

## CHAPTER 3.0 OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

This chapter addresses other considerations required pursuant to State California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Sections 15126.2(c) and (d),<sup>1</sup> and 15128. Specifically, this chapter (1) addresses effects found not significant as part of the environmental impact report (EIR) process; (2) discloses significant irreversible changes to the environment that would result from the proposed Alpine Community Plan Update (CPU); and (3) discusses growth-inducing impacts of the proposed Alpine CPU that pertain to ways in which the proposed project could promote direct or indirect growth. This section incorporates information and analysis from the 2011 General Plan EIR and 2016 Forest Conservation Initiative (FCI) General Plan Amendment (GPA) EIR (FCI EIR) (referred throughout the rest of this chapter as “prior EIRs”) as they apply to the proposed project. Section 1.3 (Project Background) of this Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) provides a background for both EIRs. The 2011 General Plan EIR analyzed the entirety of the Alpine Community Plan Area (CPA) while the FCI EIR provided an updated analysis of impacts of land use changes within the FCI lands.

### 3.1 Effects Found Not Significant as Part of the Environmental Impact Report Process

During the analysis of potential effects within this SEIR, the Energy (wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources; and renewable energy or energy efficiency plan conflict or obstruction), Hazards and Hazardous Materials (transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials; accidental release of hazardous materials; hazards to schools; existing hazardous materials sites; and private airstrips); Land Use (divide an established community and conflict with land use plans, policies and regulations); and Tribal Cultural Resources (adverse change in a tribal cultural resource) issue areas were determined to result in less than significant impacts on the environment as a result of the proposed project. The following provides a summary of the analysis completed to determine that the effects on these resources would not be significant.

#### 3.1.1 Energy Use

**Table 3-1. Energy Summary of Impacts**

<b>Issue Number</b>	<b>Issue Topic</b>	<b>Prior EIRs Conclusion*</b>	<b>Project Direct Impact(s)</b>	<b>Project Cumulative Impact(s)</b>	<b>Level of Significance After Mitigation</b>
EN-1	Wasteful, Inefficient, or Unnecessary Consumption of Energy Resources	N/A	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	N/A
EN-2	Renewable Energy or Energy Efficiency Plan Conflict or Obstruction	N/A	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	N/A

N/A – not applicable

\* Impact of the expansion of energy facilities was previously discussed in the prior EIRs, however the new Appendix G checklist questions regarding energy efficiency and consistency with energy plans were not included or available in the prior EIRs analysis.

<sup>1</sup> The requirements of State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(a) are met in Chapter 2, *Environmental Effects of the Proposed Project*, under each resource discussion.

### ***3.1.1.1 Existing Conditions***

This section describes the existing regional energy use, including direct and indirect consumption of energy, including electricity and natural gas, and fuel associated with transportation-related energy. The 2011 General Plan EIR, Section 2.15.1.4, presents a description of current power and energy resources relevant to the Alpine CPA and related impact analyses included in the 2011 General Plan EIR Chapter 2.16, *Utilities and Service Systems*. The environmental setting described in the 2011 General Plan EIR related to energy facilities is the same as that evaluated in this section. The discussion in this section is based on updated energy resource data.

#### ***Energy Types and Sources***

California relies on a regional power system comprised of a diverse mix of natural gas, renewable energy, hydroelectric, and nuclear generation resources. In 2018, approximately 35 percent of natural gas consumed in the state was used to generate electricity.

Gasoline and diesel fuel sold in California for motor vehicles is refined in California to meet specific formulations required by California Air Resources Board (CARB). Major petroleum refineries in California are concentrated in three counties: Contra Costa County in northern California, Kern County in central California, and Los Angeles County in southern California.

Power plants in California meet approximately 68 percent of the in-state electricity demand; hydroelectric power from the Pacific Northwest provides 12 percent, and power plants in the southwestern U.S. provide the remaining 20 percent (EIA 2014). The contribution of in- and out-of-state power plants depends on the precipitation that occurred in the previous year, the corresponding amount of hydroelectric power that is available, and other factors. San Diego Gas and Electric (SDG&E) is the primary energy supplier in San Diego County. In 2017, SDG&E derived 43 percent of its electricity from renewable sources (CEC 2019a).

#### ***Alternative Fuels***

A variety of alternative fuels are used to reduce demand for petroleum-based fuel. Conventional gasoline and diesel may be replaced (depending on the capability of the vehicle) with many transportation fuels, including biodiesel, electricity, ethanol, hydrogen, natural gas/methane, propane, and renewable diesel.

California has a growing number of alternative fuel vehicles through the joint efforts of the California Energy Commission (CEC), CARB, local air districts, federal government, transit agencies, utilities, and other public and private entities.

#### ***Transportation Fuels***

On-road vehicles use is about 90 percent of the petroleum consumed in California. Petroleum products (e.g., gasoline, diesel, jet fuel) account for almost 99 percent of the energy used in California by the transportation sector, with the rest provided by ethanol, natural gas, and electricity (Bureau of Transportation Statistics 2015). The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) projected that 1,689 million gallons of gasoline and diesel were consumed in San Diego County in 2015, an increase of approximately 183 million gallons of fuel from 2010 levels (Caltrans 2008).

## ***Vehicle Miles Traveled and Gasoline Consumption***

As noted in the regulatory setting of this section, several State mandates and efforts, such as SB 375, seek to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in California. Fuel consumption per capita in California decreased by nearly 11 percent from 2008 to 2011 (Bureau of Transportation Statistics 2015). Despite the progress in reducing per capita VMT and per capita fuel consumption, the continued projected increases in total fuel consumption and VMT can be attributed to the overall increase in population. In 2018, the daily VMT in San Diego County totaled 5,687,980, an increase of 0.7 percent over 2015 levels (Caltrans 2017, 2019). In 2019, the average fuel efficiency in San Diego County was 28.9 miles per gallon for a gasoline-powered light-duty vehicle and 4.5 miles per gallon for a gasoline-powered light-duty truck (CARB 2019).

## ***Regional Energy Resources and Use***

San Diego Gas and Electric (SDG&E) provides energy service to over 3.6 million customers (i.e., 1.4 million accounts) in San Diego county and portions of southern Orange County. The utility has a diverse power production portfolio, composed of a variety of renewable and non-renewable sources. Energy production typically varies by season and by year. Regional electricity loads also tend to be higher in the summer because higher summer temperatures drive increased demand for air-conditioning. In contrast, natural gas loads are higher in the winter because colder temperatures drive increased demand for natural gas heating.

SDG&E's EcoChoice and EcoShare options allow customers to obtain 100 percent of their energy from renewable sources (SDG&E 2020a). SDG&E buys renewable energy from generating facilities designated for EcoChoice facilities and customers can get 50 to 100 percent of their electricity from these sources. The EcoShare option allows customers to work directly with third-party renewable energy developers to purchase the rights to energy generated from a new renewable energy facility. Customers work directly with the developer to set the price and terms for the EcoShare option.

In 2018, more than 43 percent of the electricity SDG&E supplied was from renewable sources, compared to less than 1 percent in 2002 (CEC 2019a). Table 3-2 outlines the SDG&E power mix in 2018 compared to the power mix for the State. In 2018, SDG&E customers used 19,799 gigawatt hours of electricity and 482 million therms of natural gas (CEC 2020). Table 3-3 outlines the breakdown of electricity and natural gas usage by sector in the SDG&E service area. Residential and commercial uses, the types of new uses proposed in the Alpine CPU, account for 90 percent of electricity use and 94 percent of natural gas use within the SDG&E service area.

**Table 3-2. SDG&E and the State of California Power Mix in 2018**

<b>Energy Resources</b>	<b>SDG&amp;E Power Mix (%)</b>	<b>California-Wide Power Mix (%)</b>
Eligible Renewables	43	31
<i>Biomass and Waste</i>	2	2
<i>Geothermal</i>	0	5
<i>Eligible hydroelectric</i>	0	2
<i>Solar</i>	20	11
<i>Wind</i>	21	11

Energy Resources	SDG&E Power Mix (%)	California-Wide Power Mix (%)
Coal	0	3
Large Hydroelectric	0	11
Natural Gas	29	35
Nuclear	0	9
Other	<1	<1
Unspecified sources of power <sup>1</sup>	27	11
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

Notes: SDG&E = San Diego Gas and Electric

<sup>1</sup> Electricity from transactions that are not traceable to specific generation sources.

Source: CEC 2020.

**Table 3-3. Electricity and Natural Consumption in the SDG&E Service Area in 2018**

Energy Resources	Electricity (GWh)	Natural Gas (million therms)
Agriculture and Water Pump	353	4
Commercial	11,311	190
Industry	1,365	20
Mining and Construction	427	4
Residential	7,665	265
<b>Total</b>	<b>21,121</b>	<b>483</b>

Notes: GWh = gigawatt hours; SDG&E = San Diego Gas and Electric; therms = British Thermal units

Source: CEC 2020.

### ***3.1.1.2 Regulatory Framework***

Section 2.15.2 of the 2011 General Plan EIR and Section 15.2.2 of the FCI EIR include a brief discussion of the regulatory framework related to energy resources in the unincorporated County, namely a description of the Building Energy Efficiency Standards (California Energy Code). Because energy use was not covered in detail in the prior EIRs, regulations not previously discussed therein relative to energy use and conservation are summarized below.

#### **Federal**

Applicable federal regulations not included in or enacted after adoption of the General Plan in 2011 and the FCI GPA in 2016 are described below.

#### ***Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975 and Corporate Average Fuel Standards***

The Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975 established the first fuel economy standards for on-road motor vehicles sold in the United States. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) is

responsible for establishing vehicle standards and revising existing standards. Their Corporate Average Fuel Economy program was created to determine vehicle manufacturers' compliance with the fuel economy standards. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) administers the testing program that generates the fuel economy data.

### ***Safer Affordable Fuel-Efficient Vehicles Rule***

On August 2, 2018, NHTSA and EPA proposed the Safer Affordable Fuel-Efficient Vehicles Rule (SAFE Rule). This rule addresses emissions and fuel economy standards for motor vehicles and is separated in two parts as follows:

- Part One, "One National Program" (84 FR 51310), revokes a waiver granted by EPA to the State of California under Section 209 of the CAA to enforce more stringent emission standards for motor vehicles than those required by EPA for the explicit purpose of GHG emission reduction, and indirectly, criteria air pollutant and ozone precursor emission reduction. This revocation became effective on November 26, 2019, restricting the ability of CARB to enforce more stringent GHG emission standards for new vehicles and set zero emission vehicle mandates in California. CARB has estimated the vehicle tailpipe and evaporative emissions impacts to criteria air pollutants and precursors from SAFE Rule Part One and has provided off-model adjustment factors to adjust emission outputs from CARB's Emission Factor (EMFAC) model.
- Part Two, "Vehicles Rule for Model Years 2021–2026 Passenger Cars and Light Trucks" (85 FR 24174) addresses corporate average fuel economy (CAFE) standards for passenger cars and light trucks for model years 2021 to 2026. This rulemaking proposes new CAFE standards for model years 2022 through 2026 and would amend existing CAFE standards for model year 2021. The proposal would retain the model year 2020 standards (specifically, the footprint target curves for passenger cars and light trucks) through model year 2026, but comment is sought on a range of alternatives discussed throughout the proposed rule. This proposal addressing CAFE standards is being jointly developed with EPA, which is simultaneously proposing tailpipe CO<sub>2</sub> standards for the same vehicles covered by the same model years. The final SAFE Rule Part Two was published in the Federal Register on April 30, 2020. The outcome of any pending or potential lawsuits (and how such lawsuits could delay or affect its implementation) are unknown at this time.

### ***Energy Policy Act of 2005***

The Energy Policy Act of 1992 was passed to reduce the country's dependence on foreign petroleum and improve air quality. The act includes several parts intended to build an inventory of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs) in large, centrally fueled fleets in metropolitan areas. The act requires certain federal, State, and local government and private fleets to purchase a percentage of light-duty AFVs capable of running on alternative fuels each year. In addition, financial incentives are also included in the act. Federal tax deductions are allowed for businesses and individuals to cover the incremental cost of AFVs. States are also required by the act to consider a variety of incentive programs to help promote AFVs. The Energy Policy Act of 2005 provides renewed and expanded tax credits for electricity generated by qualified energy sources, such as landfill gas; provides bond financing, tax incentives, grants, and loan guarantees for clean renewable energy and rural community electrification; and establishes a federal purchase requirement for renewable energy.

### ***Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007***

The Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 is designed to improve vehicle fuel economy and help reduce U.S. dependence on oil. It represents a major step forward in expanding the production of renewable fuels, reducing dependence on oil, and confronting global climate change. The Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 increases the supply of alternative fuel sources by setting a mandatory Renewable Fuel Standard requiring fuel producers to use at least 36 billion gallons of biofuel in 2022, which represents a nearly fivefold increase over current levels; and reduces U.S. demand for oil by setting a national fuel economy standard of 35 miles per gallon by 2020—an increase in fuel economy standards of 40 percent.

By addressing renewable fuels and the CAFE standards, the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 builds upon progress made by the Energy Policy Act of 2005 in setting out a comprehensive national energy strategy for the 21st century.

### **State**

Applicable State regulations not included in or enacted after adoption of the General Plan in 2011 and the FCI GPA in 2016 are described below.

### ***Warren-Alquist Act***

The 1975 Warren-Alquist Act established the California Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission, now known as the CEC. The act established State policy to reduce wasteful, uneconomical, and unnecessary uses of energy by employing a range of measures. The California Public Utilities Commission regulates privately owned utilities in the energy, rail, telecommunications, and water fields.

### ***Assembly Bill 2076 - Reducing Dependence on Petroleum***

Pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 2076 (Chapter 936, Statutes of 2000), the CEC and CARB prepared and adopted a joint agency report in 2003, Reducing California's Petroleum Dependence. Included in this report are recommendations to increase the use of alternative fuels to 20 percent of on-road transportation fuel use by 2020 and 30 percent by 2030, significantly increase the efficiency of motor vehicles, and reduce per capita VMT (CEC and CARB 2003). A performance-based goal of AB 2076 was to reduce petroleum demand to 15 percent below 2003 demand by 2030.

### ***Integrated Energy Policy Report***

Senate Bill (SB) 1389 (Chapter 568, Statutes of 2002) required CEC to “conduct assessments and forecasts of all aspects of energy industry supply, production, transportation, delivery and distribution, demand, and prices. The Energy Commission shall use these assessments and forecasts to develop energy policies that conserve resources, protect the environment, ensure energy reliability, enhance the state's economy, and protect public health and safety.” (PRC Section 25301[a].) This work culminated in the Integrated Energy Policy Report (IEPR).

CEC adopts an IEPR every 2 years and an update every other year. The most recent IEPR was adopted March 16, 2018. The 2017 IEPR provides a summary of priority energy issues currently facing the State, outlining strategies and recommendations to further the State's goal of ensuring reliable, affordable, and environmentally responsible energy sources. Energy topics covered in the report include progress toward statewide renewable energy targets and issues facing future renewable development; efforts to increase energy efficiency in existing and new buildings; progress by utilities in achieving energy efficiency targets

and potential; improving coordination among the State's energy agencies; streamlining power plant licensing processes; results of preliminary forecasts of electricity, natural gas, and transportation fuel supply and demand; future energy infrastructure needs; the need for research and development efforts to statewide energy policies; and issues facing California's nuclear power plants.

### ***Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Part 6)***

The energy consumption of new residential and nonresidential buildings in California is regulated by the State's Title 24, Part 6, Building Energy Efficiency Standards (California Energy Code). The California Energy Code was established by CEC in 1978 in response to a legislative mandate to create uniform building codes to reduce California's energy consumption and provide energy efficiency standards for residential and non-residential buildings. CEC updates the California Energy Code every 3 years with more stringent design requirements for reduced energy consumption, which results in the generation of fewer GHG emissions.

The 2019 California Energy Code was adopted by CEC on May 9, 2018 and will apply to projects constructed after January 1, 2020. The 2019 California Energy Code is designed to move the State closer to its zero-net energy goals for new residential development. It does so by requiring all new residences to install enough renewable energy to offset all the electricity needs of each residential unit (CCR, Title 24, Part 6, Section 150.1(c)4). CEC estimates that the combination of mandatory on-site renewable energy and prescriptively required energy efficiency standards will result in a 53 percent reduction in new residential construction as compared to the 2016 California Energy Code. Non-residential buildings are anticipated to reduce energy consumption by 30 percent as compared to the 2016 California Energy Code primarily through prescriptive requirements for high-efficiency lighting (CEC 2018). The Energy Code is enforced through the local plan check and building permit process. Local government agencies may adopt and enforce additional energy standards for new buildings as reasonably necessary due to local climatologic, geologic, or topographic conditions, provided that these standards exceed those provided in the California Energy Code.

### ***Executive Order B-16-12 (2012)***

EO B-16-12 orders State entities under the direction of the Governor, including CARB, CEC, and California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), to support the rapid commercialization of zero-emission vehicles. It directs these entities to achieve various benchmarks related to zero-emission vehicles.

### ***Renewables Portfolio Standard***

The State passed legislation referred to as the Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS) that requires increasing use of renewable energy to produce electricity for consumers. California utilities are required to generate 33 percent of their electricity from renewables by 2020 (SB X1-2 of 2011); 52 percent by 2027 (SB 100 of 2018); 60 percent by 2030 (also SB 100 of 2018); and 100 percent by 2045 (also SB 100 of 2018).

### ***Assembly Bill 1007: State Alternative Fuels Plan***

AB 1007 (Chapter 371, Statutes of 2005) required CEC to prepare a State plan to increase the use of alternative fuels in California. CEC prepared the State Alternative Fuels Plan in partnership with CARB and in consultation with other State, federal, and local agencies. The plan presents strategies and actions California must take to increase the use of nonpetroleum fuels in a manner that minimizes the costs to California and maximizes the economic benefits of in-state production. The plan assessed various

alternative fuels and developed fuel portfolios to meet California's goals to reduce petroleum consumption, increase alternative fuel use, reduce GHG emissions, and increase in-state production of biofuels without causing a significant degradation to public health and environmental quality.

### ***California Energy Efficiency Action Plan***

The 2019 California Energy Efficiency Action Plan has three primary goals for the State: double energy efficiency savings by 2030 relative to a 2015 base year (per SB 350), expand energy efficiency in low-income and disadvantaged communities, and reduce GHG emissions from buildings. This plan provides guiding principles and recommendations on how the State would achieve those goals. These recommendations include:

- Identifying funding sources that support energy efficiency programs;
- Identifying opportunities to improve energy efficiency through data analysis;
- Using program designs as a way to encourage increased energy efficiency on the consumer end;
- Improving energy efficiency through workforce education and training; and
- Supporting rulemaking and programs that incorporate energy demand flexibility and building decarbonization. (CEC 2019b)

### **Local**

Applicable local regulations not included in or enacted after adoption of the General Plan in 2011 and the FCI GPA in 2016 are described below.

### ***San Diego Gas & Electric Procurement Plan***

SDG&E is a CPUC-regulated public utility that owns and operates the natural gas and electricity transmission and distribution infrastructure in San Diego County. The CPUC sets the gas and electricity rates for SDG&E and is responsible for making sure that California's utilities customers have safe and reliable utility service at reasonable rates.

SDG&E's most recent Long-Term Procurement Plan (LTPP) was filed with the CPUC in October 2014 (SDG&E 2014). The LTPP contains plans for how future (10-year period) energy needs within the SDG&E service area will be met based on CEC's energy demand projections from the 2015–2024 forecast. According to the plan, SDG&E had adequate energy supply to ensure delivery of energy through 2024 while maintaining CEC's 15 percent planning reserve margin requirement.

SDG&E's 2017 RPS Procurement Plan describes the processes used by SDG&E to determine its RPS procurement needs, as well as the methods it will use to manage its RPS portfolio to meet compliance targets in a cost-effective manner. SDG&E achieved 43 percent renewable energy in 2018, 97 percent of which was from long-term contracts (SDG&E 2020b).

### ***San Diego Association of Governments Regional Plans and Programs***

San Diego Association of Governments' (SANDAG) San Diego Forward: The 2015 Regional Plan, which incorporates the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), was adopted in 2015 and provides a planned vision for the region's transportation system through 2050. The plan also incorporates a sustainable communities strategy as required by SB 375, which includes



implementation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategy to help local governments reduce energy consumption.

SANDAG's Energy and Climate Change program supports local efforts to reduce GHG emissions in alignment with statewide goals to prepare for the impacts of climate change. Projects include climate action planning and energy engineering services for local jurisdictions, electric vehicle charging and climate adaptation (SANDAG 2019).

Through its Roadmap Program, SANDAG provides energy efficiency and engineering support to qualifying local jurisdictions (i.e., cities), which includes free energy assessments and energy management plans, or "Energy Roadmaps," to SANDAG member agencies. The County has an active Local Government Partnership with SDG&E; therefore, the County does not qualify for such support separately under the Roadmap Program.

SANDAG's Regional Energy Strategy (RES) serves as an energy policy guide to support decision-making by SANDAG and its member agencies. The 2014 RES updates SANDAG energy strategies adopted in 1994, 2003 and 2009. The RES is structured around 11 major energy topics, such as energy efficiency and conservation, renewable energy, transportation fuels, and land use and transportation planning. The Regional Energy Working Group meets regularly to provide input and feedback on issues related to the Regional Energy Strategy and tasks of the Regional Energy Planning Program, which aims to implement early actions of RES such as development of a comprehensive building retrofit program, creation of a financing program to carry out projects and improvements, and identification of opportunities to implement energy savings at municipal facilities.

### ***San Diego County Air Pollution Control District***

The San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) is the local agency authorized to regulate air quality sources within the county and the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB). SDAPCD maintains rules and regulations to support the region's portion of the State Implementation Plan and Regional Air Quality Strategy for air pollutant standards. Though regulations are primarily tied to controlling and reducing criteria pollutant emissions from construction and operational activities in the county, many of which also have associated energy efficiency benefits. Rule 50, *Visible Emissions*, regulates the discharge of any air contaminant (other than water vapor) from construction and operational activities. These regulations require that equipment used during construction and operations are consuming fuel efficiently and not resulting in emissions of harmful pollutants from incomplete combustion.

## ***County of San Diego***

### **General Plan Policies**

The General Plan includes goals and policies applicable to energy, specifically within the Conservation and Open Space and Mobility Elements, as summarized below.

### ***Conservation and Open Space Element***

Conservation and Open Space Element Goal COS-14 identifies the importance of sustainable land development that reduces emissions of criteria pollutants and GHGs through minimized transportation and energy demands. Policies COS-14.3, COS-14.6, COS-14.7, and COS 14.9 support this goal by requiring "green" and sustainable land development practices encouraging infill development and development projects that use alternative energy sources, and requiring projects that generate potentially significant levels of air pollutants and/or GHGs to incorporate renewable energy and best available control

technologies and practices into the project design. Goal COS-15 aims for sustainable architecture and buildings through building design and construction techniques that reduce emission of criteria pollutants and GHGs. Policies COS-15.1 through COS-15.5 support this goal by requiring “green building” programs, promoting existing building retrofits, requiring development to be in accordance with Title 24 energy standards, and encouraging energy conservation and efficiency through energy audits.

Goal COS-16 promotes sustainable mobility through transportation and mobility systems that minimize GHG and other air pollutant emissions. Policy COS-16.4 meets this goal by exploring potential development of alternative fuel stations at County facilities for the municipal fleet and general public.

Goal COS-18 addresses sustainable energy, specifically energy systems that reduce consumption of non-renewable resources and reduce GHG and other air pollutant emissions. Policies COS-18.1 through COS-18.3 support this goal by encouraging SDG&E and non-utility developers to facilitate development of alternative energy systems, use of energy generation from waste, and requiring alternative energy system operators to design and maintain these systems to minimize adverse environmental impacts.

### ***Mobility Element***

Mobility Element Goal M-9 identifies the importance of a maximizing the use of alternative modes of travel and effective use of the existing transportation network to reduce the need to widen or build roads. Policy M-9.2 meets this goal by requiring large commercial and office development to use transportation demand programs to reduce single-occupant vehicle traffic generation.

### **Green Building Incentive Program**

The County of San Diego Green Building Incentive Program is designed to promote the use of resource efficient construction materials, water conservation, and energy efficiency in new and remodeled residential and commercial buildings. The program offers incentives of reduced plan check turnaround time and a 7.5 percent reduction in plan check and building permit fees for projects meeting program requirements. (County of San Diego 2019)

### **Landscape Ordinance**

The County of San Diego’s Landscaping Ordinance was adopted in accordance with the State’s Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (MWELO) which establishes water efficiency standards for new and existing landscapes. The County’s ordinance applies to new construction for which the County issues a building permit or a discretionary review where the aggregate landscaped area is 500 square feet or more to obtain outdoor water use authorization. For those projects between 500 and 2,500 square feet, the County has a more streamlined process called the Prescriptive Compliance Option. All landscape areas are subject to a Maximum Applied Water Allowance (MAWA) which sets an upper limit of allowable water use per landscape area.

### **Strategic Energy Plan**

The County’s *2015-2020 Strategic Energy Plan* sets two primary energy and sustainability strategies to improve energy efficiency in the County: County operations, and community efficiency. The County operations energy strategy aims to ensure sustainability is built into organization practices to minimize water and energy consumption and costs. This strategy applies to County-owned facilities, leased facilities, and County-owned vehicles. The County community energy strategy identifies outreach and education programs to encourage residents to adopt energy and water consumption reducing practices.

In addition to improving energy efficiency, these practices are intended to minimize greenhouse gas emissions and improve the health and sustainability of County communities.

### ***Alpine CPU Policies***

The Alpine CPU identified one policy in the Conservation Element related to Energy. Conservation Policy 24 aims to promote the use of alternative and renewable, non-polluting energy systems.

#### ***3.1.1.3 Analysis of Project Effects and Determination as to Significance***

##### ***Issue 1: Wasteful, Inefficient, or Unnecessary Consumption of Energy Resources***

Based on Appendix F (Energy Conservation) and Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, the proposed project would have a significant adverse energy impact if it would result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation.

Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines requires the consideration of the energy implications of a project. CEQA requires mitigation measures to reduce “wasteful, inefficiency, and unnecessary energy usage” (PRC Section 21100[b][3]). Neither the law nor the State CEQA Guidelines establish criteria that define wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary use. Compliance with the California Energy Code would result in energy-efficient buildings. However, compliance with the California Energy Code does not address the entirety of potential energy impacts during construction and operation of the project. Thus, the energy impact discussion below also addresses additional energy consumption that would not be subject to building standards. Specifically, this includes fuel consumption by mobile vehicles.

The wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary use of energy resources for the proposed project was analyzed compared to the estimated energy efficiency of the allowable buildout of Alpine CPA under the General Plan. The proposed project buildout would allow for an increase in population, employment, and VMT in 2050 compared to the General Plan. Because the proposed project would add housing and jobs consistent with the CPU objectives, it can be determined that if the efficiency is similar to or less than the anticipated energy efficiency of the General Plan, that it would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary use of energy resources.

### **Impact Analysis**

#### ***Methodology for Estimating Energy Consumption***

Construction- and operation-related consumption by the project, measured in megawatt-hours (MWh) of electricity, therms of natural gas, gallons of gasoline, and gallons of diesel, were calculated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2016.3.2 computer program and fuel consumption rates obtained from CARB’s EMFAC model. Where project-specific information was not known, CalEEMod default values, based on the Alpine CPA location, were used.

#### ***Construction***

Land uses that could be developed under the proposed project would result in construction-related energy consumption from mobile and stationary construction equipment as well as employee and haul

truck vehicle travel. However, the specific size, location, and construction techniques and scheduling utilized for each individual development project occurring in the Alpine CPA is not currently known but would be evaluated for potential impacts as part of the development review process. With an anticipated buildout year of 2050, development of the various land uses associated with the proposed project would occur over an extended period and would depend on factors such as local economic conditions, market demand, and other financing considerations.

### *Operation*

Buildout of the proposed project would result in a future change in energy use relative to buildout under the General Plan. Direct and indirect energy consumption would result from motor vehicle travel; energy consumption associated with lighting, building heating and cooling, and appliances; and the conveyance, treatment, and distribution of potable water. The energy analysis for the proposed project evaluates the direct and indirect energy consumption associated with operation of land uses contemplated under buildout of the proposed project.

Energy use associated with motor vehicle fuel consumption during operations was calculated by estimating gasoline and diesel gallons per mile based on annual VMT, provided by the SANDAG Series 13 Activity Based Model for 2050, and countywide fuel consumed per mile from EMFAC2017.

Operational electricity and natural gas consumption under full project buildout (2050) was estimated from the modeling performed to support the Air Quality and GHG analysis, which was based on default electricity and natural gas consumption factors from CalEEMod with the application of 2019 Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards and the SDG&E RPS. Annual electricity and natural gas consumption are presented in CalEEMod in kilowatt hour (kWh) and thousand British Thermal units (kBtu) format, respectively. Annual electricity use from water consumption was estimated from total water consumption and default electricity intensity factors (in kWh per million gallons) from CalEEMod.

Refer to Appendix D for additional information on the assumptions and model data used to estimate the proposed project's potential operational emissions from area sources and Appendix F for fuel consumption estimates.

### Impact Analysis

When the prior EIRs were published, Appendix G (Checklist) of the State CEQA Guidelines did not include sample questions related to energy use to facilitate the assessment of energy impacts. As a result, energy impacts related to the buildout of the General Plan instead were discussed in the Utilities sections, specifically Section 2.15 of the 2011 General Plan EIR and Section 2.14 of the FCI EIR, and significance was determined according to the following guidelines:

"The proposed General Plan Update would be considered to have a significant impact if it would require or result in the construction of new energy production and/or transmission facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects."

Analysis in the prior EIRs found that implementation of the General Plan would have the potential to cause significant environmental effects related to increase in energy demand due to the subsequent construction and operation of new energy generation facilities. However, impacts were found to be less than significant after incorporation of proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures. The discussion of impacts related to energy from implementation of the General Plan can be found in the prior EIRs and is incorporated by reference.

## *Construction*

Energy consumption during construction activities is typically temporary and short in duration, depending on the size, phasing, and type of development. Energy would be required to demolish, prepare, and construct all allowable, future projects under the proposed project. Energy would also be required to operate and maintain construction equipment and transport construction materials. The one-time energy expenditure required to construct buildings would be nonrecoverable.

As discussed above, construction of the land use developments and infrastructure allowable under the proposed project would occur intermittently throughout the buildout period. As the timing and intensity of future development projects is not known at this time, the effects of construction activities associated with buildout of the proposed project cannot be accurately quantified at this time. Future development projects would use a variety of construction equipment and fuel types that may not necessarily be known at this time. Additionally, as fuel efficiency of construction equipment improves over time and local and state regulations require greater percentages of construction fleets to use alternative fuel sources, it is difficult to reasonably estimate fuel consumption for development projects over the proposed project's planning horizon. Therefore, it is not feasible to speculate on the exact type and quantity of fuel used during construction of the proposed project. Because it is also unknown where construction materials would be sourced from and the specific construction activities that would occur on each development site, it would also be inappropriate to speculate on the energy intensiveness of materials used during construction. As local and state regulations require less intensive construction processes, the intensity of construction activities is anticipated to decrease overtime, however it is unknown precisely what these regulations would entail.

The project would increase energy demand during temporary construction activities of each allowable project in the Alpine CPA. Construction activities would not increase long-term, ongoing demand for energy or fuel because activities would occur intermittently over the planning horizon (2050) of the proposed project. These energy needs would be temporary and are not anticipated to require additional capacity or increase peak or base period demands for electricity or other forms of energy. All development projects would be required to comply with CARB, SDAPCD, and County regulations and ordinances that would reduce the wasteful and unnecessary use of energy in construction equipment. Specifically, development projects would comply with idling restrictions requiring equipment to be shut off after periods of idling (e.g., CARB Airborne Toxic Control Measures and County Health and Safety Code Section 40720[a][3]) and construction equipment maintenance requiring all equipment engines to be properly maintained to ensure fuel is used as efficiently as possible (e.g., SDAPCD Rule 54). This impact would be less than significant because future development would be required to comply with existing energy efficiency related regulations and energy use associated with construction-activities would be temporary and necessary for individual project development.

## *Operation*

Allowable buildout of the proposed project would result in increased energy consumption during operations from new buildings and motor vehicle travel. The operation of new buildings would result in direct consumption of electricity and natural gas for lighting, space heating, and water heating. All new buildings in the Alpine CPA would be constructed in accordance with the most recent building code (i.e., California Energy Code) at the time of construction, which includes energy efficiency requirements. New residential, commercial, and industrial uses would also generate new vehicle trips on roadways that would consume gasoline and diesel fuel. State and federal regulations regarding standards for vehicles in

California are designed to reduce wasteful, unnecessary, and inefficient use of energy for transportation (See Sections 2.15.2.1 to 2.15.2.3).

It is generally understood that an increase in development potential for an area would result in increased energy consumption from additional buildings, their occupants, and vehicle travel. However, this increase in energy consumption may not necessarily be considered wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary. Thus, for the purpose of comparing energy consumption between land use alternatives (i.e., the General Plan and Alpine CPU buildouts), per capita energy consumption is used to assess plan-level energy and fuel use efficiency. Per capita energy consumption was estimated by dividing the total annual electricity, natural gas, gasoline, and diesel by the estimated population in 2050 for the land use alternative. These population estimates were provided by County staff (Appendix F) and estimated by multiplying the total number of single- and multi-family residential units allowed under each alternative by the anticipated persons per household in 2050 included in the SANDAG Series 13 Regional Growth Forecast (SANDAG 2013). A project may be determined to result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy if it accommodates increased developed while resulting in a decrease or disproportionately high increase in per capita energy consumption over projected usage rates from the General Plan.

Table 3-4 summarizes annual and per capita consumption associated with electricity, natural gas, and motor vehicles fuel use for the prior EIRs and the proposed project.

**Table 3-4. Estimate of Utility and Fuel Consumption and Energy Associated with Full Buildout of the prior EIRs and the Proposed Project (2050)**

Energy Category	Total Energy Consumption (per year)		Per Capita Energy Consumption (per capita per year) <sup>1</sup>	
	Prior EIRs	Proposed Project	Prior EIRs	Proposed Project
Electricity (MWh)	125,066	134,801	3.76	3.32
Natural Gas (therms)	2,803,763	2,976,535	84.37	72.27
Gasoline (gal)	13,447,544	15,589,603	404.67	383.77
Diesel (gal)	1,436,117	1,664,876	43.22	40.98

Notes: CPU = Community Plan Update; gal = gallon; GP = General Plan; MWh = megawatt hours; therms = British Thermal units

Energy use from industrial sources was modeled in separate CalEEMod files to reflect no increase in industrial uses beyond existing conditions. Details are shown in Appendix F.

<sup>1</sup> Per capita energy consumption estimates based on estimated populations for the General Plan and Alpine CPU buildout in 2050 from SANDAG Series 13 Regional Growth Forecast and population estimates included in the *Transportation Impact Analysis* (Chen Ryan, 2020; see Appendix F).

Source: Ascent Environmental, 2020.

As shown in Table 3-4, the proposed project would result in increased total consumption of electricity, natural gas, gasoline, and diesel. This is due to proposed project accommodating an increase in residential and commercial land uses over the General Plan. However, the differences between General Plan buildout and proposed project demonstrate that the proposed project would generally decrease per capita energy consumption. Though Table 3-4 indicates a relative increase in capita natural gas consumption between the two alternatives, the proposed project is estimated to reduce per capita consumption of electricity, gasoline, and diesel. Further, the estimates provided are considered relatively conservative as they are based on assumed persons per household estimates from the General Plan Buildout. Additionally, as

described in Chapter 1.0, *Project Description*, the proposed project includes land use development strategies that would increase building and transportation efficiency beyond what is currently assumed under the General Plan. These strategies include consolidated development potential in the Village core which would reduce per capita VMT due to shorter trip distance or use of alternative modes of travel (see Chapter 2.13, *Transportation*, for additional details), and building efficiency requirements under Title 24 that would reduce the consumption of electricity from nonrenewable sources. While net energy consumption would increase, energy efficiency per capita would stay relatively the same compared to the General Plan. The proposed project would accommodate housing beyond the General Plan buildout for the CPA. Despite this increase in associated population, the proposed project would not result in a proportional increase in energy consumption per capita for the reasons described above. Thus, the proposed project would accommodate growth in an efficient manner as evidenced by the improvement in estimated per capita energy consumption. Further, the analysis provided assumes that future developments in the Alpine CPA are built to existing Title 24 efficiency standards. However, energy consumption for future development is expected to be lower than reported due to cyclical updates to the energy and building codes. Future code cycles and anticipated to require increased building efficiency, on-site renewable energy systems, and increased market share of electric vehicles. Because the proposed project is estimated to consume energy at a similar efficiency as the General Plan, and this efficiency is anticipated to improve over time, the energy would not be consumed in a wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary manner.

According to the State CEQA Guidelines, the means to achieve the goal of conserving energy include decreasing overall energy consumption, decreasing reliance on oil, and increasing reliance on renewable energy sources.

Implementation of the 2011 General Plan EIR mitigation measures (see Appendix B, 2011 General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures) would reduce the proposed project's impacts related to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. This includes mitigation measures USS-8.1 through USS-8.3 which require the County to implement and update the *County Green Building Program*, encourage the development of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) facilities, and require County-initiated development and County-operated facilities to achieve energy efficiency standards higher than those required for private developments. All buildings constructed under the proposed project would, at a minimum, comply with the California Energy Code in effect at the time of construction and with the California Code of Regulations requirements for energy efficiency. As discussed in the *Alpine CPU Transportation Impact Study* (Chen Ryan 2020, included in Appendix G), VMT per capita under the proposed project would be lower than VMT per capita under the General Plan, which is reflected in the estimated reduction in fuel use per capita shown in Table 3-4. The proposed project would consume energy at a per capita rate similar to the General Plan, and, as required under 2019 Title 24, increase the generation of renewable energy through new residential developments. This impact would be less than significant because the proposed project's energy consumption would not be inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary.

### **Federal, State, and Local Regulations and Existing Regulatory Processes**

Various State regulations are implemented at the local level through County permitting processes. The California Building Code, Title 24 requirements are required for implementation by all new development projects and confirmed during project and plan review by the County. The County also assists in the implementation of CARB and SDAPCD regulations, and County rules, regulations, and ordinances through the discretionary review process to ensure construction projects comply with relevant regulations that improve efficiency of energy consumption in construction equipment. Finally, SDG&E is regulated by the

CPUC and required to meet renewables portfolio standard targets. In meeting these renewable portfolio standard targets, SDG&E would increase the percentage of renewable electricity provided to consumers in the region, including all buildings in the Alpine CPA. Under state RPS goals, SDG&E is required to achieve a 100 percent renewable portfolio by 2045, ahead of the anticipated buildout of the proposed project. In October 2019, the San Diego County Board of Supervisors voted to move forward with joining a community choice aggregation (CCA) program. This approval recommended the County consider joining an existing CCA or joint powers authority (JPA) in the region or explore the development of a new program. Standard CCA models in the region transition electricity purchasing responsibilities from the local utility (i.e., SDG&E) to local jurisdictions, allowing CCAs to purchase electricity portfolios that achieve greater renewable portfolio standards than existing utility procurement requirements, if required by the action that led to CCA formation (e.g., Climate Action Plan measure). Though the County has not joined an existing CCA or begun the process to create a new one, the approval to move forward with this program indicates that the County may participate in a program that could result in meeting a 100 percent renewable portfolio ahead of the State's 2045 goal.

### Summary

Construction and operation of the proposed project would result in consumption of fuel (gasoline and diesel), electricity, and natural gas. Energy consumption associated with construction would be temporary and would not require additional capacity or increased peak or base period demands for electricity or other forms of energy. The proposed project would add housing and population to the Alpine CPA in an efficient manner, consistent with the policy objectives of the proposed project. Despite increasing population and allowable development, the proposed project would result in similar or reduced energy consumption per capita compared to the General Plan. Further, estimated energy consumption per capita would be conservative as future projects in the Alpine CPA would consume less energy than reported in this analysis from increases in building energy efficiencies, on-site renewable energy requirements, and increased usage of electric vehicles. Per capita energy consumption numbers would likely improve over time. Thus, this impact would be **less than significant** because energy consumed during construction and operations would not be wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary.

While impacts associated with energy consumption are identified as less than significant, implementation of additional air quality (Chapter 2.3) and greenhouse gas (Chapter 2.6) mitigation measures would further increase the energy efficiency of future developments under the proposed project. This includes: MM-AQ-1 through MM-AQ-4, which would require construction equipment to meet more stringent engine tiers and increase the use of renewable fuels; MM-AQ-12 and MM-AQ-13, which would require future non-residential developments to identify measures to reduce VMT and County-owned and operated buildings to achieve zero net energy; and MM-GHG-1, which would require all future projects to apply best management practices to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through strategies including increased building energy efficiency, increase use of alternative modes of transportation, reduced water consumption, and reduced wastewater and solid waste generation.

### ***Issue 2: Renewable Energy or Energy Efficiency Plan Conflict or Obstruction***

Based on Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, the proposed project would have a significant impact if it would conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.



## Impact Analysis

This issue was not previously analyzed in the prior EIRs. As discussed above in Section 2.15.3.1, Issue 1, energy impacts were discussed solely in the Utility sections, specifically Section 2.15 of the 2011 General Plan EIR and Section 2.14 of the FCI EIR, and significance impacts were the result of construction of new energy production and/or transmission facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, the prior EIRs did not consider the energy impacts related to consistency with State or local plans or renewable energy or energy efficiency.

State and local renewable energy and energy efficiency plans that are applicable to the proposed project are discussed above in Section 2.15.2, *Regulatory Framework*. The relevant plans that pertain to the efficient use of energy include the California Energy Efficiency Plan. This plan identifies development goals to support energy efficiency programs, improve energy efficiency in buildings and on the consumer end, improve energy efficiency through education and training, and support building decarbonization.

As discussed in Section 2.15.3.1, *Issue 1*, the project would encourage compact design in the Village core that would reduce VMT, comply with State building efficiency requirements (i.e., California Energy Code), and include design concepts that would encourage non-automobile transportation modes (e.g., installation of bicycle facilities, increased access to transit) and increase renewable energy generation. The proposed project has the potential to result in the overall increase in consumption of energy resources during construction and operation of new buildings, however, the per capita energy consumption in comparison to the General Plan would not substantially increase.

Implementation of the 2011 General Plan EIR mitigation measures (see Appendix B, 2011 General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures) would reduce the proposed project's impacts related to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. This includes mitigation measures USS-8.1 through USS-8.3 which require the County to implement and update the *County Green Building Program*, encourage the development of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) facilities, and require County-initiated development and County-operated facilities to achieve energy efficiency standards higher than those required for private developments. Through the implementation of State requirements and local enforcement of these requirements, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. This impact would be less than significant.

### ***Federal, State, and Local Regulations and Existing Regulatory Processes***

As identified in Section 2.15.2, there are numerous federal, State, and local regulations in place that have resulted in the development of renewable energy or energy efficiency plans. All projects proposed after the implementation of the proposed project would be required to comply with all applicable renewable energy or energy efficiency plans. In addition to these regulations and policies, all discretionary approvals are also subject to CEQA, which requires consideration of potential impacts of conflicting or obstructing renewable energy or energy efficiency plans. The State currently requires that local electricity providers meet the renewables portfolio standard goal of 100 percent renewables in the electricity supply by 2045. Electricity to the Alpine CPA is currently provided by SDG&E, which is on track with, and must comply with these State goals. Further, any future actions taken by the County Board of Supervisors to join or create a CCA program could accelerate this procurement goal to meet 100 percent renewable electricity supplied to developments in the Alpine CPA prior to anticipated buildout.

## Summary

Compliance with 2019 Title 24 requirements for residential photovoltaic installation would result in an increase in renewable energy generation and use in the Alpine CPA, which would directly support the goals and strategies in the State's 2019 Energy Efficiency Action Plan. Construction and operation of buildings in the Alpine CPA would be required to comply with the 2019 California Energy Code, or later iterations, which would improve energy efficiency compared to buildings built to earlier iterations. Therefore, this impact would be **less than significant** because the project would not conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

While impacts associated with energy consumption are identified as less than significant, implementation of additional air quality (Chapter 2.3) and greenhouse gas (Chapter 2.6) mitigation measures would further increase the energy efficiency of future developments under the proposed project. This includes: MM-AQ-1 through MM-AQ-4, which would require construction equipment to meet more stringent engine tiers and increase the use of renewable fuels; MM-AQ-12 and MM-AQ-13, which would require future non-residential developments to identify measures to reduce VMT and County-owned and operated buildings to achieve zero net energy; and MM-GHG-1, which would require all future projects to apply best management practices to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through strategies including increased building energy efficiency, increase use of alternative modes of transportation, reduced water consumption, and reduced wastewater and solid waste generation.

### ***3.1.1.4 Cumulative Impact Analysis***

The geographic scope of the cumulative impact analysis for energy includes the Alpine CPA and the San Diego region.

#### ***Issue 1: Wasteful, Inefficient, or Unnecessary Consumption of Energy Resources***

A cumulative energy consumption impact would occur if development associated with cumulative projected growth within the Alpine CPA or within the geographic scope of the cumulative impact analysis for energy use combined with the proposed project would increase energy consumption throughout the region. As required by the CPUC, California utilities, including SDG&E, are required to file long-term energy resources plans with the CPUC. SDG&E's most recent long-term procurement plan was filed in October 2014 and includes plans and strategies to meet the future energy demands of its customers. SDG&E would continue to import electricity and natural gas to meet regional demand.

While impacts from past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects on energy may be cumulatively significant, the proposed project is consistent with the Energy Policy Act and AB 2076 by encouraging the use of alternative fuel vehicles and reducing per capita gasoline and diesel fuel consumption (through per capita reductions in VMT). Moreover, SDG&E continues to increase its RPS and the proposed project implement designs and comply with regulations to decrease reliance on fossil fuels and increase its use of electricity; therefore, the use of non-renewable energy would decrease as a proportion of the project's energy needs. Consequently, the proposed project would support regional efforts to ensure long-term energy supply through the allowable development of solar photovoltaic systems on residential buildings. Though the proposed project would result in an increase in total energy consumed in the Alpine CPA, the proposed project would not increase per capita consumption compared to the General Plan. Further, future energy demand in new developments in the Alpine CPA would be less than what is reported in this analysis and assumed under existing SDG&E procurement plans. With future

code cycles at the state and local levels requiring increased energy efficiency in future developments, it is not anticipated that the proposed project would conflict with SDG&E's procurement plans. This impact would be **less than cumulatively considerable** because all development in the proposed project would comply with State energy efficiency and renewable energy requirements, and does not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary use of energy.

### ***Issue 2: Renewable Energy or Energy Efficiency Plan Conflict or Obstruction***

The proposed project could result in a cumulatively considerable impact if it conflicts with a long-term plan developed locally or by the State to increase renewable energy or energy efficiency. As discussed in Section 2.14.3.2, the proposed project would support the implementation of the State's Energy Efficiency Action Plan through compliance with State building efficiency requirements and codes. This impact would be **less than cumulatively considerable** because the project would not conflict with a relevant renewable energy or energy efficiency plan.

## **3.1.2 Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

**Table 3-5. Hazards and Hazardous Materials Summary of Impacts**

<b>Issue Number</b>	<b>Issue Topic</b>	<b>Prior EIRs Conclusion</b>	<b>Project Direct Impact</b>	<b>Project Cumulative Impact</b>
HAZ-1	Routine Transport, Storage, Use, Disposal, or Release of Hazardous Materials into the Environment	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant
HAZ-2	Hazards to Schools	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant
HAZ-3	Located on a Site Included on List of Hazardous Materials Sites	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant

Potential impacts to wildfires and emergency response plans are discussed in Section 2.7, *Wildfires*, of the SEIR.

### ***3.1.2.1 Existing Conditions***

The prior EIRs identified a variety of existing and historical land uses and conditions that could potentially result in site contamination, representing potential hazards for humans and the environment when new land uses are proposed on those lands. Examples of historic land uses that have the potential to result in current site contamination include burn sites, landfills, formerly used defense sites, agriculture, and petroleum storage.

## Sites with Known or Historical Hazardous Materials Issues

### *Open Sites Listed on Hazardous Materials Databases*

The prior EIR analyses included the results of 11 hazardous materials databases to determine the baseline conditions for sites that have been subject to a hazardous materials release. The results indicated that hazardous sites were within unincorporated areas of San Diego County, including the Alpine CPA.

Based on an updated review of the hazardous materials database conducted in 2019, the Alpine CPA contains one site that is listed on the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) EnviroStor database, four sites listed as open on the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Geotracker database, and two sites listed on the Solid Waste Inventory System (SWIS) database. No other databases identified contaminated sites within Alpine. Seven sites containing known hazardous materials within the Alpine CPA are listed in Table 3-6. Four of the known sites are located within Subarea 4 and one site is in Subarea 6.

### *Burn Dump Sites*

Burn ash refers to the debris, refuse, ash, and ash-contaminated soil that result from the open burning of municipal solid waste. Burn dump sites refer to locations where the open burning of solid waste occurred. Two former burn dump sites are located within Subarea 4 of the Alpine CPA. These sites are listed as Alpine I and II Burn Sites in Table 3-6.

### *Landfills*

Active, abandoned, and closed landfills present potential issues related to the exposure of humans to hazards when a project is proposed on or near a landfill site. As documented in the General Plan Update EIR, there are no landfills in the Alpine CPA. No landfills have been constructed within the Alpine CPA since the certification of the General Plan Update EIR.

### *Formerly Used Defense Site*

As identified in the prior EIRs, formerly used defense (FUD) sites include but are not limited to hazardous, toxic and radioactive waste; military munitions including munitions constituents; containerized hazards, and toxic and radioactive waste; building demolition and debris removal; and potentially responsible party sites (government shares burden with private entity). As documented in the prior EIRs, no FUD sites are located within the Alpine CPA.

### *Agricultural Areas*

Agricultural activities include the application of fertilizers, herbicides, and pesticides that have the potential to contaminate soil and groundwater. Soils contaminated by past agricultural activities are considered a concern due to land use changes involving proposed housing developments on former agricultural lands. There is the potential for pesticides from historic or nearby land use to leach into groundwater resources and cause contamination in public or private drinking water wells. County-identified farmland categories associated with agricultural land uses within the Alpine CPA are discussed in Table 2.2-3 in Section 2.2, *Agriculture and Forest Resources*, of this SEIR. The Alpine CPA has active farms currently producing year-round and seasonal fruits and vegetables, eggs, and poultry products. The farms are generally small-scale family farms that harvest and distribute at the community level (i.e., farmers markets and community-supported agriculture programs) (Local Harvest 2019). Therefore, there are also

**Table 3-6. Open/Closed Hazardous Waste Sites within the Alpine CPA**

<b>Subarea</b>	<b>Site Name/Address<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Site Type</b>	<b>Cleanup Status</b>	<b>Contaminant</b>	<b>Potential Media of Concern</b>
4	Alpine I Burn Site 9715 Chocolate Summit Alpine, CA 91901	Land Disposal Site	Capped, Verification Monitoring as of 10/22/2009	Not Specified	None Specified
4	Alpine II Burn Site 9725 Chocolate Summit Alpine, CA 91901	Land Disposal Site	Closed with monitoring as of 6/13/2012	Copper, Lead, Other Metal, Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons	Soil
4	Alpine III – Chocolate Bar LF1 9653 Dunbar Lane Alpine, CA 91901	Land Disposal Site	Open-Closing/with monitoring as of 1/13/2014	Not Specified	None Specified
4	Alpine III – Chocolate Bar LF2 9590 Chocolate Summit Alpine, CA 91901	Land Disposal Site	Open-Closing/with monitoring as of 1/13/2014	Not Specified	None Specified
6	Alpine Country Station 2232 Alpine Blvd Alpine, CA 91901	Leaking Underground Storage Tank Cleanup Site	No further action as of 2/14/2014	Gasoline	Aquifer Used for drinking water supply
Alpine CPA	High School No 12, Study Area B, Wrights Field 2480 South Grade Rd Alpine, CA 91901	School Investigation	No further action as of 3/25/2008	Lead	Soil, Soil vapor
Alpine CPA	High School No. 12, Study Area J, Lazy-A Ranch 3093–3117 Alpine Blvd Alpine, CA 91901	Land Disposal Site	Certified as of 4/11/2014	Arsenic, Chlordane, DDD, DDE, DDT	Soil

<sup>1</sup> The site locations identified on the map are approximate because the extent of contamination and/or the exact location of sites is not always available.

Source: GeoTracker Database. Available <http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/>. Accessed: January 23, 2019.

areas that have the potential to contain elevated pesticide levels due to past and current agriculture operations within the Alpine CPA. Because there are known agricultural lands within the Alpine CPA, a potential exists for properties within the project area to contain contaminated soil and groundwater.

### ***Petroleum Contamination***

Petroleum hydrocarbons encompass a wide range of compounds including but not limited to fuels, oils, paints, dry cleaning solvents, and non-chlorinated solvents. These commonly used compounds can cause soil and groundwater contamination if not properly handled. Underground storage tanks (USTs) and above ground storage tanks (ASTs) that store petroleum are common sources of contamination in soils

and groundwater in the County. Leaking USTs (LUSTs) can result in vapor intrusion from volatile organic compounds (VOC) and benzene into homes when chemicals seep down into the soil and groundwater and travel through soil as vapor. One LUST cleanup site is located within the Alpine CPA in Subarea 6, as identified in Table 3-6.

### **3.1.2.2 Regulatory Framework**

Sections 2.7.2 and 2.6.2 of the 2011 General Plan EIR and FCI EIR, respectively, identify and/or describe the regulatory framework related to hazards and hazardous materials and are hereby incorporated by reference. The regulatory framework discussion applicable to the proposed project regarding hazards and hazardous materials is the same as the regulations evaluated in the prior EIRs, with the exception of updates to CCR, Title 24, Part 2 and Part 9; and County of San Diego Consolidated Fire Code described below. All regulations used from the prior EIRs were reviewed to ensure they are still valid today and are listed below.

Applicable federal regulations include:

- Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976, as amended by the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984
- Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) and the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) of 1986
- Chemical Accident Prevention Provisions
- Emergency Planning Community Right-to-Know Act (EPCRA)
- Hazardous Materials Transportation Act
- US Environmental Protection Act (EPA) Region 9, Preliminary Remediation Goals (PRGs); International Fire Code (IFC)
- Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Functions
- The Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act
- Federal Response Plan

Applicable state regulations include:

- Government Code Section 65962.5 (a), Cortese List
- California Health & Safety Code (HSC), Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory
- Title 22 of the CCR and Hazardous Waste Control Law
- Title 23 of the CCR, Underground Storage Tank Act
- Title 27 of the CCR, Solid Waste
- California Health & Safety Code Section 25270 etc., Aboveground Petroleum Storage Act
- California Human Health Screening Levels (CHHSLs)

- Senate Bill (SB) 1889, Accidental Release Prevention Law/California Accidental Release Prevention (CalARP) Program
- Emergency Response to Hazardous Materials Incidents
- California Fire Code (CFC)
- California Education Code (CEC)
- California State Aeronautics Act
- California Emergency Services Act

Applicable local regulations include:

- San Diego County, Site Assessment and Mitigation (SAM) Program
- County Consolidated Fire Code

### County of San Diego General Plan Policies

The General Plan includes goals and policies within the Safety and Land Use Elements that would reduce the exposure of people and the environment to hazards involved with the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials.

#### *Land Use Element*

Goal LU-11 is to appropriately site and design commercial, office, and industrial development to enhance the unique character of each unincorporated community. Policy LU-11.9 supports this goal through the use of buffers between lower intensity uses, such as low-density residential districts and higher intensity development, such as commercial or industrial uses. In addition, policy LU-11.11 requires industrial land uses with outdoor activities or storage to provide a buffer from adjacent incompatible uses.

#### *Safety Element*

Goal S-1 is to enhance public safety and the protection of public and private property within the unincorporated County. Policy S-1.1 supports this goal by minimizing the population exposed to hazards through the assignment of land use designations that reflect site-specific constraints and hazards. Policy S-1.2 would locate future public facilities away from the County's most hazardous materials that pose a threat to human lives or environmental resources. Goal S-11 is to limit human and environmental exposure to hazardous materials that pose a threat to human lives or environmental resources. Policy S-11.1 supports this goal by appropriately locating land uses that involve the storage, transfer, or processing of hazardous materials in quantities that could pose a significant risk to humans or the environment to minimize risk and comply with all applicable hazardous materials regulations.

See Appendix C for all General Plan Land Use and Safety Element policies. No other Element General Plan policies are applicable to hazards and hazardous materials.

### Alpine Community Plan Policies

There are specific Alpine CPU policies and goals found in the Land Use Element, Public Facilities and Services Element, and Conservation Element intended to protect hydrology and water quality. These policies are summarized below.

## ***Safety Element***

The Safety Goal of the Alpine Community Plan is to promote the establishment of emergency procedures and preventative measures to minimize damage from hazardous substances. This is accomplished through policy 5 that encourages the inspection and maintenance of all utilities that could pose a hazard to the community.

### ***3.1.2.3 Analysis of Project Effects and Determination as to Significance***

#### ***Issue 1: Routine Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials or Release of Hazardous Materials into the Environment***

Based on Appendix G of CEQA and the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Hazardous Materials (County of San Diego 2007a), the proposed project would have a significant impact if it would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

#### **Impact Analysis**

The prior EIRs determined that the General Plan would result in less than significant direct and cumulative impacts on the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or the release of hazardous materials into the environment. The discussion of impacts related to transportation, use, and disposal of hazardous materials can be found in Section 2.7.3.1 of the 2011 General Plan EIR and Section 2.6.3.1 of the FCI EIR; and impacts related to accidental release of hazardous materials can be found in Section 2.7.3.2 of the 2011 General Plan EIR and Section 2.6.3.2 of the FCI EIR; and are hereby incorporated by reference.

The 2011 General Plan EIR concluded that the General Plan would involve an increase in the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials; however, any future development and use of land uses, as designated, would be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local regulations related to hazardous materials. The required compliance with these regulations would ensure impacts related to transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials would be less than significant.

The FCI EIR concluded that the General Plan would have a significant impact if it would result in businesses, operations, or facilities that transport and handle hazardous substances in excess of the threshold quantities listed in Chapter 6.95 of the California HSC, generate hazardous waste regulated under Chapter 6.5 of the HSC, and/or store hazardous substances in USTs regulated under Chapter 6.7 of the HSC. The FCI EIR noted that any future development would be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local regulations related to hazardous materials such as RCRA, CERCLA, the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, IFC, CCR Title 22, and CCR Title 27. Additionally, regulations that reduce the potential for humans or the environment to be affected by an accidental release of hazardous materials include the Chemical Accident Prevention Provision, RCRA, Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, California HSC, CCR Title 23, Aboveground Petroleum Storage Act, CalARP; Emergency Response to Hazardous Materials Incidents, California Emergency Services Act, and the County Consolidated Fire Code. Required compliance with these regulations would ensure impacts related to transport, use, and disposal, or accidental release of hazardous materials would be less than significant because these regulations are in place to avoid and minimize hazardous material impacts on the environment from their routine use. Therefore, required compliance with existing regulations would



ensure impacts related to transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes would be less than significant.

The proposed project would allow for increased density within three of seven subareas within the Alpine CPA, which would involve an increase in the transport, use, and disposal or accidental release of hazardous materials. However, any future development associated with land use designation changes under the proposed project would be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local regulations related to hazardous materials, and the existing goals and policies of the General Plan's Safety Element and Land Use Element identified above. Required compliance with these regulations would ensure impacts related to transport, use and disposal or accidental release of hazardous materials would not create a significant hazard. Therefore, similar to the prior EIRs, impacts associated with the implementation of the proposed project would be **less than significant**.

### *Federal, State, and Local Regulations and Existing Regulatory Processes*

As described above, future development would be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local regulations related to hazardous materials as identified in the prior EIRs and the existing goals and policies of the General Plan's Safety Element and Land Use Element. Regulations including but not limited to RCRA, CERCLA, the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, IFC, CCR Title 22, CCR Title 27, Chemical Accident Prevention Provision, Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, California HSC, CCR Title 23, Aboveground Petroleum Storage Act, CalARP; Emergency Response to Hazardous Materials Incidents, California Emergency Services Act, and the County Consolidated Fire Code would apply to subsequent projects.

Additionally, the General Plan identifies several policies within the Safety Element and Land Use Element that would reduce the potential for proposed land uses and development associated with the proposed project to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. These include policies S-1.1, S-1.2, S-11.1, S-11.2, LU-11.9, and LU-11.11, which are described in the prior EIRs.

### *Summary*

The Alpine CPU includes goals and policies that could help serve to reduce impacts from future development projects implemented under the CPU. There are also numerous regulations and policies in place that will continue to apply to subsequent projects that are discretionary, including the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance (Hazardous Materials). With implementation of federal, state, and local regulations, impacts would be **less than significant**.

## ***Issue 2: Hazards to Schools***

Based on Appendix G of CEQA and the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Hazardous Materials (County of San Diego 2007a), the proposed project would have a significant impact if it would emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school.

### Impact Analysis

The prior EIRs determined that the General Plan would result in less than significant direct and cumulative impacts on the hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous materials within 0.25 mile of a school. The discussion of impacts related to hazardous emissions and the handling of hazardous

materials within 0.25 mile of a school can be found in Section 2.7.3.3 in the 2011 General Plan EIR and Section 2.6.3.3 of the FCI EIR and is hereby incorporated by reference.

The prior EIRs determined that most land uses have the potential to use, store, transport, and dispose of hazardous materials. Schools may also use and dispose of hazardous materials, such as cleaning products or laboratory chemicals, that potentially pose a risk to the public. Therefore, hazardous materials usage within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school is likely to occur. However, compliance with federal and state regulations pertaining to hazardous wastes, including the State CEQA Guidelines, would ensure that risks associated with hazardous emissions and schools would remain below a level of significance. As identified in the prior EIRs (Section 2.7.2 of the 2011 General Plan EIR; Section 2.6.2 of the FCI EIR) federal, state, and local regulations that require strict adherence to reduce hazardous emissions and hazardous materials handling within 0.25 mile of an existing school include but are not limited to CHHSLs; California Government Code Section 65850.2; HSC, Division 20, Chapter 6.95, Article 2, Sections 25500 through 25520; CalARP; and the CEC. Development projects are reviewed for potential hazardous emissions or substances under CEQA using the County's Guidelines for Determining of Significance. Section 15186 of the State CEQA Guidelines establishes requirements for school projects, as well as projects near schools, to ensure that potential health impacts resulting from exposure to hazardous materials, wastes, and substances are examined and disclosed in an environmental document. Section 15186 also states that hazardous materials that must be considered a risk are those which may impose a health or safety hazard to persons who would attend or would be employed at a school.

Due to the increased development density within the CPA, the use, storage, or transportation of hazardous materials within 0.25 mile of a school would increase under implementation of the proposed project from the transportation of hazardous materials on roadways within the vicinity of schools. Future development within the Alpine CPA may affect an existing or future school, if a proposed land use or development located close to a school would use, store, or dispose of hazardous materials. According to the FCI EIR (Table 2.7-10), there are no schools within 0.25 mile of a hazardous material site within the Alpine CPA listed under Government Code 65962.5; however, there are several schools within the Alpine CPA. Almost all land uses have the potential to use, store, transport, and dispose of hazardous materials. Even school operations may use and dispose of hazardous materials, such as cleaning products or laboratory chemicals, that potentially pose a risk to the public. Therefore, it is possible that implementation of the proposed project would result in the use, storage, or transport of hazardous materials within 0.25 mile of a school.

The proposed project would allow for increased density within the Alpine CPA, which would involve the handling of acutely hazardous materials or producing hazardous emissions that could be located within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school. However, similar to the prior EIRs, compliance with federal and state regulations pertaining to hazardous wastes, including the CEQA Guidelines, and implementation of existing goals and policies of the General Plan's Land Use and Safety Elements, would ensure that risks associated with hazardous emissions and the handling of hazardous materials and schools would remain below a level of significance with the implementation of the proposed project. Required compliance with these regulations would ensure impacts related to the handling of acutely hazardous materials or producing hazardous emissions, that could be located within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school, would not create a significant hazard. Therefore, similar to the prior EIRs, impacts associated with the implementation of the proposed project would be **less than significant**.

### *Federal, State, and Local Regulations and Existing Regulatory Processes*

As described above, future development would be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local regulations related to the handling of hazardous materials or producing hazardous emissions that could be located within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school as identified in the prior EIRs and the existing goals and policies of the General Plan's Safety Element and Land Use Element. Regulations including but not limited to CEQA Section 15186; CHHSLs; California Government Code Section 65850.2; HSC, Division 20, Chapter 6.95, Article 2, Sections 25500 through 25520; CalARP; and the CEC would apply to subsequent projects.

In addition, the General Plan includes several policies, specifically within the Land Use and Safety Elements, that would reduce the potential for the proposed project to emit hazardous materials or involve handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school. These include policies S-11.3 and LU-11.10, which are fully described in the General Plan.

### *Summary*

The Alpine CPU includes goals and policies that could help serve to reduce impacts from future development projects implemented under the CPU. There are also numerous regulations in place that will continue to apply to subsequent projects that are discretionary, including the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance (Hazardous Materials). With implementation of federal, state, and local regulations, impacts would be **less than significant**.

### *Issue 3: Located on an Existing Hazardous Materials Site*

Based on Appendix G of CEQA and the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Hazardous Materials (County of San Diego 2007a), the proposed project would have a significant impact if it would:

- Be located on a site or within 0.25 mile from a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 or otherwise known to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment
- Include structure(s) for human occupancy and/or significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill (excluding burn sites) and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment
- Propose development on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash) and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment
- Be located on or within 1,000 feet of a FUD site and it has been determined that it is probable that munitions or other hazards are located on site that could represent a significant hazard to the public or the environment
- Result in human or environmental exposure to soils or groundwater that exceed EPA Region 9 PRGs, Cal/EPA CHHSLs, or Primary State or Federal Maximum Contaminant Levels for applicable contaminants and the exposure would represent a hazard to the public or environment

- Involve the demolition of commercial, industrial, or residential structures that contain asbestos containing material (ACM), lead-based paint (LBP), and/or other hazardous materials, and result in a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

### Impact Analysis

Typical adverse effects related to existing contamination from hazardous substances relate to the potential for site conditions or site contamination to result in adverse human or environmental effects. Potential pathways of exposure to contaminants from existing contamination include direct ingestion of contaminated soils and/or groundwater, inhalation of volatiles and fugitive dusts, potential explosion hazards associated with landfill gas, ingestion of contaminated groundwater caused by migration of chemicals through soil to an underlying potable aquifer, dermal absorption, ingestion of homegrown produce that has been contaminated via plant uptake, and migration of volatiles into basements and slabs. Potential exposure to contaminants could also occur to construction workers during site development and to the residents or workers that occupy the ultimate land use approved on the site.

Under the prior EIRs, proposed land uses and development have the potential to be located on sites such as burn dump sites; active, abandoned, or closed landfills; areas with historic or current agriculture; or areas with petroleum contamination. However, incorporation of General Plan policies and compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations related to existing on-site hazardous materials contamination would reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels.

As described in Section 2.6.2, *Regulatory Framework*, there are numerous federal, state, and local regulations that prevent or reduce hazards to the public and environment from existing hazardous materials sites. These include but are not limited to CERCLA, PRGs, Cortese List, and CHHSLs.

There are known hazardous materials sites within the Alpine CPA, and project implementation may result in future development on or within 0.25 mile of a site identified in one of the regulatory databases, compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. As discussed in Section 3.1.1.2, *Existing Conditions*, and identified in Table 3-6, there are seven hazardous materials sites identified on regulatory databases. Subarea 4 includes four of these known sites and Subarea 6 includes one site. Two of the sites within Subarea 4 are burn dump sites. There are no known hazardous materials sites within Subareas 1, 2, 3, and 5.

The Alpine CPA has active farms currently producing year-round and seasonal fruits and vegetables, eggs, and poultry products. The farms are generally small-scale family farms that harvest and distribute at the community level (i.e., farmers markets and community supported agriculture programs) (Local Harvest 2019). Therefore, there are also areas that have the potential to contain elevated pesticide levels due to past and current agriculture operations within the Alpine CPA.

The proposed project would allow for increased density within three of seven subareas of the Alpine CPA and, as such, would result in future development on or within a hazardous site. In addition, the proposed project has the potential to create a hazard to the public or the environment through exposure of new development in an area identified as burn dump sites. However, similar to the prior EIRs, compliance with federal and state regulations pertaining to hazardous sites, including CEQA Guidelines, and implementation of existing goals and policies of the General Plan would ensure that risks associated with hazardous sites would remain below a level of significance with the implementation of the proposed project. Therefore, similar to the prior EIRs, impacts associated with the implementation of the proposed project would be **less than significant**.

### ***Federal, State, and Local Regulations and Existing Regulatory Processes***

As described above, future development would be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local regulations related to hazardous sites as identified in the prior EIRS and the existing goals and policies of the General Plan's Safety Element. Regulations including but not limited to CERCLA; PRGs; Cortese List; and CHHSLs would apply to subsequent projects.

The General Plan also includes several policies within the Safety Element that would reduce impacts related to existing hazardous materials sites on proposed land uses and development associated with the proposed project. These include policies S-11.4 and S-11.5, which are fully described in the General Plan.

### ***Summary***

The Alpine CPU includes goals and policies that could help serve to reduce impacts from future development projects implemented under the CPU. There are also numerous regulations in place that will continue to apply to subsequent projects that are discretionary, including the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance (Hazardous Materials). With implementation of federal, state, and local regulations, impacts would be **less than significant**.

### ***3.1.2.4 Cumulative Impacts Analysis***

The geographic scope of the cumulative impact analysis for hazardous materials includes the communities that surround Alpine, including Crest/Dehesa, Lakeside, Cuyamaca, Descanso, Pine Valley, and Jamul/Dulzura because the surrounding communities contain land use designations that allow for the handling and storage of large quantities of hazardous materials. The cumulative geographic area would also include the Viejas Reservation, which is located within the Alpine CPA but is not within the jurisdiction of the County.

### ***Issue 1: Routine Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials or Release of Hazardous Materials into the Environment***

Cumulative projects within the geographic scope for hazardous materials are likely to result in new development that would include facilities that could involve the use, storage, disposal, transport, or accidental release of hazardous materials, and that could potentially increase hazards to the public or the environment. For example, the general plans of surrounding jurisdictions contain industrial land use designations, which allow businesses to handle large quantities of hazardous materials, thereby increasing the use, storage, and disposal of such materials. However, similar to the proposed project, cumulative projects would be required to comply with regulations applicable to the use, disposal, and transport of hazardous materials, including RCRA, CERCLA, the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, IFC, and CCR Title 22 and Title 27. Therefore, any potential significant impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance through compliance with applicable regulations, and the identified cumulative projected growth, as described in Chapter 1 of this SEIR, would not result in a significant cumulative impact.

As described above in Section 3.1.1.3, Issue 1: Routine Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials or Release of Hazardous Materials into the Environment, the land use designation within the proposed project would involve the increased transport, use, disposal, and potential for an accidental release of hazardous materials. However, potential direct impacts would be less than significant because of required compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations and existing County goals and policies. As

such, the proposed project, in combination with other cumulative projects, **would not contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact.**

### ***Issue 2: School Hazards***

Cumulative projects in the region, such as general plan amendments in surrounding jurisdictions and private projects, would result in population growth. As population increases in the region, public services, such as schools, and industries and services that use hazardous materials, such as manufacturing facilities and dry cleaners, would concurrently increase. Proposed schools could potentially be located in the vicinity of facilities that produce hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, while existing schools could be affected by new or expanded facilities that use hazardous waste. However, cumulative projects would be subject to CEQA review and CEC requirements. These requirements, such as mandated hazard investigations for potential school sites and analyses of proposed projects or existing land uses, would reduce the risk of cumulative projects to emit hazardous materials within 0.25 mile of schools. Therefore, a significant cumulative impact would not occur.

As described in Section 33.1.1.3, Issue 2: School Hazards, the land use designation within the proposed project would result in future development, which could involve handling acutely hazardous materials or producing hazardous emissions within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school. However, as described above, compliance with federal and state regulations pertaining to hazardous wastes and existing County goals and policies would ensure that risks associated with hazardous emissions and schools would remain at a less than significant level. As such, the proposed project, in combination with other cumulative projects, **would not contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact.**

### ***Issue 3: Located on an Existing Hazardous Materials Site***

It is assumed that the cumulative project area has existing hazardous materials sites, pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, similar to the Alpine CPA. Therefore, implementation of cumulative projects, such as development within other community plan areas, or private projects not included in the Alpine CPU, could result in the location of a project on a site with existing hazardous materials issues, which would result in a potentially significant impact on the public or environment. However, most cumulative projects would be required to undergo CEQA review, and all would be required to comply with applicable regulations that prevent risks associated with existing hazardous materials sites, such as CERCLA, PRGs, Cortese List, and CHHSLs. Therefore, cumulative projects would not result in a significant cumulative impact associated with existing hazardous materials sites.

Implementation of the proposed project could result in facilities being located on a site that would create potentially significant hazards to the public or environment, such as those pursuant to Government Code 65962.5, including burn dump sites. However, any future development of the land uses under the proposed project would be required to comply with federal, state, and local regulations and existing County goals and policies related to existing on-site hazardous materials contamination. Therefore, as described in Section 3.1.1.3, Issue 3: Located on an Existing Hazardous Materials Site, the proposed project would have a less than significant direct impact. As such, the proposed project, in combination with other cumulative projects, **would not contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact.**

### 3.1.3 Land Use and Planning

**Table 3-7. Land Use and Planning Summary of Impacts**

<b>Issue Number</b>	<b>Issue Topic</b>	<b>Prior EIRs Conclusion</b>	<b>Project Direct Impacts</b>	<b>Project Cumulative Impacts</b>	<b>Level of Significance After Mitigation</b>
LU-1	Divide an Established Community	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
LU-2	Conflict with Land Use Plans, Policies, and Regulations	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant

#### 3.1.3.1 Existing Conditions

The Alpine CPA covers approximately 68,100 acres and is characterized by diverse geography, a predominantly residential land use pattern, and an established village area. The most distinguished geographic features are the rugged peaks of the Viejas and El Cajon Mountains near the El Capitan Reservoir in the northern portion of the Alpine CPA, and the hills and valleys around the Loveland Reservoir in the southern portion. The Alpine CPA is bisected by Interstate (I-) 8, with a majority of the population concentrated in and around the vicinity of the Alpine village area adjacent to the freeway (see Figure 1-2). The Cleveland National Forest (CNF) comprises most of the land in the eastern and northern portions of the Alpine CPA. Privately held lands within and adjacent to these areas were subject to the FCI until December 31, 2010 (see Chapter 1).

The Viejas Indian Reservation and Capitan Grande Reservation are also located within the Alpine CPA boundaries but are not under the jurisdiction of the County.

As discussed in Chapter 1, the proposed project focuses land use changes within four of six subareas and FCI lands (Subarea 7) outside of the six subareas. With the exception of Subareas 4, 5, and 7, the subareas are generally centered around or extend from Alpine Boulevard. The following discussion describes the existing land uses within each of the subareas (see Figure 1-3).

Alpine Boulevard forms the commercial spine of the Alpine village area and runs parallel to, and south of I-8 (Figure 1-3). The village boundary is roughly centered around the majority of the length of Alpine Boulevard as it traverses the Alpine CPA. Residential development abuts the southern side of the predominantly commercial uses along Alpine Boulevard, with a general development pattern of decreasing density moving away from the town center with some pockets of denser development away from the town center, such as the Palo Verde and Crown Hills developments. To the north of the commercial core and I-8, there is mostly low-density rural residential development on the rolling hills, with residential lots ranging from 1 to 10 acres. CNF comprises most of the land in the eastern and northern portions of the Alpine community, including approximately 13,500 acres under the FCI.

Subarea 1 is located north of I-8 and northwest of Tavern Road, beginning roughly at Tavern Road as it curves to the northwest. The subarea generally encompasses the area just south of Larkspur Drive. Existing land uses in this area consist of graded, but undeveloped, industrial uses. Single-family residential

abuts this subarea to the north and east, industrial uses are located to the south, and natural open space is to the west.

Subarea 2 is centrally located within Alpine and encompasses an area just south of Alpine Boulevard centered along Tavern Road from Tavern Court in the north to South Grade Road in the south and includes parcels north of Wright's Field between Tavern Road and Eltinge Drive. Existing land uses within this subarea are primarily low- to moderate-density single-family residential. The Joan MacQueen Middle School and Boulder Oaks Elementary School are also located in this subarea along Tavern Road.

Subarea 3 is located north of Alpine Boulevard, extending between Otto Avenue to the north and I-8 to the south and East Victoria Drive/South Grade Road on the west to near the Willows Road freeway overpass in the east. This subarea is sparsely developed and includes large-lot, single-family homes that are generally separated by lots containing open space.

Subarea 4 abuts the northwestern edge of the Alpine CPA, north of I-8 and Alpine Boulevard. It is bounded roughly by Chocolate Summit Drive/Olde Highway 80 on the east and south, by Silva Road (and the Alpine CPA boundary) on the west, and by the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) water boundary on the north. This area is occupied predominantly by low-density residential uses and undeveloped open space. The Los Coches Creek Middle School is also located in this subarea, as are several churches.

Subarea 5 is located in the eastern portion of the Alpine CPA, outside of the SDCWA boundary, and south of I-8 between the Alpine Boulevard/Willows Road exit and the East Willows Road exit. The southern boundary of this subarea varies but is generally north of the Palo Verde Ranch residential neighborhood and the Sweetwater River. Existing land uses in this subarea are dominated by natural, undeveloped open space, some of which is located within the CNF. Low-density residential uses are concentrated near I-8.

Subarea 6 centers on the village segment of Alpine Boulevard spanning from Vista Alpine Road in the west to East Victoria Drive/South Grade Road in the east, focusing on commercial lots that front Alpine Boulevard. Land uses in this area are retail and commercial uses typical of a village, primarily smaller stand-alone commercial establishments such as restaurants, offices, and gift shops. Other uses include daycare facilities, religious facilities, County library, healthcare providers, a sheriff's station, multi-family residential complexes, a mobile home park, and single-family residential neighborhoods.

### **3.1.3.2 Regulatory Framework**

Section 2.9 of the 2011 General Plan EIR and Section 2.8 of the FCI EIR describe the Regulatory Framework related to land use and is incorporated by reference. New regulations adopted since preparation of the prior EIRs include the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan, and Alpine Village Core Form-Based Code Ordinance (Ordinance 8900) of the San Diego County Zoning Ordinance, which are discussed below. In addition, the FCI, which was included in the regulatory framework of the prior EIRs, is no longer applicable. The remaining regulatory framework discussed in the prior EIRs regarding land use since adoption of the General Plan is still applicable and is listed below.

Applicable federal regulations include:

#### **Cleveland National Forest Land Management Plan**

The purpose of the Cleveland National Forest Land Management Plan is to identify the long-term vision and strategic management direction for the CNF and to facilitate the development of management activities that will contribute toward the realization of the national forest's desired conditions. The plan defines the limits for management and offers the flexibility to adapt decisions to accommodate changing



resource conditions. In addition, the Land Management Plan identifies land use zones that are used to help demonstrate the management's intent and to indicate the anticipated level of public land use in any area of the national forest. Most of the CNF adjacent to the Alpine CPA is designated as Developed Areas Interface, which allows for various uses under resources managements, public use and enjoyment, commodity or commercial uses, and fire and fuels management.

Applicable state regulations include:

- California Aeronautics Act
- California Planning and Zoning Law
- California Office of Planning and Research General Plan Guidelines
- Local Agency Formation Commission
- Natural Community Conservation Planning (NCCP) Act of 1991
- SB-375

### Local Regulations

Applicable local regulations include:

#### *County of San Diego*

- Community and Subregional Plans
- Specific Plans
- San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP)
- County Trails Program
- County of San Diego Board of Supervisors Policies I-64, I-104, and J-33
- Zoning Ordinance
- San Diego County Regional Air Quality Strategy
- Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin Plan

Applicable local regulations not included in or adopted after adoption of the FCI GPA in 2016 are described below:

#### *SANDAG San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan*

San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan (Regional Plan) is a combination and update of the Regional Comprehensive Plan for the San Diego Region and the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy into one plan. The Regional Plan anticipates the growth that will occur in the region and provides a blueprint for a regional transportation system, while also establishing the region's sustainable community strategy with the overarching vision of promoting sustainability and offering more mobility options for people and goods. The Regional Plan goals are structured into three overarching themes: Healthy Environment & Communities, Innovative Mobility & Planning, and Vibrant Economy. The Regional Plan also identifies six general categories of policy objectives and, within each, specific policy objectives. The policy objective categories are Habitat and Open Space Preservation, Regional Economic Prosperity, Environmental Stewardship, Mobility Choices, Partnerships/Collaboration, and Healthy and Complete Communities. The last update to the Regional Plan was completed in 2019, with an additional update anticipated in 2021.

### ***Alpine Village Core Form-Based Code Regulations, Sections 8900–8980 (Adopted July 31, 2014)***

The Alpine Village Core regulations apply to the area identified in the Alpine Community Plan as the Village Core and are intended to preserve and promote the village character while creating a balanced automobile, bicycling, and pedestrian-friendly environment for residents, business owners, and visitors. These regulations are also intended to encourage the continuation and growth of the character of Alpine while promoting the economic development of the Alpine Village Core. These regulations establish permitted uses, development standards, design standards, and thoroughfare design standards.

### ***Forest Conservation Initiative (FCI)***

The 2011 General Plan and the General Plan EIR included land use map changes that excluded approximately 71,300 acres of private lands within the CNF in the unincorporated County that were formerly designated as FCI lands. The FCI was a voter-approved initiative in 1993 that required a minimum lot size of 40 acres for these lands. The FCI expired on December 31, 2010. With its expiration, the former FCI lands reverted to the land use designations of the previous General Plan (1978) in effect before the FCI was enacted. As a result, the land use designations associated with the FCI lands were not consistent with the 2011 General Plan land use designations. In addition, the land use mapping for the former FCI lands was not consistent with the General Plan goals and policies, and guiding principles. The 2016 FCI GPA and associated EIR resulted in re-designation of former FCI lands with land use categories consistent with the guiding principles, and goals and policies of the adopted 2011 General Plan. In addition, the FCI GPA included changes in land use designations for approximately 400 acres of private lands adjacent to former FCI lands to ensure that the land use designations for these additional 400 acres are consistent with the changes proposed for the former FCI lands and vice versa (County of San Diego 2016).

### **County of San Diego General Plan Policies**

The following provides a summary of existing County of San Diego General Plan policies specifically applicable to environmental impacts associated with land use. Other impact analyses sections, such as Biological Resources, Noise, and Aesthetics, address compatibility with plans related to those topics. See Appendix C for all General Plan policies.

#### ***Land Use Element***

Goal LU-1 is to sustain the intent and integrity of the Community Development Model and the boundaries between Regional Categories. This is accomplished through multiple policies but those specific to the Alpine CPU include policies LU-1.2 and LU-1.4 by prohibiting leapfrog development and new land use designations that are not contiguous with existing or planned village areas.

Goal LU-2 is in place to maintain the County's rural character through conservation and enhancement of the unincorporated County's communities, rural setting, and character. The policies that support this goal are specific to preserving the rural character of communities such as Alpine, for example updating community plans (LU-2.1), assigning density and minimum lot sizes (LU-2.3), and ensuring that land uses and densities reflect the unique issues, character, and development objectives of the CPA (LU-2.4).

#### ***Housing Element***

Goal H-2 is intended to promote well-designed residential neighborhoods that respect unique local character and the natural environment, while expanding affordable housing opportunities. Specifically,

policy H-2.1 requires that development in existing residential communities is designed well and does not degrade or detract from the character of surrounding development.

### ***Mobility Element***

Goals M-1 and M-2 are in place to establish safe and efficient road networks, while providing adequate capacity to accommodate planned land uses and regional traffic patterns. Specific to land use are policies M-1.3 and M-2.1 that address the treatment of high-volume roadways to avoid bisecting communities and ensuring that development projects provide associated road improvements to achieve a level of service of “D” or higher.

### **Alpine CPU Policies**

There are specific Alpine CPU policies and goals found in the Land Use and Mobility Elements intended to protect land use that would apply to the proposed project, as summarized below.

### ***Land Use Element***

Land Use Element Policy LU-2.1 promotes the role of Alpine Boulevard as the “main street” of Alpine by focusing commercial and mixed-use development between Tavern Road and West Willows off-ramps. Land Use Element Goal LU-4 encourages the use of specific plans as a way to accomplish the goals of the General Plan while providing flexibility to address site-specific considerations. Additionally, Land Use Element Goal LU-5 aims to uphold and maintain the project parameters established as part of the Alpine Highlands Specific Plan Area. Land Use Element Goal LU-6 encourages a balance of land uses to conserve natural and man-made resources and accommodate people of diverse lifestyles, occupations, and interests.

### ***Mobility Element***

Mobility Element Policy M-1.7 supports the improvement of circulation access from Harbison Canyon Road to Alpine Boulevard and I-8 via Arnold Way. To promote the implementation of improved circulation along this route, a new or expanded roadway may need to be constructed, which has the potential of traversing, and dividing, an existing established neighborhood. Any improvements or new routes would be required to be consistent with existing General Plan Update Policy M-1.3, which requires that bisecting communities or town centers be avoided and that roadway designs use narrower rights-of-way, flexibility in design standards, and lower design speeds in order to avoid the division of established neighborhoods.

A number of other Alpine Community Plan policies are not directly relevant to the analysis of impacts on land use from the proposed project. Nonetheless, any project built under the proposed project would have to comply with Alpine Community Plan policies to avoid the potential for substantial adverse physical impacts to occur due to a conflict with a plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purposes of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact.

## ***3.1.3.3 Analysis of Project Effects and Determination of Significance***

### ***Issue 1: Divide an Established Community***

Based on Appendix G of CEQA, the proposed project would have a significant impact if it would physically divide an established community.

## Impact Analysis

The prior EIRs concluded that the General Plan had the potential to result in the division of an established community through the development of new roadways and, as such, had the potential to result in direct and cumulative significant impacts associated with the physical division of an established community. The discussion of impacts can be found in Section 2.9 of the 2011 General Plan EIR and 2.8 of the FCI EIR and is incorporated by reference.

Implementation of General Plan policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant levels. These policies would ensure that impacts related to land use remain less than significant because they restrict locations of the village regional designations to areas within the community where certain conditions are met, require updates to the community plans to establish community-specific character and vision goals, require compatible planning and development that respect community character, and require consideration of roadway design that reflects community character.

Implementation of the proposed project would change land use designations within four of the seven subareas throughout the Alpine CPA, enabling a denser development pattern within three of those subareas as identified on Figure 1-4. The proposed project focuses these changes on providing local service and residential density close to existing or planned services and concentrates density in existing highly developed areas of Alpine, specifically the Village.

The proposed land use designations within all of the subareas would not result in the division of an established community because future development occurring under the proposed project would be contained within existing parcel boundaries, and would not require the division of existing established neighborhoods to allow for the construction of major new roadways or other infrastructure. Specifically, two roadways currently identified in the Mobility Element Network, New Road 23 (a local road from Victoria Circle to East Victoria Drive) and El Monte Road (a 2.3C Minor Collector road from Lakeside community boundary to El Capitan Reservoir) are proposed to be removed from the Mobility Element Network. One new roadway, New Road 26, is proposed to be added to the Mobility Element Network and would be classified as a 2.C Minor Collector road. New Road 26 would be located in the eastern portion of the Alpine CPA, from Alpine Boulevard to Dieguenos via Viejas Creek Trail. This road would be consistent with the scale and capacity of existing roadways in the community and would include pedestrian-oriented widths and may include other pedestrian-oriented amenities, such as sidewalks and designated crosswalks. The proposed road alignments would not involve major thoroughfares that would require infringement into existing neighborhoods for right-of-way acquisition, nor would they involve wide widths, faster travel speeds, overpasses or other such facilities that could introduce physical or safety obstacles that could adversely affect mobility within or between existing neighborhoods or between existing neighborhoods and existing neighborhood amenities such as parks. As such, roadway improvements occurring under the proposed project would not result in the division of an established neighborhood.

No additional residential units would result from implementation of the proposed project in Subareas 1, 3, and the former FCI Lands (Subarea 7), as compared to buildout under the current General Plan land use designations. Residential units would be reduced for Subarea 5.

Subarea 2, centrally located within Alpine, could experience a substantial change in density under implementation of the proposed project. The land use designation changes would involve changing existing Village Residential (VR-4.3, VR-2.9, VR-2) land uses to a higher density (VR-10.9, VR-7.3) and reclassifying a small area from Village Residential to Semi-Rural Residential (SR-1) or Neighborhood

Commercial (C-3). These higher density residential land use designations have the potential to result in up to 1,093 residential units compared to 313 residential units that would be allowed under buildout of the current General Plan land use designations.

Subarea 4, located in the northwestern portion of the CPA and north of I-8, would have an increase in density through the re-designation of existing Semi-Rural Residential (SR-1, SR-2) to uniformly SR-0.5 land use designations. The addition of the Village Core Mixed Use (C-5) and Neighborhood Commercial (C-3) near the intersection of Dunbar Lane and Chocolate Summit Drive will introduce local services to this subarea. The higher density residential land use designation has the potential to result in up to 851 residential units compared to 166 residential units that would be allowed under buildout of the current General Plan land use designations.

Subarea 5, in eastern Alpine, would recognize a slight decrease in residential density from what is planned in the General Plan, with a gradual increase in residential density near Alpine Boulevard, and maintaining a lower density buffer to the CNF.

Subarea 6, located in Alpine Village and south of I-8, would result in an increase in density as the land use designations for the area would be re-designated from Residential Commercial (RC) to VCMU (C-5) to provide additional high density residential options and flexibility in commercial options. The proposed project has the potential to result in up to 617 residential units compared to 38 residential units that would be allowed under buildout of the current General Plan Land Use designation.

The increase in density within the subareas would be achieved by developing currently undeveloped areas. The new local road would be required to connect new residential development with existing collector roadways. New development, including the new roadway, would be constructed within existing parcels and, because this development would be implemented on undeveloped land, there would be no division of existing, established neighborhoods. Consequently, the proposed land use designation changes would not result in the division of an established community.

Therefore, this impact would be reduced from that identified in the prior EIRs and would be less than significant. No new or more severe impacts would occur, and no new mitigation measures are required.

### ***Federal, State, and Local Regulations and Existing Regulatory Processes***

As noted in Section 3.1.2.2, there are local and state regulations currently in place that help protect the division of the County's communities. The County Zoning Ordinance contains several regulations that pertain to communities, as described above in Section 3.1.2.2, that implement the land use guidelines. The Alpine Village Core Regulations of the County Zoning Ordinance serve to regulate development in the village to preserve and promote the village character, encourage growth, and promote economic development.

In addition, the General Plan includes several policies within the Land Use Element, Housing Element, and Mobility Element applicable to the Alpine CPU that would ensure that the proposed land use designations or new or expanded roadways associated with the Alpine CPU would not physically divide an established community. These policies include policies LU-1.2, LU-1.4, LU-2.1, LU-2.3, LU-2.5, LU-10.1, LU-11.2, LU-12.4, H-2.1, and M-1.3 (see Section 3.1.2.2, *Regulatory Framework*, above).

These policies would ensure that impacts related to land use remain less than significant because they restrict locations of the village regional designations to areas within the community where certain conditions are met, require updates to the community plans to establish community-specific character

and vision goals, require compatible planning and development that respect community character, and require consideration of roadway design that reflects community character.

### *Summary*

The Alpine CPU includes goals and policies that could help serve to reduce impacts from future development projects implemented under the CPU and not create new additional impacts that would result in physically dividing communities as compared to the prior EIRs. There are also numerous regulations in place that will continue to apply to subsequent projects that are discretionary. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

### ***Issue 2: Conflict with Land Use Plans, Policies, and Regulations***

Based on Appendix G of CEQA, the proposed project would have a significant impact if it would conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation (including but not limited to a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

### Impact Analysis

The prior EIRs evaluated impacts from the adoption of the land use map and goals and policies of the General Plan and determined that buildout under the General Plan would not result in potentially significant direct or cumulative impacts resulting from a conflict with the land use plans, policies, or regulations of agencies with jurisdiction in the County adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact. The discussion of impacts can be found in Section 2.9 of the 2011 General Plan EIR and Section 2.8, of the FCI EIR; and is incorporated by reference.

Alpine is an unincorporated community within San Diego County and, as such, the proposed project is required to be consistent with the goals, policies, and planning concepts of the General Plan. In addition, this analysis also addresses the project's consistency with regional plans, including SANDAG's San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan, the Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin Plan, Regional Air Quality Standards, and the County Trails Program. The proposed project is not within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport or in the vicinity of an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, an Airport Influence Area, or a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, and further analysis is not required. In addition, the proposed project would continue to be consistent with the Zoning Ordinance, because the Zoning Ordinance would be updated to be consistent with any new land use designations adopted as part of the proposed project. Most of the CNF adjacent to the Alpine CPA is designated as Developed Areas Interface, which allows for various uses under resources management, public use and enjoyment, commodity or commercial uses, and fire and fuels management. These uses are consistent with the proposed uses adjacent to the CNF, including maintaining a lower density buffer in Subarea 5 and maintaining and proposing new community and regional trails.

Implementation of the proposed project would change land use designations within four of the seven subareas throughout the Alpine CPA, and no land use changes are proposed outside of the seven subareas. The proposed project concentrates residential development adjacent to transit routes, community services, retail options, and employment opportunities in order to reduce the total vehicle miles traveled (VMT) for residents of Alpine, which is in alignment with the goals and policies adopted for purposes of avoiding an environmental impact in the prior EIRs. The General Plan includes policies that call for land

uses and densities to be consistent with the character of the unincorporated communities within the County's jurisdiction and the maintenance of rural character, as summarized in Table 3-8.

**Table 3-8. Project Consistency with Relevant Policies from the General Plan**

Policy	Proposed Project Consistency
<p><b>Policy LU-1.2: Leapfrog Development.</b> Prohibit leapfrog development which is inconsistent with the Community Development Model. Leapfrog Development restrictions do not apply to new villages that are designed to be consistent with the Community Development Model, that provide necessary services and facilities, and that are designed to meet the LEED-Neighborhood Development Certification or an equivalent. For purposes of this policy, leapfrog development is defined as village densities located away from established Villages or outside established water and sewer service boundaries. (See applicable community plan.)</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The proposed project would not assign new land use designations with village densities away from established villages or outside established water and sewer service boundaries. The proposed project would add C-5 in Subarea 4 outside the village boundary but within an area already served by water and sewer and established development.</p>
<p><b>Policy LU-1.4: Village Expansion.</b> Permit new Village Regional Category designated land uses only where contiguous with an existing or planned Village and where all of the following criteria are met:</p> <p>Potential Village development would be compatible with environmental conditions and constraints, such as topography and flooding</p> <p>Potential Village development would be accommodated by the General Plan road network</p> <p>Public facilities and services can support the expansion without a reduction of services to other County residents</p> <p>The expansion is consistent with community character, the scale, and the orderly and contiguous growth of a Village area</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The proposed project would not expand the village boundary or increase the amount of land designated with village regional land use categories within the Alpine CPA in areas that are contiguous existing village areas.</p>
<p><b>Policy LU-2.1: Community Plans.</b> Maintain updated Community Plans, as part of the General Plan, to guide development to reflect the character and vision for each individual unincorporated community, consistent with the General Plan.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The proposed project involves updating the Alpine community plan, which will guide development to reflect the character and vision for the community.</p>
<p><b>Policy LU-2.3: Development Densities and Lot Sizes.</b> Assign densities and minimum lot sizes in a manner that is compatible with the character of each unincorporated community.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The land use designation changes proposed under the project would comply with this policy because they would provide residential densities that, while greater than existing development in some areas, would conform with the existing urban or suburban development</p>

Policy	Proposed Project Consistency
	within those areas. Specifically, increased densities within Subareas 2, 4, and 6 would primarily occur adjacent to areas already containing higher density village residential designations, thus constituting an expected extension of an existing development pattern, including the proposed village residential land use designations proposed along Alpine Boulevard and Tavern Road. In addition, Subarea 4 would experience increased densities, but designations would mostly remain within the semi-rural categories
<b>Policy LU-2.4: Relationship of Land Uses to Community Character.</b> Ensure that the land uses and densities within any Regional Category or Land Use Designation depicted on the Land Use Map reflect the unique issues, character, and development objectives for a Community Plan area, in addition to the General Plan Guiding Principles.	<b>Consistent.</b> For the reasons stated above for policy LU-2.3, land use designations would conform to the unique issues or character of the existing development patterns.
<b>Policy LU-2.5: Greenbelts to Define Communities.</b> Identify and maintain greenbelts between communities to reinforce the identity of individual communities.	<b>Consistent.</b> Existing greenbelts would be maintained and no expanded development would occur into greenbelt areas under the proposed project. Developed areas of Alpine already abut Lakeside to the west.
<b>Policy LU-2.9: Maintaining Rural Character.</b> Consider level of service criteria, in accordance with Policy M-2.1, to determine whether adding lanes to a Mobility Element road would adversely impact the rural character of a community or cause significant environmental impacts. In those instances, consider other options to mitigate LOS where appropriate.	<b>Consistent.</b> Current regulations require the evaluation of transportation impacts to focus on VMT rather than LOS or other delay-based metrics (refer to Section 2.13 Transportation). The proposed project including the addition of one roadway as identified in the San Diego County General Plan Mobility Element, and changes to the roadway classifications under the Alpine CPU, would not result in significant environmental impact to the rural character of the Alpine community.
<b>Policy LU-3.1: Diversity of Residential Designations and Building Types.</b> Maintain a mixture of residential land use designations and development regulations that accommodate various building types and styles.	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed project includes a variety of residential land use designations, ranging from rural, single-family land use designations to denser suburban single-family and multi-family designations. Development occurring under the proposed project would result, therefore, in various building types and styles, as is permitted by the Alpine Design Guidelines.
<b>Policy LU-3.2: Mix of Housing Units in Large Projects.</b> Require new large residential developments (generally greater than 200 dwelling units) to integrate a range of housing	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed project designates several different residential land use categories that would allow for development of a range of housing types and lot and building sizes. These would range from large-lot, rural single-family



Policy	Proposed Project Consistency
types and lot and building sizes. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]	homes to denser, smaller lot single-family homes as well as multi-family developments.
<b>Policy LU-5.1: Reduction of Vehicle Trips Within Communities.</b> Incorporate a mixture of uses within Villages and Rural Villages and plan residential densities at a level that support multi-modal transportation, including walking, bicycling, and the use of public transit, when appropriate.	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed project would increase residential densities, primarily within the village areas of the community, which would support multi-modal transportation opportunities, including walking and bicycling. It would also place more residents within the existing bus routes that operate through the Alpine CPA, which are primarily along Alpine Boulevard.
<b>Policy LU-5.4: Planning Support.</b> Undertake planning efforts that promote infill and redevelopment of uses that accommodate walking and biking within communities.	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed project increases residential densities in subareas that would promote infill development or redevelopment opportunities that would accommodate walking and biking opportunities. Specifically, increased residential densities along Alpine Boulevard and Tavern Road would place a large number of residents within walking or biking distance of the retail destinations within the community's center.
<b>Policy LU-9.1: Village and Community Core Planning.</b> Encourage the delineation of and development of more detailed planning direction for the character, design, uses, densities, and amenities of Village areas, Town Centers, and other community cores in Community Plans to assist in the future planning of residences, infrastructure, businesses, and civic uses.	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed project involves an update to the Alpine Community Plan in order to identify more detailed planning direction throughout the community.
<b>Policy LU-9.12: Achieving Planned Densities in Villages.</b> In villages, encourage future residential development to achieve planned densities through multi-family, mixed use, and small-lot single-family projects that are compatible with the community character.	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed project would achieve this goal by re-designating areas to more dense Village Residential land use designations, specifically within Subareas 2, 4, and 6.
<b>Policy LU-10.1: Residential Connectivity.</b> Require residential development in Semi-Rural areas to be integrated with existing neighborhoods by providing connected and continuous street, pathway/trail, and recreational open space networks.	<b>Consistent.</b> One new roadway planned in the Mobility Element of the Alpine CPU would be designed to connect new or existing neighborhoods with other neighborhoods and with community amenities.
<b>Policy LU-11.2: Compatibility with Community Character.</b> Require that commercial, office, and industrial development be located, scaled, and designed to be compatible with the unique character of the community.	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed project would maintain community character by focusing development within the village boundary. The proposed commercial uses are focused along the central portion of the Alpine CPA (intersection of Dunbar Lane and Chocolate Summit Drive and Alpine Boulevard) in order to build on and strengthen the existing commercial activity in Alpine's core.

Policy	Proposed Project Consistency
	Therefore, the proposed project would be compatible with the community character.

As discussed in Table 3-8, the proposed project would be consistent with policies that seek to implement diversity in residential designations and building types, a mix of housing units, reductions of VMT, promotion of infill development, and promotion of village and community core planning. These policies would be achieved primarily within the village boundaries of the Alpine CPA, including within Subareas 2 and 6. The creation of higher density village development would also be consistent with the sustainability strategies of SANDAG's San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan, which seeks to implement the requirements of SB-375 and calls for a more sustainable development patterns that involve compact, mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented developments that provide greater mobility options. The project would implement this type of development and, as such, is consistent with the goals and policies of the Regional Plan. Specifically, these plans endorse a land use pattern that channels much of the region's future growth into existing urban communities, preserving and protecting the lifestyle and sensitive environment of the rural unincorporated areas. Land use designation changes proposed in Subareas 2, 4, and 6 in the proposed project would be generally consistent with this land use pattern by proposing higher density village development within the Padre Dam Municipal Water District (PDMWD) boundary and in areas that currently have higher density development. In addition, as discussed in Table 3-8, while Subarea 4 is not within the village boundary, intensification of land uses in that subarea would maintain consistency with semi-rural densities that already occur within Subarea 4; these land use changes would be adjacent to existing urban development and within the service area of existing water and sewer providers. Therefore, land use changes occurring in Subarea 4 would be consistent with existing policies.

The proposed changes for Subarea 5 would be consistent with General Plan or Regional Plan policies because they would allow for a slight decrease in residential density from what was planned in the General Plan and gradual increase of residential density near Alpine Boulevard, and would maintain a lower density buffer to the CNF. This development would be in alignment with policy LU-1.2, which is aimed at restricting development to areas already served by existing utilities, the extension of which would result in environmental impacts.

The proposed project would not result in any changes or interruptions to the trails and pathways that are part of the County Trails Program; , as such, the project would remain consistent with those plans and policies. Finally, as detailed in Section 2.3, *Air Quality*, of this SEIR, the proposed project would be consistent with the San Diego County Regional Air Quality Strategy, and, as discussed in Section 2.8, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, the project would be consistent with the San Diego Basin Plan.

### ***Federal, State, and Local Regulations and Existing Regulatory Processes***

The state CEQA guidelines require that applicable future development within the CPA assess the potential to conflict with land use plans, policies, and regulations. Additionally, the prior EIRs and associated mitigation measures, and County development regulations and processes help ensure that land use plans, policies, and regulations are implemented within the Alpine CPA.

### ***Summary***

The proposed project would be consistent with the land use plans and policies adopted for the purposes of mitigating or avoiding an environmental impact. Because this land use impact was determined to be less than significant in the prior EIRs, no land use mitigation measures were identified in those documents.

However, aesthetics mitigation measures Aes-1.2, Aes-1.4 through Aes-1.9, and Aes-3.1 and Aes-3.2 listed in Appendix B would also help avoid community character impacts. Land use impacts would be **less than significant**.

### ***3.1.3.4 Cumulative Impact Analysis***

The geographic scope of cumulative impact analysis for land use includes communities that surround Alpine, including Crest/Dehesa, Lakeside, Cuyamaca, Descanso, Pine Valley, and Jamul/Dulzura, as the surrounding communities have somewhat similar character and may also be affected by the CPU.

Also included is the Viejas Reservation, which is located within the Alpine CPA but is not within the jurisdiction of the County. Additionally, portions of the CNF are incorporated into the geographic scope.

#### ***Issue 1: Divide an Established Community***

Future growth and development occurring within the geographic scope, including within the adjacent tribal lands (such as the recent expansion of the Viejas Casino and Resort), would occur within the boundaries of existing parcels or may require subdivision of existing larger parcels; This growth and development, however, would not require intrusion into or division of existing neighborhoods. In addition, while future growth and development may require new or widened roadways that would have the potential to physically divide an established community, similar to the proposed project and consistent with General Plan policies, it is anticipated that roadway design would respect the continuity of existing communities. The CNF generally does not contain established neighborhoods, and future development within the CNF generally involves recreational facilities such as riding and hiking trails, lodges, or camping areas, which would not involve the division of established communities. Residential development could occur on private property holdings adjacent to the CNF within the County's jurisdiction and would generally involve rural residential uses within previously undeveloped, or minimally developed, areas and not within areas where established communities exist. Therefore, a cumulatively significant impact related to the physical division of an established community would not occur.

The proposed project would increase density beyond what was anticipated in the prior EIRs, however, as discussed in Section 3.1.2.3, project-level impacts related to physical division of an established community would result in less than significant impacts. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to cumulative impacts from the physical division of an established community would be reduced compared to those identified in the prior EIRs and would **not be cumulatively considerable**.

#### ***Issue 2: Conflict with Land Use Plans, Policies, and Regulations***

Future growth and development within the geographic scope would have the potential to result in a cumulative impact if it would conflict with existing land use plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact. The communities surrounding the Alpine CPA are within the County's jurisdiction. It is anticipated that future growth and development occurring within the County's jurisdiction would comply with the General Plan or would otherwise require a general plan amendment that would be compatible with existing General Plan policies.

As discussed above in Section 3.1.2.3, implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with existing land use plans, policies, or regulations of agencies with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact, and project-level impacts would be less than significant. When combined with future growth and development in the adjacent communities, this

would not result in conflicts with the General Plan and other applicable policies adopted for the purposes of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Proposed project policies identified in Section 3.1.2.3 and mitigation measures identified in Section 2.1, *Aesthetics*, would be implemented to avoid potential impacts related to conflicts with policies. Therefore, the proposed project would **not be cumulatively considerable** or be more severe than identified in the prior EIRs.

### 3.1.4 Tribal Cultural Resources

**Table 3-9. Tribal Cultural Resources Summary of Impacts**

<b>Issue Number</b>	<b>Issue Topic</b>	<b>Prior EIRs Conclusions</b>	<b>Project Direct Impact</b>	<b>Project Cumulative Impact</b>
TCR-1	Change the Significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource	N/A*	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant

\*Not applicable; Tribal cultural resources were not addressed in the 2011 General Plan EIR or the 2016 FCI EIR.

Neither the 2011 General Plan EIR nor the 2016 FCI EIR addressed impacts on tribal cultural resources. In accordance with Assembly Bill (AB) 52, further described below, Native American Tribes culturally affiliated with the Alpine CPA have been contacted for input regarding the potential impacts the proposed project would have on tribal cultural resources.

#### 3.1.4.1 Existing Conditions

AB-52, as discussed below, amended CEQA to add another category of cultural resource: tribal cultural resources. Tribal cultural resources are defined as “sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a tribe,” which are either “included in or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Historic Register” or “included in a local register of historical resources” (Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21074). A lead agency may also determine, based on its discretion and substantial evidence, that a resource is a tribal cultural resource based on the criteria used to determine whether a historical resource is eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) set forth in PRC Section 5024.1(c). In applying those criteria, the lead agency is to consider the significance of the resource to the relevant California Native American tribe (PRC Section 21074(a)(2)).

Tribal cultural resources are further defined as “sites, features, places, and objects with cultural value to descendant communities or cultural landscapes; and sacred places including but not limited to Native American sanctified cemeteries, places of worship, religious or ceremonial sites, or sacred shrines” (PRC Section 21074). These resources must be listed in the Native American Heritage Commission’s (NAHC’s) Sacred Lands File, included in or eligible for the CRHR, included in a local register of historical resources, or determined significant by the CEQA lead agency.

#### Ethnographic Resources and Sacred Sites

Ethnographic resources that are potential tribal cultural resources include sites, areas, and materials important to Native Americans for religious, spiritual, or traditional uses. These can encompass the sacred character of physical locations (mountain peaks, springs, and burial sites) or particular native plants, animals, or minerals that are gathered for use in traditional ritual activities. Villages; burials; rock art; rock features; and traditional hunting, gathering, or fishing sites may also constitute significant Native

American cultural resources. Such resources may be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) as Traditional Cultural Properties and may be included in the California Sacred Lands File maintained by the California NAHC. For specific projects, the NAHC would provide information to qualified persons conducting cultural resources studies. Although the NAHC does not provide the location of the resources, they would provide a list of knowledgeable Native Americans who can be contacted for additional information. Tribal consultation with these individuals and organizations is conducted during the CEQA process.

### **3.1.4.2 Regulatory Framework**

Applicable federal regulations include:

No federal regulations are directly applicable to tribal cultural resources.

Applicable state regulations include:

#### **California Environmental Quality Act and Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 (California Register of Historical Resources)**

CEQA requires public agencies to evaluate the implications of their project(s) on the environment and includes significant historical resources as part of the environment. According to CEQA, a project that causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource or a unique archaeological resource has a significant effect on the environment (State CEQA Guidelines 15064.5, PRC Section 21083.2).

CEQA defines a substantial adverse change as follows:

- Physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired.
- Demolition or material alteration of the physical characteristics that convey the resource's historical significance and justify its designation as a historical resource.

Public agencies must treat any cultural resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant (14 CCR] 15064.5). A historic resource is considered significant if it meets the definition of historical resource or unique archaeological resource.

The term *historical resource* includes but is not limited to any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that is historically or archaeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California (PRC Section 5020.1(j)). Historical resources may be designated as such through three different processes.

1. Official designation or recognition by a local government pursuant to local ordinance or resolution (PRC Section 5020.1(k)).
2. A local survey conducted pursuant to PRC Section 5024.1(g).
3. Listing in or eligibility for listing in the NRHP (PRC Section 5024.1(d)(1)).

The CRHR is very similar to the NRHP program. The CRHR was enacted in 1992, and its regulations became official January 1, 1998. The CRHR is administered by the Office of Historic Preservation and was established to serve as an authoritative guide to the state's significant historical and archaeological

resources (PRC Section 5024.1). State law provides that, in order for a property to be considered eligible for listing in the CRHR, it must be significant under any of the following four criteria, which parallel NRHP criteria.

1. The property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage.
2. The property is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.
3. The property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master of possesses high artistic values.
4. The property has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

To be considered a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA, the resource must also have *integrity*, which is the authenticity of a resource's physical identity evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource's period of significance.

Resources, therefore, must retain enough of their historic character or appearance to be recognizable as historical resources and to convey the reasons for their significance. Integrity is evaluated with regard to the retention of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. It must also be judged with reference to the particular criteria under which a resource is eligible for listing in the CRHR (14 CCR 4852(c)).

Resources listed in the NRHP are automatically included in the CRHR.

### Assembly Bill 52

AB 52 (Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014) establishes a formal consultation process for California Native American tribes as part of CEQA and equates significant impacts on tribal cultural resources with significant environmental impacts (PRC Section 21084.2). PRC Section 21074 defines tribal cultural resources as follows.

- Sites, features, places, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to descendant communities or cultural landscapes defined in size and scope that are:
  - Included in or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR); or,
  - Included in a local register of historical resources.
- A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC Section 5024.1.

Sacred places can include Native American sanctified cemeteries, places of worship, religious or ceremonial sites, and sacred shrines. In addition, both unique and non-unique archaeological resources, as defined in PRC Section 21083.2, can be tribal cultural resources if they meet the criteria detailed above. The lead agency relies upon substantial evidence to make the determination that a resource qualifies as a tribal cultural resource when it is not already listed in the CRHR or a local register.

AB-52 defines a "California Native American Tribe" (Tribe) as a Native American Tribe located in California that is on the contact list maintained by the NAHC (PRC Section 21073). Under AB-52, formal

consultation with Tribes is required prior to determining the level of environmental document if a Tribe has requested to be informed by the lead agency of proposed projects and if the Tribe, upon receiving notice of the project, accepts the opportunity to consult within 30 days of receipt of the notice. AB-52 also requires that consultation, if initiated, address project alternatives and mitigation measures for significant effects, if specifically requested by the Tribe. AB-52 states that consultation is considered concluded when either the parties agree to measures to mitigate or avoid a significant effect on tribal cultural resources, or when either the Tribe or the agency concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached after making a reasonable, good-faith effort. Under AB-52, any mitigation measures recommended by the agency or agreed upon with the Tribe may be included in the final environmental document and in the adopted mitigation monitoring program if they were determined to avoid or lessen a significant impact on a tribal cultural resource. If the recommended measures are not included in the final environmental document, then the lead agency must consider the four mitigation methods described in PRC Section 21084.3(e). Any information submitted by a Tribe during the consultation process is considered confidential and is not subject to public review or disclosure. It will be published in a confidential appendix to the environmental document unless the Tribe consents to disclosure of all or some of the information to the public.

#### Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5/Public Resources Code Section 5097.9

HSC 7050.5 addresses the protection of human remains discovered in any location other than a dedicated cemetery and makes it a misdemeanor for any person who knowingly mutilates or disinters, wantonly disturbs, or willfully removes any human remains in or from any location other than a dedicated cemetery without authority of law, except as provided in PRC Section 5097.99. It further states that in the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there must be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the coroner of the county in which the human remains are discovered has determined that the remains are not subject to the provisions concerning investigation of the circumstances, manner, and cause of any death, and the recommendations concerning the treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative, in the manner provided in PRC Section 5097.98. If the coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his or her authority and if the coroner recognizes the human remains to be those of a Native American, or has reason to believe that they are those of a Native American, he or she will contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the NAHC. Whenever the NAHC receives notification of a discovery of Native American human remains from the county coroner, it must immediately notify those people it believes to be the Most Likely Descendants of the deceased Native American. The descendants may inspect the site of the discovery and make recommendations on the removal or reburial of the remains.

#### California Government Code Section 6254(r) and 6254.10

California Government Code Section 6254(r) and Section 6254.10 of the California Public Records Act were enacted to protect archaeological sites from unauthorized excavation, looting, or vandalism. Section 6254(r) explicitly authorizes public agencies to withhold information from the public relating to "Native American graves, cemeteries, and sacred places maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission." Section 6254.10 specifically exempts from disclosure requests for "records that relate to archaeological site information and reports, maintained by, or in the possession of the Department of Parks and Recreation, the State Historical Resources Commission, the State Lands Commission, the Native American Heritage Commission, another state agency, or a local agency, including the records that the agency obtains through a consultation process between a Native American tribe and a state or local agency."

Applicable local regulations include:

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Sections 86.601-860608,  
Resource Protection Ordinance

The Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) requires that cultural resources be evaluated as part of the County's discretionary environmental review process, and if any resources are determined significant under the RPO, they must be preserved. The RPO prohibits development, trenching, grading, clearing, and grubbing, or any other activity or use damaging to significant prehistoric or historic site lands, except for scientific investigations with an approved research design prepared by an archaeologist certified by the Register of Professional Archaeologists. Sites determined to be RPO significant must be avoided and preserved.

San Diego County Local Register of Historical Resources (San Diego County  
Administrative Code Section 396.7)

The County of San Diego maintains a Local Register of Historical Resources (Local Register) modeled after the CRHR (San Diego County Administrative Code Section 396.7). The purpose of the Local Register is to develop and maintain "an authoritative guide to be used by state agencies, private groups, and citizens to identify the County's historical resources and to indicate which properties are to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change." Sites, places, or objects that are eligible to the NRHP or the CRHR are automatically included in the Local Register. Resources may also be listed on the Local Register if they meet set criteria specified in Section 396.7 of the San Diego County Administrative Code (County of San Diego 2001).

County of San Diego General Plan Policies

Neither the 2011 General Plan nor the 2016 FCI GPA included goals and policies related to tribal cultural resources. However, the General Plan does include policies in the conservation element related to cultural resources that also apply to tribal cultural resources. Goal COS-7 is for the protection and preservation of important archaeological resources. Policies COS-7.1 and COS-7.2 support this goal through preservation of resources from loss or destruction through avoidance or open space. Policy COS-7.3 requires that archaeological materials be treated appropriately, which may include curation or repatriation. Policy COS-7.4 aligns with the consultation requirement of AB-52, and policy COS-7.5 requires that human remains (are also tribal cultural resources) be appropriately handled as required by federal, state, and local regulations.

Alpine Community Plan Policies

The Alpine Community Plan has no goals or policies related to tribal cultural resources.

***3.1.4.3 Analysis of Project Effects and Determination of  
Significance***

***Issue 1: Tribal Cultural Resources***

Guidelines for the Determination of Significance Analysis

Based on Appendix G of CEQA, the proposed project would have a significant impact if it would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource that is:



- Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or;
- A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

### Impact Analysis

Neither the 2011 General Plan EIR nor the 2016 FCI EIR included an analysis of tribal cultural resources. The 2011 General Plan EIR was prepared and approved prior to the requirement for tribal cultural resources to be assessed and the 2016 FCI EIR Notice of Preparation (NOP) was released (August 30, 2012) prior to the implementation of AB-52. Therefore, an analysis of tribal cultural resources was not required.

For the Alpine CPU, Native American consultation began on June 12, 2017, when the County conducted outreach with seven tribes (Barona, Campo, Jamul, Kwaaymii, Santa Ysabel, Sycuan, and Viejas) for purposes of AB-52 consultation. On June 14, 2017, a request was submitted to the NAHC for information on documented Native American resources. Although a Sacred Lands File was not conducted, the NAHC provided a list of 13 local tribal governments to the County for purposes of SB-18 consultation. On August 15, 2017, County staff conducted outreach with 13 local tribal governments (Barona, Campo, Ewiiapaayp, Inaja, Jamul, Kwaaymii, La Posta, Manzanita, Mesa Grande, San Pasqual, Santa Ysabel, Sycuan, and Viejas) that the NAHC identified requesting whether they want to participate in tribal consultation on the proposed project pursuant to SB-18. Three tribes responded (Barona, Jamul, and Santa Ysabel) declining consultation and deferred to the Viejas Band. Viejas requested formal consultation. County staff met with Viejas on October 24, 2017. Viejas was informed that the project is a policy document. They raised no issues and consultation was concluded. Viejas did, however, request to be included in notifications for public review and hearings, and that they be consulted on subsequent projects. The San Pasqual Band was noticed of the project on February 3, 2020, and declined consultation because the “project is a GPA and not an actual development project.” The results of the tribal outreach did not yield the identification of any known tribal cultural resources or human remains within the Alpine CPA.

The Alpine CPU would allow for increased density within the Alpine CPA. Any future development associated with land use designation changes under the proposed project would be required to consult as required pursuant to federal, state, and local regulations. Required compliance with these regulations would ensure impacts related to tribal cultural resources would be **less than significant**.

### *Federal, State, and Local Regulations and Existing Regulatory Processes*

As described above, future development would be required to comply with applicable federal, state and local regulations related to tribal cultural resources. Regulations including but not limited to CEQA, PRC Section 5024.1, AB-52, PRC Section 5097.9, HSC Section 7050.5, and Government Code Sections 6254(r) and 6254.10 would apply to subsequent projects.

## *Summary*

The Alpine CPU includes goals and policies that could help serve to reduce impacts from future development projects implemented under the CPU. There are also numerous regulations in place that will continue to apply to subsequent projects that are discretionary, including the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance – Archaeological and Historic Resources. With implementation of federal, state, and local regulations, impacts would be **less than significant**.

### ***3.1.4.4 Cumulative Impacts Analysis***

The geographic scope of the cumulative impact analysis for hazardous materials includes the communities that surround Alpine, including Crest/Dehesa, Lakeside, Cuyamaca, Descanso, Pine Valley, and Jamul/Dulzura because the surrounding communities include traditional use areas of local Kumeyaay tribes. The cumulative geographic area would also include the Viejas Reservation, which is located within the Alpine CPA but is not within the jurisdiction of the County.

### ***Issue 1: Tribal Cultural Resources***

Cumulative projects located in the region, such as such as general plan amendments in surrounding jurisdictions or private projects, would potentially result in the destruction or loss of tribal cultural resources due to ground-disturbing activities, such as grading and excavation during construction. Any projects with the potential to destroy or damage tribal cultural resources would be regulated by applicable federal, state and local regulations, including the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), Cal NAGPRA, National Historic Preservation Act Section 106, SB-18 and AB-52, PRC Section 5079, CEQA Section 21084.3, and the County RPO. Therefore, cumulative projects would not result in a potentially significant cumulative impact.

As described above in Section 3.1.3.3, Issue 1: Tribal Cultural Resources, the land use designation within the proposed project would involve the increased density that would increase ground-disturbing activities. However, potential direct impacts would be less than significant because of required compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations and existing County goals and policies. As such, the proposed project, in combination with other cumulative projects, **would not contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact**.

## **3.2 Effects Found Not Significant during the Initial Study**

An Initial Study was prepared for the proposed project as part of the environmental scoping process. The Initial Study determined that one or more aspects of the following resources would not be significant: geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials (airports and vectors), noise (airports), population and housing (displacement), and transportation and traffic (Congestion Management Program [CMP] and air traffic patterns). In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15128, a brief explanation indicating the reasons that the effects on these resources would not be significant is provided under each subheading below.

### 3.2.1 Geology and Soils

#### 3.2.1.1 *Earthquake Fault*

The prior EIRs concluded that future development would be required to comply with all relevant federal, state, and local regulations and building standards, and therefore impacts were determined to be less than significant.

The Alpine CPA is in a seismically active region of Southern California. However, no active faults are within the Alpine CPA or within 50 feet of the Alpine CPA boundary. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**.

#### 3.2.1.2 *Seismic Ground Shaking*

The prior EIRs concluded that compliance with construction standards, such as the California Building Code (CBC), and the County's building permit process would ensure that impacts from strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

Southern California is a seismically active region. All of San Diego County is located within CBC Seismic Design Categories E and F, which have the highest seismic ground shaking potential. Future development within the Alpine CPA and associated with the Alpine CPU would be susceptible to ground shaking produced by seismic events, which could expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking. However, buildings within San Diego County must conform to CBC Seismic Design Categories E and F structural design requirements; this would be ensured through the County building permit process. Therefore, compliance with construction recommendations and/or the requirements of the geotechnical investigations prepared for future development projects, as well as compliance with building code requirements, would result in a **less than significant** impact related to seismic ground shaking.

#### 3.2.1.3 *Seismic Related Ground Failure*

Liquefaction refers to an event in which loose sand and silt are saturated with water, then behave like a liquid when shaken by an earthquake. The prior EIRs concluded that future development would be required to comply with all relevant federal, state, and local regulations and building standards, and therefore impacts were determined to be less than significant.

The Alpine CPA is in a Potential Liquefaction Area, as identified in the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards (County of San Diego 2007b). The Alpine CPA contains approximately 490 acres of potential liquefaction areas.

Future development associated with the Alpine CPU could expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects from seismically related ground failure, including liquefaction. However, prior to issuance of building permits, the County requires projects in a potential liquefaction area to prepare a geotechnical study (a requirement of the CBC). The geotechnical study required for project sites within an area of required investigation must demonstrate that the liquefaction hazard would be low and at an acceptable level. Therefore, compliance with construction recommendations and/or the requirements of the geotechnical investigations prepared for future development projects, as well as compliance with building code requirements, would result in a **less than significant** impact related to ground failure including liquefaction.

### **3.2.1.4 Landslides**

The County identifies Landslide Susceptibility Areas based on the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards (County of San Diego 2007b). The development of Landslide Susceptibility Areas is based on the landslide risk profiles included in the San Diego County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (County of San Diego, Office of Emergency Services 2018). Landslide risk areas are defined by data pertaining to the steepness of slopes (greater than 25 percent), soil series (from SANDAG), based on the US Geological Survey [USGS] 1970s series), soil-slip susceptibility (from USGS), and the Landslide Hazard Zone Maps (limited to the western portion of the County) developed by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. The prior EIRs concluded that compliance with construction standards, such as the CBC, and the County's landslide standards would reduce impacts from potential landslide hazards to less than significant levels.

Portions of the Alpine CPA are within a Landslide Susceptibility Area, as identified in the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. The Alpine CPA contains gabbroic soils, which are slide prone, on slopes that are steeper than 15 percent. However, none of the Alpine CPU subareas are within a Landslide Susceptibility Area.

The County requires projects within a landslide susceptibility area to prepare a geologic evaluation to determine whether there are risks to people or property from landslides. The geologic evaluation is required to conform to the California Board of Geologists and Geophysicists Guidelines for Engineering Geologic Reports and be completed by a Certified Engineering Geologist. Therefore, compliance with construction recommendations and/or the requirements of the geotechnical evaluations prepared for future development projects within the Alpine CPA, as well as compliance with building code requirements, would result in **less than significant** impacts related to landslides.

### **3.2.1.5 Soil Erosion**

The prior EIRs concluded that land uses proposed would allow construction and operational activities that could expose topsoil to erosion from water or wind; however, compliance with existing applicable regulations, such as the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program, CBC, and the County Grading Ordinance, would reduce potential impacts to a level below significant. In addition, the proposed project would not contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact related to soil erosion or topsoil loss.

Construction and operation of development projects can cause soil erosion if adequate best management practices (BMPs) are not implemented. The Alpine CPU would provide land development guidance as well as a combination of policies and land use designations that would be applied to future development. As such, future development associated with the proposed project could result in substantial soil erosion if adequate best management practices are not implemented.

All construction activities occurring under the Alpine CPU would be required to comply with the CBC and the County Grading Ordinance, both of which would ensure implementation of appropriate measures during grading and construction activities to reduce soil erosion. The County Grading Ordinance requires all clearing and grading activities to be carried out with dust control measures, such as watering, applying surfactants, shrouding, controlling vehicle speeds, paving in access areas, or other measures to reduce erosion from wind. Construction occurring under the Alpine CPU would also be required to comply with the NPDES permit program, which requires stormwater pollution prevention plans (SWPPPs) to be prepared and BMPs to be identified for construction sites greater than 1 acre. Implementation of

appropriate BMPs would protect water quality by controlling stormwater runoff and ensuring that the quality of stormwater flows meets the applicable requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

Future development projects allowed under the Alpine CPU would be required under the MS4 NPDES permit program to include minimum BMPs, such as silt fencing, desilting basins, sediment traps and check dams, street sweeping, storm drain inlet protection, sandbag barriers, straw bale barriers, gravel bag berms, and fiber rolls to reduce erosion associated with the small construction sites. Therefore, compliance with all applicable regulations, including the CBC, NPDES, and County Grading Ordinance, would reduce impacts to a **less than significant** level.

### ***3.2.1.6 Soil Stability***

The prior EIRs concluded that development could result in hazards associated with on- or off-site landslides, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. However, it was also concluded that future development projects would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local building standards and regulations. Compliance with such regulations would reduce direct and cumulative impacts associated with on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse to a less than significant level. In addition, the General Plan would not contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact associated with soil stability.

There are numerous soil types throughout the Alpine CPA, some of which may be unstable in their existing condition. Future development associated with the Alpine CPU could be located on soil that is unstable, or could become unstable, leading to lateral spreading, subsidence, or collapse; the proposed project could exacerbate existing conditions, causing soils to become unstable and result in an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.

The County relies on the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan to determine the potential for subsidence. No occurrences of subsidence in the Alpine CPA have been recorded in the past 50 years. Therefore, future development implemented under the Alpine CPU is not anticipated to result in a potentially significant impact due to locating structures in areas with subsidence risks. In areas that could be susceptible to lateral spreading, landslides, or liquefaction, the County requires development projects to prepare a geotechnical study and/or investigation. Compliance with report recommendations would be required to minimize hazards associated with landslides. The County's Grading Ordinance also includes requirements to ensure soil stability during grading and construction as well as requirements for any steepening of slopes.

Compliance with the requirements for geotechnical investigations, as well as compliance with building code requirements, would result in **less than significant** impacts related to landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.

### ***3.2.1.7 Expansive Soil***

The prior EIRs concluded that land uses would be designated that allow structures to be developed on potentially expansive soils. However, compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations, including the CBC, would reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels. In addition, the General Plan would not contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact associated with soil stability.

Expansive soils, as defined within Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), are found within the Alpine CPA. The Alpine CPU includes updated goals and policies, such as Housing Element Goal 1, which

aims to promote a variety of housing types in all economic ranges in existing and future development while maintaining and promoting housing stability in harmony with Alpine's natural rural environment, to reflect the character of Alpine and guide growth and development. Future development associated with the Alpine CPU that would result from land use designation changes within the four subareas could occur on potentially expansive soils. Therefore, future construction projects within the Alpine CPA could be affected by expansive soils. However, all projects would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations, including the International Building Code and CBC. Compliance with such regulations would reduce potentially significant impacts to **less than significant**.

### ***3.2.1.8 Septic Tanks or Alternative Wastewater Disposal Systems***

The prior EIRs concluded that development in areas where soils are incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or other on-site wastewater treatment systems would be allowed. However, future development projects would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations, including County Department of Environmental Health standards. Compliance with such regulations would reduce potential impacts to less than significant. In addition, the General Plan would not contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact related to wastewater disposal systems.

The Alpine CPA includes areas that are within sewer service areas as well as areas that are required to use on-site wastewater disposal treatment systems, including individual septic systems to meet wastewater demands.

Prior to siting an on-site wastewater treatment system, a landowner must comply with RWQCB siting standards. Individual development projects implemented under the Alpine CPU would be required to adhere to RWQCB standards and conduct site evaluations specific to the proposed development.

The County Department of Environmental Health has several policies in place for permitting septic systems. The County's *Design Manual for Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems* (2010) describes how systems are reviewed and permits are issued in San Diego County; it also provides design criteria for these systems. Future development requiring on-site wastewater treatment systems would also be required to comply with the County's On-site Wastewater Treatment System Groundwater Separation Policy as well as County Code Section 68.601.

All future development projects would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations related to septic tanks and wastewater disposal. Compliance with such regulations would reduce the potential for septic systems to be located in soils that would be incapable of supporting such systems. Therefore, impacts associated with wastewater disposal systems would be **less than significant**.

## **3.2.2 Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

### ***3.2.2.1 Airports***

The prior EIRs determined that the Alpine CPA is not within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, it was concluded that no impacts would occur.

Since certification of the 2011 General Plan Update EIR, there have been no changes regarding airports in the Alpine CPA. The proposed project is not within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport or in the vicinity of an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, an Airport Influence Area, or a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, which would constitute a safety hazard to aircraft.

and/or operations from an airport or heliport. Therefore, the project would not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area and would result in **no impacts**.

### **3.2.2.2 Vectors**

The prior EIRs determined that future development would result in potentially significant impacts related to increasing human exposure to vectors. However, compliance with existing regulations, policies, plans, and guidelines associated with vector control would ensure that impacts would remain less than significant. It was also determined that these projects would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact associated with increased human exposure to vectors.

Typical adverse effects related to vectors are twofold. First, vectors can cause potentially significant public health risks because of the transmission of diseases to human and animal populations. Second, vectors can create a nuisance for residents of the County. A project that proposes a source of vector breeding habitat could result in an unnecessary increase in vector populations. When the vector breeding source is near a substantial human population, a potentially adverse environmental effect could occur.

Implementation of the Alpine CPU could result in the creation of sources of standing water that could persist for more than 72 hours. This could substantially increase human exposure to vectors, such as mosquitoes that are capable of transmitting potentially significant public health diseases or creating nuisances. However, the future development associated with the proposed project would be required to comply with existing regulations and processes associated with vector control. Therefore, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment by substantially increasing human exposure to vectors. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

## **3.2.3 Noise**

### **3.2.3.1 Airport-Related Noise**

The prior EIRs concluded that direct and cumulative impacts related to excessive noise exposure from a public or private airport was less than significant through a combination of federal, state, and local regulations; existing County regulatory processes; the General Plan goals and policies; and specific implementation programs identified in the 2011 General Plan EIR.

The Alpine CPA is not located within the vicinity of an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels and would result in **no impact**.

## **3.2.4 Population and Housing**

### **3.2.4.1 Displacement of Housing or People**

The prior EIRs determined that future development would not displace a substantial number of housing units or people. It was also concluded that the General Plan would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact associated with a displacement of housing or people.

The Alpine CPU proposes land use designation changes that would enable a denser development pattern within three of seven subareas, and one subarea would have reduced density. While the proposed project could result in the intensification of uses, primarily residential, this would be largely accomplished by infill development that would not involve the displacement of existing housing or people. Because future development occurring under the Alpine CPU would be contained within existing parcel boundaries, and

would not require the removal of existing housing to allow the construction of major new roadways or other infrastructure, the proposed land use designations would not result in the displacement of existing housing or people. In addition, the Alpine CPU does not include any plans for demolition of structures, including housing. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the displacement of existing housing. As such, impacts would be **less than significant**.

### 3.2.5 Transportation and Traffic

#### 3.2.5.1 *Applicable Congestion Management Program*

Neither the 2011 General Plan EIR nor the 2016 FCI EIR provided an analysis of CMPs. California State Proposition 111, passed by voters in 1990, established a requirement that urbanized areas prepare and regularly update a CMP. The requirements within the state CMP were developed to monitor the performance of the transportation system, develop programs to address near-term and long-term congestion, and better integrate transportation and land use planning.

The designated congestion management agency for the San Diego region is SANDAG. SANDAG is responsible for preparing the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), of which the CMP is an element, to monitor transportation system performance, develop programs to address near- and long-term congestion, and better integrate land use and transportation planning decisions. The CMP includes a requirement for enhanced CEQA review applicable to certain large developments that generate an equivalent of 2,400 or more average daily vehicle trips or 200 or more peak hour vehicle trips. These large projects must complete a traffic analysis that identifies the proposed project's impacts on CMP system roadways, their associated costs, and appropriate mitigation. Early project coordination with affected public agencies, the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), and the North County Transit District (NCTD) is required to ensure that the impacts of new development on CMP transit performance measures are identified. SANDAG provided regular updates for the state CMP from 1991 through 2008. In October 2009, the San Diego region elected to be exempt from the state CMP, and, since this decision, SANDAG has been abiding by CCR Title 23, Section 450.320 to ensure the region's continued compliance with the federal congestion management process. Therefore, it was concluded that **no impacts** would occur with the implementation of the proposed project.

#### 3.2.5.2 *Air Traffic Patterns*

The prior EIRs determined that the Alpine CPA is not within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public or private use airport. Therefore, it was determined that no impacts would result.

The proposed project is an update to the existing Alpine Community Plan. The Alpine CPA is outside of an Airport Influence Area and not within 2 miles of a public or private use airport; therefore, the project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns and **no impact** would occur.

### 3.3 Significant Irreversible Environmental Effects

CEQA Sections 21100(b)(2) and 21100.1(a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(c) require that EIRs prepared for the adoption of a plan, policy, or ordinance of a public agency must include a discussion of significant irreversible environmental changes of project implementation. The proposed project would involve adoption of a community plan update; therefore, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15127, this SEIR is required to include the identification of any significant irreversible environmental changes resulting from the proposed project.



Generally, a project would result in significant irreversible changes if:

1. The impacts would generally commit future generations to similar uses;
2. The project would involve a large commitment of nonrenewable resources;
3. The project involves uses in which irreversible damage would result from any potential environmental accidents associated with the project; or
4. The proposed consumption of resources is not justified (e.g., the project involves the wasteful use of energy).

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 Alpine CPA. The proposed project would also change land use designations within four of seven subareas within the Alpine CPA. These land use changes could generally result in increased density compared to the existing land use map in the current Alpine Community Plan. Development consistent with the proposed project would constitute a long-term commitment to these lands uses.

The Alpine CPU does not propose any specific development; however, future development activities allowed under the Alpine CPU could involve demolition of existing structures and improvements, including parking lots, hardscape, and buildings. Similar to the General Plan, irreversible changes would likely occur due to future grading and construction activities associated with future land uses allowed under the proposed project. Although environmental impacts of these changes can generally be addressed by mitigation measures, the potential for disturbance would be an irreversible change. Restoration of the areas to predevelopment conditions would not be feasible given the degree of disturbance and the increased density of development.

Future development would require a permanent commitment of non-renewable natural resources primarily from the direct consumption of fossil fuels similar to the General Plan. These fossil fuels would be consumed during both construction and operation in the form of diesel and gasoline used in construction equipment, commute vehicles, trucks, and vessels. Electricity would also be consumed during construction and operation from power tools, electric equipment, and lighting, although not all the electricity would come from non-renewable sources. The use of finite fossil fuels such as natural gas for the generation of electricity would be irretrievable and irreversible. Construction activities would also require the consumption of other natural resources, including lumber and other forest products; sand and gravel; asphalt, steel, copper, other metals; and water. Building materials, while recyclable in part at some long-term future date, would for practical purposes be considered permanently consumed. The materials used during construction and operational activities would be unavailable for other uses and their use would be considered irreversible.

Implementation of the proposed project could potentially result in an increase of approximately 5,618 people over what is anticipated in the current General Plan within the seven subareas, which would result in increased demand on public services and utilities (see Section 2.11, *Public Services*, and Section 2.14, *Utilities and Service Systems*). This increased demand would require expansion of infrastructure resulting in the irreversible conversion of land and the permanent commitment of resources, such as water and energy, by making these resources available to more residents and consumers similar to the General Plan.

In addition to increasing consumption of mineral resources such as concrete and gravel for development, the Alpine CPU would propose land use designation changes within the subareas that would limit the

availability of mineral resources in areas designated as MRZ-3 by allowing a density of development that would be incompatible with future mining operations. Future development in Subarea 4 would have the potential to encroach on known or unknown mineral resource deposits in such a way that would have the potential to prevent the success of future resource recovery sites. Similar to the General Plan, future development of the Alpine CPU has the potential to preclude mineral resource deposits from being available for future extraction by placing structures on top of resources or by being located within the vicinity of known mineral deposits (see Section 2.9, *Mineral Resources*).

CEQA requires an EIR to discuss any irreversible damage associated with environmental accidents that could result from a project. The Alpine CPU does not propose any land uses involving heavy industrial operations or the transport, storage, use, and disposal of hazardous materials or wastes that could result in environmental accidents. Similar to the current land use designations, the subareas would continue to have residential land use designations under the Alpine CPU, but with increased density. Industries and businesses using hazardous materials may expand to accommodate the projected population growth under implementation of the proposed project. Compliance with applicable federal, state, and local hazardous materials regulations would ensure the proposed project would not foreseeably result in irreversible environmental damage related to the accidental release of hazardous materials (see Sections 3.1.1 and 3.2.2, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, of this SEIR).

### 3.4 Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Effects

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(b) requires an EIR to discuss unavoidable significant environmental effects of the proposed project. Because the Alpine CPU is tiering from the 2011 General Plan EIR for the subject areas of Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas, Traffic and Transportation, and Wildfire and both the 2011 General Plan EIR and the 2016 FCI EIR for all other subject areas, the following describes the new or more severe significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the proposed project compared to those of the prior EIRs as relevant. Table 3-10 lists the issues by resource area that were determined to be significant and unavoidable in the 2011 General Plan EIR and the 2016 FCI EIR, and whether the Alpine CPU would result in new or more severe significant and unavoidable impacts. Full descriptions of the new or more severe significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed project are provided in Sections 2.1 through 2.15 of this SEIR, as applicable.

**Table 3-10. Comparison of Significant and Unavoidable Impacts of the General Plan and FCI EIRs and the Alpine CPU**

Issue	2011 General Plan Update EIR Determination	2016 FCI EIR Determination	New or More Severe Impact of the Alpine CPU?	Alpine CPU Determination
<b>Aesthetics</b>				
Visual Character or Quality	SU	SU	Yes	SU
Light or Glare	SU	SU	Yes	SU
<b>Agriculture and Forestry Resources<sup>1</sup></b>				
Direct Conversion of Agricultural Resources	SU	SU	No	SU
Indirect Conversion of Agricultural Resources	SU	SU	No	SU

Issue	2011 General Plan Update EIR Determination	2016 FCI EIR Determination	New or More Severe Impact of the Alpine CPU?	Alpine CPU Determination
Direct and Indirect Conversion of Forestry Resources	SU	SU	No	SU
<b>Air Quality</b>				
Air Quality Plans	LTS	LTS	Yes	SU
Air Quality Violations	SU	SU	Yes	SU
Non-Attainment Criteria Pollutants	SU	SU	Yes	SU
Sensitive Receptors	SU	SU	Yes	SU
<b>Biological Resources</b>				
Special-Status Species	SU	SU	Yes	SU
Riparian Habitat and Other Sensitive Natural Communities	SU	SU	Yes	SU
Wildlife Movement Corridors and Nursery Sites	SU	SU	Yes	SU
<b>Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change</b>				
Compliance with Applicable Reduction Goals	LTSM	SU	Yes	SU
Potential Effects of Global Climate Change on the Alpine CPU	LTSM	SU	Yes	SU
<b>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>				
Wildland Fire Hazards	SU	SU	Yes <sup>2</sup>	SU
<b>Hydrology and Water Quality</b>				
Groundwater Quality Operational	SU	SU	Yes	SU
Groundwater Supplies and Recharge	SU	SU	No	SU
<b>Mineral Resources</b>				
Mineral Resource Availability	SU	SU	Yes	SU
Mineral Resource Recovery Sites	SU	SU	Yes	SU
<b>Noise</b>				
Excessive Noise Levels	LTSM	LTSM	Yes	SU
Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels	SU	SU	Yes	SU
<b>Public Services</b>				
Fire Protection Services	LTS	LTS	Yes	SU
School Services	SU	SU	Yes	SU
Other Public Facilities (Library)	LTS	LTS	Yes	SU

Issue	2011 General Plan Update EIR Determination	2016 FCI EIR Determination	New or More Severe Impact of the Alpine CPU?	Alpine CPU Determination
<b>Traffic</b>				
Unincorporated County Traffic and LOS Standards	SU	SU	Yes	SU
Adjacent Cities Traffic and LOS Standards	SU	N/A	N/A	N/A
Rural Road Safety/Hazardous Design Features	SU	SU	Yes	SU
<b>Utilities</b>				
New or Expanded Utility Facilities	LTSM	LTSM	Yes	SU
Adequate Water Supplies	SU	SU	No	SU
Sufficient Landfill Capacity	SU	SU	No	LTS
<b>Wildfire<sup>3</sup></b>				
Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans for Wildfire	N/A	N/A	Yes	SU
Expose Receptors to Pollutants from Wildfire	N/A	N/A	Yes	SU
Exacerbate Wildfire Risk from New Infrastructure	N/A	N/A	Yes	SU
Expose People or Structures to Significant Risks from Post-Wildfire Hazards	N/A	N/A	Yes	SU

<sup>1</sup> Forestry Resources was added to Agricultural Resources in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines after certification of the 2011 General Plan Update PEIR.

<sup>2</sup> This issue was analyzed in the Wildfire section of this SEIR.

<sup>3</sup> Wildfire was added as a new issue in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines as part of a comprehensive update to the guidelines adopted by the California Resources Agency in December 2018. As such, the specific issues analyzed in this SEIR were not analyzed in the 2011 General Plan Update PEIR.

SU = significant and unavoidable; LTS = less than significant; LTSM = Less than significant with mitigation; N/A = not applicable; LOS = level of service

### 3.5 Growth-Inducing Impacts

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(e) requires an EIR to discuss the ways in which a proposed project could directly or indirectly foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing in the surrounding environment. For example, direct growth inducement would result if a proposed project involved construction of new housing. Indirect growth might occur if a project were to establish substantial new permanent employment opportunities or stimulate the expansion of additional utilities or public services into unserved areas.

Similarly, a proposed project would indirectly induce growth if it would remove an obstacle to additional development, such as removing a constraint on a required public service or utility. A project proposing to extend roadways into an area that was previously inaccessible and/or undeveloped would be considered growth-inducing. Additionally, expansion of existing roadway capacities could potentially be growth-inducing as a result of improved accessibility.

The following discusses the characteristics and consequences of the proposed project that may encourage and facilitate other activities that could result in significant individual or cumulative effects on the environment. This analysis does not assume that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment (State CEQA Guidelines 15126.2(d)).

### 3.5.1 Population Growth

SANDAG provides growth projections for the Alpine CPA, for the years 2020, 2035, and 2050. 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.

The Alpine CPU is intended to serve as a comprehensive long-term plan guiding growth and physical development within the Alpine CPA. One of the guiding principles of the County's General Plan is to support a reasonable share of projected regional population growth. The proposed project would allow for increased residential land use densities. Specifically, the proposed residential land use densities would have the potential to result in the development of approximately 6,078 housing units within the seven subareas of the Alpine CPA. In comparison, approximately 4,065 housing units could be developed within the seven subareas under the current General Plan. Therefore, the additional housing units associated with the proposed project represent a potential increase of 2,013 housing units from what could be developed within the seven subareas under the current General Plan.

Additional housing units associated with the proposed project could result in an associated population of approximately 16,958 people<sup>2</sup> within the seven subareas. Under the current General Plan, the potential population increase based on existing allowable density would be approximately 11,341 people within the seven subareas. Thus, the proposed project could result in a potential population increase of approximately 5,618 people over what is anticipated in the current General Plan within the seven subareas. Population in relationship to SANDAG projections is further discussed in Section 1.3 of this document. Consequently, the potential growth associated with the proposed project is not accounted for in the General Plan or regional growth projections. It should be noted that this population increase would only potentially occur within the seven subareas of the Alpine CPA and does not reflect any additional population growth that could occur in the remainder of the Alpine CPA.

The proposed project would primarily concentrate higher density residential land uses within the Village boundary. However, Subareas 2, 4, and a majority of Subarea 5 are outside of the existing Village boundary. These areas make up approximately 90 percent of the total land area of the seven subareas. The proposed project would include a slight reduction in housing units in Subarea 5 than could be developed under the current General Plan. Although the proposed residential densities within Subareas 2 and 4 are appropriate for their location relative to the Village, the proposed project would allow for a greater number of housing units to be developed than could be developed under the General Plan. Because of the rural nature of Subareas 4 and 5, future development within these subareas would likely require infrastructure improvements to accommodate this growth because the existing infrastructure would not be adequate (see Section 3.5.3 for a discussion of the physical obstacles to growth that would be removed by the proposed project).

---

<sup>2</sup> The potential population increase associated with the proposed project was determined by multiplying the total number of potential new housing units (6078) within the seven subareas by the forecasted persons per household rate (2.79).

Because the proposed project would allow for a greater number of potential housing units and associated population and infrastructure than anticipated in the prior EIRs, the proposed project would be considered growth-inducing.

### 3.5.2 Economic Growth

One way that growth inducement can be measured involves economic growth, which considers a range of demand for temporary and permanent employees, to an increase in the overall revenue base for an area, to a new demand for supporting services such as retail, restaurant, and entertainment uses. Economic growth could occur as new businesses are established or existing businesses expand as well as with the creation of new sources of employment. Increased commercial and residential development typically generates a secondary or indirect demand for other services, such as groceries, entertainment, and medical services that stimulate economic activity.

The development of new uses consistent with those in the proposed project would result in secondary demand for goods and services. In addition, economic growth would also result in additional population growth as new jobs are created and employees that fill those job positions create an increased demand for housing in the region. Both employment and population growth would be accommodated under the proposed project through the intensification of development within the Alpine CPA. The proposed project would change the existing land uses in Subarea 6, which is considered the core village area of the CPA, from Village Residential (VR-15), Semi-Rural Residential (SR-1), General Commercial (C-1), Rural Commercial (C-4), and Public/Semi-Public Facilities to entirely Village Core Mixed Use (C-5). As detailed in the Land Use Element of the General Plan, the VCMU (C-5) designation is intended for pedestrian-scaled town center development, and encourages a variety of commercial, civic, and residential uses that may be mixed on a single site or adjacent parcels. Per the Alpine CPU, development allowed within the Alpine Village area (i.e., Subarea 6) includes high-density multifamily residential, commercial, industrial, and civic uses.

Buildout of the VCMU (C-5) land use designation in Subareas 2, 4, and 6 could include new retail businesses and restaurants that would provide new local jobs for residents within the community. Additionally, future development allowed under the Alpine CPU would involve construction that would generate an economic stimulus from the use of building materials, the sales of new residential units, the operation of new commercial facilities, and the introduction of new consumer demand in the CPA.

### 3.5.3 Removal of Obstacles to Growth

The elimination of either physical or regulatory obstacles is a growth-inducing impact. The sections below discuss physical obstacles and regulatory obstacles to growth.

#### Physical Obstacles to Growth

A physical obstacle to growth typically involves the lack of public services and infrastructure. A project would trigger growth if it would result in infrastructure with excess capacity or if it would remove an obstacle to growth in an area, such as providing infrastructure, including roadways, that were previously not available.

To accommodate the growth associated with buildout of the proposed project, it is anticipated that new or expanded infrastructure would be required, such as the extension of roads and utility services. As discussed further in Section 2.14, *Utilities and Service Systems*, of this SEIR, future development associated

with the proposed project could require new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, and/or telecommunications facilities.

The majority of the Alpine CPA (approximately 81 percent) is not within the SDCWA service boundary and is therefore entirely dependent on groundwater. Padre Dam Municipal Water District, which purchases water from the SDCWA, serves Subareas 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7 as well as a small portion of Subarea 5. Future development associated with the proposed project would require connections to existing water distribution lines. Due to the density increase proposed within Subareas 2, 4, and 6, there is a potential that upsizing of water distribution lines would be required.

Any future development occurring outside of the Alpine or Lakeside Sanitation District boundaries, such as in portions of Subareas 4 and 7, would rely on septic systems unless substantial infrastructure improvements are completed to provide service connections to these areas and increase the capacity of the sewer pumps that convey wastewater to the Metropolitan Wastewater System. Other infrastructure that would be needed to serve future development within the seven subareas includes electricity and natural gas distribution as well as telecommunication facilities. To provide sewer service to these subareas, annexation to Alpine and/or Lakeside Sanitation District would be required for any future connections to these sanitation districts. Similar to water districts, annexation to any sanitation district would first be subject to the LAFCO annexation process. At this programmatic level of analysis, it is unknown whether future development within portions of Subareas 4 and 7 would be annexed to either of these sanitation districts.

In addition to the proposed land use changes described in Section 1.4, *Project Description*, of this SEIR the proposed project includes several proposed changes to the Mobility Element, including roadway re-classifications and roadway re-configurations, as well as the removal and addition of roadway segments. These proposed changes are identified in Table 1-3 in Section 1.4.4. Of the seven subareas included in the Alpine CPU, Subarea 5 in the eastern portion of the Alpine CPA has the most underdeveloped roadway network and would have growth and development potential, with a total of 429 potential dwelling units that could be developed at buildout of the proposed project, which is 31 units below the number currently allowed by the General Plan. The Alpine CPU has identified one additional mobility element roadway within Subarea 5 that would be intended to serve the potential growth in these new residential neighborhoods and connect to Alpine Boulevard and would have a roadway designation of a minor collector (2.C). Proposed mobility network changes are described in Section 1.4.4 and shown in Table 1-3. The extension of utility services and roadways into these less developed portions of the Alpine CPA would remove physical obstacles to growth.

### Regulatory Obstacles to Growth

Generally, the elimination or change in regulatory processes, including existing plans, policies, and ordinances, would potentially result in the removal of regulatory obstacles to growth, which would allow for new or increased population growth to occur. As detailed further in Chapter 1, *Project Description, Location, and Environmental Setting*, 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. The proposed project also involves changes to existing land use designations within four of seven subareas of the Alpine CPA, which would increase allowable land use density. A General Plan Amendment is a component of the proposed project to incorporate the updated community plan land use designations. In addition, a rezone of land uses within each of the subareas would be required for consistency with the updated community plan.

The proposed land use designation changes, which would increase the land use intensity, would allow for an increase in housing and population growth within the Alpine CPA. The proposed project could result in a potential population of approximately 16,958 people within the seven subareas. This represents a potential increase of approximately 5,618 people more than allowed under the existing General Plan land use designations within the seven subareas.

A majority (approximately 70 percent) of potential development and growth associated with the proposed project would occur within the Village boundary and would not require substantial infrastructure improvements. While sections of Subarea 4 are designated as Village Residential land uses, Subarea 4 is located outside of the Village boundary, and although the proposed residential densities within Subarea 4 are appropriate for their location relative to the Village, the proposed project would still allow for a greater number of housing units to be developed within this subarea than could be developed under the General Plan. Because of the rural nature of Subarea 4, future development within this subarea would likely require infrastructure improvements to accommodate this growth because the existing infrastructure would not be adequate (see *Physical Obstacles to Growth*, above, for a discussion of the physical obstacles to growth that would be removed by the Alpine CPU). For these reasons, the proposed project is considered to result in the removal of obstacles to population growth.

### **3.5.4 Summary of Growth-Inducing Impacts**

The proposed project would be considered growth-inducing because it would accommodate new residential development, resulting in the direct inducement of population growth, an increase in employment opportunities, and the removal of obstacles to growth that would induce population growth in the region. Therefore, the proposed project would have the potential to result in adverse physical environmental effects due to population growth.