

## SUMMARY

This chapter provides a summary of the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (Draft SEIR) prepared for the Alpine Community Plan Update (Alpine CPU), prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The County of San Diego (County) is the Lead Agency for the SEIR, as defined by CEQA. This means the County has the primary responsibility for evaluating the environmental effects of the Alpine CPU and considering whether to approve the Alpine CPU.

This Draft SEIR analyzes and discloses the environmental impacts of the proposed project, which is the Alpine CPU. The Alpine CPU is a component of the General Plan. The proposed project refines the General Plan specifically to the Alpine Community Plan Area (CPA) by developing community-specific policies, updating the mobility network, and determining new land use designations. Subsequent actions that would be forthcoming as a result of the proposed project is a Rezone, Design Guidelines, Transfer of Development Rights, and Implementation Plan. As described further below, there are six alternatives with different land use designations and associated changes to the mobility network; however, the policies remain the same for the Alpine CPU.

This Draft SEIR tiers from the General Plan EIR (2011) and the Forest Conservation Initiative (FCI) General Plan Amendment (GPA) EIR (2016) (referred to throughout the rest of this section as “prior EIRs”) for all topic areas except air quality, greenhouse gas (GHG), wildfire, and transportation and traffic, and evaluates the changes from the Alpine CPU in comparison to what was analyzed in the prior EIRs. For topic areas of air quality, GHG, wildfire, and transportation and traffic, see topic area for baseline and tiering off of prior EIRs. This SEIR is programmatic in nature in that it analyzes the reasonably foreseeable impacts of the changes to the existing Alpine Community Plan. It should be noted that the Alpine CPU itself does not propose any specific development project that would result in physical impacts on the environment. However, it is reasonably foreseeable that subsequent projects implemented after adoption of the Alpine CPU could result in physical impacts on the environment.

As a result of community input and staff analysis, six alternatives with different land use designations were developed for seven subareas within the Alpine CPA. These seven subareas are the only areas within Alpine that would experience a change in land use designations. The proposed project analyzed in this SEIR is the Village-Focused Alternative that proposes services and residential density close to existing or planned infrastructure. The Village-Focused Alternative was selected to be analyzed because it increases density in more highly developed areas in Alpine near existing infrastructure and commercial/retail options to reduce the number and length of car trips. The proposed project would increase the allowable residential development capacity in the Alpine CPA from 4,065 dwelling units (allowed by the current General Plan) to 6,078 dwelling units. It should be noted however, that six additional land use alternatives with varying densities are fully analyzed within Chapter 5 Alternatives, of this SEIR. The results of the alternatives analysis are summarized within this section (see Section S.3 below) and a brief description of each alternative is provided below.

The No Project Alternative, analyzes what would happen if the Alpine CPU were not to be adopted. Alternatives 1 through 3 propose less density than is currently proposed by the project and allowed by the current General Plan while Alternatives 4 and 5 propose more density. Table 4-2 in Chapter 4 of this document, summarizes the buildout assumptions for these alternatives compared to the proposed project and current General Plan.

## **S.1 Overview**

### **S.1.1 Project Location**

The proposed project is located in Alpine, an unincorporated community in the eastern portion of San Diego County, approximately 25 miles east of downtown San Diego. The Alpine CPA covers approximately 68,100 acres of land characterized by diverse geography, residential land use patterns, and an established town center. Distinguishable geographic features include the rugged peaks of the Viejas and El Cajon Mountains near El Capitan Reservoir in the northern portion of the community, as well as the hills and valleys around Loveland Reservoir in the southern portion.

The Alpine CPA is bisected by Interstate 8 (I-8). Most of the land in the eastern and northern portions are within the Cleveland National Forest (CNF). The Alpine CPA is bordered by the Central Mountain CPA to the north and east, the Jamul-Dulzura CPA to the south, and the Lakeside and Crest-Dehesa-Harbrison Canyon-Granite Hills CPAs to the west. The Viejas Indian Reservation and Capitan Grande Reservation are also within the boundaries of the Alpine CPA; however, they are not under the County's jurisdiction. The project location is further discussed in Section 1.2 of this document.

### **S.1.2 Project Objectives**

The County has identified the following objectives for the proposed project:

1. Refine the policies and land use framework established by the General Plan to encompass the Community's vision for Alpine.
2. Provide community-specific policies and establish development guidance in pursuit of the County's GHG reduction targets.
3. Ensure new development is planned and designed in a manner that protects Alpine's natural setting and unique community character.
4. Require new development and encourage existing development to minimize impacts to public safety and provide adequate defensibility from wildfires.
5. Promote sustainability by focusing growth where services and infrastructure exist or can be reasonably built.
6. Encourage compact, mixed use development to support a vital Village core and advance the County's goals to reduce Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMTs).
7. Minimize the impacts from development on sensitive natural resources—such as Alpine Creek, Viejas Mountain, and CNF for the benefit of the community.
8. Provide and support a multi-modal transportation network that enhances connectivity and supports community development patterns.
9. Reinforce the vitality, local economy, and character of Alpine while balancing housing, employment, and recreational opportunities.

### **S.1.3 Project Description**

#### **S.1.3.1 *Proposed Land Use Designation Changes***

The proposed project analyzed in this SEIR consists of the Village Focused Alternative. The proposed land uses would re-designate the land use designations within four of the seven subareas of the Alpine CPA. Under the proposed project, no land use changes are proposed outside of the seven subareas. The proposed land use designations concentrate residential development adjacent to transit routes, community services, retail options and employment opportunities in order to reduce the total VMT for residents of Alpine. To accomplish this goal, land use designation changes would concentrate higher density uses closer to the Village, allow mixed use in the Village Core, and provide neighborhood commercial opportunities near established residential communities and freeway access.

The proposed land use changes would result in an increase in intensity, density and the number of potential dwelling units that could be developed within the CPA. The proposed land use changes would result in changes in density and the number of potential dwelling units that could be developed at buildout of the Community Plan, as further discussed in Section S.1.3.2, *Residential Yields Analysis*.

#### **S.1.3.2 *Residential Yields Analysis***

To determine the number of dwelling units that could be expected to be developed under the proposed project, a residential yields analysis was completed. First, parcels that would experience land use changes were entered into a database along with their Assessor Parcel Numbers, General Plan designations, and proposed Alpine CPU designations. The parcels were then grouped into polygons based on their land use designations and processed through a geographic information system (GIS) based application that constrained potential yield based on the presence of built lands, rural lands, floodplains, wetlands, public lands, future roads, habitat preserve, Alquist-Priolo fault zones, airport noise, airport hazard zones, steep slope, habitat tier 1 and 2, and Pre-approved Mitigation Areas (PAMA). To be conservative, the County Groundwater Ordinance was removed as a constraint, which allowed for the maximum expected yield to be calculated under the assumption that water could be provided to the subareas either by extending the County Water Authority/Padre Dam Municipal Water District boundary or through potential financing options detailed in the Implementation Plan.

Under the current General Plan, 4,065 potential dwelling units could be developed within the seven subareas, while 6,078 potential dwelling units could be developed under the proposed project. Outside of the seven subareas, the maximum residential development potential is 2,365 for both the General Plan and the Alpine CPU. Therefore, the maximum residential development potential in the Alpine CPA is 6,430 dwelling units under the current General Plan and 8,443 dwelling units with the proposed project.

#### **S.1.3.3 *Community Plan Elements***

The proposed project would update and refine the adopted Alpine Community Plan's goals and policies to reflect the character of Alpine and guide growth and development in the Alpine CPA. These updates are consistent with the goals, policies, and planning concepts of the General Plan and all other applicable County plans and programs. The proposed Alpine CPU consists of six elements: Land Use, Mobility, Conservation and Open Space, Housing, Safety, and Noise.

## Land Use

The Land Use Element provides the community's land use framework including the General Plan's regional categories related to the Community Plan's land use designations, existing land uses, infrastructure, and public services. This element provides goals and policies to provide a balance of land uses, promoting economic opportunities and scenic travel routes, and preservation of agricultural resources.

## Mobility

The Mobility Element provides the community's mobility network including roads, transit, bike paths, and trails. Existing and planned roads are provided through a map and matrix, which is an appendix to the Community Plan. Goals and policies are provided to support multi-modal transportation systems.

The proposed project includes several proposed changes to the Mobility Element including roadway re-classifications, roadway re-configurations, as well as the removal and addition of roadway segments.

## Conservation and Open Space

The Conservation and Open Space Element discusses open space and recreational resources that make Alpine unique and how these resources will be protected and maintained for their local and regional benefits. The goals and policies provided promote a balance of natural and man-made open space resources, as well promoting a balance between connectivity for the community and wildlife.

## Housing

The Housing Element discusses the current housing supply in Alpine, the importance of creating "missing middle" housing, housing affordability, senior housing and housing programs and services. The goals and policies of the Housing Element are geared towards promoting a variety of housing types in all economic ranges; encouraging community involvement and keeping the rural character.

## Safety

The Safety Element discusses natural and human-made hazards such as fire hazards, steep slopes, and flooding as well as the fire services and law enforcement resources in the Alpine community. The goals and policies of the Safety Element promote the establishment of emergency procedures and preventative measures to minimize hazards; and encourage improvements to the built environment to promote community safety.

## Noise

The Noise Element explains how noise is measured and the generators of noise related to both transportation and non-transportation. The goal and policy of the Noise Element promote the minimization of noise in residential neighborhoods.

## **S.2 Summary of Significant Effects and Mitigation Measures that Reduce or Avoid the Significant Effects**

This Draft SEIR examines the potential environmental effects of the proposed project, including information related to existing site conditions, analyses of the types and magnitude of individual and cumulative environmental impacts, and feasible mitigation measures that could reduce or avoid

environmental impacts. The potential environmental effects of the proposed project were analyzed for the following areas.

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Energy
- Geology and Soils
- GHG Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Wildfire

This SEIR evaluates the proposed project and five additional land use alternatives, as well as the No Project Alternative. The proposed project and alternatives represent a range of land uses and potential development intensities with similar types of environmental effects but with differing degrees of impact. Detailed evaluations of the differences between the proposed project and the alternatives are included in Chapter 4.0, *Alternatives*, of the SEIR.

Table S-1, presented at the end of this chapter, provides a summary of the environmental impacts that could result from implementation of the Alpine Community Plan Update and feasible mitigation measures that could reduce or avoid environmental impacts. For each impact, Table S-1 identifies the significance of the impact before mitigation, applicable mitigation measures, and the level of significance of the impact after the implementation of the mitigation measures. Alpine CPU mitigation measures, beginning with “MM,” are also listed in Chapter 6 of this SEIR. Prior EIR mitigation measures are included in Appendix B of this SEIR.

## **S.3 Project Alternatives**

### **S.3.1 Summary of Alternatives**

#### **S.3.1.1 *No Project Alternative***

The No Project Alternative is provided to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving the proposed project. The No Project Alternative for the Alpine CPU would be the continuation of the current General Plan (adopted in 2011, amended in 2016) land use designations and zoning guiding development in the unincorporated areas of the County, including the seven subareas of the Alpine CPA, through the forecasted buildout year of 2050.

No expansion of the village boundary would occur under this alternative. Similar to the proposed project, the highest-density residential land use designations under this alternative would include high-density Village Core Mixed Use (C-5), which would allow up to 30 dwelling units per acre. However, only two areas with this designation—an area centered around the intersection of Alpine Boulevard and Arnold Way and an area east of the Viejas Casino and Resort, which are outside of the subarea boundaries. VR-10.9 and VR-15 designations, which would allow up to 10.9 or 15 dwelling units per acre, respectively, would also be allowed in a few pockets, primarily centered around Alpine Boulevard and Interstate (I) 8. All other land use designations within the seven subareas would include the lower- to moderate-density VR designations (VR-2 through VR-7.3) or Semi-Rural designations. The No Project Alternative would result

in 4,065 allowable dwelling units in the seven subareas (2,013 fewer than the proposed project), and a total forecasted population for the CPA of 35,918 and approximately 5,617 residents fewer than the proposed project<sup>1</sup>.

### ***S.3.1.2 Alternative 1: Former FCI Lands in Alpine***

The Former FCI Lands in Alpine Alternative (Alternative 1) would reduce capacity in the CPA by reverting all former FCI lands in the Alpine CPA to RL-40 (one residential dwelling unit per 40 gross acres). The alternative applies to Subareas 3, 5, 6, and 7, which consists of areas south of I-8 roughly between the Alpine Boulevard/I-8 intersection and the East Willows Road/I-8 intersection and a number of parcels north of I-8 and in the southern areas of the Alpine CPA, including areas near Japatul Road, Japatul Valley Road, and Lyons Valley Road (see Figure 4-1). This is the only alternative that proposes a change in Subarea 7, which is currently designated for low-density RL-20 or SR-4 residential uses, and others are designated as Public Agency Lands or Tribal lands. This alternative was developed as a response to the FCI settlement and to evaluate the potential outcome of lowering density for former FCI lands. This alternative would result in a reduction of seven dwelling units in Subarea 3; 385 dwelling units in Subarea 5; and 2,703 dwelling units in Subarea 7 compared to the current General Plan. There are no changes in the dwelling units in Subarea 6 compared to the current General Plan. This alternative would result in fewer dwelling units in Subareas 2 through 7 when compared to the proposed project, and the same number of units in Subarea 1.

One new roadway is proposed in Subarea 5 (New Road 26), which is a minor collector road from Alpine Boulevard to Via Dieguenos via Viejas Creek Trail (see Figures 4-2a and 2b). The new road would provide a secondary access to Palo Verde Estates, which currently only has one way in and one way out. No other new or expanded Mobility Element roads would be constructed under this alternative as the proposed density does not necessitate any additional new or expanded roadways. In addition, this alternative would not amend the village boundary.

As shown in Table 4-3, this alternative would result in approximately 970 future allowable dwelling units in the seven subareas, which is 3,095 fewer units than the current General Plan and 5,108 fewer units than the proposed project. This alternative has a total forecasted population for the CPA of approximately 27,283 residents, which is 8,635 fewer residents than the current General Plan and 14,252 fewer residents than the proposed project.

### ***S.3.1.3 Alternative 2: Former FCI Lands In Eastern Alpine***

The Former FCI Lands in Eastern Alpine Alternative (Alternative 2) would reduce capacity in the CPA by reverting areas within former FCI study areas in Subarea 5 to their former land use designation of RL-40 (one dwelling unit per 40 gross acres). This alternative would involve land use designation changes in the area south of I-8 roughly between the Alpine Boulevard/I-8 intersection and the East Willows Road/I-8 intersection (see Figure 4-3). Like Alternative 1, this alternative was developed as a response to the FCI settlement.

This alternative would change some areas in Subarea 5 from their current General Plan designations of Rural Commercial (C-4), Village Residential 2 (VR-2), and Semi-Rural 4 (SR-4) to Rural Lands 40 (RL-40). Under this alternative, 75 dwelling units could be constructed within these areas instead of the 460 units allowed by the current General Plan. No land use changes to any other subareas would be proposed with

---

<sup>1</sup> Population increase based on SANDAG's forecasted persons per household rate (2.79). Increase in dwelling units multiplied by average persons per household.

this alternative when compared to the current General Plan. This alternative would result in fewer dwelling units in Subareas 1 through 6 when compared to the proposed project, and the same number of units in Subarea 7.

One new roadway is proposed in Subarea 5 (New Road 26), which is a minor collector road running from Alpine Boulevard to Via Dieguenos via Viejas Creek Trail (see Figures 4-4a and 4b). The new road would provide a secondary access to Palo Verde Estates, which currently only has one way in and one way out. No other new or expanded Mobility Element roads would be constructed under this alternative as the proposed density does not necessitate any additional new or expanded roadways. In addition, this alternative would not amend the village boundary.

As shown in Table 4-3, this alternative would result in approximately 3,680 allowable dwelling units in the seven subareas, which is 385 fewer units than the current General Plan and 2,398 fewer units than the proposed project. This alternative has a total forecasted population for the CPA of approximately 34,844, which is 1,074 fewer residents than the current General Plan and 6,691 fewer residents than the proposed project.

### **S.3.1.4    *Alternative 3: Low Alternative***

The Low Alternative (Alternative 3) would re-designate residential land uses in Subarea 5 only (see Figure 4-5) to create a gradual increase in residential density near Alpine Boulevard while maintaining a residential buffer for the CNF. Under the current General Plan, 460 dwelling units could be built in Subarea 5 while the alternative reduces capacity to a proposed 429 dwelling units. Under Alternative 3, several parcels within Subarea 5 would be re-designated from an existing SR-4 designation, which allows for up to one dwelling unit per 4, 8, or 16 acres depending on slope, to the lower-density RL-20 or RL-40 designation, which allows for one dwelling unit per 20 acres. In addition, an area within the northeastern portion of this subarea, abutting the I-8 corridor, would be re-designated from SR-4 to SR-1 and General Commercial uses. This alternative was proposed as an option for eastern Alpine during the FCI environmental review process. This alternative would result in fewer dwelling units in Subareas 1 through 6 when compared to the proposed project, and the same number of units in Subarea 7.

One new roadway is proposed in Subarea 5 (New Road 26), which is a minor collector road from Alpine Boulevard to Via Dieguenos via Viejas Creek Trail (see Figures 4-6a and 6b). The new road would provide a secondary access to Palo Verde Estates, which currently only has one way in and one way out. No other new or expanded Mobility Element roads would be constructed under this alternative because the proposed density does not necessitate any additional new or expanded roadways. In addition, this alternative would not amend the village boundary.

This alternative would result in approximately 4,034 allowable dwelling units in the seven subareas, which is 31 units fewer than the current General Plan and 2,044 fewer units than the proposed project. This alternative has a total forecasted population for the CPA of approximately 35,832 residents, which is 86 fewer residents than the current General Plan and 5,703 fewer residents than the proposed project.

### **S.3.1.5    *Alternative 4: Moderate Alternative***

The Moderate Alternative (Alternative 4) would re-designate land uses in Subareas 1 through 5. Subareas 6 and 7 would retain the land use designations assigned in the current General Plan. The Moderate Alternative proposes an increase in density around areas where services, amenities, underutilized land, and freeway access already exist and where planned Mobility Element roads will be developed primarily by Otto Avenue, Tavern Road, and Chocolate Summit. This alternative only proposes residential land use

designations and does not include any commercial land use designations. In addition, this alternative would extend the village boundary to the east in portions of Subarea 5 as a result of the proposed village land uses. This alternative would result in fewer dwelling units in Subareas 4 and 6 and a greater number of dwelling units in Subareas 1 through 3 and 5 when compared to the proposed project, and the same number of units in Subarea 7.

Land use designation changes would occur as follows (see Figure 4-7) as compared to the current General Plan:

- Subarea 1: A portion of this subarea currently designated Limited Impact Industrial (I-1) would be re-designated to VR-7.3 to match existing VR-7.3 land uses to the east.
- Subarea 2: Land use designations in this subarea would change from existing designations of VR-2, VR-2.9, VR-4.3, and SR-1 to VR-7.3 and VR-10.9. In addition, a new light collector roadway (New Road 25) is proposed to abut Wright's Field to the north (see Figures 4-8a and 8b).
- Subarea 3: Land use designation changes in this area would increase density slightly from SR-1 to SR-0.5. However, the easternmost portion of this subarea with severe slope constraints would change from SR-1 to the lower-density SR-2.
- Subarea 4: The northern and eastern portions of this subarea would be re-designated to SR-1 from SR-2.
- Subarea 5: Several land use changes would occur in this subarea. Some parcels adjacent to the I-8 corridor would change from VR-2 and SR-4 designations to VR-4.3 and SR-1. Parcels farther south would be re-designated from SR-4 and RL-40 to SR-1, SR-2, and RL-20. A small area in the northeastern area of this subarea would be re-designated General Commercial and SR-0.5 from SR-4. While a transfer request has not been submitted nor is it the County's intent to submit a request, the alternative includes evaluating the possibility of a land transfer with the CNF. Three new roadways are proposed in this subarea, New Roads 26, 27, and 29. New Road 26 is a minor collector road from Alpine Boulevard to Via Dieguenos via Viejas Creek and would provide a secondary access to Palo Verde Estates. New Roads 27 and 29 are minor collector roads. New Road 27 runs from Alpine Boulevard to cul-de-sac #2 and New Road 29 runs from Alpine Boulevard to New Road 28 (see Figures 4-8a and 8b). These two new roads would accommodate increased capacity resulting from higher density in the subarea.

This alternative would result in approximately 5,691 allowable dwelling units in the seven subareas, which would result in 1,626 more units than the current General Plan and 387 fewer units than the proposed project. This alternative has a total forecasted population for the CPA of approximately 40,455 residents, which is 4,537 more residents than the current General Plan and 1,080 fewer residents than the proposed project.

### **S.3.1.6    *Alternative 5: High Alternative***

The High Alternative (Alternative 5) would re-designate land uses in Subareas 1 through 6. The High Alternative proposes land use changes that could connect parks, schools, and open space to high-density residential in the Tavern Road community and increase opportunities for high-density residential and new commercial in the Village. In addition, this alternative would extend the village boundary to include Subarea 3 and portions of Subarea 5 as a result of the proposed village land uses. This alternative would result in fewer dwelling units in Subarea 4 and a greater number of dwelling units in Subareas 1 through 3 and 5 when compared to the proposed project, and the same number of units in Subareas 6 and 7.



Land use designation changes would occur as follows (see Figure 4-9) as compared to the current General Plan:

- Subarea 1: The subarea would be re-designated from VR-7.3 and I-1 to VR-15, similar to the land uses to the south.
- Subarea 2: Land use designations in this subarea would change from existing designations of VR-2, VR-2.9, VR-4.3, and SR-1 to VR-10.9, VR-20, and VR-24. In addition, a new light collector roadway (New Road 25) is proposed to abut Wright's Field to the north (see Figures 4-10a and 10b).
- Subarea 3: Existing SR-1 land uses would change to VR-7.3 and VR-10.9.
- Subarea 4: The subarea would change from SR-1, SR-2, and VR-2 to SR-0.5.
- Subarea 5: Several land use changes would occur in this subarea. Parcels adjacent to the I-8 corridor would be changed from VR-2 and SR-4 designations to VR-4.3, VR-7.3, VR-10.9, and VR-2.9. Parcels farther south would be re-designated from SR-4 and RL-40 to SR-1, SR-10, and RL-20. A small area in the northeastern area of this subarea would be re-designated General Commercial and VR-7.3. While a transfer request has not been submitted nor is it the County's intent to submit a request, the alternative would include evaluating the possibility of land exchanges with the CNF for Public Agency Lands located in the southwest portion of the subarea.
  - Eight new roadways are proposed in this subarea, New Roads 26 through 33. New Road 26 is a minor collector road from Alpine Boulevard to Via Dieguenos via Viejas Creek and would provide a secondary access to Palo Verde Estates. New Roads 27 through 33 are minor collector roads off of Alpine Boulevard in this subarea (see Figures 4-10a and 10b). These roads would accommodate increased capacity resulting from higher density in the subarea.
- Subarea 6: The subarea would be re-designated from VR-15, SR-1, C-1, C-4, and P/SP to C-5 to provide high-density residential options and flexibility in commercial options.

This alternative would result in approximately 11,498 allowable dwelling units in the seven subareas, which would result in 7,433 more units current General Plan and 5,420 more units than the proposed project. This alternative has a total forecasted population for the CPA of approximately 56,657 residents, which is 20,739 more residents than the current General Plan and 15,122 more residents than the proposed project.

### **S.3.2 Environmentally Superior Alternative**

Pursuant to CEQA, the EIR is required to identify the environmentally superior alternative. The alternative that would reduce the greatest number of impacts compared to the proposed project would be the Former FCI Lands Alternative (Alternative 1). The reduced impacts associated with Alternative 1 are the result of the significant reduction in allowable dwelling units compared to the proposed project; specifically, Alternative 1 would allow 5,108 fewer dwelling units than the proposed project throughout Subareas 1 through 7. Therefore, Alternative 1 is considered the environmentally superior alternative because it would reduce the greatest number of impacts. However, this alternative would not achieve most of the project objectives.

### **S.3.3 Areas of Controversy and Issues to be Resolved by the Decision Making Body**

#### **S.3.3.1 Areas of Controversy Known to the Lead Agency**

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

- Evacuation of people from remote development when wildland fires occur in CNF
- Increased wildfire risk from increased density and number of homes
- Secondary effects of wildfires on ecosystems, wildlife, waterways and water quality, air quality, geology and soils, and GHG
- Future incompatible development and utility/water supply needs
- Lowering of the groundwater table from the installation of household wells
- The need to bring water and sewage services to East Willows Road
- Effects of future development on downstream water supply sources such as Loveland Reservoir
- Discourage the use of septic systems and promote annexation to sanitation districts
- Preservation of cultural resources
- Impacts on the draft East County Multiple Species Conservation Program and PAMAs
- Impacts to wetlands and riparian habitat; listed and other sensitive plant and wildlife species, including nesting birds; effects of lighting, noise, human activity, exotic species, and drainage; wildlife corridor and movement areas; conflicts between human and wildlife interface; habitat degradation, loss, and fragmentation; effects on Critical Biological Areas of the CNF; and effects on ecosystem services such as filtration of runoff
- Visual impacts relate to increased development adjacent to Cleveland National Forest

#### **S.3.3.2 Issues to be Resolved by the Decision Making Body**

The County of San Diego Board Of Supervisors (BOS) serves as the decision-making body for the Alpine Community Plan Update. The following is a description of issues related to the Alpine Community Plan Update that must be resolved by the BOS prior to or at the time of project approval and SEIR certification. Prior to the BOS taking final action on these issues, Planning & Development Services and the Planning Commission will develop recommendations. In developing these recommendations and rendering a decision, the County will consider input provided by the public, other agencies, and the Alpine Community Planning Group. Additionally, the decisions of the Planning Commission and BOS are made in public hearings at which public comment is invited.

- **Final Composition of the Alpine Community Plan Update Land Use Map.** The BOS must decide on the final composition of the Alpine Community Plan Update land use map, specifically addressing which land use designations will be assigned to specific properties. This SEIR evaluates the Village Focused alternative as the proposed project, along with five alternatives: Alternative 1 - Former FCI Lands in Alpine, Alternative 2 - Former FCI Land in Eastern Alpine, Alternative 3 - Low, Alternative 4 - Moderate, and Alternative 5 - High. In addition, the No Project

Alternative (General Plan) was analyzed. The proposed project and alternatives represent a range of development intensities with similar types of environmental effects but with differing degrees of impact. Detailed evaluations of the differences between the proposed project and the alternatives are included in Chapter 4.0 of this SEIR, *Project Alternatives*. It is possible that the BOS may approve a land use map that represents a combination of the alternatives where a designation on a particular property is the same as on one of the alternatives or within the range that is evaluated in the SEIR. Should the BOS decide to approve a designation that is beyond the range that is considered in this SEIR, additional analysis may be necessary prior to certification of the SEIR.

- **Alpine Community Plan Update Text, Roadway Network, and Other Components.** The BOS must decide on the final composition of the Alpine Community Plan elements, circulation maps, and other components of the project. During the course of the project, the County has compiled numerous comments and recommendations from community groups, agencies, and other stakeholders. Planning & Development Services has continually sought consensus but a variety of opposing opinions remain. The BOS will make a final ruling in these areas of differing opinion, which will be reflected in the text or maps of the Alpine Community Plan or in the documents of other components of the project. Specifically, items that will likely be considered include the wording of Alpine Community Plan narrative, goals, and policies; the circulation network and road classifications; the land use maps; content of the Alpine Community Plan Implementation Plan; and other related components. Any modification made by the BOS to these elements that are outside of the analysis contained in this SEIR will require additional analysis prior to approval and certification of the EIR.
- **Proposed Mitigation.** The BOS will evaluate the full array of mitigation measures described in this SEIR and determine whether they represent all feasible measures to substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in this SEIR. The BOS may decide to add, remove, or alter measures to improve effectiveness in lessening significant environmental effects. Additionally, the BOS may decide that certain measures are inappropriate or infeasible. The BOS would prepare and adopt detailed findings on the feasibility of mitigation measures to substantially lessen or avoid the significant effects on the environment.
- **Consideration of Project Alternatives.** The BOS will evaluate the alternatives as summarized in Section S.3 above. A full discussion of the alternatives analyzed is provided in Chapter 4 of this SEIR. For those alternatives that would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in this SEIR, the BOS must either adopt the alternative or find it to be infeasible.
- **Benefits of the Project Compared to Environmental Effects.** This SEIR has identified adverse environmental effects that are unavoidable. The BOS must determine if the adverse environmental effects are considered acceptable with consideration of economic, legal, social, technological, and other relevant benefits of the Alpine CPU. In making this determination, it is relevant for the BOS to consider the existing General Plan in comparison to the proposed project. The BOS would prepare and adopt a statement of overriding considerations, as described in CEQA Section 15093 to reflect the balancing of competing public objectives, if the BOS decides to approve the proposed project or one of the alternatives which have the potential to cause one or more significant effects on the environment.
- **Project Approval.** The BOS must decide whether or how to approve or carry out the proposed land use changes to any or all of the Alpine CPU subareas.

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
<b>2.1 Aesthetics and Visual Resources</b>				
<b>Project Impacts</b>				
Scenic Vistas	<b>Impact-AES-1: Have a Substantial Adverse Effect on a Scenic Vista.</b> The proposed project has the potential to create more severe impacts to scenic resources associated with increased building height and scale as compared to the prior EIRs. This would be considered a significant impact.	PS	<p><b>Aes-1.2:</b> Protect sensitive biological habitats and species through regulations that require avoidance and mitigation of impacts. Existing programs include the County MSCP and associated BMOs, RPO, and CEQA Guidelines. While protecting biological resources, these programs also preserve natural open space that contributes to the quality of many of the County's scenic vistas.</p> <p><b>Aes-1.4:</b> Revise the Design Review process to streamline the process, improve consistency in implementation, and update design criteria as necessary. Current components of that process include Special Area Designators, Design Review Guidelines, and the Site Plan review and approval process.</p> <p><b>Aes-1.5:</b> Create a Conservation Subdivision Program that facilitates conservation-oriented project design.</p> <p><b>Aes-1.6:</b> Require that project approvals with significant potential to adversely affect the scenic quality of a community require community review and specific findings of community compatibility. Examples can be found in the Zoning Ordinance with the numerous special uses or exceptions allowed pursuant to Administrative and Use Permits, and Site Plans. This practice has been proven useful for reducing impacts to aesthetic resources and their usefulness will increase as community plans and design guideline are updated pursuant to Aes-1.3 and Aes-1.4.</p>	LS

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
<b>Impact-C-AES-1: Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Contribution to Having a Substantial Adverse Effect on a Scenic Vista.</b> The proposed project would cause a similar impact related to impacts to scenic resources with increased building height and scale compared to the prior EIRs. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to this impact would be cumulatively considerable.		PS	<b>Aes-1.7:</b> Develop and implement programs and regulations that preserve agricultural lands (such as the County's CEQA guidelines and the Farm Program). Most existing agricultural lands are key components of scenic vistas and community character and the preservation of these resources is critical to minimizing impacts to these resources.	
			<b>Aes-1.8:</b> Continue to develop and implement programs and regulations that minimize landform alteration and preserve ridgelines and steep slopes where appropriate. Examples include the County's Grading Ordinance, RPO, and CEQA Guidelines.	
			<b>Aes-1.9:</b> Work with communities and other stakeholders to identify key scenic vistas, viewsheds of County scenic road and highways, and other areas of specific scenic value. Apply Resource Conservation Area designations or other special area designators, guidelines, and tools to guide future development of parcels within these viewsheds to avoid impacts to the scenic vistas.	
			Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR mitigation measures Aes-1.2, and Aes-1.4 through Aes-1.9, as described above.	LS

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Scenic Resources	No New or More Severe Impacts than Previously Identified in prior EIRs. The proposed project would not result in any new or more severe impacts on scenic resources and impacts are less than significant.	LS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR mitigation measures Aes-1.2, and Aes-1.4 through Aes-1.9, as described above.	LS
	No New or More Severe Cumulative Impacts than Previously Identified in prior EIRs	LS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR mitigation measures Aes-1.2, and Aes-1.4 through Aes-1.9, as described above.	LS
Visual Character or Quality	<b>Impact-AES-2: In Non-urbanized Areas, Substantially Degrade the Existing Visual Character or Quality of Public View of the Site and Its Surrounding.</b> The land use designation changes occurring as part of the proposed project would allow for an increase in density of residential development within three subareas, and mobility network changes, the implementation of which would result in considerable alteration of the visual character and quality of the subareas as compared to the prior EIRs. This would be considered a significant impact.	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR mitigation measures Aes-1.2, and Aes-1.4 through Aes-1.9, as described above.  <b>Aes-3.1:</b> Improve upon the County road standards or other right of way design guidelines to provide standards related to road design, parking, landscaping, and elements of the public realm that to are critical to the character of a community.  <b>Aes-3.2:</b> Implement existing and prepare new community right-of-way development standards, as appropriate, that supplement the County road standards in order to recognize the unique constraints and character of different communities.	SU
	<b>Impact-C-AES-2: Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Contribution in Non-urbanized Areas, Substantially Degrade the Existing Visual Character or Quality of Public View of the Site and Its Surrounding.</b> The proposed project	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR mitigation measures Aes-1.2, and Aes-1.4 through Aes-1.9, Aes-3.1, and Aes-3.2, as described above.	SU

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
	would cause a similar impact to dark skies as compared to prior EIRs. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to this impact would be cumulatively considerable			
Light or Glare	<b>Impact-AES-3: Create a New Source of Substantial Light or Glare that would Adversely Affect Day or Nighttime Views in the Area.</b> Given the magnitude of the potential project development, impacts to dark skies would be more severe than those identified in the prior EIRs. This would be considered a significant impact.	PS	<b>Aes-4.1:</b> Coordinate with communities and stakeholders to review light pollution controls and consider amendments or expansions to those controls as determined necessary to reduce impacts to dark skies that are important to community character.  <b>Aes-4.2:</b> Maintain light and glare regulations that minimize impacts to adjacent properties, sensitive areas, community character, observatories, and dark skies. These regulations are currently found in the Light Pollution Code and Zoning Ordinance. Additional reviews are implemented on discretionary projects in accordance with CEQA and the County's CEQA guidelines.	SU
	<b>Impact-C-AES-3: Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Contribution by Creating a New Source of Substantial Light or Glare that would Adversely Affect Day or Nighttime Views in the Area.</b> The proposed project would cause a similar impact to visual character and quality as compared to prior EIRs. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to this impact would be cumulatively considerable.	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR mitigation measures Aes-4.1 and Aes-4.2, as described above.	SU

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
<b>2.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources</b>				
<b>Project Impacts</b>				
Convert Agricultural Resources	<b>Impact-AG-1: Convert Agricultural Resources.</b> Due to increased development densities proposed in the Alpine CPA, the proposed project would cause a more severe potentially significant impact related to the direct conversion of agricultural resources compared to the prior EIRs. This would be considered a significant impact.	PS	<p><b>Agr-1.1:</b> Implement the General Plan Regional Category map and Land Use Maps which protect agricultural lands with lower density land use designations that will support continued agricultural operations.</p> <p><b>Agr-1.2:</b> Develop and implement programs and regulations that protect agricultural lands (such as the CEQA guidelines, Zoning Ordinance, Right to Farm Act, Open Space Subvention Act, Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program, San Diego County Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer Information Ordinance, BOS Policy I-133, and the San Diego County Farming Program), as well as, those that support implementation of the Williamson Act (including the CEQA guidelines, Zoning Ordinance, and Subdivision Ordinance).</p> <p><b>Agr-1.3:</b> Create a Conservation Subdivision Program that facilitates conservation-oriented project design through changes to the Subdivision Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance, Zoning Ordinance, Groundwater Ordinance, and other regulations as necessary with the goal of promoting conservation of natural resources and open space (including agricultural lands) while improving mechanisms for flexibility in project design so that the production of housing is not negatively impacted.</p> <p><b>Agr-1.4:</b> Develop and implement the PACE program which compensates landowners for voluntarily limiting future development on their land.</p>	SU



Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
			<p><b>Agr-1.5:</b> Revise community plans to identify important agricultural areas within them and specific compatible uses and desired buffers necessary to maintain the viability of that area. Community plans are used to review development projects (including General Plan Amendments).</p>	
			<p><b>MM-AG-1:</b> As a part of the discretionary review of subsequent projects proposed under the Alpine CPU, applicants shall be required to demonstrate that the project would not convert agricultural resources that meet the Prime and Statewide soil criteria, as defined by the FMMP, and as determined by the Agricultural Guidelines, to a non-agricultural use or appropriate project-specific mitigation shall be required. Applicants may be subject to subsequent project-level analysis pursuant to the County LARA model and/or submit an agricultural resource report to determine the importance, and mitigation (if required) of said agricultural resources. This shall occur on a project-by-project basis and would be required through conformance with the Guidelines for Determining Significance for Agricultural Resources.</p>	

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
	<b>Impact-C-AG-1: Result in Cumulative Conversion of Agricultural Resources.</b> The proposed project would cause a more severe potentially significant impact related to the direct conversion of agricultural resources compared to the prior EIRs. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to this impact would be cumulatively considerable.	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR Mitigation Measures Agr-1.1, Agr-1.2, and Agr-1.5; and Bio-1.1, 1.3, and 1.6; and Alpine CPU Mitigation Measure MM-AG-1.	SU
Conflict with Agricultural Zoning or Williamson Act Contract	<b>Impact-AG-2: Conflict with Agricultural Zoning or a Williamson Act Contract.</b> Due to increased development densities proposed in the Alpine CPA, the proposed project would cause more severe potentially significant impacts related to conflict with agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contract compared to the prior EIRs. This would be considered a significant impact.	PS	Implement 2011 Alpine CPU Mitigation Measure MM-AG-1.  <b>Agr-2.1:</b> Prior to the approval of any Zoning Ordinance Amendment that would result in the removal of an "A" designator from a certain property, an analysis shall be conducted to ensure that the action removing such a designation will not result in any significant direct or indirect adverse impact to a Williamson Act Contract lands.	LS
	<b>Impact-C-AG-2: Result in a Cumulative Conflict with Agricultural Zoning or a Williamson Act Contract.</b> The proposed project would cause a more severe potentially significant impact related to the conflict with agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contract compared to the prior EIRs. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to this impact would be cumulatively considerable.	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR Mitigation Measure Agr-2.1 and Alpine CPU Mitigation Measure MM-AG-1.	LS

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Result in the Loss or Conversion of Forestry or Timberland Resources	<b>Impact-AG-4: Cause the Direct or Indirect Conversion of Forestry Resources.</b> Due to increased development densities proposed in the Alpine CPA, the proposed project would cause a more severe potentially significant impact related to the direct and indirect conversion of agricultural resources compared to the FCI EIR. This would be considered a significant impact.	PS	<p><b>Bio-1.1:</b> Create a Conservation Subdivision Program that facilitates conservation-oriented project design through changes to the Subdivision Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance, Zoning Ordinance, Groundwater Ordinance, and other regulations as necessary. It is intended that these changes will promote conservation of natural resources and open space while improving mechanisms for flexibility in project design so that production of housing stock is not negatively impacted. Additionally, any such allowances of flexibility must be done with consideration of community character through planning group coordination and/or findings required for project approval.</p> <p><b>Bio-1.3:</b> Implement conservation agreements through Board Policy I-123, as this will facilitate preservation of high-value habitat in the County MSCP Subarea Plan.</p> <p><b>Bio-1.6:</b> Implement the RPO, BMO, and HLP Ordinance to protect wetlands, wetland buffers, sensitive habitat lands, biological resource core areas, linkages, corridors, high-value habitat areas, subregional coastal sage scrub focus areas, and populations of rare, or endangered plant or animal species.</p> <p><b>MM AG-3:</b> As a part of the discretionary review of subsequent projects proposed under the Alpine CPU, applicants shall be required to demonstrate that the project would not convert forestry resources as determined by CEQA, to a non-forestry use or appropriate project-specific mitigation shall be required. Applicants may be subject to subsequent</p>	SU

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
			project-level analysis that may require an agricultural resources report to determine the resource importance, impacts and mitigation (if required). This shall occur on a project-by-project basis and would be required pursuant to CEQA.	
	<b>Impact-C-AG-4: Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Contribution to the Direct or Indirect Conversion of Forestry Resources.</b> The proposed project would cause a more severe potentially significant impact related to the direct and indirect conversion of forestry resources compared to the FCI EIR. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to this impact would be cumulatively considerable.	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR Mitigation Measure Bio-1.1, Bio-1.3, and Bio-1.6 and Alpine CPU Mitigation Measure MM-AG-3.	SU
Cause Indirect Conversion of Agriculture or Forestry Resources	<b>Impact-AG-3: Cause an Indirect Conversion of Agricultural or Forestry Resources.</b> Due to increased development densities proposed in the Alpine CPA, the proposed project would cause a more severe potentially significant impact related to the indirect conversion of agricultural resources compared to the prior EIRs. This would be considered a significant impact.	PS	<b>Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR Mitigation Measures Agr-1.1 through Agr-1.5.</b>  <b>MM AG-2:</b> As a part of the discretionary review of subsequent projects located within a one-mile radius of an existing agricultural operation, Williamson Act Contract or County Agricultural Preserve, shall be required to demonstrate that the project would not indirectly impact said resources or appropriate project-specific mitigation shall be required. Subsequent projects may be assessed pursuant to the County LARA model and/or prepare an agricultural resources report to determine impacts and mitigation (if required) to reduce indirect impacts to said resource. This shall occur on a project-by-project basis and would be required through conformance with the	SU

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
			Guidelines for Determining Significance for Agricultural Resources.	
	<b>Impact-C-AG-3: Result in a Cumulative Indirect Impact on Agricultural or Forestry Resources.</b> The proposed project would cause a more severe potentially significant impact related to the indirect conversion of agricultural resources compared to the prior EIRs. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to this impact would be cumulatively considerable.	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR Mitigation Measures Agr-1.1 through Agr-1.5 and MM AG-2.	SU
<b>2.3 Air Quality and Health Risk</b>				
<b>Project Impacts</b>				
Conflict with Applicable Air Quality Plan	<b>Impact-AQ-1: Conflict with Air Quality Plans.</b> Due to increased development densities proposed in the Alpine CPA which are not consistent with the RAQS and SIP, the proposed project would cause a more severe potentially significant impact related to plan consistency compared to the prior EIR. This would be considered a significant impact.	PS	<b>Air-2.1:</b> Provide incentives such as preferential parking for hybrids or alternatively fueled vehicles such as compressed natural gas (CNG) vehicles or hydrogen- or electric-powered vehicles. The County shall also establish programs for priority or free parking on County streets or in County parking lots for hybrids or alternatively fueled vehicles.  <b>Air-2.2:</b> Replace existing vehicles in the County fleet as needed with the cleanest vehicles commercially available that are cost-effective and meet vehicle use needs.  <b>Air-2.3:</b> Implement transportation fleet fueling standards to improve the number of alternatively fueled vehicles in the County fleet.  <b>Air-2.4:</b> Provide incentives to promote the siting or use of clean air technologies where feasible. These technologies shall include, but not be limited to, fuel	SU

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
			<p>cell technologies, renewable energy sources, and hydrogen fuel.</p> <p><b>Air-2.5:</b> Require that the following measures be implemented on all construction projects where project emissions are above the SLTs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Multiple applications of water during grading between dozer/scrapper passes</li> <li>• Paving, chip sealing or chemical stabilization of internal roadways after completion of grading</li> <li>• Use of sweepers or water trucks to remove “track-out” at any point of public street access</li> <li>• Termination of grading if winds exceed 25 miles per hour</li> <li>• Stabilization of dirt storage piles by chemical binders, tarps, fencing or other erosion control</li> <li>• Use of low-sulfur fuels in construction equipment</li> <li>• Use of low-VOC paints</li> <li>• Projects exceeding SLTs will require ten percent of the construction fleet to use any combination of diesel catalytic converters, diesel oxidation catalysts, diesel particulate filters and/or CARB certified Tier I, II, III, IV equipment. Equipment is certified if it meets emission standards established by the EPA for mobile non-road diesel engines of almost all types. Standards established for hydrocarbons, oxides of nitrogen (NOX), carbon monoxide, and particulate matter. Tier I standards are for engines over 50 hp (such as bulldozers) built between 1996 and 2000, and engines under</li> </ul>	

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
			<p>50 hp (such as lawn tractors) built between 1999 and 2000. Tier II standards are for all engine sizes from 2001 to 2006, and Tier III standards are for engines rated over 50 hp from 2006 to 2008 (EPA 1998). Tier IV standards apply to engines of all sizes built in 2008 or later. Standards are increasingly stringent from Tier I to Tier IV.</p> <p><b>Air-2.6:</b> Use County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Air Quality to identify and mitigate adverse environmental effects on air quality.</p> <p><b>Air-2.7:</b> Implement County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) regulations for air emissions from all sources under its jurisdiction.</p> <p><b>Air-2.8:</b> Require NSRs to prevent permitting projects that are “major sources.”</p> <p><b>Air-2.9:</b> Implement the Grading, Clearing, and Watercourses Ordinance by requiring all clearing and grading to be conducted with dust control measures.</p> <p><b>Air-2.10:</b> Revise Board Policy F-50 to strengthen the County’s commitment and requirement to implement resource-efficient design and operations for County-funded renovation and new building projects. This could be achieved by making the guidelines within the policy mandatory rather than voluntary.</p> <p><b>Air-2.11:</b> Implement County Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) to attain State air quality standards for O3.</p> <p><b>Air-2.12:</b> Revise Board Policy G-15 to require County facilities to comply with Silver Leadership in Energy</p>	

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
			and Environmental Design (LEED) standards or other equivalent Green Building rating systems.	
			<p><b>Air-2.13:</b> Revise Board Policy G-16 to require the County to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adhere to the same or higher standards it would require from the private sector when locating and designing facilities concerning environmental issues and sustainability; and</li> <li>• Require government contractors to use low emission construction vehicles and equipment.</li> </ul>	
			<p><b>Air-4.1:</b> Use the policies set forth in the CARB's Land Use and Air Quality Handbook (CARB 2005) as a guideline for siting sensitive land uses. Implementation of this measure will ensure that sensitive land uses such as residences, schools, day care centers, playgrounds, and medical facilities are sited appropriately to minimize exposure to emissions of TACs.</p>	
			<p>Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR Mitigation Measures <b>Air-2.1</b> through <b>Air-2.13</b>, and <b>Air-4.1</b> as described above.</p>	
	<p><b>Impact-C-AQ-1: Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Conflict with Air Quality Plans. Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Conflict with Air Quality Plans.</b> The proposed project would cause a more severe potentially significant cumulative impact related to air quality plan consistency compared to the prior EIR. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to this impact would be cumulatively considerable</p>	PS		SU



Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Violate an Air Quality Standard	<b>Impact-AQ-2: Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Increase in Nonattainment Pollutant.</b> Due to the increase in construction and operation emissions from increased development proposed by the Alpine CPU the project would cause a potentially significant impact related to nonattainment criteria air pollutants. Due to the increased density proposed, the project would result in a more severe impact than the prior EIR and mitigation is therefore required.	PS	<p>Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR Mitigation Measures <b>Air-2.1</b> through <b>Air-2.13</b>, and <b>Air-4.1</b> as described above.</p> <p><b>Construction Mitigation Measures</b></p> <p><b>MM-AQ-1.</b> Require construction contractors to use high-performance renewable diesel (HPRD) fuel for diesel-powered construction equipment. Exemptions can be made for where HPRD is not commercially available within 200 miles of the Alpine CPA, or where the use of HPRD would not be economically feasible for use in project construction. The construction contract must document their unavailability or demonstrate economic burden to receive exemption from this requirement. Any HPRD product that is considered for use by the construction contractor shall comply with California's Low Carbon Fuel Standards. HPRD fuel must meet the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Be hydrogenation-derived (reaction with hydrogen at high temperatures) from 100 percent biomass material (i.e., nonpetroleum sources), such as animal fats and vegetables,</li> <li>• contain no fatty acids or functionalized fatty acid esters, and</li> <li>• have a chemical structure that is identical to petroleum-based diesel which ensures HPRD will be compatible with all existing diesel engines; it must comply with American Society for Testing and Materials D975 requirements for diesel fuels.</li> </ul> <p><b>MM-AQ-2.</b> Require construction contractors to minimize idling time either by shutting equipment off</p>	SU

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
			<p>when not in use or reducing the time of idling to 5 minutes [California Code of Regulations, Title 13, sections 2449(d)(3) and 2485]. Provide clear signage that posts this requirement for workers at the entrances to the site.</p> <p><b>MM-AQ-3.</b> Require construction contractors to stagger the scheduling of construction activities to avoid the simultaneous operation of construction equipment to minimize criteria pollutant levels resulting from operation of several pieces of emissions-intensive equipment, to the extent feasible.</p> <p><b>MM-AQ-4.</b> Require construction contractors to reduce construction-related exhaust emissions by ensuring that all off-road equipment greater than 50 horsepower (hp) and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities shall operate on at least an EPA-approved Tier 3 or newer engine. Exemptions can be made for specialized equipment where Tier 3 engines are not commercially available within 200 miles of the Alpine CPA. The construction contract must identify these pieces of equipment, document their unavailability, and ensure that they operate on no less than an EPA-approved Tier 2 engine.</p> <p><b>MM-AQ-5.</b> Require construction contractors to maintain all construction equipment in proper working condition according to manufacturer's specifications. The equipment must be checked by a certified mechanic and determine to be running in proper condition before it is operated.</p>	

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
			<p><b>MM-AQ-6.</b> Require construction contractors to implement and comply with the following fugitive dust control practices.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce fugitive dust from disturbed soil areas by: watering exposed soil with adequate frequency for continued moist soil (without overwatering to the extent that sediment flows off the site); suspending excavation, grading, and/or demolition activity when wind speeds exceed 20 miles per hour; installing wind breaks (e.g., trees or solid fencing) on windward side(s) of construction areas; and planting vegetative ground cover (fast-germinating native grass seed) in disturbed areas.</li> <li>• Reduce fugitive dust from unpaved roads by: installing wheel washers for all existing trucks, or washing off all trucks and equipment leaving the site; treating site access to a distance of 100 feet from the paved road with a six- to 12-inch layer of wood chips, mulch, or gravel; and posting a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and a person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints.</li> </ul> <p><b>MM-AQ-7.</b> Require construction contractors to reduce construction-related fugitive VOC emissions by ensuring that low-VOC coatings that have a VOC content of 10 grams/liter (g/L) or less are used during construction. The construction contract must demonstrate the use of low-VOC coatings and be submitted to SDAPCD prior to the start of construction.</p>	

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
<b><i>Operation Mitigation Measures</i></b>				
			<p><b>MM-AQ-8.</b> Prohibit the installation of wood burning stoves or fireplaces in discretionary residential developments. All stoves and fireplaces installed in proposed discretionary residential developments must be natural gas or electric.</p>	
			<p><b>MM-AQ-9.</b> Require all new residential and commercial developments to include accessible outdoor outlets in the project design to facilitate the use of electricity-powered landscaping equipment.</p>	
			<p><b>MM-AQ-10.</b> Require the provision of educational materials for residential and commercial tenants concerning green consumer products and electric powered landscaping equipment. Prior to receipt of any certificate of final occupancy, the project sponsors shall work with the County to develop electronic correspondence to be distributed by email to new residential and commercial tenants that encourages the purchase of consumer products that generate lower than typical VOC emissions. Examples of green products may include low-VOC architectural coatings, cleaning supplies, and consumer products, as well as alternatively fueled landscaping equipment. The correspondence will also discuss the air quality and public health benefits of using electric powered landscaping equipment over conventional gasoline-powered equipment.</p>	
			<p><b>MM-AQ-11.</b> Encourage water heaters in new residential developments to be either solar, electrically powered, or tankless gas.</p>	

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
			<p><b>MM-AQ-12.</b> Require all non-residential projects to prepare a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan that focuses on reducing vehicle trips during commute hours. Project applicants shall coordinate with the County on project-specific requirements for a TDM plan related to a County TDM Ordinance, if adopted, or similar requirement. In lieu of an adopted TDM Ordinance at the county-level, projects should develop a TDM program that includes trip reduction policies supported by the SANDAG <i>Mobility Management Guidebook</i> (SANDAG 2019) or the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) <i>Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures</i> (CAPCOA 2010). Any TDM plans that developed outside of compliance with a County-adopted ordinance will be reviewed and approved by the County.</p> <p><b>MM-AQ-13.</b> Require all new County-owned and -operated buildings proposed within the Alpine CPA to achieve zero net energy. Additionally, all landscaping equipment used at County owned and operated buildings and managed landscaped areas would be all electric.</p>	
	<p><b>Impact-C-AQ-2: Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Increase in Nonattainment Pollutant from Cumulative Projects.</b> Similar to the 2011 General Plan, the proposed project would cause a potentially significant cumulative impact related to nonattainment criteria air pollutants. Due to the increased</p>	PS	<p>Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR Mitigation Measures <b>Air-2.1</b> through <b>Air-2.13</b>, and <b>Air-4.1</b>, and <b>MM-AQ-1</b> through <b>MM-AQ-13</b> as described above.</p>	SU

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
	density proposed, the project would result in a more severe impact than the prior EIR and mitigation is therefore required.			
Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations	<b>Impact-AQ-3: Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations.</b> Due to project specific construction and operation details being unknown, the proposed project would cause a potentially significant impact related to sensitive receptors. Due to the potential for exacerbated pollutant exposure, the project would result in a more severe impact than the prior EIR and mitigation is therefore required.	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR Mitigation Measures <b>Air-2.1</b> through <b>Air-2.13</b> , and <b>Air-4.1</b> , and <b>MM-AQ-13</b> as described above..	SU
	<b>Impact-C-AQ-3: Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations.</b> Similar to the 2011 General Plan, the proposed project would cause a potentially significant cumulative impact related to sensitive receptors. This would be considered a significant impact. Due to the potential for exacerbated pollutant exposure, the project would result in a more severe impact than the prior EIR and mitigation is therefore required.		Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR Mitigation Measures <b>Air-2.1</b> through <b>Air-2.13</b> , and <b>Air-4.1</b> , and <b>MM-AQ-13</b> as described above.	SU
Create Objectionable Odors	Direct and cumulative impacts related to emissions of odors are less than significant	LS	No New Mitigation Measures are Required.	LS

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
<b>2.4 Biological Resources</b>				
<b>Project Impacts</b>				
Substantial Adverse Effect on any Candidate, Sensitive, or Special-Status Species in Local or Regional Plans, Policies or Regulations	<b>Impact-BIO-1: Adversely Affect Special-Status Plant and Wildlife Species.</b> Increased density and intensity associated with the proposed project would result in a more severe loss of sensitive habitat and the special-status plant and wildlife species it supports compared to the prior EIRs. This would be considered a significant impact.	PS	<p><b>Bio-1.1:</b> Create a Conservation Subdivision Program that facilitates conservation-oriented project design through changes to the Subdivision Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance, Zoning Ordinance, Groundwater Ordinance, and other regulations as necessary. It is intended that these changes will promote conservation of natural resources and open space while improving mechanisms for flexibility in project design so that production of housing stock is not negatively impacted. Additionally, any such allowances of flexibility must be done with consideration of community character through planning group coordination and/or findings required for project approval.</p> <p><b>Bio-1.2:</b> Implement and revise existing Habitat Conservation Plans/Policies to preserve sensitive resources within a cohesive system of open space. In addition, continue preparation of MSCP Plans for North County and East County.</p> <p><b>Bio-1.3:</b> Implement conservation agreements through Board Policy I-123, as this will facilitate preservation of high-value habitat in the County MSCP Subarea Plan.</p> <p><b>Bio-1.4:</b> Coordinate with nonprofit groups and other agencies to acquire preserve lands.</p> <p><b>Bio-1.5:</b> Utilize County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biological Resources to identify adverse impacts to biological resources. Also utilize the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records and the Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species to</p>	SU

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
			locate special status species populations on or near project sites. This information will be used to avoid or mitigate impacts as appropriate.	
			<b>Bio-1.6:</b> Implement the RPO, BMO, and HLP Ordinance to protect wetlands, wetland buffers, sensitive habitat lands, biological resource core areas, linkages, corridors, high-value habitat areas, subregional coastal sage scrub focus areas, and populations of rare, or endangered plant or animal species.	
			<b>Bio-1.7:</b> Minimize edge effects from development projects located near sensitive resources by implementing the County Noise Ordinance, the County Groundwater Ordinance, the County's Landscaping Regulations (currently part of the Zoning Ordinance), and the County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance.	
			<b>MM-Bio-1:</b> As a part of the discretionary review of subsequent projects proposed under the Alpine CPU, County staff shall review proposed projects to determine if any potentially significant biological resource is present on site. If it is determined that potentially significant biological resources are present on site, compliance with the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance – Biological Resources, shall be required. This may require, pursuant to PDS staff determination, the preparation of a technical report or memorandum that would evaluate the biological of the resource and identify appropriate mitigation measures, as required	
	<b>Impact-C-BIO-1: Cumulatively Considerable Contribution to Adverse Effects on Special-Status</b>	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR Mitigation Measures Bio-1.1 through Bio-1.7 and MM-BIO-1.	SU



Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
	<b>Plant and Wildlife Species.</b> Future development associated with the Alpine CPU, when combined with cumulative growth and development within the cumulative study area, would increase habitat loss and potential impacts on special-status species. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to this cumulative impact would be more severe than the contribution identified in the prior EIRs. This impact would be cumulatively considerable.			
Substantial Adverse Effect on any Riparian Habitat or Other Sensitive Natural Community Identified in Local or Regional Plans, Policies, Regulations or by CDFW, NMFS, or USFWS	<b>Impact-BIO-2: Adversely Affect Riparian Habitat and Other Sensitive Natural Communities.</b> Increased density and intensity associated with the proposed project would result in a more severe loss of riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities compared to the prior EIRs. This would be considered a significant impact.	PS	<b>Bio-2.1:</b> Revise the Ordinance Relating to Water Conservation for Landscaping to incorporate appropriate plant types and regulations requiring planting of native or compatible non-native, non-invasive plant species in new development.  <b>Bio-2.2:</b> Require that development projects obtain CWA Section 401/404 permits issued by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for all project-related disturbances of waters of the U.S. and/or associated wetlands. Also continue to require that projects obtain Fish and Game Code Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreements	SU

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
			from the California Department of Fish and Game for all project-related disturbances of streambeds.  <b>Bio-2.3:</b> Ensure that wetlands and wetland buffer areas are adequately preserved whenever feasible to maintain biological functions and values.  <b>Bio-2.4:</b> Implement the Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance to protect wetlands.  Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR Mitigation Measures Bio-1.1 through Bio-1.7 and MM-Bio-1, as described above.	
	<b>Impact-C-BIO-2: Cumulatively Considerable Contribution to Adverse Effects on Riparian Habitat and Other Sensitive Natural Communities.</b> Future development associated with the Alpine CPU, when combined with cumulative growth and development within the cumulative study area, would increase riparian habitat loss. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to this cumulative impact would be more severe than the contribution identified in the prior EIRs. This impact would be cumulatively considerable.	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR Mitigation Measures Bio-1.1 through Bio-1.7 and Bio-2.1 through Bio-2.4, and MM-Bio-1.	SU
Substantial Adverse Effect on Federally Protected Wetlands as Defined by	<b>Impact-BIO-3: Adversely Affect Federally Protected Wetlands.</b> Increased density and intensity associated with the proposed project would result in a more severe direct loss of federally protected and County	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR Mitigation Measures Bio-1.1, Bio-1.5 through Bio-1.7, and Bio-2.2 through Bio-2.4, and MM-Bio-1.	LS

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Section 404 of the Clean Water Act	RPO wetlands compared to the prior EIRs. This would be considered a significant impact.			
Substantial Interference with the Movement of any Native Resident or Migratory Fish or Wildlife Species	<b>Impact-BIO-4: Adversely Affect Wildlife Movement Corridors and Nursery Sites.</b> Increased density and intensity associated with the proposed project would have the potential to result in greater impacts on sensitive habitats, some of which have the potential to include nursery sites. As such, direct and indirect impacts on wildlife nursery sites associated with the Alpine CPU would be more severe than those identified in the prior EIRs. This would be considered a significant impact.	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR Mitigation Measures Bio-1.1 through Bio-1.7 and Bio-2.3, and MM-Bio-1.	SU
	<b>Impact-C-BIO-3: Cumulatively Considerable Contribution to Adverse Effects on Wildlife Corridors and Nursery Sites.</b> Future development associated with the Alpine CPU, when combined with cumulative growth and development within the cumulative study area, would result in a greater loss of nursery sites. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to this impact would be more severe than the contribution identified in the prior EIRs. This impact would be cumulatively considerable.	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR Mitigation Measures Bio-1.1 through Bio-1.7 and Bio-2.3, and MM-Bio-1.	SU

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Conflict with any Applicable Local Policies or Ordinances	No New or More Severe Impacts Than Previously Identified in the Prior EIRs.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
	Because development associated with the proposed project would be required to comply with the aforementioned ordinances and policies protecting biological resources, potential impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, potential impacts would be similar to those identified in the prior EIRs.			
	No New or More Severe Cumulative Impacts Than Previously Identified in the Prior EIRs.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
	Potential project-level impacts would be less than significant and would be similar to those identified in the prior EIRs. Additionally, implementation of General Plan policies would further reduce the potential for development to conflict with local policies and ordinances protecting biological resources. Because cumulative projects would also be required to comply with these policies and ordinances, the proposed project's contribution to cumulative impacts would be less than significant and similar to the contribution identified in the prior EIRs and would not be cumulatively considerable.			

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Habitat Conservation Plans	No New or More Severe Impacts Than Previously Identified in the Prior EIRs.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
	Because future development within the SCMSCP would be required to comply with the BMO and make MSCP Conformance Findings, impacts would be less than significant.			
	No New or More Severe Cumulative Impacts Than Previously Identified in the Prior EIRs.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
	Future development associated with the proposed project would be required to comply with the applicable HCPs and NCCPs, as well as the local policies and ordinances that support them, and the proposed project would result in less than significant project-level impacts associated with conflicts with adopted HCPs and NCCPs, similar to the prior EIRs. Additionally, implementation of General Plan policies identified in policies identified in Section 2.4.2.1 would further reduce the potential for proposed project-related development to conflict with adopted HCPs and NCCPs.			
<b>2.5 Cultural Resources</b>				
<b>Project Impacts</b>				
Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of a	<b>Impact-CUL-1: Change the Significance of a Historical Resource.</b> Due to increased development densities proposed in	PS	<b>Cul-1.1:</b> Utilize the RPO, CEQA, the Grading and Clearing Ordinance, and the Zoning Ordinance to identify and protect important historic and archaeological resources by requiring appropriate	LS

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Historical Resource as Defined in Section 15064.5	the Alpine CPA, the proposed project would cause a more severe potentially significant impact related to historical resources compared to the prior EIRs. This would be considered a significant impact.		<p>reviews and applying mitigation when impacts are significant.</p> <p><b>Cul-1.2:</b> Provide incentives through the Mills Act to encourage the restoration, renovation, or adaptive reuse of historic resources.</p> <p><b>Cul-1.3:</b> Initiate a new effort to identify and catalog historic and potentially historic resources within unincorporated San Diego County. This process will require public participation and evaluation by County staff and the Historic Site Board. The anticipated result of this effort is: 1) at minimum, landowners will be better informed of potential resources on their properties as well as the options available to them under the State/National Register or the Mills Act; and 2) in some cases, properties may be zoned with a special area designator for historic resources, thereby restricting demolition/removal and requiring a Site Plan permit for proposed construction which will be reviewed by the Historic Site Board.</p> <p><b>Cul-1.4:</b> Support the Historic Site Board in their efforts to provide oversight for historic resources.</p> <p><b>CUL-1.5:</b> Ensure landmarking and historical listing of County owned historic sites</p> <p><b>Cul-1.6:</b> Implement, and update as necessary, the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Cultural Resources to identify and minimize adverse impacts to historic and archaeological resources</p> <p><b>Cul-1.7:</b> Identify potentially historic structures within the County and enter the information in the Department of Planning and Land Use property</p>	

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
			<p>database. Identification will occur by compiling information from all available sources (e.g., County surveys, Historic Site Board, information received from SOHO and community planning groups, information from other jurisdictions, etc.) and shall be updated at least every five years.</p> <p><b>Cul-1.8:</b> Revise the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) to apply to the demolition or alteration of identified significant historic structures.</p> <p><b>MM-CUL-1:</b> Important historic resources in the Alpine Plan area shall be protected through utilization of dedicated open space.</p> <p><b>MM-CUL-2:</b> Support the preparation of an inventory of significant historical landmarks in Alpine</p> <p><b>MM-CUL-3:</b> As a part of the discretionary review of subsequent projects proposed under the Alpine CPU, County staff shall review proposed projects to determine if any potentially historical significant resource is present on site. If it is determined that potentially significant historical resources are present on site, compliance with the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance – Cultural Resources: Archaeological and Historic Resources, shall be required. This may require, pursuant to County Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) staff determination, the preparation of a technical report or memorandum that would evaluate the historical significance of the resource and identify appropriate mitigation measures, as required.</p>	

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
	<b>Impact-C-CUL-1:</b> The proposed project would cause a more severe potentially significant impact related to historical resources compared to the prior EIRs. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to this impact would be cumulatively considerable.	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR Mitigation Measures Cul-1.1 through Cul-1.8, and MM-CUL-1 through MM-CUL-3.	LS
Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of an Archaeological Resource as Defined in Section 15064.5	<b>Impact-CUL-2: Change the Significance of an Archaeological Resource.</b> Due to increased development densities proposed in the Alpine CPA, the proposed project would cause more severe potentially significant impacts related to archaeological resources compared to the prior EIRs. This would be considered a significant impact.	PS	<p><b>Cul-2.1:</b> Develop management and restoration plans for identified and acquired properties with cultural resources.</p> <p><b>Cul-2.2:</b> Facilitate the identification and acquisition of important resources through collaboration with agencies, tribes, and institutions, such as the South Coast Information Center (SCIC), while maintaining the confidentiality of sensitive cultural information</p> <p><b>Cul-2.3:</b> Support the dedication of easements that protect important cultural resources by using a variety of funding methods, such as grants or matching funds, or funds from private organizations</p> <p><b>Cul-2.4:</b> Protect significant cultural resources through regional coordination and consultation with the NAHC and local tribal governments, including SB-18 review</p> <p><b>Cul-2.5:</b> Protect undiscovered subsurface archaeological resources by requiring grading monitoring by a qualified archaeologist and a Native American monitor for ground disturbing activities in the vicinity of known archaeological resources, and also, when feasible, during initial surveys</p> <p><b>Cul-2.6:</b> Protect significant cultural resources by facilitating the identification and acquisition of</p>	LS



Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
			important resources through regional coordination with agencies, and institutions, such as the South Coast Information Center (SCIC) and consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and local tribal governments, including SB-18 review, while maintaining the confidentiality of sensitive cultural information.	
			<b>MM-CUL-4:</b> Important archaeological resources in the Alpine Plan area shall be protected through utilization of dedicated open space.	
			<b>MM-CUL-5:</b> As a part of the discretionary review of subsequent projects proposed under the Alpine CPU, County staff shall review proposed projects to determine if an archaeological resource as defined by PRC Section 21083.2, State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a), and the RPO has the potential to be located on site. If it is determined that an archaeological resource has the potential to be located on site, compliance with the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance – Cultural Resources: Archaeological and Historic Resources, shall be required. This may require, pursuant to County PDS staff determination, the preparation of a technical report or memorandum that would evaluate the significance of the resource and identify appropriate mitigation measures.	
	<b>Impact-C-CUL-2:</b> The proposed project would cause a more severe potentially significant impact related to archaeological resources compared to the prior EIRs. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to this	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR Mitigation Measures Cul-2.1 through Cul-2.6, and MM-CUL-4, and MM-CUL-5.	LS

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
	impact would be cumulatively considerable.			
Directly or Indirectly Destroy a Unique Paleontological Resource or Site or Unique Geologic Feature	<b>Impact-CUL-3: Destroy a Unique Paleontological Resource.</b> Due to increased development densities proposed in the Alpine CPA, the proposed project would cause more severe potentially significant impacts related to paleontological resources and unique geology compared to the prior EIRs. This would be considered a significant impact.	PS	<p><b>Cul-3.1:</b> Implement the Grading Ordinance and CEQA to avoid or minimize impacts to paleontological resources, require a paleontological resources monitor during grading when appropriate, and apply appropriate mitigation when impacts are significant.</p> <p><b>Cul-3.2:</b> Implement, and update as necessary, the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Paleontological Resources to identify and minimize adverse impacts to paleontological resources.</p> <p><b>MM-CUL-6:</b> Paleontological monitoring programs will be implemented for projects that are located within paleontological sensitive areas that include Subarea 2. The monitoring program will be implemented on a project-by-project basis and conform to all applicable federal, state, and local regulations and the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance - Paleontological Resources.</p> <p><b>MM-CUL-7:</b> As a part of the discretionary review of subsequent projects proposed under the Alpine CPU, County staff shall review proposed projects to determine if any unique geology is present on site. If it is determined that unique geology is present on site, compliance with the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance – Unique Geology, shall be required. This may require, pursuant to County PDS staff determination, incorporation of project design features and mitigation measures to reduce impacts.</p>	LS

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
	<b>Impact-C-CUL-3:</b> The proposed project would cause a more severe potentially significant impact related to paleontological resources compared to the prior EIRs. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to this impact would be cumulatively considerable.	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR Mitigation Measures Cul-3.1 and Cul-3.2, and MM-Cul-6 and MM-Cul-7.	LS
Disturb any Human Remains, Including Those Interred Outside of Formal Cemeteries	<b>Impact-CUL-4: Disturb Human Remains.</b> Due to increased development densities proposed in the Alpine CPA, the proposed project would cause more severe potentially significant impacts related to human remains compared to the prior EIRs. This would be considered a significant impact.	PS	<b>Cul-4.1:</b> Include regulations and procedures for discovery of human remains in all land disturbance and archaeological-related programs. Ensure that all references to discovery of human remains promote preservation and include proper handling and coordination with Native American groups. Apply appropriate mitigation when impacts are significant.	LS
	<b>Impact-C-CUL-4:</b> The proposed project would cause a more severe potentially significant impact related to human remains compared to the prior EIRs. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to this impact would be cumulatively considerable.	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR Mitigation Measures Cul-4.1.	LS
<b>2.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change</b>				
<b>Project Impacts</b>				
Generation of GHG Emissions in 2030 and 2050	<b>Impact-GHG-1 and Impact-C-GHG-1: Result in a Cumulatively Considerable GHG Emissions That May Have a Significant Impact on the Environment in 2030.</b> The proposed project would result in emissions of GHGs as a result of	PS	<b>CC-1.1:</b> Update the County Green Building Program to increase effectiveness of encouraging incentives for development that is energy efficient and conserves resources through incentives and education  <b>CC-1.2</b> Prepare a County Climate Change Action Plan with an update baseline inventory of greenhouse gas	SU

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>construction and operation of development in the Alpine CPA. The Alpine CPU does not include policies that would require developments to comply with project-level GHG reduction measures that would be consistent with the 2017 Scoping Plan to achieve the State's 2030 GHG emissions reduction target. In addition, the proposed project would not achieve VMT reductions consistent with State climate goals. This would be considered a significant impact and would be cumulatively considerable.</p> <p><b>Impact-GHG-2 and Impact-C-GHG-2: Result in Cumulatively Considerable GHG Emissions That May Have a Significant Impact on the Environment in 2050.</b> The proposed project would result in emissions of GHGs as a result of construction and operation of development in the Alpine CPA. The Alpine CPU does not include policies that would require developments to comply with project-level GHG reduction measures that would be consistent with the 2017 Scoping Plan. Further, the 2017 Scoping Plan identifies that existing technologies and feasible measures would not be adequate to achieve the State's 2050 GHG reduction goal. In addition, the</p>		<p>emissions from all sources, more detailed greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets and deadlines; and a comprehensive and enforceable GHG emissions reduction measures that will achieve a 17% reduction in emissions from County operations from 2006 by 2020 and a 9% reduction in community emissions between 2006 and 2020. Once prepared, implementation of the plan will be monitored and progress reported on a regular basis</p> <p><b>CC-1.3</b> Work with SANDAG to achieve regional goals in reducing GHG emissions associated with land use and transportation.</p> <p><b>CC-1.4</b> Review traffic operations to implement measures that improve flow and reduce idling such as improving traffic signal synchronization and decreasing stop rate and time</p> <p><b>CC-1.5</b> Coordinate with the San Diego County Water Authority and other water agencies to better link land use planning with water supply planning with specific regard to potential impacts from climate change and continued implementation and enhancement of water conservation programs to reduce demand. Also support water conservation pricing (e.g., tiered rate structures) to encourage efficient water use</p> <p><b>CC-1.6</b> Implement and expand County-wide recycling and composting programs for residents and businesses. Require commercial and industrial recycling</p> <p><b>CC-1.7</b> Incorporate the California ARB's recommendations for a climate change CEQA threshold into the County Guidelines for Determining</p>	

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
	proposed project would not achieve VMT reductions consistent with state climate goals. This would be considered a significant impact and would be cumulatively considerable.		<p>Significance for Climate Change. These recommendations will include energy, waste, water, and transportation performance measures for new discretionary projects in order to reduce GHG emissions. Should the recommendation not be released in a timely manner, the County will prepare its own threshold.</p> <p><b>CC-1.8</b> Revise County Guidelines for Determining Significance based on the Climate Change Action Plan. The revisions will include guidance for proposed discretionary projects to achieve greater energy, water, waste, and transportation efficiency.</p> <p><b>CC-1.9</b> Coordinate with APCD, SDG&amp;E, and the California Center for Sustainable Energy to research and possibly develop a mitigation credit program. Under this program, mitigation funds will be used to retrofit existing buildings for energy efficiency to reduce GHG emissions.</p> <p><b>CC-10</b> Continue to implement the County Groundwater Ordinance, Watershed Protection Ordinance (WPO), Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), MSCP and prepare MSCP Plans for North and East County in order to further preserve wildlife habitat and corridors, wetlands, watersheds, groundwater recharge areas and other open space that provide carbon sequestration benefits and to restrict the use of water for cleaning outdoor surfaces and vehicles. The WPO also implements low-impact development practices that maintain the existing hydrologic character of the site to manage storm water and protect the environment. (Retaining storm water</p>	

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
			<p>runoff on-site can drastically reduce the need for energy-intensive imported water at the site.).</p> <p><b>CC-1.11</b> Revise the Ordinance Relating to Water Conservation for Landscaping to further water conservation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create water-efficient landscapes and use water-efficient irrigation systems and devices, such as soil moisture-based irrigation controls.</li> <li>• Use reclaimed water for landscape irrigation.</li> <li>• Restrict watering methods (e.g., prohibit systems that apply water to non-vegetated surfaces) and control runoff.</li> <li>• Provide education about water conservation and available programs and incentives.</li> </ul> <p><b>CC-1.12</b> Continue to coordinate with resource agencies, CALFIRE, and fire districts to minimize potential wildfire risks in the County and to plan for the potential increase in future risk that may result from Climate Change.</p> <p><b>CC-1.13:</b> Continue to implement and revise as necessary the Regional Trails Plan as well as the Community Trails Master Plan to connect parks and publicly accessible open space through shared pedestrian/bike paths and trails to encourage walking and bicycling.</p> <p><b>CC-1.14:</b> Provide public education and information about options for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. In addition to addressing land development, education</p>	

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
			<p>should also address purchasing, conservation, and recycling.</p> <p><b>CC-1.15:</b> Reduce VMT and encourage alternative modes of transportation by implementing the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During Community Plan updates, establish policies and design guidelines that: encourage commercial centers in compact walkable configurations and discourage “strip” commercial development</li> <li>• Expand community bicycle infrastructure.</li> <li>• Revise the Off-Street Parking Design Manual to include parking placement concepts that encourage pedestrian activity and concepts for providing shared parking facilities.</li> <li>• Establish comprehensive planning principles for transit nodes such as the Sprinter Station located in North County Metro.</li> <li>• Continue to locate County facilities near transit facilities whenever feasible.</li> <li>• Coordinate with SANDAG, Caltrans, and tribal governments to maximize opportunities to locate park and ride facilities.</li> <li>• Continue to coordinate with SANDAG, Caltrans, and transit agencies to expand the mass transit opportunities in the unincorporated county and to review the location and design of transit stops. Establish a DPLU transit coordinator to ensure land use issues are being addressed.</li> </ul>	

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Update the Zoning Ordinance to require commercial, office, and industrial development to provide preferred parking for carpools, vanpools, electric vehicles, and flex cars.</li> </ul> <p><b>CC-1.16</b> Develop and implement a Strategic Energy Plan to increase energy efficiency in existing County buildings and set standards for any new County facilities that will ultimately reduce GHG emissions. This will include implementation of the following measures as will be detailed within the Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve energy efficiency within existing operations through retrofit projects, updated purchasing policies, updated maintenance/operations standards, and education.</li> <li>Improve energy efficiency of new construction and major renovations by applying design criteria and participating in incentive programs.</li> <li>Provide energy in a reliable and cost-effective manner and utilize renewable energy systems where feasible.</li> <li>Monitor and reduce energy demand through metering, building controls, and energy monitoring systems.</li> <li>Increase County fleet fuel efficiency by acquiring more hybrid vehicles, using alternative fuels, and by maintaining performance standards for all fleet vehicles.</li> </ul> <p><b>CC-1.17</b> Develop and implement a County Operations Recycling Program. This will include implementation</p>	



Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
			<p>of the following measures as will be detailed within the Program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reuse and recycle construction and demolition waste (including, but not limited to, soil, vegetation, concrete, lumber, metal, and cardboard).</li> <li>• Provide interior and exterior storage areas for recyclables and green waste and adequate recycling containers located in public areas.</li> <li>• Recover by-product methane to generate electricity.</li> <li>• Provide education and publicity about reducing waste and available recycling services.</li> </ul> <p><b>CC-1.18</b> Develop and implement a County Operations Water Conservation Program.</p> <p><b>CC-1.19</b> Revise the Zoning Ordinance to facilitate recycling salvaged concrete, asphalt, and rock.</p> <p><b>MM-GHG-1:</b> Require all development in the Alpine CPA to demonstrate consistency with the 2017 Scoping Plan through the implementation of all applicable BMPs. All development subject to the discretionary review process will identify which BMPs are applicable to the project and provide supporting evidence through CEQA review. This determination shall be provided through a BMP Consistency Review Checklist, developed by the County, to determine whether an individual project would be consistent with required measures.</p>	

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Conflict with Applicable Plan(s) in 2030 and 2050	<p><b>Impact-GHG-3 and Impact-C-GHG-3: Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Conflict with an Applicable Plan, Policy, or Regulation of an Agency Adopted for the Purpose of Reducing Emissions of GHGs by 2030.</b> The Alpine CPU does not include policies that would require developments to comply with project-level GHG reduction measures that would be consistent with the 2017 Scoping Plan, which identifies measures to achieve the State's 2030 GHG reduction target. In addition, the proposed project would not achieve VMT reductions consistent with state climate goals. This would be considered a significant impact and would be cumulatively considerable.</p> <p><b>Impact GHG-4 and C-GHG-4: Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Conflict with an Applicable Plan, Policy, or Regulation of an Agency Adopted for the Purpose of Reducing Emissions of GHGs by 2050.</b> The Alpine CPU does not include policies that would require developments to comply with project-level GHG reduction measures that would be consistent with the 2017 Scoping Plan, which identifies measures to achieve the State's 2030</p>	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update Mitigation Measures CC-1.1 through CC-1.19, and <b>MM-GHG-1</b> as described above.	SU

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
	GHG reduction target. The 2017 Scoping Plan identifies that existing technologies and feasible measures would not be adequate to achieve the State's 2050 GHG reduction goal. In addition, the proposed project would not achieve VMT reductions consistent with state climate goals. This would be considered a significant impact and would be cumulatively considerable.			
<b>2.7 Wildfire</b>				
<b>Project Impacts</b>				
Adopted Emergency Response or Emergency Evacuation Plan	<b>Impact-WILD-1: Substantially Impair an Adopted Emergency Response Plan or Emergency Evacuation Plan.</b> There is the potential that emergency response and evacuation would be insufficient during wildfires due to the substantial potential growth that could occur under the Alpine CPU. Consequently, this growth could substantially impair existing emergency response and evacuation plans, potentially increasing the risk to loss of life and property in the event of a wildfire. This would be considered a significant impact.	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR Mitigation Measures MM-Haz-3.1 through MM-Haz-3.3, MM-Haz-4.4, MM-Pub-1.5, and Alpine CPU Measures MM-Tra-4.1 through MM-Tra-4.3 (see Appendix B, General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures, or corresponding section in this table).  <b>MM-WILD-1:</b> As a part of the discretionary review of subsequent projects proposed under the Alpine CPU, County staff shall review proposed projects to determine if subsequent projects are located within a High or Very High FHSZ. Subsequent projects within these zones would be required to prepare an FPP that is subject to the review and approval of the Alpine Fire Protection District and the San Diego County Fire Authority. Prior to preparation of an FPP, subsequent projects shall coordinate with appropriate fire agencies to ensure that modeling of the FPP and design of the project is appropriate to meet the Fire Adapted Communities Strategy. The FPP shall assess a project's compliance with current regulatory codes and ensure that impacts resulting from wildland fire hazards have	SU

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
			<p>been adequately mitigated. The FPP shall identify evacuation routes within the vicinity of the project site and those routes shall not impair the ability of surrounding development to evacuate. Prepared FPPs for projects within 1 mile of the CNF, shall be provided to CNF for review.</p> <p><b>MM-WILD-2:</b> As a part of the discretionary review of subsequent projects that have an occupancy of 200 or more, proposed under the Alpine CPU, an Evacuation Plan would be required. The Evacuation Plan shall not be in conflict with the community-wide evacuation plans that are part of the Alpine Community Wildfire Protection Plan that has been prepared by the Alpine Fire Safe Council. Evacuation Plans shall include analysis regarding the evacuation capabilities, improving on- and off-site roadways, and any improvements necessary to handle the egress and ingress during an evacuation.</p> <p><b>MM-WILD-3:</b> As a part of the discretionary review of subsequent projects proposed under the Alpine CPU, identify the adequacy of the access and evacuation routes relative to the degree of development or use (including but not limited to road width, road type, length of dead-end roads, and turnouts). If the routes are determined to be inadequate as part of this review, the Fire Authority Having Jurisdiction (FAHJ) will identify the required improvements to be made.</p>	
	<p><b>Impact-C-WILD-1: Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Contribution to the Impairment of an Adopted Emergency Response or Evacuation Plans.</b></p>	PS	<p>Implement 2011 General Plan EIR mitigation measures MM-Haz-3.1 through MM-Haz-3.3, MM-Haz-4.4, MM-Pub-1.5, and MM-Tra-4.1 through MM-Tra-4.3 and MM-WILD-1 through MM-WILD-3.</p>	SU

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
	The proposed project would cause a greater impact related to the impairment of Adopted Emergency Response or Evacuation Plans compared to existing conditions and the impact identified in the 2011 General Plan EIR. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to this impact would be cumulatively considerable.			
Expose Receptors to Pollutants from Wildfire	<b>Impact-WILD-2: Expose Receptors to Pollutants from Wildfire.</b> Future development associated with the Alpine CPU would have the potential to exacerbate wildfire risk by introducing a substantial number of new residents to less developed areas of the community, who in turn could be exposed to pollutant concentrations in the event of a wildfire. This would be considered a significant impact.	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan EIR mitigation measures MM-Haz-4.1, MM-Haz-4.3, MM-Haz-4.4, MM-Hyd-3.2, MM-Pub-1.4, MM-Pub-1.7, MM-Tra-4.3, and MM-CC-1.12 (see Appendix B, General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures or corresponding section in this table) , and MM-WILD-1 through MM-WILD-3 described above.	SU
	<b>Impact-C-WILD-2: Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Contribution to the Exposure of Receptors to Pollutants from Wildfire.</b> The proposed project would cause a greater impact related to the exposure of receptors to pollutants from wildfire compared to existing conditions and the impacts identified in the 2011 General Plan EIR. Therefore, the proposed project's	PS	Implement MM-Haz-4.1, MM-Haz-4.3, MM-Haz-4.4, MM-Hyd-3.2, MM-Pub-1.4, MM-Pub-1.7, MM-Tra-4.3, and MM-CC-1.12 (see Appendix B, General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures) and MM-WILD-1 through MM-WILD-3.	SU

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
	contribution to this impact would be cumulatively considerable.			
Exacerbate Wildfire Risk from New Infrastructure	<b>Impact-WILD-3: Exacerbate Wildfire Risk from New Infrastructure.</b> Future development associated with the Alpine CPU within the less developed subareas would likely require paving of new roads to improve emergency services and evacuation access or paving over existing dirt roads and the extension of utilities such as electrical power lines. Areas of increased density and land use intensity are located within the village boundary (Subareas 2 and 6), directly south of a new fire station, and an area adjacent to the current primary evacuation route (Subarea 4). However, most wildfires are started near developed areas and roadways, so future development and associated infrastructure within these areas would have the potential to exacerbate wildfire risk, which would be a potentially significant impact.	PS	Implement MM-Haz-4.1, MM-Haz-4.3, MM-Haz-4.4, MM-Lan-1.2, MM-Pub-1.3 through MM-Pub-1.6, MM-Pub-1.8, MM-Tra-1..4, and MM-Tra-4.3 (see Appendix B, General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures or corresponding section of this table), and MM-WILD-1 through MM_WILD-3.	SU
	<b>Impact-C-WILD-3: Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Contribution the Exacerbation of Wildfire Risk from New Infrastructure.</b> The proposed project would cause a greater impact related to the exacerbation of wildfire risk from new infrastructure compared to existing conditions and the impacts	PS	Implement MM-Haz-4.1, MM-Haz-4.3, MM-Haz-4.4, MM-Lan-1.2, MM-Pub-1.3 through MM-Pub-1.6, MM-Pub-1.8, MM-Tra-1..4, and MM-Tra-4.3 (see Appendix B, General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures or corresponding section of this table), and MM-WILD-1 through MM_WILD-3.	SU

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
	identified in the 2011 General Plan EIR. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to this impact would be cumulatively considerable.			
Expose People or Structures to Significant Risks from Post-Wildfire Hazards	<b>Impact-WILD-4: Expose People or Structures to Significant Risks from Post-Wildfire Hazards.</b> The proposed project would both potentially exacerbate wildfire risk and increase risks to life and property by placing a substantial number of new housing units and residents in an area prone to wildfire and susceptible to post-fire hazards. Consequently, the proposed project would expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. This would be considered a significant impact.	PS	Implement MM-Haz-4.4, MM-Hyd-3.1, MM-Hyd-3.2, MM-Hyd-3.3, MM-Hyd-6.1, MM-Tra-4.3, and MM-CC-1.12 (see Appendix B, General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures or corresponding section of this table), and MM-WILD-1 through MM-WILD-3.	SU
	<b>Impact-C-WILD-4: Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Contribution to On- or Off-site Flooding.</b> The proposed project would cause a greater impact related to the exposure of receptors to pollutants from wildfire compared to existing conditions and the impacts identified in the 2011 General Plan EIR. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to this impact would be cumulatively considerable.	PS	Implement MM-Haz-4.4, MM-Hyd-3.1, MM-Hyd-3.2, MM-Hyd-3.3, MM-Hyd-6.1, MM-Tra-4.3, and MM-CC-1.12 (see Appendix B, General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures or corresponding section of this table), and MM-WILD-1 through MM-WILD-3	SU

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
<b>2.8 Hydrology and Water Quality</b>				
<b>Project Impacts</b>				
Violate any Water Quality Standards	<b>Impact-HYD-1: Violate Surface Water Quality Standards and Requirements during Construction Activities.</b> Due to increased development densities in the proposed project, construction of the proposed project would cause a more severe impact related to surface water quality standards and requirements compared to the impact identified in the prior EIRs. This would be considered a significant impact prior to mitigation.	PS	<p><b>Hyd-1.2:</b> Implement and revise as necessary the Watershed Protection Ordinance to reduce the adverse effects of polluted runoff discharges on waters and to encourage the removal of invasive species and restore natural drainage systems.</p> <p><b>Hyd-1.3:</b> Establish and implement LID standards for new development to minimize runoff and maximize infiltration.</p> <p><b>Hyd-1.4:</b> Revise and implement the Stormwater Standards Manual requiring appropriate measures for land use with a high potential to contaminate surface water or groundwater resources.</p> <p><b>Hyd-1.5:</b> Utilize the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Surface Water Quality, Hydrology, and Groundwater Resources to identify adverse environmental effects.</p> <p><b>Hyd-1.6:</b> Implement, and revise as necessary, Board Policy I-84 requiring that discretionary project applications include commitments from available water and sanitation districts.</p> <p><b>Hyd-1.7:</b> Ensure County planning staff participation in the review of wastewater facility long range and capital improvement plans.</p> <p><b>Hyd-1.8:</b> Allow wastewater facilities contingent upon approval of Major Use Permit to ensure facilities are adequately sized.</p>	LS



Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
			<p><b>Hyd-1.9:</b> Review septic system design, construction, and maintenance in cooperation with the Regional Water Quality Control Board through the Septic Tank Permit Process.</p> <p><b>Hyd-1.10:</b> Coordinate with the State Water Resources Control Board to develop statewide performance and design standards for conventional and alternative On-site Wastewater Treatment Systems.</p>	
	<p><b>Impact-HYD-2: Violate Surface Water Quality Standards and Requirements during Operational Activities.</b> Due to increased development densities in the proposed project, operation of the proposed project would cause a more severe impact related to surface water quality standards and requirements compared to the impact identified in the prior EIRs. This would be considered a significant impact prior to mitigation.</p>	PS	<p>Implement 2011 General Plan Update Mitigation Measures Hyd-1.2 through Hyd-1.10, as described above.</p>	LS
	<p><b>Impact-HYD-3: Violate Groundwater Quality Standards and Requirements during Construction Activities.</b> Due to increased development densities in the proposed project, construction of the proposed project would cause a more severe potentially significant impact related to groundwater quality standards and requirements compared to the impact identified in the prior EIRs. This would be</p>	PS	<p>Implement 2011 General Plan Update Mitigation Measures Hyd-1.2 through Hyd-1.10, as described above.</p>	LS

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
	considered a significant impact prior to mitigation.			
	<b>Impact-HYD-4: Violate Groundwater Quality Standards and Requirements during Operational Activities.</b> Due to increased development densities in the proposed project, operation of the proposed project would cause a more severe potentially significant impact related to groundwater quality standards and requirements compared to the impact identified in the prior EIRs. This would be considered a significant impact prior to mitigation.	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update Mitigation Measures Hyd-1.2 through Hyd-1.10, as described above.	SU
	<b>Impact-C-HYD-1: Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Contribution to Violating Water Quality Standards and Requirements.</b> The proposed project would cause a similar impact related to violating water quality standards and requirements compared to the impact identified in the prior EIRs. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to this impact would be cumulatively considerable.	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update Mitigation Measures Hyd-1.2 through Hyd-1.10, as described above.	SU
Deplete Groundwater Supplies	<b>Impact-HYD-5: Substantially Deplete Groundwater Supplies or Interfere Substantially with Groundwater Recharge.</b> Due to increased development densities in the proposed project, the proposed	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update Mitigation Measures Hyd-1.2 through Hyd-1.5, as described above.  <b>Hyd-2.1:</b> Implement, and revise as necessary, Board Policy I-84 requiring that discretionary project	SU

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
	project would cause more severe potentially significant impact related to depleting groundwater supplies and interfering with recharge compared to the impact identified in the prior EIRs. This would be considered a significant impact prior to mitigation.		<p>applications include commitments from available water districts. Also implement and revise as necessary Board Policy G-15 to conserve water at County facilities.</p> <p><b>Hyd-2.2:</b> Implement the Groundwater Ordinance to balance groundwater resources with new development. Also revise the Ordinance Relating to Water Conservation for Landscaping (currently Zoning Ordinance Sections 6712 through 6725) to further water conservation through the use of recycled water.</p> <p><b>Hyd-2.4:</b> Coordinate with the San Diego County Water Authority and other water agencies to coordinate land use planning with water supply planning and implementation and enhancement of water conservation programs.</p> <p><b>Hyd-2.5:</b> Implement and revise as necessary the Resource Protection Ordinance and Policy I-68 Proposed Projects in Flood Plains / Floodways to restrict development in flood plains/floodways.</p>	
	<p><b>Impact-C-HYD-2: Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Contribution to Substantially Depleting Groundwater Supplies or Interfering Substantially with Groundwater Recharge.</b> The proposed project would cause a similar impact related to depleting groundwater supplies and interfering with groundwater recharge compared to the impacts identified in the prior EIRs. Therefore, the proposed</p>	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update Mitigation Measures Hyd-1.1 through Hyd-1.5, Hyd-2.1, Hyd-2.2, Hyd-2.4, and Hyd-2.5, as described above.	SU

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Erosion or Siltation	project's contribution to this impact would be cumulatively considerable.			
	<b>Impact-HYD-6: Result in Substantial Erosion or Siltation On or Off Site during Construction Activities.</b> Due to increased development densities in the proposed project, construction of the proposed project would cause more severe impacts related to erosion or siltation on or off site compared to impacts identified in the prior EIRs. This would be considered a significant impact prior to mitigation.	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update Mitigation Measures Hyd-1.2, Hyd-1.3, and Hyd-1.5, as described above.  <b>Hyd-3.1:</b> Implement and revise, as necessary, ordinances to require new development to be located down and away from ridgelines, conform to the natural topography, not significantly alter dominant physical characteristics of the site, and maximize natural drainage and topography when conveying storm water.  <b>Hyd-3.2:</b> Implement and revise as necessary the RPO to limit development on steep slopes. Also incorporate Board Policy I-73, the Hillside Development Policy, into the RPO to the extent that it will allow for one comprehensive approach to steep slope protections.  <b>Hyd-3.3:</b> Implement the Grading, Clearing and Watercourses Ordinance to protect development sites against erosion and instability.	LS
	<b>Impact-HYD-7: Result in Substantial Erosion or Siltation On or Off Site during Operational Activities.</b> Due to increased development densities in the proposed project, operation of the proposed project would cause more severe impacts related to erosion or siltation on or off site compared to the impacts identified in the prior EIRs. This would be considered a significant impact prior to mitigation.	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR Mitigation Measures Hyd-1.2, Hyd-1.3, Hyd-1.5, and Hyd-3.1 through Hyd-3.3.	LS

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
	<p><b>Impact-C-HYD-3: Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Contribution to Erosion or Siltation.</b></p> <p>Increases in impervious surfaces from individual projects associated with the proposed project could result in erosion and siltation that would be individually limited, but cumulatively considerable when taken into account together. As such, there is a potential that buildout of the proposed project as a whole could include impervious surfaces that, when combined with cumulative growth and development, would result in erosion and siltation and a cumulatively considerable impact. Consequently, the proposed project's contribution to cumulative impacts associated with erosion and siltation would be more severe than that identified in the prior EIRs. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to this impact would be cumulatively considerable.</p>	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR Mitigation Measures Hyd-1.2, Hyd-1.3, Hyd-1.5, and Hyd-3.1 through Hyd-3.3.	LS
Flooding	<p><b>Impact-HYD-8: Result in Flooding On or Off Site during Construction Activities.</b> Due to increased development densities in the proposed project, construction of the proposed project would cause more severe potentially significant impacts related to flooding on or off site compared to the impacts identified in the prior EIRs. This would be</p>	PS	<p>Implement 2011 General Plan Update Mitigation Measures MM-Hyd-1.2 through MM-Hyd-1.5, and MM-Hyd-2.5, as described above.</p> <p><b>MM-Hyd-4.1:</b> Implement the Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance to reduce flood losses in specified areas.</p> <p><b>MM-Hyd-4.2:</b> Implement the Grading, Clearing and Watercourses Ordinance to limit activities affecting watercourses.</p>	LS

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
	considered a significant impact prior to mitigation.		<b>MM-Hyd-4.3:</b> Implement and revise as necessary Board Policies such as: Policy I-68, which establishes procedures for projects that impact floodways; Policy I-45, which defines watercourses that are subject to flood control; and Policy I-56, which permits, and establishes criteria for, staged construction of off-site flood control and drainage facilities by the private sector when there is a demonstrated and substantial public, private or environmental benefit.	
	<b>Impact-HYD-9: Result in Flooding On or Off Site during Operational Activities.</b> Due to increased development in the proposed project, operation of the proposed project would cause more severe potentially significant impacts related to flooding on or off site compared to the impacts identified in the prior EIRs. This would be considered a significant impact.	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update Mitigation Measures Hyd-1.2 through Hyd-1.5, Hyd-2.5, and Hyd-4.1 through Hyd-4.3.	LS
	<b>Impact-C-HYD-4: Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Contribution to On- or Offsite Flooding.</b> Increases in impervious surfaces from individual projects associated with the proposed project could result in on- or off-site flooding that would be individually limited, and cumulatively considerable when taken into account together. There is a potential that buildout of the proposed project could include impervious surfaces that, when combined with cumulative growth and development,	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update Mitigation Measures Hyd-1.2 through Hyd-1.5, Hyd-2.5, and Hyd-4.1 through Hyd-4.3.	LS

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
	would result in on- or off-site flooding and a cumulatively considerable impact. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to this impact would be cumulatively considerable.			
Exceed Capacity of Stormwater Systems	<b>Impact-HYD-10: Exceed Capacity of Existing Stormwater Drainage Facilities.</b> Due to increased development densities in the proposed project, the proposed project would cause more severe impacts related to exceeding existing stormwater drainage facilities compared to the impacts identified in the prior EIRs. This would be considered a significant impact prior to mitigation.	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update mitigation measures Hyd-1.2 through Hyd-1.5, Hyd-2.5, Hyd-3.1, and Hyd-4.1 through Hyd-4.3, as described above.	LS
Housing within a 100-year Flood Hazard Area	<b>Impact-HYD-11: Place Housing within a 100-Year Flood Hazard Area.</b> Due to increased development densities in the proposed project, the proposed project would cause more severe potentially significant impacts related to placing housing within a 100-year flood hazard area compared to the impacts identified in the prior EIRs. This would be considered a significant impact prior to mitigation.	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update mitigation measures Hyd-1.2, Hyd-1.5, Hyd-2.5, Hyd-4.1, and Hyd-4.2, as described above.  <b>MM-Hyd-6.1:</b> Implement the RPO to prohibit development of permanent structures for human habitation or employment in a floodway and require planning of hillside developments to minimize potential soil, geological and drainage problems.	LS
Impeding or Redirecting Flood Flows	<b>Impact-HYD-12: Impede or Redirect Flood Flows.</b> Due to increased development densities in the proposed project, the proposed project would cause more severe	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update mitigation measures Hyd-1.2 through Hyd-1.5, Hyd-2.5, Hyd-4.1 through Hyd-4.3, and Hyd-6.1, as described above.	LS

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
	potentially significant impacts related to impeding or redirecting flood flows compared to the impacts identified in the prior EIRs. This would be considered a significant impact prior to mitigation.			
Dam Inundation and Flood Hazards	No New or More Severe Impacts than Previously Identified in the 2011 General Plan Update PEIR.  There are no dam inundation zones within the Village Boundary, and none of the subareas are located within dam inundation areas. Therefore, direct impacts of the proposed project with regard to the risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding from the failure of a levee or dam would be less than significant.	LS	No New Mitigation Measures are Required	LS
Seiche, Tsunami, and Mudflow Hazards	<b>Impact-HYD-13: Expose People to Inundation by Mudflow.</b> Due to increased development densities in the proposed project, the proposed project would cause more severe potentially significant impacts related to inundation by mudflow compared to the impacts identified in the prior EIRs. This would be considered a significant impact prior to mitigation.	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update mitigation measures Hyd-3.1 through Hyd-3.3, as described above.	LS



Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
<b>2.10 Mineral Resources</b>				
<b>Project Impacts</b>				
Mineral Resource Availability	<b>Impact-MIN-1: Reduce Mineral Resource Availability.</b> Due to the increase of land uses incompatible with mining operations allowed by the proposed project, the proposed project would result in a more severe potentially significant impact related to reducing mineral resource availability than determined in the prior EIRs. This would be considered a significant impact.	PS	<b>Min-1.1:</b> Assess the impact of new development on mineral resources as required by the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Mineral Resources. Update the CEQA Guidelines for Determining Significance (Mineral Resources) to include the requirement to evaluate whether access is being maintained to existing mining sites.	SU
	<b>Impact-C-MIN-1: Reduce Mineral Resource Availability.</b> The proposed project, in combination with other growth in the San Diego region, would result in a more severe potentially significant impact related to reducing mineral resource availability than determined in the prior EIRs. Therefore, impacts associated with the loss of available mineral resources would be significant	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR Mitigation Measure Min-1.1.	SU
Mineral Resource Recovery Sites	<b>Impact-MIN-2: Preclude Future Mineral Resource Recovery Sites.</b> Due to the higher density development and encroachment of incompatible uses on potential or likely mineral resource deposits in land categorized as MRZ-3, the proposed project would result in more severe impacts on mineral resource recovery sites	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR Mitigation Measure Min-1.1.	SU

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
	compared to the prior EIRs. This would be considered a significant impact.			
	<b>Impact-C-MIN-2: Preclude Future Mineral Resource Recovery Sites.</b> The proposed project, in combination with other growth in the San Diego region, would result in more severe impacts on mineral resource recovery sites compared to the prior EIRs. Therefore, impacts associated with mineral resources recovery sites would be significant.	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR Mitigation Measure Min-1.1.	SU

## 2.11 Noise and Vibration

### Project Impacts

Expose Persons to or Generate Noise Levels in Excess of Established Standards	<b>Impact-NOI-1: Generate Excessive Noise Levels.</b> Due to increased development densities proposed in the Alpine CPA, as well as proposed new roadway connections, the proposed project would cause a more severe potentially significant impact related to excessive transportation noise levels from roadways compared to the prior EIRs. This would be considered a significant impact.	PS	<p><b>Noi-1.1:</b> Require an acoustical analysis whenever a new development may result in any existing or future noise sensitive land uses being subject to on-site noise levels of 60 dBA (CNEL) or greater, or other land uses that may result in noise levels exceeding the “Acceptable” standard in the Noise Compatibility Guidelines (Table N-1 in the Noise Element).</p> <p><b>Noi-1.2:</b> Revise the Guidelines for Determining Significance for new developments where exterior noise level on patios or balconies for multi-family residences or mixed-use development exceeds 65 dBA (CNEL), a solid noise barrier is incorporated into the building design of balconies and patios for units that exceed 65 dBA (CNEL) while still maintaining the openness of the patio or balcony.</p> <p><b>Noi-1.3:</b> Require an acoustical study for projects proposing amendments to the County General Plan</p>	SU
---	---	----	---	----

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
			<p>Land Use Element and/or Mobility Element that propose a significant increase to the average daily traffic due to trips associated with the project beyond those anticipated in the General Plan.</p> <p><b>Noi-1.4:</b> Edit the Guidelines for Determining Significance standard mitigation and project design considerations to promote traffic calming design, traffic control measures, and low-noise pavement surfaces that minimize motor vehicle traffic noise.</p> <p><b>Noi-1.5:</b> Coordinate with Caltrans and SANDAG as appropriate to identify and analyze appropriate route alternatives that may minimize noise impacts to noise sensitive land uses within the unincorporated areas of San Diego County.</p> <p><b>Noi-1.8:</b> Implement and/or establish procedures (or cooperative agreements) with Caltrans, the City of San Diego, and other jurisdictions as appropriate to ensure that a public participation process or forum is available for the affected community to participate and discuss issues regarding transportation generated noise impacts for new or expanded roadway projects that may affect noise sensitive land uses within the unincorporated areas of San Diego County.</p> <p><b>Noi-1.9:</b> Coordinate with Caltrans and the DPLU Landscape Architect, and receive input from community representatives as appropriate (e.g., Planning or Sponsor Group) to determine the appropriate noise mitigation measure (planted berms, noise attenuation barriers or a combination of the two) to be required as a part of the proposals for roadway improvement projects and ensure that the County's Five Year Capital Improvement Program and</p>	

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
			<p>Preliminary Engineering Reports address noise impacts and appropriate mitigation measures for road improvement projects within or affecting the unincorporated area of the County.</p> <p><b>MM-NOI-1:</b> For any new multi-family residences or mixed-use development proposed subsequent to the adoption of the Alpine CPU, private residential patios or balconies will not be required to comply with the 65 dBA (CNEL), provided that all of the following criteria are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A barrier required around the patio/balcony per applicable building codes (i.e., for safety), if any, will be of solid construction with a minimum surface density of 4 pounds per square foot (e.g., concrete block, stucco, Plexiglas, or other solid material of appropriate thickness). Additional height beyond the minimum code requirement is not required.</li> <li>b) The remainder of the building will be designed and constructed to limit interior noise levels to 45 dBA (CNEL) or less within private living spaces.</li> <li>c) Owners of units with balconies that do not meet the 65 dBA (CNEL) limit will provide occupancy disclosure notices to all future tenants/owners regarding potential noise impacts.</li> </ul>	
	<p><b>Impact-C-NOI-1: Generate Excessive Noise Levels.</b> The proposed project would cause more severe potentially significant impacts related to</p>	PS	<p>Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR Mitigation Measures <b>Noi-1.1, Noi-1.2, Noi-1.3, Noi-1.4, Noi-1.5,</b></p>	SU

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
	excessive noise levels from roadways compared to the prior EIRs. Consequently, the proposed project's contribution to cumulative impacts associated with excessive noise levels would be more severe than those identified in the prior EIRs and would be cumulatively considerable.		<b>Noi-1.8</b> , and <b>Noi-1.9</b> , as well as Alpine CPU <b>MM-NOI-1</b> , as described above.	
Expose Persons to or Generate Excessive Groundborne Vibration or Groundborne Noise Levels	<b>Impact-NOI-2: Generate Excessive Groundborne Vibration.</b> Due to increased development densities proposed in the Alpine CPA, as well as proposed new roadway connections, the proposed project would cause more severe potentially significant impacts related to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels from construction activity compared to the prior EIRs. This would be considered a significant impact.	PS	<p><b>Noi-2.2:</b> Revise the County CEQA determinations of significance to reflect limits in the Noise Compatibility Guidelines and Noise Standards [Policy N-3.1]. Periodically review the Guidelines for Determining Significance to incorporate standards for minimizing effects of groundborne vibration during project operation or construction.</p> <p><b>Noi-2.3:</b> Review project applications for industrial facilities to ensure they are located in areas that would minimize impacts to noise-sensitive land uses. Revise CEQA Guidelines for Determining Significance to incorporate appropriate noise attenuation measures for minimizing industrial-related noise.</p> <p><b>Noi-2.4:</b> Require an acoustical study whenever a proposed extractive land use facility may result in a significant noise impact to existing noise sensitive land uses, or when a proposed noise sensitive land use may be significantly affected by an existing extractive land use facility. The results of the acoustical study may require a "buffer zone" to be identified on all Major Use Permit applications for extractive facilities whenever a potential for a noise impact to noise sensitive land uses may occur.</p>	LS

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels	<b>Impact-NOI-3: Result in a Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels.</b> Due to increased development densities proposed in the Alpine CPA, potential new commercial uses, and proposed new roadway connections, the proposed project would cause more severe potentially significant impacts related to permanent increases in noise levels from roadways and commercial land uses compared to the prior EIRs. This would be considered a significant impact.	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR Mitigation Measures <b>Noi-1.3, Noi-1.4, Noi-1.5, Noi-1.8, Noi-2.3, and Noi-2.4</b> , as described above.  <b>Noi-3.1:</b> Ensure that for new County road improvement projects either the County's Noise Standards are used to evaluate noise impacts or the project does not exceed 3 decibels over existing noise levels [Policy N-4.6].  <b>Noi-3.2:</b> Work with the project applicant during the review of either the building permit or discretionary action (whichever is applicable) to determine appropriate noise reduction site design techniques that include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Orientation of loading/unloading docks away from noise sensitive land uses.</li> <li>• Setbacks or buffers to separate noise generating activities from noise sensitive land uses.</li> <li>• Design on-site ingress and egress access away from noise sensitive land uses [Policy N-5.1].</li> </ul>	SU
	<b>Impact-C-NOI-2: Result in a Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels.</b> The proposed project would cause more severe potentially significant impacts related to permanent increases in noise levels from roadways, industrial, commercial, and agricultural land uses compared to the prior EIRs. Consequently, the proposed project's contribution to cumulative impacts associated with a permanent increase	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR Mitigation Measures <b>Noi-1.3, Noi-1.4, Noi-1.5, Noi-1.8, Noi-2.3, Noi-2.4, Noi-3.1, and Noi-3.2</b> , as described above.	SU

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
	in ambient noise levels would be similar to those identified in the prior EIRs and would be cumulatively considerable.			
Temporary or Periodic Increase in Ambient Noise Levels	<b>Impact-NOI-4: Cause a Temporary Increase in Ambient Noise Levels.</b> Due to increased development densities proposed in the Alpine CPA, as well as new roadway connections, the proposed project would cause more severe potentially significant impacts related to temporary increases in noise levels from construction activities and intermittent nuisance noise compared to the prior EIRs. This would be considered a significant impact.	PS	<p><b>Noi-4.1:</b> Periodically review and revise the Noise Ordinance and Section 6300 of the Zoning Ordinance as necessary to ensure appropriate restrictions for intermittent, short-term, or other nuisance noise sources.</p> <p><b>Noi-4.2:</b> Augment staff and equipment as appropriate to facilitate enforcement of the Noise Ordinance.</p> <p><b>MM-NOI-2:</b> Future discretionary projects within the Alpine CPA area shall implement best practices to reduce construction noise at nearby sensitive receptors to an average sound level of 75 dBA Leq or less for an 8-hour period, between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. Measures to reduce construction noise shall be included in the contractor specifications and may include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limit construction activities to between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday; no construction activities should occur at any time on Sunday or holidays (January 1, the last Monday in May, July 4, the first Monday in September, the fourth Thursday in November, and December 25). Personnel should not be permitted on the job site, and material or equipment deliveries and collections should not be permitted outside of these hours.</li> <li>Equip construction equipment with noise-reduction features such as intake silencers,</li> </ul>	LS

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
			<p>mufflers, and engine shrouds that are no less effective than those originally installed by the manufacturer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Switch off construction equipment when it is not in use.</li> <li>• Locate stationary noise-generating equipment (e.g., compressors, generators, etc.), staging areas, and laydown areas as far as possible from adjacent residential receivers.</li> <li>• Prohibit haul trucks from idling on site or in the project vicinity for periods greater than 5 minutes, except as needed to perform a specified function (e.g., concrete mixing).</li> <li>• Schedule high noise-producing construction activities during periods that are least sensitive, such as during daytime hours when neighboring residents are generally away at work.</li> <li>• Acoustically shield stationary equipment located near residential receivers with temporary noise barriers.</li> <li>• Limit on-site vehicle speeds to 15 miles per hour (mph) or less.</li> <li>• Route construction-related truck traffic away from noise-sensitive areas to the extent feasible.</li> <li>• Utilize "quiet" air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists.</li> </ul>	



Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prepare a detailed construction plan identifying the schedule for major noise-generating construction activities. The construction plan shall identify a procedure for coordination with adjacent residential land uses so that construction activities can be scheduled to minimize noise disturbance.</li> <li>Designate a "disturbance coordinator" who will be responsible for responding to any complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator will determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., bad muffler) and will require that reasonable measures be implemented to correct the problem.</li> </ul>	
Excessive Noise Exposure from a Private Airstrip	<p>No New or More Severe Impacts Than Previously Identified.</p> <p>None of the land use changes proposed as part of the project would occur close to the airfield site. Therefore, no noise impacts related to this private airstrip would occur, and the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to excessive noise exposure from a public or private airport.</p>	LS	No New Mitigation Measures are Required	LS
<b>2.12 Public Services</b>				
<b>Project Impacts</b>				
Fire Protection and Emergency Services	<p><b>Impact-PS-1: Result in Adverse Physical Impacts Associated with the Provision of New or Physically Altered Fire Protection Facilities.</b></p> <p>Due to increased development</p>	PS	<b>Pub-1.1:</b> Participate in interjurisdictional reviews to gather information on and review and provide comments on plans for new or expanded governmental facilities in the region.	SU

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
	densities proposed, the proposed project would cause a more severe potentially significant impact related to the construction of fire protection facilities compared to the 2011 General Plan and FCI GPA. This would be considered a significant impact.		<p><b>Pub-1.2:</b> Plan and site governmental facilities that are context-specific according to their location in village, semi-rural, or rural lands.</p> <p><b>Pub-1.3:</b> Revise Board Policy I-63 to minimize leapfrog development and to establish specific criteria for GPAs proposing expansion of areas designated Village regional category. This is intended to limit unexpected demands for new or expanded public services and the associated governmental facilities.</p> <p><b>Pub-1.4:</b> Review General Plan Amendments for consistency with the goals and policies of the General Plan such that future development in hazardous wildfire areas will be limited to low-density land uses that do not necessitate extensive new fire protection facilities.</p> <p><b>Pub-1.5:</b> Implement, and revise as necessary, Board Policy I-84 requiring that discretionary project applications include commitments from available fire protection districts. These commitments shall also demonstrate that the distance between the projects and the fire service facilities do not result in unacceptable travel times.</p> <p><b>Pub-1.6:</b> Maintain and use the County GIS and the County Guidelines for Determining Significant impacts in order to identify fire prone areas during the review of development projects. Once identified, ensure that development proposals meet requirements set by the FAHJ and that new/additional fire protection facilities are not required; or, if such facilities are required, that potential environmental impacts resulting from</p>	

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
			<p>construction are evaluated along with the development project under review.</p> <p><b>Pub-1.7:</b> Implement the Building and Fire code to ensure there are adequate fire protections in place associated with the construction of structures and their defensibility, accessibility and egress, adequate water supply, coverage by the local fire district, and other critical issues.</p> <p><b>Pub-1.8:</b> Require CEQA reviews on new public facilities (fire, sheriff, libraries, etc.) or significant expansions and mitigation of environmental impact to the extent feasible.</p> <p><b>Pub-1.9:</b> Implement procedures to ensure new development projects fund their fair share toward fire services facilities including the development of a long-term financing mechanism, such as an impact fee program or community facilities development, as appropriate. Large development projects are required to provide their fair share contribution to fire services either by providing additional funds and/or development of infrastructure.</p>	
	<p><b>Impact C-PS-1: Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Contribution Associated with Adverse Physical Impacts Associated with the Provision of New or Physically Altered Fire Protection Facilities.</b> The proposed project would cause a more severe potentially significant impact related to fire protection facilities compared to the prior EIRs. Therefore, the</p>		<p>Implement 2011 General Plan Update mitigation measures <b>Pub-1.1</b> through <b>Pub-1.9</b>, as described above.</p>	SU

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
	proposed project's contribution to this impact would be cumulatively considerable.			
Police Protection	<b>Impact PS-2: Result in Adverse Physical Impacts Associated with the Provision of New or Physically Altered Police Facilities.</b> While the proposed project would increase the population within the Alpine Station service area from what was anticipated in the current General Plan, no new or expanded police facilities would be required. Impacts would be less than significant.	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS
	<b>Impact C-PS-2: Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Contribution Associated with Adverse Physical Impacts Associated with the Provision of New or Physically Altered Police Protection Facilities.</b> The proposed project would cause a more severe potentially significant impact related to police protection facilities compared to the prior EIRs. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to this impact would be cumulatively considerable.	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update mitigation measures <b>Pub-1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 1.8</b> , as described above.	LS
Schools	<b>Impact-PS-3: Result in Adverse Physical Impacts Associated with the Provision of New or Physically Altered School Facilities.</b> Due to increased development densities	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update mitigation measures <b>Pub-1.1, Pub-1.2, and Pub-1.3</b> , as described above.	LS

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
	proposed, the proposed project would cause more severe potentially significant impacts related to the construction of school facilities compared to the 2011 General Plan and FCI GPA. This would be considered a significant impact.		<p><b>Pub-3.1:</b> Coordinate with school districts to encourage siting new facilities in accordance with the County's General Plan and encourage implementing feasible mitigation measures to mitigate environmental impacts.</p> <p><b>Pub-3.2:</b> Implement, and revise as necessary, Board Policy I-84 requiring that discretionary project applications include commitments from available school districts.</p>	
	<p><b>Impact-C-PS-3: Result in Cumulatively Considerable Adverse Physical Impacts Associated with the Provision of New or Physically Altered School Facilities.</b> The proposed project would cause a more severe potentially significant impact related to school facilities compared to the prior EIRs. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to this impact would be cumulatively considerable.</p>	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR mitigation measures <b>Pub-1.1, Pub-1.2, Pub-1.3, Pub-3.1, and Pub-3.2</b> , as described above.	LS
Other Public Services/Library Services	<p><b>Impact-PS-4: Result in Adverse Physical Impacts Associated with the Provision of New or Physically Altered Library Facilities.</b> Due to increased development densities proposed, the proposed project would cause more severe potentially significant impacts related to the construction of library facilities compared to the 2011 General Plan</p>	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR mitigation measures <b>Pub-1.1, Pub-1.2, and Pub-1.3</b> , as described above.	SU

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
	and FCI GPA. This would be considered a significant impact.			
	<b>Impact C-PS-4: Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Contribution Associated with Adverse Physical Impacts Associated with the Provision of New or Physically Altered Library Facilities.</b> The proposed project would cause a more severe potentially significant impact related to library facilities compared to the prior EIRs. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to this impact would be cumulatively considerable.	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR mitigation measures <b>Pub-1.1</b> , <b>Pub-1.2</b> , and <b>Pub-1.3</b> , as described above.	SU
<b>2.13 Recreation</b>				
<b>Project Impacts</b>				
Deterioration of Parks and Recreational Facilities	<b>Impact-REC-1: Result in Deterioration of Parks and Recreational Facilities.</b> Future development occurring as part of implementation of the Alpine CPU would result in an increased demand for parks and recreational facilities such that substantial deterioration of these recreational resources would occur.	PS	<p><b>Rec-1.1:</b> Implement Board Policy I-44 to identify park and recreation needs and priorities for communities, and utilize the Community Plans when identifying park and recreation facility requirements.</p> <p><b>Rec-1.2:</b> Coordinate with communities, agencies and organizations to identify, prioritize and develop park and recreation needs. This shall include pursuing partnership opportunities with school districts and other agencies to develop new park and recreation facilities; on-going support of the Park Advisory Committee and use of community center surveys to solicit input on park and recreation program and facility needs and issues; and continuing partnerships with other jurisdictions to share operation and</p>	LS

---

maintenance costs for facilities via joint powers agreements.

**Rec-1.4:** Participate in discretionary project review of residential projects with 50 or more units to identify park facility needs. Also, implement the Subdivision Ordinance to require the provision of trail and pathways shown on the Regional Trails Plan or Community Trails Master Plan. In addition, modify development standards and design guidelines to include common open space amenities, such as tot lots, and the use of universal design features that accommodate both abled and disabled individuals.

**Rec-1.5:** Attain funding for land acquisition and construction of recreational facilities by taking the following actions: implement the PLDO; solicit grants and bonds to fund the operation and maintenance of park and recreation facilities; and form Landscape Improvement Districts and County Service Areas.

**Rec-1.6:** Acquire trail routes across private lands through direct purchase, easements, and dedication, or by other means from a willing property owner/seller. Encourage the voluntary dedication of easements and/or gifts of land for trails through privately- owned lands, including agricultural and grazing lands.

**Rec-1.7:** Prioritize the acquisition and development of trail segments in a manner to provide maximum public benefit given available public and private resources and the population served. As part of this effort, also maintain a database of information on the locations, status of easements, classifications, forms of access, and land ownership relative to trail facilities.

---

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
			<p><b>Rec-1.8:</b> Implement and revise as necessary the Regional Trails Plan as well as the Community Trails Master Plan. This will ensure that community goals, policies, and implementation criteria are defined for community trails. Facilitate inter-jurisdictional coordination for the implementation of these plans.</p>	
			<p><b>Rec-1.9:</b> Consult with the appropriate governing tribal council to facilitate the provision of trail connections through tribal land and/or Native American cultural resources.</p>	
			<p><b>Rec-1.10:</b> Develop procedures to coordinate the operation and maintenance of pathways with similar activities for adjacent roads and road rights-of-way.</p>	
			<p><b>Rec-1.11:</b> Prioritize open space acquisition needs through coordination with government agencies and private organizations. Once prioritized, acquire open space lands through negotiation with private land owners and through MSCP regulatory requirements. The operation and management of such acquisitions will continue to be achieved by preparing, implementing, and updating Resource Management Plans and MSCP Area Specific Management Directives (ASMDs) for each open space area.</p>	
	<p><b>Impact C-REC-1: Result in Deterioration of Parks and Recreational Facilities.</b> The proposed project would cause a similar impact related to the deterioration of parks and recreational facilities compared to the impacts identified in the prior</p>	PS	<p>Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR mitigation measures <b>Rec-1.1 through Rec-1.11</b>, as described above.</p>	LS



Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
	EIRs. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to this impact would be cumulatively considerable.			
Construction of New Recreational Facilities	<b>Impact-REC-2: Require Construction or Alteration of Recreational Facilities.</b> The increased population that would occur with implementation of the Alpine CPU would result in the need for new or expanded parks and recreational facilities, the construction of which would result in significant environmental effects.	PS	<p><b>Rec-2.1:</b> Update Community Plans to reflect the character and vision for each individual community; to address civic needs in a community and encourage the co-location of uses; to establish and maintain greenbelts between communities; to prioritize infrastructure improvements and the provision of public facilities for villages and community cores; and to identify pedestrian routes. With these issues addressed in community plans, potential impacts to visual resources, community character, natural resources, cultural resources, and traffic will be substantially lessened should new or expanded recreational facilities be needed in a given community.</p> <p><b>Rec-2.2:</b> Use community design guidelines as a resource when designing park and recreation facilities. This will help ensure that such facilities are consistent with community character.</p> <p><b>Rec-2.3:</b> Amend the Subdivision Ordinance to require new residential development to be integrated with existing neighborhoods by providing connected and continuous road, pathway/trail and recreation/open space networks. Also, add new conservation-oriented design guidelines for rural lands projects as part of this amendment. These measures will assist in the planning for recreational facilities as new development is</p>	LS

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
			<p>proposed while minimizing impacts to sensitive resources and community character.</p> <p><b>Rec-2.4:</b> Develop procedures to consider designating trails that correspond to existing (non- designated) trails, paths, or unpaved roadbeds that already have a disturbed tread. This will minimize new impacts to the natural environment and will potentially benefit existing trail users.</p> <p><b>Rec-2.5:</b> Through implementation of Resource Management Plans, monitor and manage preserves and trails such that environmental resources do not become impacted as a result of soil erosion, flooding, fire hazard, or other environmental or man- made effects. Any impacts identified to environmental resources will be restored in accordance with the management directives within the Resource Management Plans.</p> <p><b>Rec-2.6:</b> Develop procedures to encourage the involvement and input of the agricultural community in matters relating to trails on or adjacent to agricultural lands and place a priority on the protection of agriculture.</p>	
	<p><b>Impact C-Rec-2: Construction or Alteration of Recreational Facilities.</b> The proposed project would cause a similar impact related to the construction or alteration of recreational facilities compared to the impacts identified in the prior EIRs. Therefore, the proposed project's</p>	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR mitigation measures <b>Rec-2.1 through Rec-2.6</b> , as described above.	LS

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
	contribution to this impact would be cumulatively considerable.			
<b>2.14 Transportation and Traffic</b>				
<b>Project Impacts</b>				
Conflict with a Program, Plan, Ordinance or Policy Addressing the Circulation System	<b>Impact-TRA-1: Conflict with a Program, Plan, Ordinance or Policy.</b> The proposed project would exceed residential, employee and retail regional VMT thresholds, and therefore would conflict with the State and County-adopted VMT policies. In addition, the increased density generated by the proposed project would increase the pedestrian and bicycle activity without the presence of adequate facilities, which may adversely affect pedestrian and bicycle safety.	PS	<b>MM-TRA-1:</b> As part of the discretionary review of subsequent projects proposed under the Alpine CPU, County staff shall review proposed project to determine if subsequent projects would be required to implement TDMs, in accordance with the County's TSG.  <b>Tra-1.1:</b> Coordinate with SANDAG and adjacent cities during updates to the RTP to identify a transportation network that maximizes efficiency, enhances connectivity between different modes of travel, and minimizes impacts when locating new freeways and State highways  <b>Tra-1.7:</b> Implement the San Diego County TIF Ordinance, which defrays the costs of constructing planned transportation facilities necessary to accommodate increased traffic generated by future development.  <b>Tra-2.1:</b> Establish coordination efforts with other jurisdictions when development projects will result in a significant impact on city roads. When available, use the applicable jurisdiction's significance thresholds and recommended mitigation measures to evaluate and mitigate impacts.	SU
	<b>Impact-C-TRA-1: Exceed Adopted Levels of Standard.</b> The proposed project would result in cumulative impacts in regard to exceeding cumulative VMT thresholds and being inconsistent with State and County-	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR mitigation measures Tra-1.1, Tra-1.7, and Tra-2.1 and Alpine CPU MM-TRA-1, as described above.	SU

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
	adopted VMT policies. In addition, the increased density generated by the proposed project would contribute to a cumulative impact to pedestrian and bicycle activity without the presence of adequate facilities, which may adversely affect pedestrian and bicycle safety.			
Exceeds Thresholds For Vehicle Miles Traveled	<b>Impact TRA-2: Exceed VMT Thresholds.</b> The proposed project's VMT would exceed the residential, employee, and retail regional VMT thresholds for the San Diego region.	PS	<p><b>MM-TRA-2.</b> As a part of the discretionary review of subsequent projects proposed under the Alpine CPU, County staff shall require applicants to include a TDM plan and implementation strategy based on the quantifiable measures outlined in the CAPCOA Guidelines or other TDM Guidelines adopted by the County. These strategies may include, but are not limited to: vanpools, telecommute or alternative work schedules, and master planned communities (with design and land use diversity to encourage intra-community travel). Neighborhood Electric Vehicle networks may also be appropriate for larger scale developments. The project-specific VMT reduction estimates of the selected TDM plan and implementation strategy shall be calculated.</p> <p><b>MM-TRA-3.</b> As a part of the discretionary review of subsequent projects proposed under the Alpine CPU, County Planning &amp; Development Services staff shall review proposed projects to determine if new development within Alpine shall be required to implement the following Active Transportation Improvements to reduce VMT levels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LUT-9 Improve Design of Development - Maximum VMT Reduction 21.3% and minimum reduction of 3%.</li> </ul>	SU

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
			<p><u>Grouped categories that go along with LUT-9</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ SDT-5: Incorporate Bike Lane Street Design</li> <li>○ SDT-6: Provide Bike Parking in Non-Residential Projects</li> <li>○ SDT-7: Provide Bike Parking with Multi-Unit Residential Projects</li> <li>○ SDT-9: Dedicate Land for Bike Trails</li> <li>● SDT-1: Provide Pedestrian Network Improvements – Maximum VMT Reduction 2%</li> <li>● SDT-2: Provide Traffic Calming Measures - Maximum VMT Reduction 1%</li> </ul> <p><b>Tra-1.3:</b> Implement the County Public Road Standards during review of new development projects. Also revise the Public Road Standards to include a range of road types according to Regional Category context.</p> <p><b>Tra-1.4:</b> Implement and revise as necessary the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Transportation and Traffic to evaluate adverse environmental effects of projects and require mitigation when significant impacts are identified</p> <p><b>Tra-1.6:</b> Develop project review procedures to require large commercial and office development to use Transportation Demand Management Programs to reduce single-occupant vehicle traffic generation and to prepare and forward annual reports to the County on the effectiveness of the program.</p>	

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
			<p><b>Tra-3.1:</b> Coordinate with SANDAG to obtain funding for operational improvements to State highways and freeways in the unincorporated area.</p> <p>Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR mitigation measures Tra-1.1 and Tra-1.7 as described above.</p>	
	<b>Impacts C-TRA-2: Exceed VMT Thresholds.</b> The proposed projects cumulative VMT would exceed the San Diego region thresholds.	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR mitigation measures Tra-1.1, Tra-1.3, Tra-1.4, Tra-1.6, Tra-1.7, and Tra-3.1, and Alpine CPU mitigation measures MM-TRA-2 and MM-TRA-3, as described above.	SU
Substantially Increase Hazards due to a Design Feature	<b>Impact TRA-3: Substantially Increase Hazards Due to a Design Feature.</b> The proposed project would increase hazards due to incompatible uses.	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR mitigation measures Tra-1.3, Tra-1.4, Tra-1.6, and Tra-3.1 as described above.	SU
	<b>Impact C-TRA-3: Conflict with existing circulation system policies.</b> The proposed project would contribute to a significant cumulative roadway safety impact.	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR mitigation measures Tra-1.3, Tra-1.4, Tra-1.6, and Tra-3.1 as described above.	SU
Result in Inadequate Emergency Access	No New or More Severe Impacts than Previously Identified in the 2011 General Plan Update PEIR	LS	<p><b>Tra-4.2:</b> Implement the Building and Fire Codes to ensure there are adequate service levels in place associated with the construction of structures and their accessibility and egress.</p> <p><b>Tra-4.3:</b> Implement and revise as necessary the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Wildland Fire and Fire Protection to evaluate adverse environmental effects of projects. Require fire protection plans to ensure the requirements of the County Fire Code and other applicable regulations are being met.</p>	LS

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
			<p><b>Tra-4.4:</b> Implement and revise as necessary the Subdivision Ordinance to ensure that proposed subdivisions meet current design and accessibility standards</p>	
			<p>Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR mitigation measures Tra-1.3, Tra-1.4, Tra-1.6, and Tra-4.1.</p>	
<b>2.15 Utilities</b>				
<b>Project Impacts</b>				
New or Expanded Utility Facilities	<p><b>Impact-UTIL-1: Require New or Expanded Utility Facilities Resulting in Environmental Impacts.</b> Because the proposed project would allow for a greater number of housing units requiring utility service connections compared to the 2011 General Plan and FCI GPA, the proposed project would result in new or more severe impacts than those identified in the prior EIRs.</p>	PS	<p><b>USS-2.1:</b> Revise Board Policy I-63 to minimize leapfrog development and to establish specific criteria for GPAs proposing expansion of areas designated village regional category. This is intended to limit unexpected demands for new water and wastewater facilities.</p> <p><b>USS-2.2:</b> Perform CEQA review on privately initiated water and wastewater facilities and review and comment on water and wastewater projects undertaken by other public agencies to ensure that impacts are minimized and that projects are in conformance with County plans.</p> <p><b>USS-2.3:</b> Implement, and revise as necessary, the Green Building Program to encourage project designs that incorporate water conservation measures, thereby reducing the potential demand for new water purveyors with the buildout of General Plan Update.</p> <p><b>USS-3.1:</b> Amend the Subdivision Ordinance to add additional design requirements for subdivisions that encourage conservation-oriented design. Also amend it to require new residential development to be integrated with existing neighborhoods by providing connected and continuous road, pathway/trail and recreation/open space networks. This will reduce</p>	SU

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
			<p>scattered development footprints and increase pervious surfaces in site design, thereby minimizing the need for new stormwater drainage facilities.</p> <p><b>USS-3.2:</b> Prepare Subdivision Design Guidelines that establish a process to identify significant resources on a project site, identify the best areas for development and create a conservation-oriented design for both the project and open space areas.</p> <p><b>USS-3.3:</b> Use the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Surface Water Quality and Hydrology to identify adverse environmental effects on water quality.</p> <p><b>USS-3.4:</b> Implement the LID handbook and establish LID standards for new development to minimize runoff and maximize infiltration.</p> <p><b>USS-3.5:</b> Evaluate the environmental effects of all proposed stormwater drainage facilities and ensure that significant adverse effects are minimized and mitigated.</p> <p><b>USS-8.1:</b> Implement, and revise as necessary, the County Green Building Program through incentives for development that is energy efficient and conserves resources.</p> <p><b>USS-8.2:</b> Revise Board Policy F-50 to strengthen the County's commitment and requirement to implement resource-efficient design and operations for County funded renovation and new building projects. Also revise Board Policy G-15 to require County facilities to comply with Leadership in Energy and Environmental</p>	



Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
			<p>Design (LEED) standards or other Green Building rating systems.</p> <p><b>USS-8.3:</b> Revise Board Policy G-16 to require the County to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adhere to the same or higher standards it would require from the private sector when locating and designing facilities concerning environmental issues and sustainability</li> <li>Require government contractors to use low emission construction vehicles and equipment.</li> </ul>	
	<p><b>Impact-C-UTIL-1: Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Contribution to Impacts from New or Expanded Utility Facilities.</b></p> <p>Future development associated with the proposed project would require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities that could cause significant environmental effects, resulting in a more severe impact. Although implementation of the General Plan policies and prior EIRs mitigation measures would reduce this impact, it cannot be guaranteed that impacts would be reduced below a level of significance because the specific details of future utility infrastructure projects are not currently known, and the relocation or</p>	PS	<p>Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR Mitigation Measures USS-2.1 through USS-2.3, USS-3.1 through USS-3.5, and USS-8.1 through USS-8.3.</p>	SU

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
	construction of new or expanded utilities is under the purview of utility providers and agencies, not the County. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to cumulative impacts associated with new or expanded utilities would be more severe than the contribution identified in the prior EIRs and would be a potentially significant cumulative impact.			
Adequate Water Supplies	<b>Impact-UTIL-2: Lack Adequate Water Supply.</b> Because shortages have been identified in Padre Dam Municipal Water District's 2015 UWMP, and buildout of the proposed project would further increase the demand for potable water from the district from what was anticipated in the 2011 General Plan and FCI GPA, impacts on water supplies would be more severe than those identified in the prior EIRs and would be potentially significant.	PS	<p><b>USS-4.1:</b> Review General Plan Amendments for consistency with the goals and policies of the General Plan. This shall include designating groundwater dependent areas with land use density/intensity that is consistent with the long-term sustainability of groundwater supplies; locating commercial, office, civic, and industrial development in villages, town centers or at transit nodes; and ensuring that adequate water supply is available for development projects that rely on imported water.</p> <p><b>USS-4.2:</b> Implement, and revise as necessary, the County Green Building Program with incentives for development that is energy efficient and conserves resources, including both groundwater and imported water.</p> <p><b>USS-4.3:</b> Implement Policy I-84 requiring discretionary projects obtain water district commitment that water services are available. Also</p>	SU

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
			Implement and revise as necessary Board Policy G-15 to conserve water at County facilities.	
			<b>USS-4.4:</b> Implement the Groundwater Ordinance to balance groundwater resources with new development and implement and revise as necessary the Watershed Ordinance to encourage the removal of invasive species to restore natural drainage systems, thereby improving water quality and surface water filtration. Also revise the Ordinance Relating to Water Efficient for Landscaping to further water conservation through the use of recycled water.	
			<b>USS-4.5:</b> Use the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Groundwater Resources, Surface Water Quality, and Hydrology to identify and minimize adverse environmental effects on groundwater resources.	
			<b>USS-4.6:</b> Establish a water credits program between the County and the Borrego Water District to encourage an equitable allocation of water resources.	
			<b>USS-4.7:</b> Coordinate with the San Diego County Water Authority and other water agencies to coordinate land use planning with water supply planning and support continued implementation and enhancement of water conservation programs.	
	<b>Impact-C-UTIL-2: Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Contribution to a Lack of Adequate Water Supply.</b> The proposed project would increase density beyond what	PS	Implement 2011 General Plan Update PEIR Mitigation Measures USS-4.1 through USS-4.7.	SU

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>was anticipated in the prior EIRs, resulting in additional growth and development. Because this growth would not have been accounted for in the current water supply and demand projections of Padre Dam Municipal Water District's 2015 UWMP, the proposed project would further strain local water supplies. As such, the proposed project would result in a more severe impact on water supplies. Similar to cumulative projects, future projects associated with the proposed project that meet the definition of a water demand project, as defined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15155, would be required to obtain a water supply assessment from Padre Dam Municipal Water District that demonstrates adequate water supplies are available. However, because Padre Dam Municipal Water District has potential to experience shortages under long-term scenarios, future development associated with the proposed project, when combined with cumulative growth and development within Padre Dam Municipal Water District's service boundary, could inhibit the agency's ability to meet water demand and further contribute to potential long-term water supply shortages. Therefore, the proposed project's</p>			

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
	contribution to this impact would be a potentially significant cumulative impact.			
Adequate Wastewater Treatment Capacity	<p><b>Impact-UTIL-3: Lack Adequate Wastewater Treatment Capacity.</b></p> <p>Because the number of potential housing units would be greater under the proposed project, thereby increasing the amount of wastewater requiring treatment, potential impacts on wastewater treatment capacities would increase relative to those identified in the prior EIRs, and impacts would be significant. As such, the proposed project would cause a more severe significant impact on wastewater treatment capacities than those identified in the prior EIRs and impacts would be potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p><b>USS-1.1:</b> Participate in interjurisdictional reviews to gather information on and review and provide comments on plans of incorporated jurisdictions and public agencies in the region.</p> <p><b>USS-1.2:</b> Implement and revise as necessary Board Policy I-84 to ensure adequate availability of sewer/sanitation service for development projects that require it. Also revise Board Policy I-78 to include additional criteria and regulatory requirements restricting the location of small wastewater treatment facilities.</p> <p><b>USS-1.3:</b> Ensure County planning staff participation in the review of wastewater facility long range and capital improvement plans.</p>	LS
Sufficient Landfill Capacity	<p>Less Severe Impact than Previously Identified in the 2011 General Plan Update PEIR.</p> <p>Sufficient landfill capacity is available to serve the proposed project. In addition, future development associated with the proposed project would be required to demonstrate compliance with federal, state, and local regulations, including AB 341 and the County's Integrated Waste Management Plan.</p>	LS	No Mitigation Measures are Required	LS

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Significance Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure(s)</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
Solid Waste Regulations or the Expansion of Existing Infrastructure	No New or More Severe Impacts than Previously Identified in the 2011 General Plan Update PEIR. Compliance with the noted regulations is mandatory; therefore, impacts would be similar to those in the prior EIRs.	LS	No Mitigation Measures are Required	LS

Notes: PS = Potentially significant; LS = Less than significant; NI = No Impact; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Alpine CPU mitigation measures, beginning with "MM," are also listed in Chapter 6 of this SEIR. Prior EIR mitigation measures are included in Appendix B of this SEIR.