



County of San Diego

MARK WARDLAW
DIRECTOR

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 310, SAN DIEGO, CA 92123
(858) 505 – 6857 • Fax (858) 694-2555
www.sdcountry.ca.gov/pds

KATHLEEN A. FLANNERY
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

August 30, 2018

CEQA Initial Study – Environmental Checklist Form (Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G)

1. Project name, project number(s), environmental log number:

Alpine Community Plan Update, PDS2016-GPA-16-011, PDS2018-ER-18-00-002

2. Lead agency name and address:

County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 110
San Diego, CA 92123-1239

3. a. Contact: Greg Kazmer, Environmental Coordinator
b. Phone number: (858) 505-6857
c. E-mail: Gregory.Kazmer@sdcounty.ca.gov

4. Project location:

Alpine is an unincorporated community in the eastern portion of San Diego County, approximately 25 miles east of downtown San Diego (Figure 1). The Alpine Community Plan Area (CPA) covers approximately 68,100 acres of land that is characterized by diverse geography, residential land use patterns, and an established town center area. The most distinguished geographic features are the rugged peaks of the Viejas and El Cajon Mountains near El Capitan Reservoir in the northern portion of the community as well as the hills and valleys around Loveland Reservoir in the southern portion. The Alpine CPA is bisected by Interstate 8, with the majority of the population concentrated in and around the Alpine town center, which is adjacent to the freeway. Cleveland National Forest comprises most of the land in the eastern and northern portions of the CPA.

The Alpine CPA is bordered by the Central Mountain CPA to the north and east, the Jamul-Dulzura CPA to the south, and the Lakeside and Crest-Dehesa-Harbisson Canyon-Granite Hills CPAs to the west (Figure 2). The Alpine CPA includes the suburban Glen Oaks

neighborhood in the western portion and the Viejas Mountains, El Cajon Mountains, and Cleveland National Forest in the east. The elevation of the terrain ranges from approximately 1,500 feet at the vegetated drainages to more than 4,100 feet in the semi-arid hilly terrain of the Viejas and El Cajon Mountains.

The town of Alpine, which is in the north-central portion of the CPA, is the most densely populated community within the planning area. Local development on both sides of Interstate 8 consists primarily of residential/rural-residential, commercial, industrial, and mixed uses. The planning area also includes the communities of Peutz Valley, Japatul Valley, Hidden Glen, Dunbar Lane, and Galloway Valley. Development within these communities consists of rural-residential and light agricultural uses. The Viejas Indian Reservation and Capitan Grande Reservation are also within the boundaries of the Alpine CPA; however, they are not within the County's jurisdiction.

5. Project applicant name and address:

County of San Diego – Planning and Development Services

6. General plan

Community Plan:	Alpine
Land Use Designation:	Various
Density:	Various
Floor Area Ratio (FAR)	Various

7. Zoning

Use Regulation:	Various
Minimum Lot Size:	Various
Special Area Regulation:	Various

8. Description of project:

The project comprises a comprehensive update to the Alpine Community Plan proposed by the County of San Diego (County). A Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) will be prepared in order to analyze and disclose the environmental impacts of the project. The SEIR will tier from the General Plan Update (GPU) Program EIR (PEIR), the Forest Conservation Initiative (FCI) SEIR, and include updated baseline conditions, as discussed further below. The SEIR will also be programmatic in nature in that it will analyze the reasonably foreseeable impacts of the changes to the plan. For example, changes to land use densities could result in an increase or decrease in impacts that were previously analyzed in the GPU EIR. It should be noted that the project itself does not propose any specific development project that would result in physical impacts on the environment. However, it is reasonably foreseeable that subsequent projects that are implemented after adoption of the Alpine Community Plan Update (ACPU) could result in physical impacts on the environment.

The proposed project would update and refine the current plan's goals and policies to reflect the character of Alpine and guide growth and development. The ACPU includes an infrastructure study and market analysis, which are intended to provide

additional information to guide decision-making. It will also provide an opportunity to consolidate regulations, such as zoning and design guidelines. The ACPU will provide strategies and specific implementing actions to ensure that the land use vision will be accomplished. The implementation plan organizes and prioritizes actions, which are intended to parallel existing County efforts.

The ACPU may set forth changes in land use designations based on a constraints analysis and community input. In large part, existing zoning will be applied to land uses, although new designations that better support the goal of mixed-use development as well as transit-oriented development may also be developed. The project will further refine the land use patterns established as a part of the 2011 GPU and 2016 FCI projects. The structure of the ACPU will mirror the County General Plan where possible, including the land use, mobility, conservation/open space, housing, safety, and noise elements, although some elements may be omitted from the community plan where unique goals/policies/analyses are not applicable.

A special development feasibility study is being prepared to analyze several Areas of Consideration (as defined in the FCI SEIR) for future development. The feasibility study will include an assessment of infrastructure needs associated with roads, water, sewers, electricity, and fire protection and be used to determine appropriate land use densities and zoning designations. The feasibility study will consider Areas of Consideration AL-3, -4, -5, -6, -7, and -11B. More information on the project and community outreach efforts is available on the project web page at <https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/pds/CommunityGroups/AlpineCommunityPlanUpdate.html>.

As previously described, the project will require an SEIR that will tier from the GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR. This SEIR will use information from both of these EIRs and provide more specific analysis and details for the Alpine CPA.

The GPU PEIR (Environmental Review Number 02-ZA-001, State Clearinghouse Number 2002111067), was certified by the Board of Supervisors on August 3, 2011. The certified PEIR evaluated potentially significant effects associated with the following environmental areas of potential concern: 1) aesthetics, 2) agricultural resources, 3) air quality, 4) biological resources, 5) cultural and paleontological resources, 6) geology and soils, 7) hazards and hazardous materials, 8) hydrology and water quality, 9) land use and planning, 10) mineral resources, 11) noise, 12) population and housing, 13) public services, 14) recreation, 15) transportation and traffic, 16) utilities and service systems, and 17) climate change.

Of these 17 environmental subject areas, it was determined that geology and soils, as well as population and housing, would not involve potentially significant impacts. The remaining environmental issues evaluated included impacts that would be significant and unavoidable, with the exception of impacts associated with the

following four subject areas, which would be mitigated to a level below significant: cultural and paleontological resources, land use and planning, recreation, and climate change. The final certified GPU PEIR is available online at the County's website at <http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/pds/gpupdate/environmental.html>.

On December 14, 2016, the Board of Supervisors approved the FCI project. The FCI lands entail approximately 72,000 acres within 13 communities within the unincorporated County. Of those, 1,354 parcels containing 13,747 acres are located within the Alpine community. The FCI was a voter-approved initiative which required that private lands within the Cleveland National Forest in San Diego County have a minimum lot size of 40 acres. The FCI was originally approved in 1993 and expired on December 31, 2010.

The land use map changes adopted as part of the GPU did not include FCI lands. When the FCI expired, the areas affected by the FCI reverted to the land use designations in effect before the FCI was enacted. As a result of the Board's approval of the FCI project in 2016, the GPU land use designations, Guiding Principles, and Policies were applied to the former FCI lands.

The FCI SEIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts to: 1) aesthetics, 2) agricultural and forestry resources, 3) air quality, 4) biological resources, 5) hazards and hazardous material, 6) hydrology and water quality, 7) mineral resources, 8) noise, 9) public services, 10) transportation and traffic, and 11) utilities and service systems. It also identified significant and unavoidable impacts to global climate change. The final certified FCI SEIR is available online at the County's website at <https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/advance/FCI/fcifinalseir.html>

The components of the ACPU are still being developed. However, development of the ACPU will be guided by and must remain consistent with the goals, policies, and planning concepts identified in the County General Plan and other relevant County plans and programs.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 allows a streamlined environmental review process for projects that are consistent with the densities established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified. The ACPU would update and refine the use of streamlining under CEQA Guidelines 15183 specific to the Alpine CPA.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The Alpine CPA is bordered by the Central Mountain Subregional Plan area to the north and east, the Jamul-Dulzura CPA to the south, and the Lakeside and Crest-Dehesa-Harbison Canyon-Granite Hills CPAs to the west. The CPA includes the suburban neighborhood of Glen Oaks in the western portion, the Viejas and the El Cajon Mountains in the northern portion, and Cleveland National Forest in the east. The terrain ranges from approximately 1,500 feet in the vegetated drainages to more than 4,100 feet in the semi-arid hilly terrain of the Viejas and El Cajon Mountains.

The town of Alpine is in the north-central portion of the CPA and is the most densely populated community within the planning area. Local development on both sides of I-8 consists primarily of residential/rural-residential, commercial, industrial, and mixed uses. The planning area also includes the communities of Peutz Valley, Japatul Valley, Hidden Glen, Dunbar Lane, and Galloway Valley. Development within these communities consists of rural-residential and light agricultural uses. The Viejas Indian Reservation and Capitan Grande Reservation are also within the boundaries of the Alpine CPA; however, they are not within the County’s jurisdiction.

10. The ACPU would require a General Plan Amendment from the County of San Diego and other permits as described herein, or any other approvals necessary of desirable to implement the ACPU (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

Permit Type/Action	Agency
General Plan Amendment	County of San Diego
Rezone	County of San Diego

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

YES NO

Note: Conducting consultation early in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process allows tribal governments, public lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts on tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process (see Public Resources Code Section 21083.3.2). Information is also available from the Native American Heritage Commission’s Sacred Lands File, per Public Resources Code Section 5097.96, and the California Historical Resources Information System administered


by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code Section 21082.3(e) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: The environmental factors checked below could be affected by this project and involve at least one impact that would be a "potentially significant impact" or "less than significant with mitigation incorporated," as indicated by the checklists on the following pages.

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture and Forest Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Mandatory Findings of Significance
- Energy Use

DETERMINATION:

- On the basis of this Initial Study, Planning and Development Services finds that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- On the basis of this Initial Study, Planning and Development Services finds that, although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions to the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- On the basis of this Initial Study, Planning and Development Services finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and a SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.



 Signature
 Greg Kazmer

 Printed Name

8/29/18

 Date
 Land Use/Environmental Planner

 Title

I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

A vista is a view from a particular location or composite views along a roadway or trail. Scenic vistas often refer to views of natural lands but may also be compositions of natural and developed areas or even entirely developed and unnatural areas, such as a scenic vista of a rural town and surrounding agricultural lands. What is scenic to one person may not be scenic to another, so the assessment of what constitutes a scenic vista must consider the perceptions of a variety of viewer groups.

The items that can be seen within a vista are visual resources. Adverse impacts or individual visual resources or the addition of structures or developed areas may or may not adversely affect the vista. Determining the level of impact on a scenic vista requires analyzing the changes to the vista as a whole and also to individual visual resources.

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR concluded they could result in the obstruction, interruption, or detracting of a scenic vista as a result for future development activity. However, implementation of General Plan policies and mitigation measures, as well as compliance with the County's Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) and County Zoning Ordinance, resulted in a determination that direct and cumulative impacts on scenic vistas would be less than significant.

Certain areas in the County have been designated as Resource Conservation Areas (RCAs) for the purposes of informing future planning decisions. RCAs include, but are not limited to, areas of aesthetic quality, groundwater problem areas, coastal wetlands, native wildlife habitats, construction quality sand areas, littoral sand areas, astronomical dark skies areas, scenic geologic formations; and significant archaeological and historical sites. According to the GPU, the following RCAs within the Alpine CPA are considered valuable because of visual resources:

- **El Capital Reservoir and El Cajon Mountain.** El Cajon Mountain is valuable as a visual landmark and for wildlife habitat.
- **Viejas Mountain.** Viejas Mountain is a visual landmark and is valuable for its excellent example of undisturbed broad leaf and narrow leaf chaparral.
- **Sweetwater River Canyon and Adjacent Archaeological Resource Areas.** This canyon is valuable for its undisturbed habitats, including chaparral, virgin riparian woodland and oak woodland as well as a pristine perennial stream and aquatic ecosystems. It also offers a dramatic view that can be partially viewed at an Interstate 8 (I-8) roadside viewpoint.

- **Loveland Reservoir and Surrounding Visual Resources.** Loveland Reservoir serves as a rest stop for migratory waterfowl and its surrounding environs contain habitat used by the protected Golden eagle and other raptorial birds, as well as large mammals.
- **Horsethief Creek/Pine Valley Creek Region.** Portions of this isolated area are suitable habitat for several species of rare plants. It is also valued for its high visual resource and archaeological potential.
- **Gaskill Peak Region.** Habitats on this mountain are inhabited by large mammals and raptorial birds as well as plants. It is also valued as a visual resource.
- **Bells Mountain.** This is valued as a visual landmark and its high archaeological resource potential.

The proposed project will update the existing Alpine Community Plan with updated planning goals and policies that reflect the character of Alpine and can be used to guide future growth and development. The ACPU may include changes in land use in terms of intensity and coverage and new designations that better support the goals of mixed-use development and transit-oriented development. The project may also include the designation of additional scenic vistas to those detailed previously. The subsequent development activity implemented under the ACPU could result in the obstruction, interruption, or detracting of a scenic vista. Therefore, the proposed project could result in a potentially significant impact on scenic vistas. Further discussion in the EIR is warranted.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

The term "State Scenic Highway" refers to those highways that are officially designated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as scenic. Generally, the area defined within a State Scenic Highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The dimension of a scenic highway is usually identified by using a motorist's line of vision; however, a reasonable boundary is selected when the view extends to the distant horizon. The scenic highway corridor extends to the visual limits of the landscape abutting the scenic highway.

The County Scenic Highway System was originally intended to serve as a master plan for official State Scenic Highway designations. The County's Scenic Highway System Priority List serves as the basis for initiating specific corridor studies.

Criteria for establishing the County Scenic Highway System Priority List includes:

- Routes traversing and providing access to major recreation, scenic or historic resources;
- Routes traversing lands under the jurisdiction of public agencies;
- Routes supported by significant local community interest; and
- Routes offering unique opportunities for the protection and enhancement of scenic recreational and historical resources.

Projects meeting three or more of the above criteria are classified as first priority projects and are the highest priority for corridor studies. Routes meeting only two of the above criteria are classified as second priority projects. All other projects are classified as third priority. Only a handful of corridor studies have been initiated due to lack of funding and no routes have been officially designated as a County Scenic Highway. Currently, the list serves more as a source for identifying resources than as a way to implement the scenic highways program.

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development would result in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts related to scenic resources within a scenic highway. However, incorporation of General Plan policies and mitigation measures, as well as compliance with the County's RPO and County Zoning Ordinance, resulted in the determination that direct and cumulative impacts on scenic vistas would be less than significant.

No designated State Scenic Highways are located within the Alpine CPA or the vicinity. One eligible State Scenic Highway, I-8, is within the Alpine CPA, and includes views of Viejas Mountain, El Capitan Reservoir, and Sweetwater River (County 2016a). The General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element identifies roads within the unincorporated county that are part of the County Scenic Highway System Priority List. These roads include I-8 from the El Cajon city limits to the Imperial county line, Japatul Road from Lyons Valley Road to I-8, Honey Springs Road from State Route 94 to Lyons Valley Road, Dehesa Road from El Cajon city limits to Tavern Road, and Mountain View Road from La Cresta Boulevard to Harbison Canyon Road. The Alpine Community Plan identifies three scenic view corridors from I-8: 1) views toward El Capitan Reservoir, 2) east and west views of Viejas Mountain, and 3) south views along Sweetwater River.

Implementation of the ACPU could increase density that would in turn have the potential to impact scenic resources through the removal or substantial adverse change of features that contribute to the valued visual character or image of the community, State Scenic Highway, or localized area. Therefore, the impact on designated scenic highways and, more generally, scenic resources could be significant. Further discussion in the EIR is warranted.

- c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR concluded that future development would result in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts related to changes to the existing visual character or quality of the community. General Plan policies and mitigation measures were implemented to reduce impacts on visual character and quality but not to a level below significant. Impacts were determined to be significant and unavoidable.

Under the GPU, general commercial use was planned for the existing town center, which is surrounded by village and semi-rural residential areas, primarily in the center of the CPA along I-8. Moving from the town center are residential areas that transition from semi-rural to rural to provide a buffer between the open space and proposed development. The GPU intensified development allowances within the town center.

The GPU PEIR characterized Alpine as a rural community, characterized by low-density residential estates and a well-developed town center area with commercial and industrial uses as well as higher-density residential uses. The town center has a rustic village character, which is ensured by the existing design guidelines. The more rural estate properties, with 2-acre lot sizes (minimum), are separated from the town center by a buffer with 1-acre residential lots (minimum). These land uses influence the rural characteristics and visual quality of the community. The GPU PEIR also stated that the visual quality of the landscape is important to the community, as is the protection of scenic ridgelines from excessive grading.

Implementation of the proposed project may result in changes with respect to land use designations and future development, which could alter the existing visual character or quality of the Alpine CPA. Therefore, impacts on visual quality could be potentially significant. Further analysis in the EIR is therefore warranted.

- d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development could result in increased light and glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views. General Plan policies and mitigation measures were implemented to

reduce direct and cumulative impacts related to nighttime lighting but not to a level below significant. Impacts were determined to be significant and unavoidable.

The County's Light Pollution Code (LPC), or the Dark Sky Ordinance, was adopted "to minimize light pollution for the enjoyment and use of property and the night environment by the citizens of San Diego County and to protect the Palomar and Mount Laguna observatories from the effects of light pollution that have a detrimental effect on astronomical research by restricting the permitted use of outdoor light fixtures on private property" (Section 59.101). The LPC regulates applicants for any permit required by the County for work involving outdoor light fixtures, unless exempt. The LPC designates all areas within a 15-mile radius of each observatory as Zone A, with all other areas designated as Zone B. Zone A has more stringent lighting restrictions due to its proximity to the observatories, including limits on decorative lighting.

According to the GPU EIR (see Figure 2.1-8), the eastern portion of the Alpine CPA is within Zone A, which is within 15 miles of the Mount Laguna Observatory. The dark night sky in the Alpine CPA is considered an important visual characteristic. Subsequent projects implemented in accordance with the ACPU could result in new sources of light or glare in the CPA. Therefore, impacts related to light and glare could be significant. Further discussion in the EIR is warranted.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES – Would the project:

- a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Important Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development could result in direct and cumulative impacts from the conversion of agricultural uses. General Plan policies and mitigation measures were implemented to reduce direct and cumulative impacts related to the conversion of agricultural uses but not to a level below significant. Impacts were determined to be significant and unavoidable.

The GPU EIR separated agricultural resources into two commodity categories: grazing lands or croplands. The grazing lands category includes two agricultural land use types: grazing lands and field crops. The croplands category includes three agricultural land use types: intensive agriculture, orchards and vineyards, and truck crops. The Alpine CPA contains 4,063 acres of grazing lands and 68 acres of cropland (GPU EIR Table 2.2-3).

The County has numerous programs and ordinances related to the preservation of existing farmland, which will be discussed in the CPU and analyzed within the EIR. As the land use designations associated with the CPU are not fully developed at this time, the project could include the conversion of designated farmland to another use. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant and further analysis is required.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The 2011 GPU PEIR determined that future development could result in direct conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use or Williamson Act contract land. However, General Plan policies and mitigation measures were implemented to reduce land use conflicts with agricultural uses to a less-than-significant level. Cumulative impacts were determined to be less than significant.

According to the GPU EIR, there are 68,136 acres that have an agricultural zoning designation, of which 13,424 acres are designated for general agriculture. In addition, 13,417 acres are designated as agricultural preserves, while 1,428 acres have Williamson Act contracts. As previously mentioned under the response to II(a), the land use designations associated with the CPU are not fully developed at this time. Therefore, the proposed project could conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use and Williamson Act contract lands. Impacts on existing zoning for agricultural uses and Williamson Act contracts would be potentially significant and further discussion in the EIR is warranted.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: Since certification of the GPU PEIR, the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G Environmental Checklist Form regarding agricultural resources was expanded to include impacts on forestlands. Because the component was added to CEQA Appendix G after adoption of the GPU PEIR, potential impacts on forestry resources were not analyzed in the GPU PEIR. The FCI SEIR, however, analyzed potential impacts to forest land. It stated that because the County does not specifically identify any jurisdictional land as forest land through zoning, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land. It also did not identify impacts to timberland or timber production zones as no such lands exist within the County.

Public Resources Code Section 12220(g) defines forestland as land that can support a 10 percent native tree cover (any species) under natural conditions that allows for biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits. The County does not contain land that has been specifically designated for forestland, timberland, or timberland production; however, the site may contain vegetation communities that can support a native tree cover (any species) under natural conditions.

The U.S. Forest Service defines a forested area as “forestland” if it is at least 1 acre in size and at least 10 percent occupied by forest trees of any size or an area that formerly had such tree cover and is not currently developed for non-forest use. Non-forest uses may include cropland, pasturelands, residential areas, and other land uses. Forestland includes transition zones, which are those areas between heavily forested and non-forested lands that are at least 10 percent stocked with forest trees as well as forest areas adjacent to urban and built-up lands (County of San Diego 2016b).

Development on or near land that contains forestry resources could directly or indirectly result in the loss of forestland or the conversion of forestland to non-forest use. The county does not contain any zoning classifications for forestland, timberland or timberland production zones; however, Cleveland National Forest is adjacent to the Alpine CPA. As previously mentioned, the land use designations associated with the CPU are not fully developed at this time. Therefore, the ACPU’s potential to conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland or timberland, will be further analyzed within the EIR.

d) Result in the loss of forestland, conversion of forestland to non-forest use, or other changes in the existing environment that, because of their location or nature, could result in the conversion of forestland to non-forest use?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: Please see the response to II(c) above. To adequately analyze potential impacts associated with the direct and indirect conversion of forestland within the Alpine CPA, further discussion will be provided in the EIR.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment that, because of their location or nature, could result in the conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources to non-agricultural use?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: Please see responses II(a) through II(d). The land use designations associated with the ACPU are not fully developed at this time. Therefore,

the ACPU's potential to result in the conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources to non-agricultural use will be further analyzed within the EIR.

III. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

An air quality analysis will be conducted to analyze the project's consistency with all of the Appendix G and County thresholds for air quality, such as pollutant emissions and concentrations associated with future development under the ACPU. A brief discussion is provided below; however, it should be noted that this issue will be fully analyzed within the EIR.

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR resulted in a determination that the project direct and cumulative impacts associated with air quality plans would be less-than-significant.

The San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) is required, pursuant to the federal and state Clean Air Acts, to reduce emissions of criteria pollutants for which the county is in nonattainment status (i.e., ozone [O₃], particulate matter 10 microns in diameter or smaller [PM₁₀], and particulate matter 2.5 microns in diameter or smaller [PM_{2.5}]). The most recent SDAPCD air quality attainment plans are the 2016 RAQS as well as the 2012 ozone maintenance and 2016 attainment plans. The RAQS outlines SDAPCD's plans and control measures to attain the state air quality standards for ozone, while the relevant SIP documents, the 2012 maintenance plan and 2016 attainment plan, outline SDAPCD's plans and control measures for attaining federal air quality standards for ozone. Both the federal and state plans forecast future emissions and determine the strategies necessary to reduce stationary-source emissions through regulatory controls. These air quality plans include all emissions sources within the county, including, but not limited to, stationary sources and mobile sources.

The ACPU will update and refine the current plan's goals and policies to reflect the character of Alpine and guide growth and development. Future development within the Alpine CPA that exceeds the GPU (i.e., the level currently anticipated by the California Air Resources Board (ARB) and San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)) could lead to air quality emissions that were not accounted for in the applicable air quality plans. Therefore, the ACPU will be evaluated for consistency with the RAQS and SIP. At this stage of analysis, impacts would be potentially significant and this issue will be analyzed in the EIR.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR both determined that each project would result in a violation of an air quality standard and contribute to a significant cumulative impact. Implementation of General Plan policies and mitigation measures would reduce direct and cumulative impacts related to air quality violations but not to a level below significant. Impacts were determined to be significant and unavoidable.

The project entails an update to the existing Alpine Community Plan and, as such, would not directly result in construction activities or operational air quality emissions. However, future projects implemented as a result of the ACPU could indirectly contribute to a violation of an air quality standard or an existing or projected air quality violation. Therefore, impacts are potentially significant and this issue area will be further analyzed in the EIR.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment status under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including through the release of emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

San Diego County is presently in nonattainment status under the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) for O₃, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀ and in nonattainment status under the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for O₃. O₃ is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs), also referred to as reactive organic gases (ROGs), and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil), solvents, petroleum processing and storage, and pesticides. Sources of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} in both urban and rural areas include motor vehicles exhaust, wood-burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, dust from paved and unpaved road travel, and windblown dust from open lands.

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that they would result in a violation of an air quality standard and contribute to a significant cumulative impact. Implementation of General Plan policies and mitigation measures would reduce direct and cumulative impacts related to air quality violations but not to a less-than-significant level. Impacts were determined to be significant and unavoidable.

Although the proposed project would not directly result in any construction activities or operational air quality emissions, future projects implemented under the ACPU could result in emissions from their construction and operation. These potential indirect impacts of the ACPU could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria pollutants, including those for which the region is in nonattainment status. Further discussion will be provided in the EIR.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (preschool through 12th grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, day-care centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions who could be adversely affected by changes in air quality. The County also considers residences to be sensitive receptors because they may house children or the elderly.

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR concluded that the projects would expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of pollutants, resulting in significant project and cumulative impacts. Mitigation was implemented to reduce direct and cumulative impacts on sensitive receptors but not to a level below significant. Impacts were determined to be significant and unavoidable.

As previously described, an air quality analysis will be conducted to evaluate short-, medium-, and long-term pollutant emissions and concentrations associated with future development under the ACPU. The study will determine if the proposed project has the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Further discussion will be provided in the EIR.

e) Create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR concluded that they would comply with SDAPCD regulations that require odor sources to reduce impacts on nearby receptors and that impacts would be less than significant. In addition, cumulative impacts would be less than significant. According to ARB's *CEQA Air Quality and Land Use Handbook*, land uses associated with odor complaints typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting facilities, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding facilities. Although it is not expected that any of these types of facilities would be proposed under the ACPU, allowable land uses are still being developed. Therefore, to be conservative, impacts could be significant. This topic will be analyzed further in the EIR.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI EIR determined that direct, indirect, or cumulative potentially significant impacts would occur from the loss of special-status species. Implementation of proposed General Plan policies and mitigation, in addition to compliance with applicable regulations, would reduce impacts; however, impacts were determined to be significant and unavoidable.

According to the GPU PEIR (see Figure 2.4-1), the Alpine CPA contains coastal sage scrub, chaparral, grassland, and other woodland habitats that support sensitive or special-status species. The GPU PEIR (Table 2.4-1) anticipated that 5,975 acres of habitat could be impacted under buildout of the GPU. There are numerous federal, State and local regulations that protect sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).

The ACPU, which could increase buildout potential, would have the potential to increase the amount of habitat impacted and therefore could result in impacts on sensitive species. At this level of analysis, impacts would be potentially significant and further discussion in the EIR will be provided.

- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that direct, indirect, and/or cumulative impacts would affect riparian habitats and other sensitive natural communities. Implementation of proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts but impacts were significant and unavoidable.

The Alpine CPA contains riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities. The GPU PEIR (Table 2.4-3) anticipated that 454 acres of riparian habitat could be impacted

under buildout of the GPU. There are a number of federal, State, and local regulations in place to protect riparian habitat. The Clean Water Act (CWA) regulates certain impacts to federally protected wetlands as well as non-wetland waters of the U.S. The California Lake and Streambed Alteration Program (Section 1602 of the CDFG Code) requires written notification to CDFW prior to altering a riparian area supported by a lake, river, or stream. On the local level, the County's RPO restricts certain impacts to wetlands, wetland buffers, floodways, and floodplain fringe areas.

At this stage of analysis, future land uses under the ACPU have not been fully refined. Development associated with implementation of the ACPU could result in impacts on riparian or sensitive natural communities. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant and further discussion in the EIR is warranted.

- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal areas, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that a potentially significant direct impact on federally protected wetlands would occur. However, implementation of proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant.

The Alpine CPA contains wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the CWA. The GPU PEIR (Table 2.4-6) anticipated that 454 acres of riparian habitat could be impacted under buildout of the GPU. The CWA regulates certain impacts to federally protected wetlands as well as non-wetland waters of the U.S. At this stage of analysis, future land uses under the ACPU have not been fully refined. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant and further discussion in the EIR is warranted.

- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that significant direct and cumulative impacts on wildlife movement corridors would occur. Implementation of proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures, in addition to compliance with applicable regulations, would reduce impacts on wildlife corridors;

however, impacts would not be reduced to a level below significant. Impacts were determined to be significant and unavoidable.

As previously disclosed, the land use designations, policies, and design guidelines associated with the ACPU are being refined. If the ACPU allowed intensified development in the Alpine CPA, it could result in direct or indirect impacts on designated core habitat areas and linkages. According to the GPU EIR (Figure 2.4-2), there is one designated Habitat Linkage that runs through the western portion of the CPA.

Direct impacts on wildlife movement corridors generally occur from blockages or interference with the connectivity between blocks of habitat, a decrease in the width of a corridor or linkage that constrains movement, or the loss of visual continuity within a linkage or corridor. Nursery sites, which are located throughout the unincorporated county, include areas that provide the resources necessary for reproduction of a species, including foraging habitat, breeding habitat, and water sources. Implementation of the ACPU could result in impacts on wildlife movement corridors and the use of native wildlife nursery sites as a result of future projects that could be implemented consistent with the ACPU. Therefore, the proposed project could result in a potentially significant impact on wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites. Further discussion in the EIR is warranted.

- e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted habitat conservation plan; natural community conservation plan; other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan; or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Incorporated | | |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that no conflicts with any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan would occur. Additionally, no contribution to a significant cumulative impact on these plans or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources would occur.

Two natural resource plans have direct application to the treatment of biological resources within the Alpine CPA, the South County Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP) and the Draft East County MSCP. Other local ordinances, such as the RPO and the Biological Mitigation Ordinance (BMO), will also be analyzed within the EIR. As the ACPU is still being developed, impacts could be potentially significant. Further discussion in the EIR is warranted.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, as defined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that a potentially significant direct and cumulative impact on historical resources would occur. However, General Plan policies and mitigation measures were implemented to reduce potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts on historic resources to less-than-significant levels.

According to the GPU PEIR, the Alpine CPA contains one or more historical resources, including the Julian Eltinge Residence and the Alpine Woman's Club (see Table 2.5-2). Future development associated with implementation of the proposed project could cause a substantial change in the significance of a historical resource, per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. Therefore, impacts could be potentially significant. Further discussion in the EIR is warranted.

- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts on archaeological resources would occur. However, General Plan policies and mitigation measures reduced potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts on archaeological resources to less-than-significant levels.

The proposed ACPU could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, including destruction or disturbance of an important archaeological site or any portion of an important archaeological site that contains or has the potential to contain information important to history or prehistory. Future development associated with implementation of the proposed project could cause a substantial change in the significance of an archaeological resource, per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. Therefore, impacts could be potentially significant. Further discussion in the EIR is warranted.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic site?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The 2011 PEIR determined that the GPU would result in a potentially significant direct and cumulative impact on paleontological resources. However, General Plan policies and mitigation measures would reduce potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts to less-than-significant levels.

The Alpine CPA is located within the Peninsular Ranges Region, which covers most of San Diego County. The Peninsular Ranges Region is primarily underlain by plutonic igneous rocks that formed from the cooling of molten magmas deep within the earth's crust. Known fossil occurrences in the Peninsular Ranges Region are extremely rare, but provide a glimpse of the potential for future discoveries of significant fossils.

According to the GPU EIR, the majority of the Alpine CPA contains geological formations that have zero potential to yield paleontological resources. The CPA also contains small portions that have low and marginal potential, as one as one small area in the central portion of the CPA that has moderate potential to contain paleontological resources. Because the CPA does include one area with moderate potential, impacts could be potentially significant. Further discussion in the EIR is warranted.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined a potentially significant direct and cumulative impact on human remains would occur. However, General Plan policies and mitigation measures would reduce potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts on human remains to less than significant.

Archaeological materials, including human burials, have been found throughout unincorporated San Diego County. Human burials have occurred outside of formal cemeteries, usually associated with archaeological resource sites and prehistoric peoples. Therefore, areas with known archaeological resources sites may have a higher risk for containing human remains. The location of most of these sites is kept confidential in order to protect these resources; however, resources throughout the County include remains left by local Native Americans and other early inhabitants. Due to the size of the study area, human remains and/or burials could be present in the CPA. Because the possibility exists for unknown human remains in the CPA, further discussion will be provided in the EIR.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

- i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less-than-Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR 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 CPA boundary. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less-than-Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR 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 would be susceptible to ground shaking produced by seismic events. Future development associated with the ACPU 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 Category 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.

iii. Seismically related ground failure, including liquefaction?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less-than-Significant Impact: The 2011 PEIR 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 contains approximately 490 acres of potential liquefaction areas, according to the GPU PEIR. 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 Alpine CPA is in a Potential Liquefaction Area, as identified in the *County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards* (County 2007). Future development associated with the ACPU 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 liquefaction.

iv. Landslides?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less-than-Significant Impact: The 2011 PEIR 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.

The Alpine CPA is not within a Landslide Susceptibility Area, as identified in the *County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards* (County 2007). The development of Landslide Susceptibility Areas is based on the landslide risk profiles included in the *San Diego County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan* (Office of Emergency Services 2010). Landslide risk areas are defined by data pertaining to the steepness of slopes (greater than 25 percent), soil series (from SANDAG, based on the U.S. Geological Survey 1970s series), soil-slip susceptibility (from USGS), and the Landslide Hazard Zone Maps (limited to western portion of the county) developed by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology.

The Alpine CPA contains gabbroic soils, which are slide prone, on slopes that are steeper than 15 percent. 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, as well as compliance with building code requirements, would result in less-than-significant impacts related to seismic ground shaking.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR 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 are not implemented. The ACPU 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 ACPU could result in substantial soil erosion if adequate best management practices are not implemented.

However, all construction activities occurring under the proposed ACPU 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, an application of surfactants, shrouding, control of vehicle speeds, paving in access areas, or other measures to reduce erosion from wind. Construction occurring under the ACPU would also be required to comply with the NPDES permit program, which requires stormwater pollution prevention plans (SWPPPs) to be prepared and best management practices (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). Therefore, compliance with all applicable regulations, including the CBC, NPDES, and County Grading Ordinance, would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

- c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Less-than-Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR concluded that they could result in hazards associated with on- or off-site landslides, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. However, it was 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 which reduced 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 GPU 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 ACPU could be located on soil that is unstable, or could become unstable, leading to lateral spreading, subsidence, or collapse; the ACPU 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 ACPU is not anticipated to result in a potentially significant impact resulting from 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.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less-than-Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR 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 GPU would not contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact associated with soil stability.

Expansive soils, as defined within Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), are found within the Alpine CPA. The ACPU could update and refine current goals and policies to reflect the character of Alpine and guide growth and development. Future development associated with the ACPU 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 California Building Code. Compliance with such regulations would reduce potentially significant impacts to below a level of significance.

e) Have soils that would be incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less-than-Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR 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 GPU 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 land owner must comply with RWQCB siting standards. Individual development projects implemented under the ACPU 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 On-site Wastewater Treatment Systems* 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.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project

- a) Generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

The State of California has developed guidelines to address the significance of climate change impacts, based on Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, which contain two significance criteria for evaluating the GHG emissions of a project.

A project would have a significant environmental impact if it would:

Generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.

Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gases.

The two criteria were intended to satisfy the legislative directive in Public Resources Code Section 21083.05. Therefore, the analysis contained herein relies on Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, the threshold of significance for evaluating the environmental effects of GHG emissions. State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4 states that "the determination of the significance of greenhouse gas emissions calls for careful judgment by the lead agency, consistent with the provisions in Section 15064. A lead agency should make a good-faith effort, based to the extent possible on scientific and factual data, to describe, calculate, or estimate the amount of greenhouse gas emissions resulting from a project." Section 15064.4(b) further states that a lead agency should consider the following non-exclusive factors when assessing the significance of GHG emissions:

1. The extent to which the project may increase or reduce GHG emissions compared with the existing environmental setting;
2. The extent to which project emissions exceed a threshold of significance that the lead agency applies to the project; and
3. The extent to which the project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement statewide, regional, or local plans for the reduction or mitigation of GHG emissions.

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(h)(1) states that “the lead agency shall consider whether the cumulative impact is significant and whether the effects of the project are cumulatively considerable.” A cumulative impact may be significant when the project’s incremental effect, though individually limited, is cumulatively considerable.

As described further below, the County has adopted a Climate Action Plan (CAP) and therefore uses criteria number 3 above to evaluate the significance of GHG emissions. Compliance with the CAP, a qualified GHG reduction plan, is the only significance threshold.

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR concluded that the GPU would result in a potentially significant direct and cumulative impact related to compliance with Assembly Bill 32. However, incorporation of General Plan policies and mitigation measures would reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels. One of the mitigation measures identified in the GPU PEIR called for the preparation of a Climate Change Action Plan designed to reach specified GHG reduction targets from community and local government operations, modifications to the Guidelines to provide guidance on the evaluation of GHG impacts and determine a project’s consistency with the CAP, and adoption of a GHG Threshold to reduce GHG emissions. In June 2012, the County adopted the 2012 CAP and an Addendum to the 2011 GPU PEIR. In a ruling issued on October 29, 2014 (*Sierra Club v. County of San Diego*, 231 Cal. App. 4th 1152 [2014]), the Fourth District Court of Appeal held that the 2012 CAP did not meet the description set forth in the adopted mitigation measure (2011 GPU PEIR Mitigation Measure CC-1.2) and that a supplemental EIR was needed for the plan.

On February 14, 2018, the Board of Supervisors adopted a new CAP and Draft SEIR. The CAP and the targets and strategies identified were based upon updated statewide GHG reduction targets, and as such necessitate changes to Goal COS-20 and Policy COS-20.1 of the 2011 GPU and mitigation adopted in the 2011 GPU PEIR, Mitigation Measures (MM) CC-1.2, CC-1.7, and CC-1.8. The changes to the goal and policy required a GPA to the 2011 GPU, which was adopted as part of the CAP project.

The project entails an update to the existing Alpine Community Plan and, as such, would not directly result in any construction- or operation-related GHG emissions. However, the ACPU could increase land use density that exceeds what was assumed in the CAP. Consequently, the project has the potential to indirectly have a significant impact on the

environment. The impact is potentially significant. This issue area will be discussed in the EIR.

- b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of GHGs?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less-than-Significant Impact
 Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: Please see the response to VII(a) above. The development of land uses associated with implementation of the proposed ACPU could increase density, which could in turn increase projected GHG emissions in the County and within the ACPU area above emissions levels projected in the CAP. Therefore, the proposed project could result in a potentially significant impact associated with applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for reducing emissions of GHGs. This issue will be analyzed in the EIR.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

- a) 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less-than-Significant Impact
 Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development would increase the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials. However, compliance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations related to the transport, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials would minimize the potential for a release to occur and provide planning mechanisms for prompt and effective cleanup if an accidental release should occur. Both of the EIRs concluded that compliance with existing regulations, as well as implementation of General Plan policies, would ensure that impacts related to an accidental hazardous materials release would be less than significant.

The GPU EIR identified five registered “active” hazardous waste transporters in the unincorporated County. According to the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC 2018), there is one registered transporter in the Alpine CPA: EFR Environmental Services, which provides hazardous spill response and other related services.

The project is an update to the existing Alpine Community Plan. Although the ACPU would not result in a direct significant hazard, an indirect effect of implementation could be future

development, which could be planned and developed in accordance with the policies contained in the ACPU. Although hazardous materials can be found in all land use designations, those that are more likely to regularly use hazardous materials include limited impact industrial, medium impact industrial, high impact industrial, general commercial and rural commercial.

As land use designations are currently under refinement, there is the potential that land uses proscribed under the ACPU could result in a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or a related accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances. Therefore, further discussion is warranted in the EIR.

b) Emit hazardous emissions or involve handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR determined that implementation of the GPU would include land uses with high potential for hazardous materials to be located within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school. However, compliance with federal and state regulations pertaining to hazardous wastes was determined to ensure that direct and cumulative risks associated with schools would be less than significant.

According to the GPU EIR (Table 2.7-10), there are no schools within 0.25 mile of hazardous material site listed under Government Code 65962.5. 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 schools and day care 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 the ACPU could result in the use, storage, or transport of hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of a school. Implementation of the ACPU would result in future development, which would be planned and developed in accordance with the policies contained in the ACPU. This future development could involve handling acutely hazardous materials or emit hazardous emissions near a school. Therefore, further discussion is warranted in the EIR.

c) Be located on 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?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: Under the GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR, land uses and development had the potential to be located on sites such as burn dumps; 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. The EIRs concluded that they would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact.

There are known hazardous materials sites, including burn dumps, within the Alpine CPA (County 2011b; Department of Toxic Substance Control 2018; State Water Resources Control Board 2018). An indirect effect of implementation of the ACPU would be future development, which would be planned and developed in accordance with the policies contained in the ACPU. This anticipated future development could be located within or near existing hazardous material sites; however, the proposed project would be unlikely to exacerbate conditions at existing hazardous sites. Therefore, further discussion is warranted in the EIR.

- d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

No Impact: The 2011 PEIR 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.

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.

- e) For a project in the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that land use designations that would allow development within 2 miles of a private airstrip could result. However, incorporation of General Plan policies and mitigation measures, as well as compliance with applicable regulations, such as the Federal Aviation Administration regulations, the Department of Defense Air Installations Compatible Use Zones, and the State Aeronautics Act, would reduce impacts related to private airstrip hazards to a level below significant. It was also concluded that they would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact with respect to safety hazards for people residing or working in the vicinity of a private airstrip.

According to the GPU EIR, there are two private airstrips within the Alpine CPA: On the Rocks (6 acres) and an unnamed airstrip owned by the U.S. Forest Service (2 acres). The proposed project is an update to the existing Alpine Community Plan. Although the ACPU would not create a direct significant hazard, the potential for indirect effects from implementation of the ACPU will be analyzed in the EIR.

- f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that development in areas not previously accounted for would increase, resulting in potentially significant impacts related to emergency response and evacuation plans. However, incorporation of General Plan policies and mitigation measures, as well as compliance with applicable regulations, such as the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan and the Dam Evacuation Plan, would reduce impacts to a level below significant. In addition, implementation of the GPU would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact.

Applicable emergency response plan requirements are set forth by the County of San Diego Office of Emergency Services and other local police and fire departments within or adjacent to the Alpine CPA through the Operational Area Emergency Plan, a comprehensive emergency plan that defines responsibilities, establishes an emergency organization, defines lines of communications, and integrates with the statewide Standardized Emergency Management System. The Operational Area Emergency Plan provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The

Office of Emergency Services coordinates emergency response at the local level in the event of a disaster, including fires. Emergency response coordination is generally facilitated by the Operational Area Emergency Operations Center as well as local responding agencies. The County of San Diego has a number of emergency response or emergency evacuation plans, which may be applicable to the Alpine CPA. The Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan includes an overview of the risk assessment process and the hazards present in the jurisdiction, hazard profiles, and vulnerability assessments.

The project would not interfere with the San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan because of the location of the project and the specific requirements of the plan, the Oil Spill Contingency Element because the project would not be located along the Coastal Zone or a coastline, or the Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan because the project would not alter major water or energy supply infrastructure, such as the California Aqueduct. The Alpine CPA lies within the Cuyamaca, El Capitan, Lake Loveland, and Palo Verde mapped dam inundation areas (County 2011b). Future projects implemented in accordance with the ACPU could conflict with adopted emergency response or evacuation plans. Therefore, further discussion is warranted in the EIR.

- g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including in areas where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development would result in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts related to exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. With the incorporation of General Plan policies and mitigation measures, as well as compliance with applicable regulations, potential impacts related to wildland fires were reduced; however, impacts would not be reduced to a level below significant. It was concluded that Direct and cumulative impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Although fires can occur anywhere in the County, fires that begin in Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) areas pose a serious threat to personal safety and structures due to rapid spread and the extreme heat that these fires often generate. The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) has mapped areas with significant fire hazards in the county through its Fire and Resource Assessment Program (FRAP). These maps place areas of the county into different Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZs) according to fuel, terrain, weather, and other relevant factors. Federal Responsibility Areas (FRAs) are areas where the U.S. Forest Service is responsible for wildfire protection. State Responsibility Areas (SRAs) are areas where CAL FIRE is responsible for wildfire

protection. The FHSZs are divided into three levels of fire hazard severity: moderate, high, and very high.

According to the GPU EIR (Table 2.7-7), 60,069 acres of the Alpine CPA (approximately 88 percent) are within WUI areas. Future development resulting from implementation of the ACPU could be located within these areas. Impacts would be considered potentially significant and further discussion will be provided in the EIR.

h) Propose a use or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future residents' exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats, or flies, that are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less-than-Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR 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 two-fold. 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 located near a substantial human population, a potentially adverse environmental effect could occur.

Implementation of the ACPU 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 proposed project would be required to comply with existing regulations and processes associated with vector control. Therefore, the ACPU 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.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development would result in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts related to wastewater discharge requirements. The 2011 PEIR concluded that compliance with existing County policies and regulations, as well as implementation of General Plan policies and mitigation measures, would reduce impacts related to wastewater discharge requirements but not to a level below significant. Impacts were determined to be significant and unavoidable.

The proposed project entails an update to the existing Alpine Community Plan. It would not directly result in construction or operational activities that would violate water quality standards. However, future projects implemented subsequent to the ACPU could result in water quality violations. This could be considered an indirect effect of the proposed project. Therefore, further discussion is warranted in the EIR.

b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development would contribute additional point- and non-point-source pollutants within Watershed Management Areas that are in violation of water quality requirements, resulting in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts on already-impaired water bodies. Implementation of the GPU policies and mitigation measures, in addition to compliance with applicable regulations, would reduce impacts, but not to a level below significant. Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

The Alpine CPA lies within the San Diego River, San Diego Bay, and Tijuana River Watershed Management Areas. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, these watersheds are impaired by a variety of pollutants. Future development associated with the proposed project could result in an increase in pollutants for which a body of water is already impaired. Further discussion is required in the EIR.

- c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development would result in potentially significant direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts related to surface and groundwater quality standards and requirements. Specifically, the Alpine CPA includes mapped nitrate problem areas along I-8. The PEIR concluded that compliance with existing County policies and regulations, as well as implementation of General Plan policies and mitigation measures, would reduce impacts related to groundwater quality standards and requirements but not to a level below significant. Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

The RWQCB has designated water quality objectives for waters of the San Diego region to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit. The Alpine CPA lies within the San Diego River, San Diego Bay, and Tijuana River Watershed Management Areas. The proposed project could contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses. Further discussion is required in the EIR.

- d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table (e.g., the production rate of existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development would result in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts related to groundwater supply and recharge. The EIRs concluded that compliance with existing County policies and regulations, as well as implementation of General Plan policies and mitigation measures, would reduce impacts related to groundwater supply and recharge but not to a level below significant. Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

The proposed project entails an update to the existing Alpine Community Plan, which would not directly deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table. However, projects implemented subsequent to and consistent with the ACPU could deplete or interfere with groundwater recharge. This

could be considered a potentially significant indirect effect of the proposed project. Therefore, further discussion is warranted in the EIR.

- e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development would result in the alternation of drainage patterns, resulting in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts related to erosion or siltation. Implementation of GPU policies and mitigation measures, in addition to compliance with applicable regulations, would reduce impacts related to erosion or siltation to a level below significant.

The proposed project entails an update to the existing Alpine Community Plan, which would not directly result in construction or operational activities that could substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that could result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. However, projects implemented subsequent to the ACPU could alter existing drainage patterns, resulting in substantial erosion or siltation. This could be considered a potentially significant indirect effect of the proposed project. Therefore, further discussion is warranted in the EIR.

- f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development would convert permeable surfaces to impermeable surfaces and result in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts related to flooding on- or off-site. However, implementation of the GPU policies and mitigation measures, in addition to compliance with applicable regulations, would reduce the direct and cumulative impacts to a level below significant.

The proposed project entails an update to the existing Alpine Community Plan, which would not directly result in construction or operational activities that could substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner

that could result in flooding on- or off-site. However, projects implemented subsequent to the ACPU could alter existing drainage patterns, potentially increasing the rate or amount of surface runoff. This could be considered a potentially significant indirect effect of the proposed project. Therefore, further discussion is warranted in the EIR.

g) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development would exceed the capacity of existing stormwater drainage facilities, resulting in potentially significant impacts. However, implementation of the GPU policies and mitigation measures, in addition to compliance with applicable regulations, would reduce the impacts to a level below significant. The 2011 PEIR concluded that the GPU would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact associated with the capacity of stormwater systems with implementation of mitigation measures.

The proposed project entails an update to the existing Alpine Community Plan, which would not directly result in construction or operational activities that would create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. However, projects implemented subsequent to the ACPU could create or contribute to runoff water. This could be considered an indirect effect of the proposed project. Therefore, further discussion is warranted in the EIR.

h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development would convert permeable surfaces to impermeable and result in potentially significant impacts related to additional sources of polluted runoff. However, implementation of the GPU policies and mitigation measures, in addition to compliance with applicable regulations, would reduce the direct and cumulative impacts to a level below significant. The 2011 PEIR concluded that the GPU would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact associated with substantial sources of polluted runoff.

The proposed project entails an update to the existing Alpine Community Plan, which would not directly provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. However, future projects implemented subsequent to the ACPU could create or contribute to polluted runoff. Therefore, further discussion is warranted in the EIR.

- i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary Map or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County floodplain maps?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less-than-Significant Impact
 Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development would result in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts associated with land designated for residential use within a 100-year floodplain. However, implementation of the GPU policies and mitigation measures, in addition to compliance with applicable regulations, would reduce the direct and cumulative impacts to a level below significant.

According to the GPU PEIR (Table 2.8-5), there are 155 acres within the Alpine CPA that are located within the 100-year floodplain and the existing uses are residential. The proposed project entails an update to the Alpine Community Plan, which would not directly result in the construction of housing. However, future projects implemented subsequent to the ACPU could place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary Map or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County floodplain maps, which could exacerbate flooding conditions. Therefore, further discussion is warranted in the EIR.

- j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect floodflows?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less-than-Significant Impact
 Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development would result in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts associated with impeding or redirecting floodflows. However, implementation of the GPU policies and mitigation measures, in addition to compliance with applicable regulations, reduced the impacts to a level below significant.

As described in the response above, portions of the Alpine CPA are within a 100-year flood hazard area. The project entails an update to the existing Alpine Community Plan and, as such, would not directly result in any construction of structures that would impede or redirect floodflows. However, subsequent projects implemented under the ACPU could be located within the 100-year floodplain. Therefore, this impact is potentially significant. This issue will be analyzed in the EIR.

k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development associated with the GPU would result in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts related to flooding. However, implementation of the GPU policies and mitigation measures, in addition to compliance with applicable regulations, would reduce the direct and cumulative impacts to a level below significant.

As previously detailed, there are portions of the Alpine CPA that are located within the 100-year flood hazard areas; and other areas could also be subject to flooding. As land uses are still being refined, there is the potential that projects could expose structures to flooding. Further discussion will be provided in the EIR.

l) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development would result in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts related to inundation risks associated with dam failure. However, implementation of the GPU policies and mitigation measures, in addition to compliance with applicable regulations, would reduce the impacts to a level below significant.

The Alpine CPA lies within the Cuyamaca, El Capitan, Lake Loveland, and Palo Verde mapped dam inundation areas (County 2011b). Impacts associated with implementation of the ACPU could expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. Further discussion will be provided in the EIR.

m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development would not expose people or structures to hazards associated with inundation by seiche or tsunami; however, future development would result in potentially

significant direct and cumulative impacts related to inundation risks associated with a mudflow. Implementation of the GPU policies and mitigation measures, in addition to compliance with applicable regulations, would reduce direct and cumulative impacts from mudflows to a level below significant.

The proposed project entails a comprehensive update to the existing Alpine Community Plan. It would not directly result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Because of the inland location of the Alpine CPA, implementation of the proposed ACPU would not expose people or structures to hazards associated with inundation by tsunami. However, projects implemented subsequent to, and consistent with, the ACPU could result in significant impacts from seiche and mudflows. Further discussion is warranted in the EIR.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development would result in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts associated with physically dividing an established community. However, implementation of the GPU policies and mitigation measures would reduce the direct and cumulative impacts to a level below significant.

The proposed project entails an update to the existing Alpine Community Plan. The ACPU will include policies that would guide development within the community. However, further discussion is needed in the EIR to determine if the project could physically divide an established community.

b) 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?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development would not conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations or with any applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans. Therefore, a potentially significant impact would not occur. In addition, they would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact associated with land use plans, policies, or regulations.

The County General Plan is the guiding land use policy document for all areas under the County's jurisdiction. The ACPU is being developed to be consistent with the General Plan. Further discussion is needed to determine if reasonably foreseeable future projects, consistent with the ACPU, could result in inconsistencies with applicable regulations, which could then lead to a conflict with applicable land use plans. This issue will be further analyzed in the EIR.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development would result in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts associated with the loss of availability of mineral resources. Implementation of GPU policies and mitigation measures would reduce direct and cumulative impacts related to the loss of availability of mineral resources but not to a level below significant. Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

In 1975, SMARA required the classification of land into Mineral Resource Zones (MRZs), according to the land's known or inferred mineral resource potential. The process was based solely on geology, without regard to existing land use or land ownership. The primary goal of classification is to ensure that the mineral potential of land is recognized by local government decision-makers and considered before they make land-use decisions that could preclude mining. The intent was that when resources were identified and the scarcity was verified, those lands would be protected for future extraction. However, many local governments must choose between mining and its most common competing land use, residential development.

According to the GPU EIR (Figure 2.10-1), the Alpine CPA is primarily underlain by cretaceous crystalline rocks and upper Jurassic metavolcanics, and also contains a small portion of quaternary alluvium and tertiary sedimentary deposits. The GPU PEIR states that Jurassic metavolcanic rock can be primarily quarried for coarse aggregates that are needed for concrete, riprap (broken rock) for breakwaters and bank protection, and decorative and dimension stone. In addition, a small western portion of the Alpine CPA was included within the SMARA classifications. This was classified as an area of "Potential Mineral Resource Significance" (MRZ-3) (California Department of Conservation 1997).

As previously discussed, the land uses associated with the proposed CPU are being refined. Therefore, at this level of analysis, it is assumed that the proposed project could result in the loss of known mineral resources. Further discussion is warranted in the EIR.

- b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site, as delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development would result in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts associated with the loss of availability of locally important mineral resource recovery sites. Implementation of GPU policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts related to the loss of mineral resource recovery sites but not to a level below significant. Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

There are active mining operations within the Alpine CPA that have been in operation since the approval of the 2011 GPU PEIR. Although it is not likely that the proposed land uses under the CPU would conflict with existing mining operations, there is the possibility that land uses could result in the loss of mineral resources. Impacts are potentially significant and further discussion is warranted in the EIR.

XII. NOISE – Would the project:

- a) Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

The County of San Diego General Plan Noise Element, Tables N-1 and N-2, concerns noise sensitive areas and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose a noise sensitive area to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 A-weighted decibels (dBA). Moreover, if a project would be in excess of 60 dBA CNEL, modifications must be made to project to reduce noise levels. Noise sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries, or similar facilities, as mentioned in Tables N-1 and N-2 of the General Plan Noise Element (County 2011a).

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development could result in potentially significant impacts related to generating noise levels in excess of standards established. It was also concluded that each would contribute to a significant cumulative impact associated with excessive noise levels.

However, implementation of General Plan policies and mitigation measures were determined to reduce direct and cumulative impacts related to excessive noise levels to a level below significant.

The proposed project entails an update to the existing Alpine Community Plan. It would not directly result in construction or operational activities that would expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies. However, projects implemented subsequent to the ACPU could create noise levels in excess of the established standards. This could be considered a potentially significant impact. Therefore, further discussion is warranted in the EIR.

b) Expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development could result in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts from the generation from excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise. However, implementation of General Plan policies and mitigation measures were determined to reduce direct and cumulative impacts related to excessive noise levels to a level below significant.

The proposed project entails an update to the existing Alpine Community Plan. It would not directly result in construction or operational activities that would expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels. However, projects implemented subsequent to the ACPU could create excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels. This could be considered a potentially significant impact. Therefore, further discussion is warranted in the EIR.

c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity, above levels existing without the project?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development could result in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts related to a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels. However, implementation of General Plan policies and mitigation measures were determined to reduce direct impacts related to permanent increases in ambient noise levels to a level below significant.

As described above, the proposed project could indirectly increase ambient noise levels during construction and operation of future projects associated with implementation of the ACPU. Therefore, this issue will be evaluated in the EIR.

d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity, above levels existing without the project?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development could result in potentially significant impacts related to a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels. However, implementation of General Plan policies and mitigation measures were determined to reduce direct impacts related to temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels to a level below significant. It was also concluded that they would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact associated with a temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels.

As described above, the proposed project could indirectly increase ambient noise levels during construction and operation of future projects associated with implementation of the ACPU. Therefore, this issue will be evaluated in the EIR.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

f) For a project in the vicinity of a private airstrip, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development could result in potentially significant impacts associated with exposing people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels from a private airstrip. It was also concluded that the GPU could contribute to a significant cumulative impact associated with exposing people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels from a private airstrip. However, implementation of General Plan policies and mitigation measures, in addition to compliance with the 1990 California Airport Noise Standards and applicable Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans, were determined to reduce direct and cumulative impacts related to excessive noise levels from a private airstrip to a level below significant.

A private airstrip is located within the Alpine CPA. Therefore, impacts at this level of analysis would be considered potentially significant and further discussion is warranted in the EIR.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

- a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through an extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development would not directly or indirectly induce unplanned population growth. It was also concluded that they would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact associated with population growth.

The proposed land uses associated with the ACPU are being refined. Therefore, the ACPU could induce growth by allowing for increased density in the Alpine CPA. The proposed project would also have the potential to indirectly induce growth because subsequent uses could require the extension of infrastructure to accommodate growth. Therefore, further discussion will be included in the EIR.

- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Less-than-Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development would not displace a substantial number of housing units. It was also

concluded that the GPU would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact associated with a displacement of housing.

The proposed project entails an update to the existing Alpine Community Plan. As previously discussed, the proposed land uses associated with the ACPU are being refined. However, the proposed ACPU would not result in the displacement of existing housing. Even if the proposed ACPU could possibly redesignate existing residential land uses as a non-residential use (which is not anticipated at this time), the project would not displace existing housing. The approval of a community plan would not result in the loss of housing. An additional action would be required prior to the removal of housing (i.e., an application would need to be submitted after CPU approval that proposes the removal of housing to a non-residential use). Nevertheless, as discussed above, it is not anticipated that the ACPU would redesignate residential uses to a non-residential use and will not result in the direct loss of existing housing. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Less-than-Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development would not displace a substantial number of people. It was also concluded that they would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact associated with a displacement of people.

Please see the response to XIII(b) above. The approval of a community plan would not result in the displacement of substantial numbers of people. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project:

a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, performance service ratios, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:

i. Fire protection?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development would result in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities. Implementation of GPU policies and mitigation measures would reduce direct and cumulative impacts related to fire protection services to a level below significant.

The Alpine CPA is served by the Alpine Fire Protection District (FPD). According to the GPU EIR (Table 2.13-2), the Alpine FPD served approximately 6,891 persons as of 2004. It was anticipated that at buildout of the GPU, the Alpine FPD would be serving 15,826 persons. Existing personnel and service information will be updated as part of the EIR. At this level of analysis, it is concluded that the ACPU could result in the need for new or physically altered fire facilities because it could allow for increased residential density above what was assumed in the GPU that could require additional firefighting personnel and facilities. Therefore, further discussion in the EIR is warranted.

i. Police protection?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development would result in potentially significant impacts associated with the need for new staffing and/or expanded police facilities to maintain acceptable response times for police protection services. However, it was determined that with the implementation of GPU policies and mitigation measures direct and cumulative impacts related to police protection services were reduced to a level below significant.

The San Diego County Sheriff's Department (SDSD) is the chief law enforcement agency in San Diego County. SDSD is the fourth largest Sheriff's Department in the U.S. It has a service area of approximately 4,200 square miles and serves a population of over 870,000 people. The Alpine CPA is primarily served by the SDSD Alpine Station, which covers the communities of Alpine, Crest, Dehesa, Harbison Canyon, Eastern Lakeside (Blossom Valley, Flinn Springs). It was estimated that the Alpine station served 9,704 persons as of 2004, and estimated it would serve 19,128 persons subsequent to GPU buildout. The ACPU could result in the need for new or physically altered police protection facilities because it could allow for new uses that would require additional law enforcement personnel and facilities. Therefore, further discussion in the EIR is warranted.

ii. Schools?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that residential land use designations implemented could result in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts associated with the need for new and/or expanded school facilities. Implementation of GPU policies and mitigation measures would reduce direct and cumulative impacts related to school services. Because of the County's limited authority over the construction and expansion of school facilities, it was determined that direct and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

The Alpine CPA is served by numerous school districts, including Alpine Union Elementary, Dehesa Elementary, Jamul/Dulzura Union Elementary, Cajon Valley Union Elementary, Ramona Unified, and Grossmont Union High (see Table 2.13-8 of the GPU EIR). The ACPU could result in the need for new or physically altered school facilities because it could allow for new uses that could increase student enrollment. Therefore, further discussion in the EIR is warranted.

iii. Parks

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The 2011 PEIR determined that the Alpine CPA is currently deficient with respect to park facilities. Future development implemented under the GPU would result in potentially significant impacts associated with parks. Implementation of GPU policies and mitigation measures would reduce direct and cumulative impacts related to parks to a level below significant. Parks and recreation are further discussed in Section XV below.

iv. Other public facilities?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that residential land use designations implemented could result in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts associated with the construction of new or expanded library facilities to accommodate new library users. Implementation of GPU policies and mitigation measures were determined to reduce direct and cumulative impacts related to library and other public services to a level below significant.

The Alpine Branch Library was constructed in 2015 and was the first library to achieve certification through the Zero Energy Program. It has a total square footage of 13,500. The GPU EIR assumed that the Alpine CPA would require a 7,486 square foot library based on 2006 population. Although it is not expected that the ACPU would increase residential density allowances that would increase the library facility requirements, the

land uses under the ACPU are under development. Therefore, the ACPU could result in indirect significant impacts on the environment related to the physical construction of new or expanded public facilities. Therefore, further discussion in the EIR is warranted.

XV. RECREATION – Would the project:

- a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that the Alpine CPA is currently deficient with respect to park facilities. With the implementation of GPU policies and mitigation measures, it has been determined that direct and cumulative impacts related to the deterioration of parks and recreational facilities would be reduced to a level below significant.

An increase in the use of existing parks and recreational facilities typically results from an increase in the number of housing units or residents in an area. The Alpine CPU could result in future development that would bring an increased number of residents to the area. These increases could have a potential impact on neighborhood parks and recreational facilities. As described in the GPU PEIR, the Alpine CPA lacks the local park and recreational acreage to adequately serve the community (County 2011b). The ACPU could result in indirect impacts on population growth, which could lead to greater use of the existing parks and recreational facilities as well as the need for future parks and recreational facilities. Therefore, impacts are potentially significant. Further discussion is warranted in the EIR.

- b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that the Alpine CPA is currently deficient with respect to park facilities. Future development implemented under the GPU would result in potentially significant impacts associated with the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. With the implementation of GPU policies and mitigation measures, it has been determined that direct and cumulative impacts related to the construction or expansion of recreational facilities would be reduced to a level below significant.

The ACPU may include new or expanded recreational facilities within the Alpine CPA indirectly through land use designations and policies. Therefore, impacts are potentially significant. Further discussion is warranted in the EIR.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC – Would the project:

- a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy for establishing measures related to the effectiveness and performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel, and relevant components of the circulation system, including, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

The County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Traffic and Transportation (Guidelines) establish measures related to the effectiveness and performance of the circulation system. These Guidelines incorporate standards from the County of San Diego Public Road Standards and Mobility Element, and the County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Program.

Potentially Significant: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development implemented under the GPU would result in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts on deficient roadway segments throughout the unincorporated county, including within the Alpine CPA. Implementation of the GPU policies and mitigation measures, in addition to compliance with applicable regulations, would reduce direct and cumulative impacts associated with traffic but not to a level below significant. Impacts were determined to remain significant and unavoidable.

The ACPU could indirectly increase vehicular traffic, which could conflict with local policies that measure the effectiveness of the circulation system. A transportation impact analysis (TIA) will be prepared for the proposed project. This issue will be further discussed in the EIR.

- b) Conflict with an applicable CMP, including, but not limited to, level-of-service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

No Impact: California State Proposition 111, passed by voters in 1990, established a requirement that urbanized areas prepare and regularly update a Congestion

Management Program (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. 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 23 CFR 450.320 to ensure the region's continued compliance with the federal congestion management process.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: The 2011 PEIR 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 entails 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 o airport; therefore, the project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns. No impact would occur.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that residential land use designations implemented could would result in the adoption of a Mobility Element network that would include existing roadways with horizontal and vertical curves that would be sharper than those allowed under existing standards, resulting in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts. Implementation of the GPU policies and mitigation measures, in addition to compliance with applicable regulations, would reduce direct and cumulative impacts associated with road safety but not to a level below significant. Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

The ACPU could indirectly increase vehicular traffic and substantially increase hazards because of a design feature. This issue will be further addressed in the TIA and EIR.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less-than-Significant Impact |
|--|---|

- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR would result in existing inadequate roadway widths, dead-end roads, and one-way roads, and gated communities continuing to occur in the unincorporated County, all of which have the potential to impair emergency access. However, incorporation of General Plan policies and mitigation measures, as well as compliance with applicable regulations, would mitigate impacts to a level below significant. It was also determined they would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact associated with emergency access.

As previously described, the land uses associated with the ACPU are being developed. Therefore, the ACPU has the potential to result in existing inadequate roadway widths, dead-end roads, and one-way roads, and gated communities. Therefore, this issue will be analyzed in the EIR.

- g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit or bicycle or pedestrian facilities or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less-than-Significant Impact
 Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development under the GPU would increase density and population, thereby increasing demand for alternative modes of transportation. Increased demand for alternative modes of transportation would require coordination between the County and the agencies responsible for public transportation planning, including SANDAG, Caltrans, transit agencies, and adjacent jurisdictions, resulting in a potentially significant impact. Implementation of General Plan policies and mitigation measures, as well as compliance with applicable regulations, would mitigate direct and cumulative impacts to a level below significant. The GPU would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact associated with emergency access.

The ACPU could indirectly increase vehicular traffic, which could conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit or bicycle or pedestrian facilities. Further discussion will be included in the EIR.

XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, or cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe and that is:

- i. 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

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: Since certification of the GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR, the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G Environmental Checklist Form was expanded to include impacts on tribal cultural resources. Because the component was added to CEQA Appendix G after adoption of these EIRs, potential impacts on tribal cultural resources were not analyzed.

A records search would be conducted for the proposed project at the South Coast Information Center to determine if tribal cultural resources that are listed, or eligible for listing, in the California Register of Historical Resources or a local register are present in the project area. The Native American Heritage Commission would be contacted to determine if sacred lands have been identified in the project area. Therefore, further discussion would be provided in the EIR.

- ii. 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 Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: Since certification of the 2011 GPU PEIR, the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G Environmental Checklist Form was expanded to include impacts on tribal cultural resources. Because the component was added to CEQA Appendix G after adoption of the 2011 GPU PEIR, potential impacts on tribal cultural resources were not analyzed in the 2011 PEIR.

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 (Assembly Bill 52), California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area can request notification regarding projects in their traditional cultural territory. Native American tribes that have requested project notification under Assembly Bill 52 have been contacted and notified of the project. The County has extended an invitation to consult under Assembly Bill 52 to the following tribes: Barona Band of Mission Indians, Campo Kumeyayy Nation, Iipay Nation of Santa Isabel, Janula Indian Village, Kwaaymii Band of Mission Indians, Sycuan Band of the Jueyaay Nation, and the Viejas Band of the Kumeyaay Indians. These tribes have not requested consultation at this time; however,

consultation will continue throughout the CEQA process. Because tribal cultural resource impacts could be identified within the Alpine CPA, further discussion will be provided in the EIR.

XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable RWQCB?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development would result in potentially significant impacts associated with wastewater treatment requirements. With the implementation of GPU policies and mitigation measures, in addition to compliance with applicable regulations, it was determined impacts related to wastewater treatment requirements would be reduced to a level below significant. The GPU would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact associated with emergency access.

Wastewater treatment for existing uses within the Alpine CPA is provided by several jurisdictions, including the Padre Dam Municipal Water District (PDMWD) and the Alpine Sanitation District. The ACPU may have the potential to increase density that may in turn increase wastewater treatment requirements. Therefore, impacts could be potentially significant. Further discussion will be provided in the EIR.

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development implemented under the GPU would increase demand for water and wastewater services, requiring the construction of new facilities and resulting in potentially significant impacts. With the implementation of GPU policies and mitigation measures, in addition to compliance with applicable regulations, it was determined that impacts related to new water and wastewater facilities would be reduced to a level below significant. The GPU would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact associated with emergency access.

Item XVIII.a, above, discusses wastewater service. Water service to existing uses within the study area is provided by the PDMWD. The ACPU may have the potential to increase density that may in turn result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment

facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, impacts could be potentially significant. Further discussion will be provided in the EIR.

- c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or an expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development implemented under the GPU would require the construction of new stormwater facilities, resulting in potentially significant impacts. With the implementation of GPU policies and mitigation measures, in addition to compliance with applicable regulations, it has been determined that impacts related to new stormwater facilities would be reduced to a level below significant. Furthermore, the 2011 PEIR concluded that the GPU would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact associated with emergency access.

The ACPU may have the potential to increase density that may in turn require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or an expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, impacts could be potentially significant. Further discussion in the EIR is warranted.

- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development would result in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts associated with the provision of adequate water supplies. With the implementation of GPU policies and mitigation measures, in addition to compliance with applicable regulations, it has been determined that direct and cumulative impacts related to adequate water supplies would be reduced but not to a level below significant. Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

See Item XVIII.b. Impacts would be potentially significant. Further discussion in the EIR is warranted.

- e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development would place additional demand on existing wastewater systems, resulting in potentially significant impacts. Implementation of GPU policies and mitigation measures, in addition to compliance with applicable regulations, would reduce impacts related to wastewater facilities to a level below significant. The GPU was determined to not contribute to a significant cumulative impact associated with emergency access.

See Items XVIII.a and b. Impacts could be potentially significant. Further discussion in the EIR is warranted.

- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development would result in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts associated with landfill capacity. With the implementation of GPU policies and mitigation measures, in addition to compliance with required regulations, it has been determined that direct and cumulative impacts related to landfill capacity would be reduced, but not to a level below significant. Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

The ACPU may have the potential to increase density that may in turn generate solid waste that could exceed existing landfill capacity. Therefore, impacts could be potentially significant. Further discussion in the EIR is warranted.

- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development would not result in potentially significant impacts associated with solid waste regulations. Additionally, it was determined they would not result in potentially significant impacts related to solid waste.

The ACPU would plan for an intensification of land uses that may generate solid waste, which could conflict with existing solid waste regulations. Therefore, impacts could be potentially significant. Further discussion in the EIR is warranted.

XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that the GPU could result in potentially significant impacts on vegetation and wildlife species, which could cause populations to drop below self-sustaining levels or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal species. With the implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures it has been determined that impacts would be reduced; however, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. In addition, the 2011 PEIR concluded that the GPU could result in impacts on major periods of California history or prehistory. However, General Plan policies and mitigation measures would mitigate potentially significant impacts on historic resources to less-than-significant levels.

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in Sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project-specific impacts, this evaluation considered the project's potential for significant cumulative effects.

The proposed project involves an update to the existing Alpine Community Plan to guide future growth and development within the Alpine CPA. Although it is likely that the proposed project would include policies that would aim to improve the quality of the environment, including wildlife habitat and archaeological historical resources, the proposed land use designations and policies will require further evaluation to reach a determination. Therefore, the ACPU could result in a significant impact. Further discussion in the EIR is warranted.

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR would result in a potentially significant cumulative impact related to aesthetics (visual character or quality and light or glare), agricultural resources (conversion of farmland and indirect conversion of farmland), air quality (air quality violations, non-attainment criteria pollutants, and sensitive receptors), biological resources (special-status plant and wildlife species, riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities, and wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites), hazards and hazardous materials (wildland fires), hydrology and water quality (water quality standards and requirements, groundwater supplies, and recharge), mineral resources (mineral resource availability and mineral resource recovery sites), noise (permanent increase in ambient noise levels), public services (school services), transportation and traffic (unincorporated County traffic and level-of-service standards and road safety), and utilities and service systems (adequate water supplies and sufficient landfill capacity).

A cumulative impact could occur for a given resource area if the project were to result in an incrementally considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact from past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects. As discussed in Sections I through XVIII, the proposed project could result in potentially significant impacts in several resource areas. Even issues that were found to be less than significant with implementation of the project could contribute to a cumulatively significant impact. As such, the potential cumulative impact from all resource issues will be evaluated in the EIR.

- c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that substantial adverse direct and indirect effects on human beings would result, given the significant and unavoidable impacts associated with implementation of the GPU.

Given the discussion provided in Sections I through XVIII, the proposed project could result in a potentially significant impact that could cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Therefore, this will be further discussed in the EIR.

XX. ENERGY USE:

- a) The County's Guidelines for Determining Significance do not include guidelines on energy. Therefore, Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines applies to the direct and indirect impact analysis, as well as the cumulative impact analysis. Appendix F does not prescribe a threshold for the determination of significance. Rather, Appendix F focuses on reducing and minimizing inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy.

A significant impact to energy would result if the project would:

1. Result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary use of nonrenewable resources during its construction or long-term operation.
2. Be inconsistent with adopted plans and policies.
3. Place a significant demand on local and regional energy supplies, or require a substantial amount of additional capacity.

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less-than-Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The GPU PEIR and FCI SEIR determined that future development implemented under the GPU would require energy facilities to be constructed or expanded, resulting in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts. Implementation of GPU policies and mitigation measures, in addition to compliance with the California Energy Efficiency Standards for residential and non-residential buildings, would reduce direct and cumulative impacts related to energy facilities to a level below significant.

The ACPU would plan for an intensification of land uses that may require additional energy during construction and operation beyond current usage levels assumed by the GPU. Therefore, impacts could be potentially significant. Further discussion in the EIR is warranted.

XXI. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

All references to federal, state, and local regulation are available on the Internet. For federal regulation, refer to <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/>. For state regulation, refer to www.leginfo.ca.gov. For County of San Diego regulation, refer to www.amlegal.com. All other references are available upon request.

California Department of Conservation. 1997. *Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region.*

California Department of Conservation. 2013 and 2014. *Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, San Diego County Williamson Act*. Available: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/San_Diego_w_13_14_WA.pdf.

California Department of Conservation. 2014. *Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, San Diego County Important Farmland Data*. Available: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2014/sdq14_w.pdf.

California Department of Toxic Substances Control. 2017. *EnviroStor Database*. Available: <http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?myaddress=Alpine>. Accessed: April 9, 2017.

County of San Diego. 2007. *County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards*. Department of Planning and Land Use. Land Use and Environmental Group, Planning and Development Services, Department of Public Works. July 30, 2007. Available: http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/dplu/docs/Geologic_Hazards_Guidelines.pdf.

County of San Diego. 2008. *County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Mineral Resources*. Department of Planning and Land Use. Land Use and Environmental Group, Planning and Development Services, Department of Public Works. First revision: July 30, 2008. Available: http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/dplu/docs/Mineral_Resources_Guidelines.pdf.

County of San Diego. 2011a. *San Diego County General Plan, A Plan for Growth, Conservation, and Sustainability*. Available: <http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/pds/generalplan.html>.

County of San Diego. 2011b. *San Diego County GPU Program Environmental Impact Report*. EIR#02-ZA-001, SCH#2002111067. August. Available: <http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/pds/gpupdate/environmental.html>.

County of San Diego. 2016a. *San Diego General Plan: Alpine Community Plan*. Available: https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/docs/CP/Alpine_CP.pdf.

County of San Diego. 2016b. *Draft Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report, Forest Conservation Initiative Lands GPA (GPA 12-004) State Clearinghouse No. 2012081082*. October. Available: <http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/advance/FCL/fcifinalseir.html>.

County of San Diego. 2018. *SanGIS Regional Data Warehouse*. Data provided by County of San Diego.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. 2018. *National Flood Hazard*. Interactive GIS mapping.

Office of Emergency Services. 2010. *San Diego County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan*. August. Available: http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/oes/emergency_management/oes_jl_mitplan.html.

State Water Resources Control Board. 2017. *GeoTracker Database*. Available: <http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=Alpine>. Accessed: April 9, 2017.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2016. *The Green Book Nonattainment Areas*. Last revised: June 17, 2016. Available: <https://www3.epa.gov/airquality/greenbook/>.