CHAPTER 1.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The County of San Diego (County) proposes a comprehensive update to the existing Alpine Community Plan (proposed project or Alpine CPU). This chapter includes a statement of project objectives, identifies the location and boundaries of the Alpine Community Plan Area (CPA), and describes the proposed project.

Community plans serve to implement the County’s General Plan. Community plans refine and tailor the General Plan to address the critical issues and concerns that are unique to a community and are not reflected in the broader policies of the Land Use Element of the General Plan. The goals and policies found in community plans are designed to provide more precise guidance regarding the character, land uses, and densities within each community. Generally, these goals and policies are more limiting and restrictive than the county-wide goals and policies, consistent with State legislation for internal consistency.

The existing Community Plan was written more than 40 years ago (1979). In that time, Alpine has significantly changed and so to have the challenges and opportunities facing future growth and development. Per CEQA Guidelines § 15124(b), the underlying purpose of the Alpine CPU is to reflect updates to the General Plan and other County plans and programs, accommodate for population growth and demographic changes, and reflect the current community’s vision for the future. This is noted below as Project Objective (1).

This Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) analyzes and discloses the environmental impacts of the Alpine CPU. This SEIR tiers from the General Plan EIR (2011) and the Forest Conservation Initiative (FCI) General Plan Amendment EIR (2016) (referred to throughout the rest of this section as “prior EIRs”), and evaluates the changes in land use density and other project components in comparison to what was analyzed in these prior EIRs. However, topic areas of air quality, greenhouse gas, wildfire, and transportation and traffic do not tier off of both prior EIRs. These topic areas rely only on the 2011 General Plan EIR. See the topic area section for a baseline discussion. This SEIR is programmatic in nature in that it analyzes the reasonably foreseeable impacts of the proposed changes to the existing Community Plan. It should be noted that the Alpine CPU does not propose any specific development projects that would result in physical impacts on the environment. However, it is reasonably foreseeable that projects implemented after adoption of the Alpine CPU could result in physical impacts on the environment.

The Alpine CPU proposes changes to the land use designations within four of the seven areas of potential change known as subareas located within the Alpine CPA. The proposed land use designations aim to concentrate residential development adjacent to transit routes, community services, retail options and employment opportunities with the intent to reduce the length of vehicle trips. Specifically, the Alpine CPU proposes higher density uses closer to the Village, allows mixed use in the Village Core, and provides neighborhood commercial opportunities near established residential communities and freeway access. The full details of the changes are provided in Section 1.4 below.

1.1 Project Objectives

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an EIR contain a “statement of the objectives sought by the proposed project.” Under CEQA, a “clearly written statement of objectives will help the Lead Agency develop a reasonable range of alternatives to evaluate in the EIR and will aid the decision-makers in preparing findings or a statement of overriding considerations. The statement of
objectives should include the underlying fundamental purpose of the project” (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15124[b]). The underlying fundamental purpose of the project is Objective 1, below.

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 greenhouse gas emission 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 Traveled (VMT).
7. Minimize the impacts from development on sensitive natural resources—such as Alpine Creek, Viejas Mountain, and Cleveland National Forest 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.

1.2 Project Location

Alpine is an unincorporated community in the eastern portion of San Diego County, approximately 25 miles east of downtown San Diego (Figure 1-1). The Alpine CPA covers approximately 68,100 acres of land characterized by diverse geography, residential land use patterns, and an established village area. The most distinguished geographic features are 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), with the majority of the population concentrated in and around the Alpine Village, which is adjacent to the freeway and includes residential and commercial centers. Cleveland National Forest comprises most of the land in the eastern and northern portions of the Alpine CPA.

The Alpine CPA is bordered by the Central Mountain CPA to the north, the Descanso and Pine Valley CPAs to the east, the Jamul-Dulzura CPA to the south, and the Lakeside and Crest-Dehesa-Harbison Canyon-Granite Hills CPAs to the west (Figure 1-2). The Alpine CPA includes the suburban Glen Oaks neighborhood in the western portion and the Viejas Mountains, El Cajon Mountains, and Cleveland National Forest in the eastern portion. The elevation of the terrain ranges from approximately 1,500 feet above mean sea level (amsl) at the vegetated drainages to more than 4,100 feet amsl in the semi-arid hilly terrain of the Viejas and El Cajon Mountains.
Alpine Village, located in the north-central portion of the Alpine CPA, is the most densely populated community within the planning area (Figure 1-3). Local development on both sides of I-8 consists primarily of residential/rural-residential, commercial, industrial, and mixed uses. The planning area also includes the communities of Peutz Valley, Japatul Valley, Hidden Glen, Dunbar Lane, and Galloway Valley. Development within these communities consists of rural-residential and light agricultural uses. 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.

1.3 Project Background

On August 3, 2011, the County of San Diego Board of Supervisors (Board) adopted the current General Plan. The Board also certified the General Plan EIR (County of San Diego 2011a, 2011b). The 2011 General Plan EIR provided an analysis of potential future development throughout the unincorporated County at a programmatic level. As part of that General Plan update process, the land use maps were updated for each of the communities in the County, which were then incorporated into the respective community plans.

The land use map changes that occurred with the adoption of the General Plan excluded approximately 71,300 acres of private lands within the Cleveland National Forest in the unincorporated County area that had been designated under the FCI. The FCI was a voter-approved initiative in 1993 that required a minimum lot size of 40 acres for private lands near the Cleveland National Forest, including land in the Alpine community. Upon its expiration on December 31, 2010, the former FCI lands reverted to the land use designations of the 1978 General Plan, which was in place when the FCI originally took effect.

To address this inconsistency, the County prepared a supplemental EIR that analyzed the re-designation of the former FCI lands consistent with the Guiding Principles and Goals and Policies of the adopted 2011 General Plan, as well as changes in the land use designations for approximately 400 acres of private lands adjacent to former FCI lands to ensure consistency between the new land uses. Included in this analysis were land use changes to approximately 13,748 acres of former FCI lands within the Alpine CPA. On December 14, 2016, the Board approved the FCI Project, and certified the associated EIR (FCI EIR). With the approval of the FCI Project, the land use map in the General Plan and all Community Plans that had FCI lands (including the Alpine Community Plan) were updated to incorporate the land use changes of the former FCI lands.

According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15150, an EIR may incorporate by reference all or portions of another document which is available to the public by only mentioning the document by reference. This SEIR incorporates by reference each of the following documents.

- General Plan EIR (August 2011)
- FCI EIR (October 2016)

Before drafting the Alpine CPU, the existing demographic, land use, and housing conditions of Alpine were analyzed. More information on this process can be found within Chapter 2 of the Background Report prepared for the project (County 2020). Alpine experienced considerable growth over the last four decades relative to its size. Since 1980, Alpine’s population has tripled from 5,368 to 18,095. The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) provides growth projections for the Alpine CPA for the years 2020, 2035, and 2050 (SANDAG 2013). For the years 2020 and 2035, SANDAG projects a total population of 18,210 and 22,044, respectively. By 2050, SANDAG projects a total population of 23,841.

Based on the existing allowable density under the current General Plan using SANDAG’s Series 13 model, the potential population within the seven subareas should be approximately 11,341 people. The proposed
The proposed project and each of the five alternatives propose varying land use designation changes for the different subareas. The proposed project analyzed within this SEIR includes the Village-Focused land use designations, which are described below in Section 1.4, Project Description. The five alternatives include the Former FCI Lands in Alpine alternative, Former FCI Lands in Eastern Alpine alternative, Low alternative, Moderate alternative, and High alternative. These five alternatives are analyzed in Chapter 4, Alternatives, of this SEIR. The results of the alternatives are summarized below in Section 1.4.2 Proposed Land Use Changes.

### 1.4 Project Description

The proposed project consists of a comprehensive update to the existing Alpine Community Plan. Specifically, the proposed project would update and refine the current community plan’s goals and policies to reflect the character of Alpine and guide future growth and development within the community, as well as change land use designations within four of the seven subareas identified within the Alpine CPA. These land use changes could result in increased density and intensity in the CPA compared to the existing land use map in the current Alpine Community Plan and General Plan. The Alpine CPU provides guidance and opportunities for future growth within Alpine but does not mandate any development. The land use changes proposed in the Alpine CPU concentrate local services and residential density in the more developed Village area where there are existing infrastructure and services. However, to accommodate growth associated with the buildout allowed by the proposed project, it is anticipated that new or expanded infrastructure would be required such as roads, water, wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, and/or telecommunications facilities.

In addition, new zoning designations will be adopted for the CPA consistent with the proposed land use designation changes. The proposed project also assumes a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) pilot program may be implemented. The goals of the TDR program are to allow some residential dwelling unit entitlements to be transferred from areas that are desired for conservation (sending areas) to more compact locations near existing infrastructure areas (receiving areas). Sending areas may be comprised of areas where unbuilt units can be transferred out to support conservation efforts and reduce development near open space or forest interface areas. Receiving areas may be comprised of areas that can accommodate increased density and focus planned growth in proximity to services, infrastructure, or village areas in a compact manner to reduce VMT. The exact location for the sending and receiving areas will be defined by the TDR pilot program.

An Implementation Plan will be developed as part of the Final Alpine CPU, which will outline and prioritize potential future CPU-consistent projects and possible sources and financial mechanisms that would assist in the implementation of the Alpine CPU.

### 1.4.1 Community Plan Elements

The adopted Alpine Community Plan was developed in conjunction with the General Plan to provide guidelines for land use decisions within the Alpine CPA. The proposed project would update and refine
the adopted Community Plan’s goals and policies to reflect the character of Alpine and guide growth and development. However, 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 chapters: Land Use, Mobility, Conservation and Open Space, Housing, Safety, and Noise.

1.4.1.1 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 preserving agricultural resources.

1.4.1.2 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 network map and matrix, which is an appendix to the Community Plan. Goals and policies are provided to support multi-modal transportation systems.

1.4.1.3 Conservation and Open Space

The Conservation and Open Space Element discusses open space and recreational resources that make Alpine unique and describes 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 promote a balance between connectivity for the community and wildlife.

1.4.1.4 Housing

The Housing Element discusses the current housing supply in Alpine, housing affordability, and senior housing. The goals and policies of the Housing Element promote a variety of housing types in all economic ranges; encouraging community involvement and keeping the rural character.

1.4.1.5 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.

1.4.1.6 Noise

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

1.4.2 Proposed Land Use Changes

To develop a range of land use alternatives for consideration, a Visioning and Existing Conditions workshop was held where the community discussed future community needs and indicated preferred areas of change in the Alpine CPA. An opportunities and constraints analysis was also conducted that evaluated community factors such as the availability of community services, transit services, slope on
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parcels, travel time for emergency services, and known existing environmental resources (i.e., vegetation communities, which can relate to biological resources or wildfire hazards). As a result of the community’s input and staff analysis, five land use alternatives (Former FCI Lands in Eastern Alpine alternative, Former FCI Lands in Alpine alternative, Low alternative, Moderate alternative, and High alternative) with different densities and intensities were developed for six subareas within the Alpine CPA. Six subareas and the five alternatives were presented at the Planning Concepts workshop. After analysis was conducted on the five alternatives, public input was given on the five alternatives and the County settled a lawsuit, a seventh subarea was added (Former FCI land in Alpine) as well as the Village-Focused alternative. The Village-Focused land use designations were chosen for the Alpine Community Plan update and are analyzed as part of this SEIR.

The project proposes to re-designate some of the land use designations within four of the seven subareas of the Alpine CPA. 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 with an overall intent to reduce VMTs. Table 1-1 identifies the change in capacity that would result from the proposed land uses changes.

### Table 1-1: Proposed Change to Development Capacity within the Subareas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subarea</th>
<th>Existing General Plan Capacity</th>
<th>Proposed Alpine CPU Capacity</th>
<th>Change/No Change</th>
<th>Change in Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>192 residential dwelling units (du)</td>
<td>192 residential du</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Not applicable (N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 acre of commercial use</td>
<td>0 acre of commercial use</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 acre of mixed-use</td>
<td>0 acre of mixed use</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.32 acres of industrial uses</td>
<td>31.32 acres of industrial uses</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>315 residential du</td>
<td>1,095 residential du</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>+780 du</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 acre of commercial use</td>
<td>1.02 acres of commercial use</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>+1.02 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 acre of mixed-use</td>
<td>0 acre of mixed use</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 acre of industrial use</td>
<td>0 acre of industrial use</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>31 residential du</td>
<td>31 residential du</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 acre of commercial use</td>
<td>0 acre of commercial use</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 acre of mixed use</td>
<td>0 acre of mixed use</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 acre of industrial use</td>
<td>0 acre of industrial use</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>166 residential du</td>
<td>851 residential du</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>+685 du(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 acre of commercial use</td>
<td>4.19 acres of commercial use</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>+4.19 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 acres of mixed-use</td>
<td>3.86 acres of mixed use</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>+3.86 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 acre of industrial use</td>
<td>0 acre of industrial use</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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 potential dwelling units are further discussed in Section 1.4.3, Residential Yields Analysis. The existing and proposed land uses are depicted on Figures 1-5 through 1-11. Table 1-2 identifies the acreages of the existing and proposed land use designations within each subarea. For a complete description of the land use designations in Table 1-2, please refer to the General Plan, Chapter 3, Land Use Element. New zoning designations would also be adopted to ensure zoning classifications are consistent with the proposed General Plan land use designations.

### Table 1-2: Existing and Proposed Land Use Designations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subarea</th>
<th>Existing General Plan Capacity</th>
<th>Proposed Alpine CPU Capacity</th>
<th>Change/No Change</th>
<th>Change in Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>460 residential du</td>
<td>429 residential du</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-31 du</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.02 acres of commercial use</td>
<td>10.96 acres of commercial use</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>+3.94 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 acre of mixed use</td>
<td>0 acre of mixed use</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 acre of industrial use</td>
<td>0 acre of industrial use</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>38 residential du</td>
<td>617 residential du</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>+579 du&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85.16 acres of commercial use</td>
<td>0 acre of commercial use</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-85.16 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 acre of mixed use</td>
<td>104.93 acres of mixed uses</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>+104.93 acres&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 acre of industrial use</td>
<td>0 acre of industrial use</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,863 residential du</td>
<td>2,863 residential du</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>116.2 acres of commercial use</td>
<td>116.2 acre of commercial use</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>152.3 acres of mixed use</td>
<td>152.3 acres of mixed use</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 acre of industrial use</td>
<td>0 acre of industrial use</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>A portion of the residential dwelling units (116 du) identified for this subarea would be provided within the mixed use designation.

<sup>2</sup>All dwelling units proposed within Subarea 6 would be provided within the total acreage for the proposed mixed use designation.

<sup>3</sup>The existing 85.16 acres of commercial uses is proposed to be provided within the total acreage for the proposed mixed use designation.
### Table 1-2. Acreages of Existing and Proposed Land Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subarea Number and Name</th>
<th>Existing Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Proposed Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited Impact Industrial (I-1)</td>
<td>31.32</td>
<td>Limited Impact Industrial (I-1)</td>
<td>31.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tavern Road</td>
<td>Village Residential (VR-4.3)</td>
<td>60.88</td>
<td>Village Residential (VR-10.9)</td>
<td>107.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village Residential (VR-2.9)</td>
<td>50.95</td>
<td>Village Residential (VR-7.3)</td>
<td>34.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village Residential (VR-2)</td>
<td>30.75</td>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial (C-3)</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-Rural Residential</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Otto Avenue</td>
<td>Semi-Rural Residential (SR-1)</td>
<td>114.22</td>
<td>Semi-Rural Residential (SR-1)</td>
<td>114.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Northwest Community Plan Area</td>
<td>Village Residential (VR-2)</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial (C-3)</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-Rural Residential (SR-1)</td>
<td>222.40</td>
<td>Village Core Mixed Use (C-5)</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-Rural Residential (SR-2)</td>
<td>417.38</td>
<td>Semi-Rural Residential (SR-0.5)</td>
<td>644.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Eastern Alpine</td>
<td>Village Residential (VR-2)</td>
<td>286.66</td>
<td>Village Residential (VR-2)</td>
<td>290.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-Rural Residential (SR-4)</td>
<td>903.50</td>
<td>Semi-Rural Residential (SR-1)</td>
<td>33.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Lands (RL-40)</td>
<td>602.38</td>
<td>Semi-Rural Residential (SR-4)</td>
<td>330.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Commercial (C-4)</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>Semi-Rural Residential (S-10)</td>
<td>84.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Agency Lands</td>
<td>280.96</td>
<td>Rural Lands (RL-20)</td>
<td>179.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Lands (RL-40)</td>
<td>871.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General Commercial (C-1)</td>
<td>7.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Commercial (C-4)</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Agency Lands</td>
<td>280.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Alpine Village</td>
<td>Village Residential (VR-15)</td>
<td>14.13</td>
<td>Village Core Mixed Use (C-5)</td>
<td>104.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-Rural Residential (SR-1)</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Commercial (C-1)</td>
<td>64.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Commercial (C-4)</td>
<td>20.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public/Semi-Public Facilities (P/SP)</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Former FCI Lands</td>
<td>Semi-Rural Residential (SR-1)</td>
<td>106.70</td>
<td>Semi-Rural Residential (SR-1)</td>
<td>106.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-Rural Residential (SR-2)</td>
<td>1074.64</td>
<td>Semi-Rural Residential (SR-2)</td>
<td>1074.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-Rural Residential (SR-4)</td>
<td>550.22</td>
<td>Semi-Rural Residential (SR-4)</td>
<td>550.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-Rural Residential (SR-10)</td>
<td>1511.55</td>
<td>Semi-Rural Residential (SR-10)</td>
<td>1511.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Lands (RL-20)</td>
<td>3691.94</td>
<td>Rural Lands (RL-20)</td>
<td>3691.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Lands (RL-40)</td>
<td>4680.28</td>
<td>Rural Lands (RL-40)</td>
<td>4680.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Lands (RL-80)</td>
<td>75.40</td>
<td>Rural Lands (RL-80)</td>
<td>75.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Commercial (RC)</td>
<td>116.20</td>
<td>Rural Commercial (C-4)</td>
<td>116.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public/Semi-Public Facilities (P/SP)</td>
<td>38.95</td>
<td>Public/Semi-Public Facilities (P/SP)</td>
<td>38.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tribal Lands (TL)</td>
<td>61.12</td>
<td>Tribal Lands (TL)</td>
<td>61.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village Core Mixed Use (C-5)</td>
<td>152.31</td>
<td>Village Core Mixed Use (C-5)</td>
<td>152.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total1                  | 15,211.39                                    | Total1  | 15,211.42                                    |

1 Totals may not sum exactly due to rounding.
1.4.3 Residential Yield Analysis

To determine the number of dwelling units that could 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. 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. Table 1-3 provides a comparison of the number of potential dwelling units that could be developed under the existing General Plan and the proposed Alpine CPU.

Table 1-3. Comparison of Potential Housing Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subarea</th>
<th>Current General Plan</th>
<th>Proposed Alpine CPU</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Northwest Village</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tavern Road and Wright’s Field</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Otto Avenue</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Northwest Community Plan Area</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Eastern Alpine</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Alpine Village</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Former FCI Lands</td>
<td>2,863</td>
<td>2,863</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,065</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,078</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,013</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 1-3, within the seven subareas 4,065 potential dwelling units could be developed under the General Plan, 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. The density outside of the seven subareas is part of the existing baseline and General Plan and would remain unchanged as part of the proposed project.

1.4.4 Proposed Mobility Network Changes

In addition to the proposed land use changes described in Section 1.4.2, there are several proposed changes to the Mobility Element including roadway re-classifications, roadway re-configurations, and the removal and addition of roadway segments. These proposed changes are identified below in Table 1-4. As shown in Table 1-4, four roadway segments are proposed to be removed from the existing Mobility Element Network: New Road 14 (from Tavern Road to West Victoria Drive), New Road 18 (from Alpine Boulevard to Eltinge Drive), New Road 23 (from Victoria Circle to East Victoria Drive), and El Monte Road (from Lakeside community boundary to El Capitan Reservoir). One new roadway segment is proposed, New Road 26, to provide secondary access to Palo Verde Estates; which currently only has one ingress and egress. New Road 26 would be located within Subarea 5, along Viejas Creek Trail, from Alpine Boulevard to Via Dieguenos. Figures 1-12a and 1-12b depicts the proposed changes to the Mobility Element Network.
### Table 1-4. Proposed Mobility Network Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Road Segment</th>
<th>Existing Designation/ Improvement</th>
<th>Existing Capacity</th>
<th>Proposed Capacity</th>
<th>Special Circumstances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Old Highway 80 (SC1930) Lakeside Community Boundary to Chocolate Summit Drive</td>
<td>2.2C Light Collector Continuous Intermittent Turn Lanes</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chocolate Summit Drive (SC1930)/ Broad Oaks Road Old Highway 80 to Lakeside Community Boundary</td>
<td>2.2E Light Collector 2.3B Minor Collector Intermittent Turn Lane – Old Highway 80 to Chocolate Creek Road 2.3C Minor Collector No Median – Chocolate Creek Road to Lakeside Community Boundary</td>
<td>16,200</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Alpine Boulevard (SF1402)/ (SC1883): Dunbar Lane to East Willows Road</td>
<td>4.1B Major Road Intermittent Turn Lanes – Dunbar Lane to Arnold Way 2.1CD Community Collector Improvement Options (Raised Median) Intermittent Left Turn Lane – Arnold Way Dunbar Lane to Tavern Road</td>
<td>34,200</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>Accepted at LOS E/F Boulder Road to Louise Drive Tavern Road to East Willows Road Shoulder as Parking Lane Separate Bike Lane Required Tavern Road to South Grade Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Road Segment</td>
<td>Existing Designation/ Improvement</td>
<td>Existing Capacity</td>
<td>Proposed Capacity</td>
<td>Special Circumstances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2BA</td>
<td>Light Collector Raised Median/ Continuous Turn Lane – Tavern Road to South Grade Road</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1CD</td>
<td>Community Collector Improvement Options (Intermittent Turn Lanes) – South Grade Road to West East Willows Road</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1C</td>
<td>Community Collector Intermittent Turn Lane – West Willows Road to East Willows Road</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Harbison Canyon Road (SF1402): Arnold Way to Crest/Dehesa Community Boundary</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2A</td>
<td>Light Collector Raised Median – Arnold Way to Bridle Run</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2C</td>
<td>Light Collector Intermittent Turn Lanes – Bridle Run to Crest/Dehesa Community Boundary</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1C</td>
<td>Community Collector Intermittent Turn Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Road Segment</td>
<td>Existing Designation/Improvement</td>
<td>Existing Capacity</td>
<td>Proposed Capacity</td>
<td>Special Circumstances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Arnold Way (SC1971):</strong> Alpine Boulevard (western end near Harbison Canyon Road) to Alpine Boulevard (near West Victoria Drive)</td>
<td><strong>2.2C Light Collector</strong>&lt;br&gt;2.1C Community Collector&lt;br&gt;Intermittent Turn Lanes – Alpine Boulevard (western end) to South Grade Road</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>Improvement Option&lt;br&gt;South Grade Road to Foss Road – Reduce shoulder width to six feet for use as a bike lane (requires parking prohibition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2.2F Light Collector</strong>&lt;br&gt;Reduced Shoulder – South Grade Road to Foss Road</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>Tavern Road to Alpine Boulevard&lt;br&gt;<strong>Combined Raised Median and Continuous Turn Lane, Intermittent and continuous two-way left turn, as appropriate</strong>&lt;br&gt;Shoulder as Parking Lane&lt;br&gt;Separate bike lane required – Tavern Road to Alpine Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2.2C Light Collector</strong>&lt;br&gt;Intermittent Turn Lanes – Foss Road to Tavern Road</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2.2A Light Collector</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>2.2C Light Collector</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Raised Median/Continuous Intermittent Turn Lane – Tavern Road to Alpine Boulevard (near West Victoria Drive)</strong></td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Foss Road</strong>&lt;br&gt;Arnold Way to South Grade Road</td>
<td><strong>2.2E Light Collector</strong>&lt;br&gt;No Median</td>
<td>16,200</td>
<td>16,200</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>South Grade Road (SA370)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Arnold Way to Alpine Boulevard</td>
<td><strong>2.2E Light Collector</strong>&lt;br&gt;No Median – Arnold Way to Via Viejas Tavern Road</td>
<td>16,200</td>
<td>16,200</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 2.2C Light Collector

**Intermittent Turn Lanes**

- **Via Viejas Tavern Road to Alpine Boulevard**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Road Segment</th>
<th>Existing Designation/ Improvement</th>
<th>Existing Capacity</th>
<th>Proposed Capacity</th>
<th>Special Circumstances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Viejas Tavern Road (SA380)</strong></td>
<td>Continuous Turn Lane – New Road 11 to Arnold Way</td>
<td>16,200&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>19,000&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Tavern Road (SA380)</strong></td>
<td>Intermittent Turn Lanes – New Road 11 to Alpine Boulevard</td>
<td>19,000&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>19,000&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>New Road 11 Victoria Park Terrace to Japatul Road</strong></td>
<td>Continuous Turn Lane – New Road 11 to Arnold Way</td>
<td>N/A&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>N/A&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Caltrans Facilities Programming Improvements (widening) of the Interstate 8 overpass is not programmed in the 2030 RTP (Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

# 2.2D Light Collector

**Improvement Options (Raised Median Passing Lane)**

- **- Arnold Way**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Road Segment</th>
<th>Existing Designation/ Improvement</th>
<th>Existing Capacity</th>
<th>Proposed Capacity</th>
<th>Special Circumstances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Tavern Road (SA380)</strong></td>
<td>Continuous Turn Lane – New Road 11 to Arnold Way</td>
<td>37,000&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>19,000&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>On-Call Projects (Reserved for Further Study)</strong></td>
<td>Continuous Turn Lane – New Road 11 to Arnold Way</td>
<td>19,000&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>19,000&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>New Road 11 Victoria Park Terrace to South Grade Road</strong></td>
<td>Continuous Turn Lane – New Road 11 to Arnold Way</td>
<td>16,200</td>
<td>16,200</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

# 2.2E Light Collector

**No Median**

- **- South Grade Road**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Road Segment</th>
<th>Existing Designation/ Improvement</th>
<th>Existing Capacity</th>
<th>Proposed Capacity</th>
<th>Special Circumstances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Tavern Road (SA380)</strong></td>
<td>Intermittent Turn Lanes – New Road 11 to Alpine Boulevard</td>
<td>16,200</td>
<td>16,200</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>New Road 11 Victoria Park Terrace to Japatul Road</strong></td>
<td>Continuous Turn Lane – New Road 11 to Arnold Way</td>
<td>9,700</td>
<td>9,700</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

# 2.2F Light Collector

**Reduced Shoulder**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Road Segment</th>
<th>Existing Designation/ Improvement</th>
<th>Existing Capacity</th>
<th>Proposed Capacity</th>
<th>Special Circumstances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>New Road 11 Victoria Park Terrace to Japatul Road</strong></td>
<td>Continuous Turn Lane – New Road 11 to Arnold Way</td>
<td>9,700</td>
<td>9,700</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>New Road 11 Victoria Park Terrace to Japatul Road</strong></td>
<td>Continuous Turn Lane – New Road 11 to Arnold Way</td>
<td>9,700</td>
<td>9,700</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Road Segment</th>
<th>Existing Designation/Improvement</th>
<th>Existing Capacity</th>
<th>Proposed Capacity</th>
<th>Special Circumstances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>New Road 11 Victoria Park Terrace to Tavern Lane Road</td>
<td>2.3A Minor Collector Raised Median</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>16,200</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2E Light Collector No Median</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>West Willows Road Willows Road to Alpine Boulevard Tavern Road New Road 11 to Victoria Park Terrace</td>
<td>2.2E Light Collector Raised Median 2.1A Community Collector Raised Median</td>
<td>37,000 (^6)</td>
<td>19,000 (^6)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Victoria Park Terrace (SC1985) Tavern Road (at Tavern Lane) to West Victoria Drive</td>
<td>2.2A Light Collector Raised Median 2.1D Community Collector Improvement Option (Passing Lane)</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>New Road 14 Tavern Road (at Tavern Lane) to West Victoria Drive</td>
<td>Local Public Road</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>West Victoria Drive (SC1990) Alpine Boulevard to Victoria Park Terrace</td>
<td>2.2E Light Collector No Median</td>
<td>16,200</td>
<td>16,200</td>
<td>Shoulder as Parking Lane Separate bike lane required – Interstate 8 to Alpine Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>North/East Victoria Drive (SC1990) Victoria Park Terrace to South Grade Road</td>
<td>2.2DF Light Collector Reduced Shoulder – Victoria Park Terrace to Otto Avenue</td>
<td>9,700</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>None Victoria Park Terrace to Otto Avenue – Reduce shoulder width to six feet for use as a bike lane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Road Segment</th>
<th>Existing Designation/ Improvement</th>
<th>Existing Capacity</th>
<th>Proposed Capacity</th>
<th>Special Circumstances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2C Light Collector</td>
<td>Intermittent Turn Lanes — Otto Avenue to South Grade Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(requires parking prohibition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Otto Avenue</td>
<td>East Victoria Road to West Willows Road</td>
<td>2.2E Light Collector</td>
<td>Intermittent Turn Lanes</td>
<td>19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>New Road 18</td>
<td>Alpine Boulevard at West Victoria Drive to Eltinge Drive at Marshall Road</td>
<td>Local Public Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Willows Road (SC2000)</td>
<td>Otto Avenue to Alpine Boulevard at Willows Road Interchange</td>
<td>2.2E Light Collector</td>
<td>No Median — Otto Avenue / West Willows Road to Viejas Casino Area</td>
<td>16,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2A Boulevard</td>
<td>Raised Median — Viejas Casino Area east to I-8 Westbound On-ramp (Exit 36)</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1A Major Road</td>
<td>Raised Median — I-8 Westbound On-ramp at Willows Road to Alpine Boulevard</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2E Light Collector</td>
<td>No Median — Viejas Casino Area to East Willows Road Interchange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1.0 Project Description, Location and Environmental Setting

#### Alpine Community Plan Update

**Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Road Segment</th>
<th>Existing Designation/ Improvement</th>
<th>Existing Capacity</th>
<th>Proposed Capacity</th>
<th>Special Circumstances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Japatul Valley Road (SF1401.1)</td>
<td>2.2F Light Collector Reduced Shoulder</td>
<td>9,700</td>
<td>9,700</td>
<td>None Improvement Option Reduce shoulder width to six feet for use as a bike lane (requires parking prohibition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Lyons Valley Road (SA390)</td>
<td>2.2F Light Collector Reduced Shoulder</td>
<td>9,700</td>
<td>9,700</td>
<td>None Improvement Option Reduce shoulder width to six feet for use as a bike lane (requires parking prohibition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Viejas View Place</td>
<td>Local Public Road 2.3C Minor Collector No Median</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23*</td>
<td>New Road 23</td>
<td>Local Public Road</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24*</td>
<td>El Monte Road (SC1920)</td>
<td>2.3C Minor Collector</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26**</td>
<td>New Road 26</td>
<td>2.3C Minor Collector No Median</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Represents the capacity for the portion of South Grade Road from Via Viejas to Tavern Road.

2 Represents the capacity for the portion of South Grade Road from Tavern Road to Alpine Boulevard.

3 Represents the capacity for the portion of Tavern Road from New Road 11 to Victoria Park Terrace; which is proposed to be moved from ME ID 8 to ME ID 12. The capacity for this segment of Tavern Road is shown under ME ID 12.

4 Represents the capacity for the portion of Tavern Road from New Road 11 to Victoria Park Terrace to Arnold Way.
Represents the capacity for the portion of Tavern Road from Arnold Way to South Grade Road.
The proposed changes are associated with ME ID 8 for Tavern Road from New Road 11 to Victoria Park Terrace, reducing the classification from a 4.1A Major Road to a 2.1A Community Collector.
* Road segment/improvement proposed to be deleted.
**New road segments/improvements proposed to be added.
N/A = Not Applicable.
1.5 Technical, Economic, and Environmental Characteristics

As previously discussed, the proposed project consists of a comprehensive update to the existing Alpine Community Plan. Specifically, the proposed project would update and refine the current Community Plan’s goals and policies to reflect the character of Alpine and guide future growth and development within the community. Land use and mobility maps will be updated with revised land use designations and zoning within four of the seven identified subareas throughout the Alpine CPA. Fundamental to the re-designation of land uses proposed under the Alpine CPU is the consistency of proposed re-designations with the Guiding Principles and Policies of the General and Community Plan. As stated in the 2011 General Plan EIR, “[c]entral to the land use concept for unincorporated San Diego County is a development pattern that balances the land requirements of residential growth with those of commerce, agriculture, recreation, and wildlife habitats. This development pattern directs future growth to areas where existing or planned infrastructure and services can support growth and to locations within or adjacent to existing communities” (County 2011b). This SEIR considers this fundamental concept in evaluating the potential environmental effects of the proposed project.

1.6 Environmental Setting

According to Section 15125 of the State CEQA Guidelines, an EIR must include a description of the existing physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the proposed project to provide the “baseline condition” against which project-related impacts are compared. Normally, the baseline condition is the physical condition that exists when the Notice of Preparation (NOP) is published. The NOP for the proposed project was published on August 30, 2018. However, this SEIR is tiering from the 2011 General Plan EIR and FCI EIR.1 As such, the baseline conditions for the proposed project are the physical conditions described in each of these EIRs, which are incorporated by reference. In some instances, however, the baseline conditions have been updated for certain environmental issue areas, including aesthetics (Section 2.1), air quality (Section 2.3), Greenhouse gas emissions (Section 2.6), transportation and traffic (Section 2.14), and wildfire (Section 2.7) to reflect any changes in circumstances that have occurred since the certification of the 2011 General Plan EIR and FCI EIR. These changes in circumstances, which could include new regulations or substantial physical changes that have occurred within the Alpine CPA, would need to be considered to accurately determine the proposed project’s potential effects on the environment.

1.7 Purpose and Intended Uses of the EIR

The County is the lead agency, as defined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15050, because it has principal responsibility for approving the proposed Alpine CPU. As the lead agency, the County also has primary responsibility for complying with CEQA. As such, the County has analyzed the environmental effects of the proposed project, the results of which are presented in this SEIR. The Board, in its role as the decision-making body of the County, is responsible for certifying the Final SEIR and adopting the Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations pursuant to Sections 15090–15093 of the State CEQA Guidelines prior to project approval.

---

1 Due to prior litigation and a settlement agreement, this SEIR does not rely on the FCI Lands GPA SEIR for air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, transportation and traffic, and wildfire.
1.7.1 Supplemental EIR

Consistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15163(a)(2), the County has prepared an SEIR to the 2011 General Plan EIR and FCI EIR since only minor additions or changes would be necessary to make the previous EIRs adequately apply to the proposed Alpine CPU. Section 15163 also states:

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

(c) A supplement to an EIR shall be given the same kind of notice and public review as is given to a draft EIR under Section 15087.

(d) A supplement to an EIR may be circulated by itself without recirculating the previous draft or final EIR.

(e) When the agency decides whether to approve the project, the decision-making body shall consider the previous EIR as revised by the supplemental EIR. A finding under Section 15091 shall be made for each significant effect shown in the previous EIR as revised.

The 2011 General Plan EIR provided an analysis of potential impacts associated with future development within the unincorporated County based on anticipated buildout of the General Plan and other relevant plans, programs, and policies. In addition, the FCI EIR analyzed the re-designation of the former FCI lands consistent with the Guiding Principles and Goals and Policies of the adopted General Plan, including land use changes to approximately 13,748 acres of former FCI lands within the Alpine CPA.

Hard copies of the 2011 General Plan EIR and FCI EIR are available for review at the County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services, located at 5510 Overland Avenue, San Diego, California 92123. In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15150, information from the 2011 General Plan EIR and FCI EIR are hereby incorporated by reference into this SEIR and are available online at:

http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/gpupdate/environmental.html.

1.7.2 Level of Analysis

The degree of specificity in an EIR corresponds to the degree of specificity in the underlying activity described in the EIR. As CEQA specifies, a Program EIR is appropriate for a Community Plan under which there will be future development proposals that are 1) related geographically, 2) logical parts in a chain of contemplated actions, 3) connected as part of a continuing program, and 4) carried out under the same authorizing statute or regulatory authority and have similar environmental impacts that can be mitigated in similar ways (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168).

For some site-specific purposes, a program-level environmental document may provide sufficient detail to enable an agency to make informed site-specific decisions within the program. This approach would allow agencies the ability to consider program-wide mitigation measures and cumulative impacts that might be slighted in a case-by-case analysis approach, and to carry out an entire program without having to prepare additional site-specific environmental documents. In other cases, the formulation of site-specific issues is unknown until subsequent design occurs leading to the preparation of later project-level environmental documentation.

Preparation of a program-level document simplifies the task of preparing subsequent project-level environmental documents for future projects under the Alpine CPU for which the details are currently unknown. This SEIR presents an analysis of the environmental impacts of adoption and implementation.
of the Alpine CPU. Specifically, it evaluates the physical and land use changes from potential development that could occur with adoption and implementation of the Alpine CPU.

Similar to the 2011 General Plan EIR, the buildout scenario as it pertains to the Alpine CPU is based on the maximum development potential of the proposed land use designations within the CPA, taking into account the specific constraints identified in Section 1.4.3, Residential Yields Analysis. As discussed in Section 1.6, Environmental Setting, the baseline conditions for the proposed project are generally the physical conditions described in the 2011 General Plan EIR and FCI EIR. However, the baseline conditions have been updated in some instances to reflect any changes in circumstances that have occurred since the certification of these EIRs. The proposed Alpine CPU would guide growth within the community over a 30-year planning horizon; as such, 2050 is assumed as the buildout year for purposes of this SEIR.

1.7.3 Streamlining and Tiering

The County intends to use the streamlining/tiering provisions of CEQA to the maximum feasible extent, so that future environmental review of specific projects is undertaken expeditiously without the need for repetition and redundancy, as provided in CEQA Guidelines Section 15152 and elsewhere.

Specifically, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, streamlined environmental review is mandated for projects that are consistent with the development density established by the community plan or general plan for which an EIR was certified, unless such a project would have environmental impacts peculiar to the project or the project site. For projects that are consistent, no additional environmental review is required except to determine whether there are any project-specific significant effects that are peculiar to the project or project site. The County intends to use this SEIR to streamline future publicly- and privately-initiated projects within the Alpine CPA that are consistent with the proposed project.

Likewise, Public Resources Code Section 21094.5 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.3 also provides for streamlining of certain qualified, infill projects.

This SEIR is intended to provide for the streamlined environmental review necessary for subsequent consideration of project-level approvals required for the following individual project types:

- Development projects consistent with the intensities and types of uses fully contemplated in the Community Plan;
- Improvements to public infrastructure systems (i.e., water, sewer and storm drains, electrical and power utilities, etc.);
- Improvements to the public roadway and transportation systems, including roadway and sidewalk repairs and improvements, new bike lanes, and other similar transportation improvements specifically contemplated in the Alpine CPU; or
- Development of public parks and open space, or private and semi-public open spaces (i.e., community gardens, etc.) as specifically contemplated in the Alpine CPU.

When considering the applicability of these streamlining provisions under CEQA, the County shall consider whether such subsequent projects may have impacts which are peculiar to the project or its site, whether the project may result in impacts which were not fully analyzed in this SEIR, or which may result in impacts that are more severe than have been identified in this SEIR.

In addition, CEQA Guidelines sections 15162-15164 allow for the preparation of a Subsequent (Mitigated) Negative Declaration, Subsequent or Supplemental, and/or Addendum, respectively, to a certified EIR
when certain conditions are satisfied. Moreover, California Government Code Section 65457 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15182 provide that once an EIR is certified and a specific plan adopted, any residential development project, including any subdivision or zoning change that implements and is consistent with the specific plan is generally exempt from additional CEQA review under certain circumstances. The above are merely examples of possible streamlining/tiering mechanisms that the County may pursue and in no way limit future environmental review of specific projects.

1.8 Impact Analysis Methodology

The methodology for analyzing potential environmental impacts of the proposed project is generally similar to that of the General Plan. Specifically, the programmatic-level analysis contained in this SEIR does not speculate on the individual environmental impacts of potential future development projects on lands re-designated under the proposed Alpine CPU.

The potential for significant impacts to occur from future development associated with the proposed Alpine CPU is based on specific technical analyses as well as GIS data and spatial analysis. Additionally, federal, state, and County regulations were considered for their applicability in reducing the effects of development under the General Plan and the proposed project. Where applicable, the same existing regulations, policies, and mitigation measures addressed in the 2011 General Plan EIR and FCI EIR to reduce potential impacts for each environmental issue are also incorporated into this SEIR. Where no applicable regulations exist, this SEIR incorporates the adopted General Plan implementation policies and 2011 General Plan EIR and 2016 FCI EIR mitigation measures.

1.9 Discretionary Actions, Decisions and Approvals

1.9.1 Supplemental Environmental Impact Report

As the CEQA lead agency, the County has the principal responsibility for approving the proposed project and certifying the accompanying Final SEIR. Table 1-5 provides a summary list of the discretionary actions that would be required for the proposed project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discretionary Action</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certification of Final SEIR</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of Findings of Fact</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of Statement of Overriding Considerations</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of the Alpine Community Plan Update</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of the General Plan Amendment</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of the Rezone</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The purpose of this SEIR is to analyze the proposed project and is intended to apply to the listed project approvals.
1.9.2 Other Agencies

1.9.2.1 Subsequent Project Review

Subsequent projects implemented under the Alpine CPU may require review and approval by other public and quasi-public agencies and jurisdictions that have purview over specific actions. These agencies may also consider this SEIR in their reviews and decision-making processes. Other jurisdictional permits, approvals, or will-serve letters could include but are not limited to:

- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife
- San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board
- San Diego Air Pollution Control District
- San Diego County Fire Authority
- Alpine Fire Protection District
- Lakeside Fire Protection District
- San Diego County Sheriff's Department
- School Districts (Alpine Union, Cajon Valley Union, and/or Grossmont Union High)
- Sanitation Districts (Alpine and/or Lakeside Sanitation Districts)
- Water Districts (Padre Dam Municipal Water District; South Bay Irrigation District)
- County of San Diego Franchise Waste Hauler (Allied Waste)
- San Diego Gas and Electric

1.9.3 Other Agencies Having Jurisdiction within Alpine CPA

Detailed below are other agencies or entities that control or manage land within the boundary of the Alpine CPA. These entities are subject to the federal environmental review regulations (i.e., National Environmental Policy Act) when it comes to the environmental review of their projects.

1.9.3.1 Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians

The Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians (Viejas) is a sovereign government recognized by the United States government. Tribal governments are autonomous entities that conduct responsibilities of many governing bodies, with such structures as executive, legislative, and judicial branches. The Viejas Government is founded on a participatory democracy, comprised of two active levels — general council and tribal council. Tribal government officials are elected to four-year terms of office by the general council, which includes all of the band's voting members. The Viejas Reservation is approximately 1,600 acres in size. Within the Reservation, Viejas owns and operates Viejas Casino and Resort, Viejas Outlets, and Ma-Tar-Awa Recreational Vehicle Park.

1.9.3.2 United States Forest Service

The United States Forest Service manages the Cleveland National Forest, located in eastern San Diego County and parts of Orange, Riverside, and Imperial Counties. The Cleveland National Forest is the southern-most National Forest in California. Consisting of 460,000 acres, the forest offers a wide variety of terrains and recreational opportunities. Regarding forest planning, the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act, as amended by the National Forest Management Act, establishes a process for developing, amending, and revising land management plans for units of the National Forest System.
The Cleveland National Forest Land Management Plan (LMP) went into effect on October 1, 2006. The revised LMP for the Cleveland National Forest describes the strategic direction at the broad program-level for managing the land and its resources. The LMP is intended to facilitate the process for adapting to change and documents the need to update, amend and eventually revise LMPs in order to achieve desired conditions while ensuring healthy National Forests.

1.10 Project Consistency with Applicable Plans

There are 19 jurisdictions in San Diego County, including the unincorporated County, with local land use authority and the responsibility for preparing their own general plans and associated environmental documents. Regional coordination is necessary to guide overall development and ensure an efficient allocation of infrastructure funding. SANDAG serves as the region's Metropolitan Planning Organization responsible for area-wide coordination and the technical and informational resource for the region's local jurisdictions. SANDAG prepares regional land use and transportation plans, which provide a basis for allocating federal and state funds used for specific items such as land use incentives and transportation improvements. The County also works with the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority on a regular basis to ensure land use compatibility with regional airports; however, the Alpine CPA is not within the Airport Influence Area for any public airports. Other agencies with regional documents affecting land use in the County are the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board and the San Diego Air Pollution Control District. The proposed project's consistency with all applicable planning documents is analyzed in Section 2.9, Land Use, of this SEIR.

In addition, as discussed in Section 1.7.3 above, subsequent projects within the Alpine CPU subarea boundaries will be reviewed to determine whether the subsequent project is within the scope of this SEIR or if additional environmental review is required. All future projects will be subject to review for consistency with the goals and policies of the Alpine CPU, as well as the approved land use and zoning designations.

1.11 Cumulative Methodology and Setting

CEQA requires that an EIR discuss cumulative impacts in addition to project-level impacts. According to Section 15355 of CEQA Guidelines, “cumulative impacts” refers to two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts. In accordance with CEQA, the discussion of cumulative impacts must reflect the severity of the impacts and the likelihood of their occurrence; however, the discussion need not be as detailed as the discussion of the environmental impacts attributable to a project alone. Further, the discussion is guided by the standards of practicality and reasonableness and should focus on the cumulative impact to which the identified other projects contribute rather than the attributes of other projects that do not contribute to the cumulative impact.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(a) requires EIRs to discuss the cumulative impacts of a project when a project’s incremental effect is cumulatively considerable. As defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15065 “cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects. The Guidelines indicate when a lead agency is examining a project with an incremental effect that is not cumulatively considerable, it need not consider the effect significant but shall briefly describe the basis for its conclusion. In addition, the Guidelines allow for a project’s contribution to be rendered less than cumulatively considerable with implementation of appropriate mitigation.
The geographic scope defines the geographic area within which projects may contribute to a specific cumulative impact. Generally, the geographic scope of the area affected by cumulative effects varies according to the environmental issue area. The geographic scope for each issue area is described further under the respective resource section of Chapter 2, Environmental Effects of the Proposed Project.

According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(b) there are two methods for establishing the scope of a cumulative impacts analysis within the assumed area.

- The List Method includes a list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those outside the control of the agency.
- The Plan Method uses the projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document, or in a prior adopted or certified environmental document, which describes or evaluates regional or area-wide conditions contributing to the cumulative impacts.

Because the proposed project involves a comprehensive update to the adopted Alpine Community Plan and would guide growth within the community over a 30-year planning horizon, the cumulative analysis for all issue areas utilizes the Plan Method. In the San Diego region, SANDAG serves as the regional transportation planning agency responsible for forecasting the region's population growth. These growth projections serve as the foundation for regional planning documents such as water supply management plans and general plans, and provide the basis for determining housing, infrastructure, and transportation needs across the San Diego region.
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