Documents and Other Materials That Constitute the Record of Proceedings:

County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services
Project Processing Center
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 110
San Diego, California 92123

County of San Diego, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
1600 Pacific Highway, Room 402
San Diego, California 92101

Custodian:

County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services
Project Processing Center
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 110
San Diego, California 92123

County of San Diego, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
1600 Pacific Highway, Room 402
San Diego, California 92101