

DRAFT FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

**San Diego County General Plan Update
DPLU Environmental Log No. 02-ZA-001
State Clearinghouse (SCH) #2002111067**

SUMMARY OF CHANGES TO THE DRAFT EIR

Lead Agency:

**County of San Diego
Department of Planning and Land Use
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B
San Diego, CA 92123**

Contact: Devon Muto, Chief of Advanced Planning

August 2011

SUMMARY OF CHANGES TO THE DRAFT EIR

Introduction

This section includes text changes to the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the San Diego County General Plan Update, dated July 1, 2009, which can be accessed at: <http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu/gpupdate/environmental.html>. These modifications resulted from response to comments received during the Draft EIR public review period as well as staff-initiated changes.

Revisions herein do not alter the conclusions of the environmental analysis such that new significant environmental impacts have been identified, nor do they constitute significant new information. Changes are provided in tracking mode (underline for new text and strike out for deleted text). Minor text changes, such as typographical errors, were made to the Final EIR as necessary. However, these minor text changes are not included in this document.

Text Changes and Edits to the Draft EIR

Acronyms and Abbreviations

- On Draft EIR page xv, under list of Acronyms and Abbreviations, the following acronym has been added:

CTSA Coordinated Transportation Service Agency

- On Draft EIR page xv, under list of Acronyms and Abbreviations, the following acronym has been added:

TDR Transfer of Development Rights

Summary

- On Draft EIR page S-1, first paragraph, the text has been revised as follows:

This chapter is a summary of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the County of San Diego General Plan Update, prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The technical appendices for the environmental analysis are included in Volume II of the EIR. ~~Comments on the Draft EIR will be~~ provided in Volume III of the Final EIR. Volume III will ~~which~~ also includes responses to comments and a summary of revisions to the Draft EIR. Finally, Volume IV is an environmental analysis of the Recommended Project, which is the alternative derived through Planning Commission and Board of Supervisor hearings.

- Draft EIR pages S-7 through S-20, Table S-1, Summary of Project Impacts, have been revised as follows:

Table S-1. Summary of Project Impacts

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policies ⁽¹⁾	Mitigation Measure(s) ⁽¹⁾	Impact After Mitigation
2.1 Aesthetics					
<p>1. Scenic Vistas: The proposed General Plan Update would have the potential to result in the obstruction, interruption, or detracting of a scenic vista as a result of future development activity.</p>	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-6.2, LU-6.3, LU-6.4, LU-6.6, LU-6.7, LU-6.89, LU-10.1, LU-10.2, M-2.3, COS-11.1, COS-11.2, COS-11.3, COS-11.4, COS-11.5, COS-11.6, COS-11.7, COS-12.1, COS-12.2	Aes-1.1 through Aes-1.11	Less Than Significant
<p>2. Scenic Resources: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would allow development to occur that would 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 neighborhood, community, State Scenic Highway, or localized area.</p>	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-6.2, LU-6.3, LU-6.4, LU-6.6, LU-6.7, LU-6.89, LU-10.1, LU-10.2, M-2.3, COS-11.1, COS-11.2, COS-11.3, COS-11.4, COS-11.5, COS-11.6, COS-11.7, COS-12.1, COS-12.2	The mitigation measures identified for Issue 1: Scenic Vistas would also mitigate impacts to scenic resources	Less Than Significant
<p>3. Visual Character or Quality: Implementation of the General Plan Update would allow increased development densities to occur in some areas which would result in the potential degradation of the existing visual character or quality of a community.</p>	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-1.64, LU-2.1, LU-2.23, LU-2.45, LU-4.1, LU-4.2, LU-4.3, LU-4.4, LU-11.2, LU-12.4, M-10.6, H-2.1	Aes-3.1 and Aes-3.2 and the mitigation measures identified for Issue 1: Scenic Vistas	Significant and Unavoidable
<p>4. Light or Glare: The proposed General Plan Update would have the potential to result in increased light and glare within the County that would</p>	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	COS-13.1, and COS-13.2, COS-13.3	Aes-4.1 and through Aes-4.23	Significant and Unavoidable

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policies ⁽¹⁾	Mitigation Measure(s) ⁽¹⁾	Impact After Mitigation
adversely affect day or nighttime views.					
2.2 Agricultural Resources					
2. Land Use Conflicts: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would not result in potential conflicts with agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contract lands.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	LU-7.1, COS-6.3	Agr-2.1	Less Than Significant
2.5 Cultural Resources					
1. Historical Resources: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in new development that would have the potential to result in substantial adverse changes to the significance of historical resources.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	COS-8.1	Cul-1.1 through Cul-1.68	Less Than Significant
2. Archaeological Resources: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in new development that would have the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, including the destruction or disturbance of an archaeological site that contains or has the potential to contain information important to history or prehistory.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	COS-7.1 through COS-7.4	Cul-1.1, Cul-1.6 Cul-2.1 through Cul-2.46	Less Than Significant
2.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials					
5. Public Airports: Generally, land uses proposed under the General Plan Update and within the vicinity of public airports include rural lands, open space, semi-rural lands, and federal and State lands. However, under the General Plan Update, some public airports, such as Fallbrook Community Airport, may be located adjacent to land uses such as village residential, which would maintain higher density populations and have the potential to result in significant hazards to the public. Although the proposed project would be required to comply with the ALUCP, development within an AIA of a public airport would have the potential to increase the risk of people living or working in these areas to hazards associated with airport operations.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-4.7, M-7.1, S-15.1, S-15.2, S-15.3	Haz-1.1 through Haz-1.5	Less Than Significant
8. Wildland Fires: Implementation of	Potentially	Potentially	LU-6.4011, LU-	Haz-4.1 through	Significant and

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policies ⁽¹⁾	Mitigation Measure(s) ⁽¹⁾	Impact After Mitigation
<p>the proposed General Plan Update would result in land uses that allow residential, commercial and industrial development in areas that are prone to wildland fires. This is due to the fact that the majority of the unincorporated County is located in high or very high fire hazard severity zones. Implementation of the General Plan Update would have the potential to expose people or structures to a potentially significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.</p>	Significant	Significant	11.2, S-3.1, S-3.2, S-3.3, S-3.4, S-3.6, S-4.1, <u>COS-18.3</u>	Haz-4.4 <u>5</u>	Unavoidable
2.8 Hydrology and Water Quality					
<p>1. Water Quality Standards and Requirements: The development of future land uses as designated in the proposed General Plan Update would contribute pollutants that would significantly degrade water quality and in some instances exacerbate existing surface and groundwater pollution conditions in the unincorporated County. Additionally, occupants of the proposed land uses would not have access to quality groundwater supplies due to existing contamination.</p>	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-6.5, LU-6. 9 <u>8</u> , LU-14.1, LU-14.2, LU-14.3, LU-14.4, COS-4.2, COS-4.3, COS-4.4, COS-5.2, COS-5.3, COS-5.5	Hyd-1.1 through Hyd-1.10	Significant and Unavoidable
<p>3. Erosion or Siltation: Implementation of the General Plan Update would result in increased runoff that has the potential to cause new erosion or worsen existing erosion problems.</p>	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	LU-6.5, LU-6. 9 <u>8</u> , COS-5.3	Hyd-1.2, Hyd-1.3, Hyd-1.5, and Hyd-3.1 through Hyd-3.3	Less Than Significant
<p>4. Flooding: Implementation of the General Plan Update would convert permeable surfaces to impermeable surfaces, which have the potential to result in flooding on or off site.</p>	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	LU-6.5, LU-6. 9 <u>10</u> , S-9.2, S-10.2, S-10.3, S-10.4, S-10.6	Hyd-1.1, Hyd-1.2, Hyd-1.3, Hyd-1.4, Hyd-1.5, Hyd-2.5, and Hyd-4.1 through Hyd-4.3	Less Than Significant
<p>5. Exceed Capacity of Stormwater Systems: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would exceed the capacity of existing stormwater drainage facilities.</p>	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	LU-6.5, LU-6. 8 <u>9</u> <u>8</u> , COS-4.3, COS-5.2, S-9.2, S-10.2 through S-10.6	Hyd-1.1, Hyd-1.2, Hyd-1.3, Hyd-1.4, Hyd-1.5, Hyd-2.5, Hyd-3.1, Hyd-4.1, Hyd-4.2, and Hyd-4.3	Less Than Significant
<p>6. Housing within a 100-year Flood</p>	Potentially	Less Than	LU-6.44 <u>12</u> ,	Hyd-1.2,	Less Than

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policies ⁽¹⁾	Mitigation Measure(s) ⁽¹⁾	Impact After Mitigation
Hazard Area: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would include land designated for residential land use within a 100-year flood plain.	Significant	Significant	COS-5.1, S-9.1 through S-9.5, S-10.1	Hyd-1.5, Hyd-2.5, Hyd-4.1, Hyd-4.2, and Hyd-6.1	Significant
7. Impeding or Redirecting Flood Flows: Implementation of the General Plan Update would impede or redirect flood flows.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	LU-6.4 12 , COS-5.1, S-9.1 through S-9.5, S-10.1	Hyd-1.2, Hyd-1.5, Hyd-2.5, Hyd-4.1, Hyd-4.2, Hyd-4.3, and Hyd-6.1	Less Than Significant
2.9 Land Use					
1. Physical Division of an Established Community: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would have the potential to result in the physical division of an established community from the construction, expansion or widening of a roadway.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-1.6 4 , LU-2.1, LU-2.2 3 , LU-2.4 5 , LU-4.1, LU-4.2, LU-4.3, LU-4.4, LU-11.2, LU-12.4, M-10.6, M-1.3, H-2.1	Lan-1.1 through Lan-1.3	Less Than Significant
2.11 Noise					
1. Excessive Noise Levels: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would have the potential to expose land uses to noise levels in excess of noise compatibility guidelines.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-2.7 8 , M-1.3, M-2.4, N-1.4, N-1.5, N-2.1, N-2.2, N-4.1, N-4.3, N-4.2, N-4.5, N-4.7, N-4.8	Noi-1.1 through Noi-1.9	Less Than Significant
3. Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Level: Implementation of the General Plan Update would permanently increase ambient noise along roadways.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-2.7 8 , M-1.3, M-2.4, N-1.5, N-4.1, N-4.2, N-4.6, N-5.1, N-5.2	Noi-1.3, Noi-1.4, Noi-1.5, Noi-1.8, Noi-2.3, Noi-2.4, Noi-3.1 and Noi-3.2	Significant and Unavoidable
2.12 Population and Housing					
1. Population Growth: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would not directly or indirectly induce unplanned population growth.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None Required However, the following policies are applicable to this issue: LU-1.4 2 , LU-9.4, LU-14.4	None Required	Less Than Significant
2.13 Public Services					
1. Fire Protection Services: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in a	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	LU-1.6 4 , LU-6.4, LU-6.4 11 ,	Pub-1.1 through Pub-1.8 9	Less Than Significant

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policies ⁽¹⁾	Mitigation Measure(s) ⁽¹⁾	Impact After Mitigation
substantial adverse physical impact associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities.			LU-12.3, LU-12.4, S-3.4, S-5.1, S-5.2, S-6.1 through S-6.5		
2. Police Protection Services: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in the need for new staffing and/or expanded police facilities in order to maintain acceptable response times for police protection services.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	LU-1.64, LU-12.3, LU-12.4	Pub-1.1, Pub-1.2, and Pub-1.3	Less Than Significant
3. School Services: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would include residential land use designations that would have the potential to result in the need to construct or expand school facilities that would result in a significant environmental impact.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-1.64, LU-9.7, LU-12.3, LU-12.4, LU-17.1 through LU-17.4, LU-18.2	Pub-1.1, Pub-1.2, Pub-1.3, Pub-3.1, and Pub-3.2	Significant and Unavoidable
4. Other Public Services: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would include land use designations that would accommodate an increase in population that would result in new library users and require the construction of new or expanded library facilities.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	LU-1.64, LU-9.4, LU-9.7, LU-12.3, LU-12.4, LU-18.1, LU-18.2	Pub-1.1, Pub-1.2, and Pub-1.3	Less Than Significant
2.14 Recreation					
1. Deterioration of Parks and Recreational Facilities: The forecasted increase in population in the County would result in the deterioration of parks and recreational facilities.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-12.1, LU-12.2, M-12.1 through M-12.8, M-12.10, H-2.2, COS-21.1, COS-21.2, COS-22.1, COS-23.1, COS-23.2, COS-24.1, COS-24.2	Rec-1.1 through Rec-1.11 2	Less Than Significant
2.15 Transportation and Traffic					
2. Adjacent Cities Traffic and LOS Standards: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in 34 roadway segments in adjacent cities that would exceed the LOS standard established by the applicable jurisdiction.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-5.1, LU-10.4, LU-11.8, LU-12.2, M-1.1, M-1.2, M-1.3, M-2.1, M-2.2, M-2.3, M-3.1, M-3.2, M-4.2, M-4.3, M-4.6, M-5.1, M-5.2, M-9.1, M-9.2	Tra-1.1, Tra-1.2, Tra-1.3, Tra-1.4, Tra-1.6 7 , Tra-1.7 8 , and Tra-2.1	
3. Rural Road Safety:	Potentially	Potentially	LU-2.7 8 ,	Tra-1.3, Tra-	Significant and

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policies ⁽¹⁾	Mitigation Measure(s) ⁽¹⁾	Impact After Mitigation
<p>Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in the adoption of a Mobility Element network that includes existing roadways with horizontal and vertical curves that are sharper than existing standards. Additionally, the proposed General Plan Update may pose an increased risk to pedestrians and bicyclists by increasing and/or redistributing traffic patterns. Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would also have the potential to result in hazards from at-grade rail crossings.</p>	Significant	Significant	LU-6.910, M-4.3, M-4.4, M-4.5, M-9.1	1.4, Tra-1.78, and Tra-3.1	Unavoidable
<p>4. Emergency Access: Under the proposed General Plan Update, existing inadequate roadway widths, dead end roads, one-way roads, and gated communities would continue to occur in the unincorporated County, all of which have the potential to impair emergency access.</p>	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	LU-2.-78, LU-6.-910, LU-12.2, M-1.2, M-3.3, M-4.4, S-3.4, S-3.5, S-14.1	Tra-1.3, Tra-1.4, Tra-1.7, Tra-4.1 through Tra-4.4	Less Than Significant
<p>5. Parking Capacity: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would designate land uses throughout the unincorporated County that would require the development of parking facilities. All future development of parking facilities associated with these land uses would be required to follow existing parking standards and requirements, such as the County's Zoning Ordinance and roadway standards. However, the land uses proposed under the General Plan Update may require modifications to existing County parking regulations.</p>	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	M-8.6, M-9.3, M-9.4, M-10.1 through M-10.4	Tra-1.4, Tra-1.5, Tra-5.1, Tra-1.6, Tra-5.2	Less Than Significant
<p>6. Alternative Transportation: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would create provisions for alternative modes of transportation, including bike lanes, bus stops, trails, and sidewalks. Many policies proposed in the General Plan Update would require coordination between the County and the agencies responsible for public transportation planning; however, existing alternative transportation plans and policies may require modification to be consistent with the goals and policies contained in the General Plan Update.</p>	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	LU-5.1, LU-5.4, LU-5.5, LU-9.8, LU-11.6, M-3.1, M-3.2, M-4.3, M-8.1 through M-8.7, M-8.8, M-9.2, M-9.4, M-11.1 through M-11.7	Tra-1.6, Tra-5.1, Tra-5.2, and Tra-6.1 through Tra-6.9	Less Than Significant

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policies ⁽¹⁾	Mitigation Measure(s) ⁽¹⁾	Impact After Mitigation
2.16 Utilities and Service Systems					
2. New Water of Wastewater Treatment Facilities: The development of future land uses as designated in the proposed General Plan Update would increase the demand for water and wastewater services, thereby requiring the construction of new facilities.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	LU-1.42, LU-4.3, H-1.3	USS-2.1 through USS-2.3	Less Than Significant
3. Sufficient Stormwater Drainage Facilities: The development of future land uses as designated under the proposed General Plan Update would require the construction of new stormwater facilities if existing facilities are not sized adequately to handle increased runoff flows.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	LU-6.5, LU-6.89, COS-4.3	USS-3.1 through USS-3.5	Less Than Significant
2.17 Global Climate Change					
1. Compliance With AB 32: By the year 2020, GHG emissions are projected to increase to 7.1 MMT CO ₂ e (from 5.3 MMT CO ₂ e in 1990) without incorporation of any GHG-reducing policies or mitigation measures. This amount represents an increase of 24 percent over 2006 levels, and a 36 percent increase from estimated 1990 levels.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	COS-10.7, COS-15.1, COS-15.2, COS-15.3, COS-17.1, COS-17.5, COS-18.2, COS-20.1, COS-20.2, COS-20.4	CC-1.1 through CC-1.189	<u>Less than Significant and Unavoidable</u>
2. Potential Effects of Global Climate Change on the Proposed General Plan Update: Climate change impacts that would be most relevant to the unincorporated County, and the proposed General Plan Update, include effects on water supply, wildfires, energy needs, and impacts to public health.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	The General Plan Update policies identified for Issue 1: Compliance with AB 32 would also reduce potential effects of global climate change on the proposed General Plan Update	The mitigation measures identified for Issue 1: Compliance with AB 32 would also mitigate potential effects of global climate change on the proposed General Plan Update	<u>Less than Significant and Unavoidable</u>

- Draft EIR pages S-22 and S-23, Table S-2, Summary of Analysis for Alternatives to the General Plan Update, have been revised as follows:

Table S-2. Summary of Analysis for Alternatives to the General Plan Update

Issue Areas	Referral Map (Proposed Project)			Alternatives to the Proposed Project		
	Without Mitigation	With Mitigation	Hybrid Map	Draft Land Use Map	Environmentally Superior Map	No Project
2.8 Hydrology and Water Quality						
Groundwater Supplies and Recharge	PS	SU	▼▲	▼▲	▼	▲
2.16 Utilities and Service Systems						
New Water or Wastewater Treatment Facilities	PS	LS	▼▲	▼▲	▼	▲
Adequate Water Supplies	PS	SU	▼▲	▼▲	▼	▲
2.17 Global Climate Change						
Compliance with AB 32	PS	SU LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Effects of Global Climate Change on the Proposed Project	PS	SU LS	▼	▼	▼	▲

Chapter 1.0, Project Description, Location, and Environmental Setting

- On Draft EIR page 1-4, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Environmental Setting:

Table 1-13 provides the environmental baseline for each issue analyzed in this EIR. The environmental setting for each environmental issue is further explained in the beginning of each section of Chapter 2.0 and in the corresponding technical reports.

- On Draft EIR page 1-8, second paragraph, the following information has been added under the heading Housing:

In accordance with State law, the Housing Element is updated every five years.

- On Draft EIR page 1-10, first paragraph, the following information has been added under the heading Mobility:

When applicable, the Mobility Element road network has been coordinated with adjacent cities and Caltrans to ensure consistency when feasible.

- On Draft EIR page 1-7, first paragraph, the following information has been added under the heading Mobility:

This initiative mandated specific land use designations, goals, and policies which ~~are~~ were in effect through December 31, 2010. ~~Upon expiration of the FCI, t~~The General Plan must be amended to remap the former FCI lands in conformance with the General Plan Update. This is discussed in further detail in Section 2.9, Land Use.

- On Draft EIR page 1-14, second paragraph, the following information has been added under the heading Community Plan Updates:

The communities proposing comprehensive updates to their community or subregional plans are Bonsall CPA, Pine Valley in the Central Mountain Subregional Planning Area, Borrego Springs in the Desert Subregional Planning Area, Fallbrook CPA, Boulevard and Potrero in the Mountain Empire Subregional Planning Area, the community of Warner Springs in the North Mountain Subregional Planning Area, Ramona CPA, the communities of Elfin Forest/Harmony Grove in the San Dieguito CPA, and Spring Valley CPA. In addition, the communities for which partial community or subregional plan updates were prepared include: Cuyamaca and Descanso in the Central Mountain Subregional Planning Area; Crest/Dehesa Subregional Planning Area; Jamul/Dulzura Subregional Planning Area; Campo/ Lake Morena, Jacumba and Tecate in the Mountain Empire Subregional Planning Area; the community of Palomar Mountain in the North Mountain Subregional Planning Area; Rainbow CPA; San Dieguito CPA; and Valle de Oro CPA. The community plans that are currently being updated are available on the General Plan Update website: <http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/dplu/gpupdate/>

- On Draft EIR page 1-17, fifth paragraph, the following information has been added under the heading Purpose and Use of an EIR:

In addition to Section 15162, other sections of the CEQA and State law may apply that allow for reduced environmental documentation or process. The County intends to use this EIR for coverage of subsequent projects, tiering, and/or streamlining future documentation to the maximum extent allowed by State law.

- On Draft EIR page 1-22, the seventh paragraph was deleted and replaced with two new paragraphs as follows:

November 6, 19, 20 and December 4, 2009 and February 19, March 12, April 16, July 9, and August 20, 2010. Nine Planning Commission hearings were conducted from late 2009 to August of 2010 to consider the General Plan Update and formulate a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. Throughout this hearing process the Planning Commission made tentative motions to approve the land use maps (by community), and the other General Plan Update documents with select changes to policies or programs. In addition, the Planning Commission directed County staff to develop a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) Program to include as part of the General Plan Update project. On August 20, 2010, the Planning Commission adopted a resolution that outlined its recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

October 20, November 10, and December 8, 2010 and February 9, March 16, and April 13, 2011. Six BOS hearings were conducted from the fall of 2010 to the spring of 2011 to consider the General Plan Update. County staff's recommendation to the BOS was generally the same as the Planning Commission recommendation with one primary exception; staff did not recommend inclusion of a TDR program. On April 13, 2011, the BOS supported County staff's recommendation with inclusion of a number of specific changes that were within the scope of the General Plan Update guiding principles and within the range of project alternatives analyzed in this EIR. A detailed analysis of how the recommended project differs from the proposed project, including BOS-directed changes, is provided in Volume IV of this EIR. BOS agendas and meeting minutes, as well as videos of

the hearings, are available on the County's website: <http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/cob/bosa/index.html>.

Since August 2006, the County DPLU has continued to provide progress reports to the BOS. The progress reports presented major issues associated with the project that were identified in the months prior to report preparation and provided an opportunity for the public and BOS to provide comments on the project as it progressed. The most recent progress report was published on May 13, 2009. Progress reports and other General Plan documents and publications are published for review as they are completed on the General Plan Update website: <http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu/gpupdate/>

- On Draft EIR page 1-26, second paragraph, the following information has been revised under the heading Pipeline Policies:

The policy developed for new PAAs and specific plans provides that applications submitted and deemed complete on or before August 6, 2003 ~~July 23, 2003~~ be processed under the provisions of the current General Plan while applications deemed complete after August 6, 2009 ~~July 23, 2003~~ be subject to the provisions of the General Plan in effect when the project is approved or disapproved. A similar corresponding policy was developed for TMs and TPMs.

- On Draft EIR page 1-28, second paragraph, the following information has been added under the heading Differences with SANDAG Population Model Forecast:

Despite the difference in population forecasts between the County's model and SANDAG's model, the higher number provided by SANDAG was incorporated into the environmental analysis for issues where the most important factor in determining impacts was the future population number where appropriate, such as in the Population and Housing section (see Chapter 2.12), because the SANDAG forecast represents the more conservative population forecast.

- On Draft EIR page 1-33, third paragraph, the following text has been added under the heading 2030 San Diego RTP:

The Regional Arterial System provides critical links to the highway network and serves as alternative routes to the regional highway network. The RAS is identified in Technical Appendix 7, Transportation Evaluation Criteria and Rankings, of the 2030 RTP; however, specific improvements to this network are not included. Planned improvements to the Regional Arterial System are identified in the local circulation elements of the cities and the county. Funding is intended to come from the local jurisdictions; however, as a result of Proposition 42 and the voter-approved \$2,071 per dwelling unit for regional arterials, TransNet funds contribute to the construction of these facilities.

- On Draft EIR page 1-36, fourth paragraph, the following text has been revised under heading 1.14.2.5 Forest Conservation Initiative (FCI) Remapping:

On November 2, 1993 the voters of San Diego County approved the FCI. Along with changes to the County's General Plan, the FCI required the County to place a minimum parcel size of 40 acres, with a maximum density of one dwelling unit per parcel, on all parcels affected by the FCI. The FCI ~~currently affected~~ currently affected approximately 83,000 acres within

Pendleton/De Luz CPA, North Mountain Subregion, Ramona CPA, Julian CPA, and the Central Mountain, Mountain Empire, Desert, and Jamul/Dulzura Subregions. The FCI is ~~scheduled to expire~~ on December 31, 2010. Currently, the County is evaluating where the land use designations should change ~~upon expiration of~~ within the former FCI areas. The purpose of the effort is to determine if there are more appropriate land uses for parcels whose uses ~~are currently have been~~ restricted by the FCI. The anticipated outcome of this effort would be to seek a GPA ~~after the FCI expires~~ based on the land use plan that is generated from this planning process. For the purposes of the EIR cumulative analysis, general assumptions were made as to which lands would be affected by the FCI GPA and the resulting land use designations. FCI-affected land is depicted with cross-hatching on the proposed General Plan Update land use plan (see Figure 1-3).

- On Draft EIR page 1-39 to 1-40, the following information was added:

Volume III of the General Plan Update EIR includes the following:

- Summary of Changes to the Draft EIR.** Modifications that resulted from responses to comments received during the Draft EIR public review period as well as staff-initiated changes
- Comment Letters and Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR.**

Volume IV of the General Plan Update EIR includes the following:

- Summary of Amendment to the EIR.** Description and Analysis of the Recommended Project
 - Appendix A.** General Plan Update Text, Goals, and Policies Differences Recommended to Proposed Project
 - Appendix B.** Land Use Map Differences Recommended Project to Proposed Project
 - Appendix C.** Areas of Difference - Recommended Project (22 mb)
 - Appendix D.** General Plan Update Mobility Element Road Network Differences - Recommended to Proposed Project
 - Appendix E.** Technical Memorandum: County General Plan Update - Recommended Project Alternative (Traffic Model Results)
 - Appendix F.** Impacted Roadway Segments and Supporting Rationale for LOS E/F Level Acceptance
- On Draft EIR pages 1-52 through 1-55, the following revisions have been made to Table 1-11, Projects Not Included in the Proposed General Plan Update Land Use Map:

Project No.	Project Name	Required Approvals	Community	Dwelling Units	Acres
7 ₋	Merriam Mountains (GPA 04-006) ⁽¹⁾	GPA/SP/TM/REZ	<u>N. County Metro and Bonsall</u>	1200 <u>2700</u>	321.16 <u>2,327.00</u>
9 ₋	Tabata (TPM 20729)	TPM	Bonsall	4	33.75
13 ₋	Northcutt, (TPM 20860)	TPM	Bonsall	2	11.77

15*	Dienhart (TPM 20664)	TPM	Bonsall	3	28.36
26*	4740 Dehesa Road/Sloan Canyon Road (TM 5485)	TM	Crest/Dehesa	10	31.89
28*	Price (TPM 20762)	TPM	Crest/Dehesa	3	24.30
49*	Alba (TPM 21120)	TPM	Fallbrook	4	35.56
45	Passerelle, Campus Park (SP 03-004) ⁽¹⁾	GPA/SPA/REZ/TM	Fallbrook	950 <u>1088</u>	500.00
46	Meadowood (GPA 04-002)	GPA/SP/REZ/TM	Fallbrook	4248 <u>886</u>	390.00
50	Campus Park West (GPA 05-003) ⁽¹⁾	GPA/SPA/REZ/TM	Fallbrook	369 <u>355</u>	116.00
55*	Jamul (TPM 20786)	TPM	Jamul/Dulzura	1	43.69
57*	Swift (TMP 20903)	TPM	Jamul/Dulzura	1	16.42
59*	Ave Loma III (TPM 21039)	TPM	Jamul/Dulzura	4	87.90
65*	Titus Project (TPM 20965)	TPM	Jamul/Dulzura	3	11.10
68*	Magnolia Courts (GPA 07-009)	GPA/TM/REZ	Lakeside	38	5.19
78*	Garza (TPM 20777)	TPM	Mountain Empire	5	53.33
79*	Bennett (TPM 20784)	TPM	Mountain Empire	5	47.53
80*	Powell Subdivision (TPM 20798)	TPM	Mountain Empire	4	40.00
90*	Tai Estates (TM 5409)	TM	N. County Metro	11	46.88
91*	Harmony Grove Meadows (GPA 05-004)	GPA/SP/REZ/TM	N. County Metro	207	111.09
96*	Los Robles Ranch (TM 5526)	TM	North Mountain	15	646.00
98*	The Prominence at Pala (TM 5321)	TM	Pala/Pauma	37	413.93
99*	Pala 114 (TM 5497)	TM	Pala/Pauma	11	113.89
100*	Pauma Ranches (TM 5506)	TM	Pala/Pauma	22	99.83
102*	Ruffin/Johnson (TPM 20725)	TPM	Pala/Pauma	5	73.11
104*	Jay Long (TPM 21066)	TPM	Pala/Pauma	2	17.75
108*	Tenaja (TPM 21049)	TPM	Pendleton/De Luz	2	27.75
110*	Oswald (TPM 20533)	TPM	Rainbow	4	47.20
111*	Brown (TPM 20717)	TPM	Rainbow	4	31.18
118*	McCandless (TPM 20564)	TPM	Ramona	5	41.00
120*	Edbell Parcel Map (TPM 20900)	TPM	Ramona	1	96.42
122*	Spitsbergen (TPM 21042)	TPM	Ramona	3	137.53
128*	Highland Valley (TPM 21051)	TPM	Ramona	3	38.00
137*	Orchard Vista (TM 5507)	TM	Valley Center	11	25.24
146*	Robinson (TMP 21105)	TPM	Valley Center	4	11.00

GPA = General Plan Amendment; MUP = Major Use Permit; REZ = Rezone; SP = Specific Plan; SPA = Specific Plan Amendment; TM = Tentative Map; TPM = Tentative Parcel Map

⁽¹⁾ Includes a Commercial or Industrial Component

(* Denotes projects that, as of 2011, are no longer foreseeable due to disapproved or withdrawn permit applications. However, build-out of these projects was included in the cumulative impact analysis.

Notes: Communities with active projects having a total increase of less than 10 units were not included in the Cumulative Impacts Traffic Model. This table includes both approved and active projects that are inconsistent with the General Plan Update.

Source: County DPLU 2008n

- On Draft EIR page 1-56, Table 1-13. Environmental Baselines Used in the DEIR, has been added to the section:

Table 1-13. Environmental Baselines Used in the DEIR

Environmental Topic/Issue	Baseline
2.1 Aesthetics	
<u>Issue 1: Scenic Vistas</u>	April 2008, when the NOP for the General Plan Update EIR was published.
<u>Issue 2: Scenic Resources</u>	
<u>Issue 3: Visual Character or Quality</u>	
<u>Issue 4: Light or Glare</u>	
2.2 Agricultural Resources	
<u>Issue 1: Conversion of Agricultural Resources</u>	April 2008, when the NOP for the General Plan Update EIR was published.
<u>Issue 2: Land Use Conflicts</u>	
<u>Issue 3: Indirect Conversion of Agricultural Resources</u>	
2.3 Air Quality	
<u>Issue 1: Air Quality Plans</u>	2004, the most recent update of the San Diego County Regional Air Quality Strategy available during EIR preparation.
<u>Issue 2: Air Quality Violations</u>	April 2008, when the NOP for the General Plan Update EIR was published.
<u>Issue 3: Non-Attainment Criteria Pollutants</u>	
<u>Issue 4: Sensitive Receptors</u>	2000, the baseline year for the most recent estimation of background cancer risk available from CARB for San Diego County.
<u>Issue 5: Objectionable Odors</u>	April 2008, when the NOP for the General Plan Update EIR was published.
2.4 Biological Resources	
<u>Issue 1: Special Status Species</u>	April 2008, the publication date of the Multiple Species Conservation Program and the NOP for the General Plan Update EIR.
<u>Issue 2: Riparian Habitats and Other Sensitive Natural Communities</u>	
<u>Issue 3: Federally Protected Wetlands</u>	
<u>Issue 4: Wildlife Movement Corridors</u>	
<u>Issue 5: Local Policies and Ordinances</u>	
<u>Issue 6: Habitat Conservation Plans and Natural Community Conservation Plans</u>	
2.5 Cultural and Paleontological Resources	
<u>Issue 1: Historical Resources</u>	September 2008, when the Julian Historic Survey was completed.
<u>Issue 2: Archaeological Resources</u>	April 2008, when the NOP for the General Plan Update EIR was published.
<u>Issue 3: Paleontological Resources</u>	
<u>Issue 4: Human Remains</u>	
Environmental Topic/Issue	Baseline
2.6 Geology and Soils	
<u>Issue 1: Exposure to Seismic-Related Hazards</u>	April 2008, when the NOP for the General Plan Update EIR was published.
<u>Issue 2: Soil Erosion or Topsoil Loss</u>	
<u>Issue 3: Soil Stability</u>	

<u>Environmental Topic/Issue</u>	<u>Baseline</u>
<u>Issue 4: Expansive Soils</u>	
<u>Issue 5: Waste Water Disposal Systems</u>	
<u>Issue 6: Unique Geologic Features</u>	2007, when the Natural Resources Inventory of San Diego County was completed.
<u>2.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials</u>	
<u>Issue 1: Transport, Use and Disposal of Hazardous Materials</u>	
<u>Issue 2: Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials</u>	
<u>Issue 3: Hazards to Schools</u>	
<u>Issue 4: Existing Hazardous Materials Sites</u>	
<u>Issue 5: Public Airports</u>	April 2008, when the NOP for the General Plan Update EIR was published.
<u>Issue 6: Private Airports</u>	
<u>Issue 7: Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans</u>	
<u>Issue 8: Wildland Fires</u>	
<u>Issue 9: Vectors</u>	
<u>2.8 Hydrology and Water Quality</u>	
<u>Issue 1: Water Quality Standards and Requirements</u>	April 2008, when the NOP for the General Plan Update EIR was published.
<u>Issue 2: Groundwater Supplies and Recharge</u>	2008, the baseline year for the General Plan Update Groundwater Study.
<u>Issue 3: Erosion or Siltation</u>	
<u>Issue 4: Flooding</u>	
<u>Issue 5: Exceed Capacity of Stormwater Systems</u>	April 2008, when the NOP for the General Plan Update EIR was published.
<u>Issue 6: Housing within a 100-year Flood Hazard Area</u>	
<u>Issue 7: Impeding or Redirecting Flood Flows</u>	
<u>Issue 8: Dam Inundation and Flood Hazards</u>	
<u>Issue 9: Seiche, Tsunami and Mudflow Hazards</u>	
<u>2.9 Land Use</u>	
<u>Issue 1: Physical Division of an Established Community</u>	
<u>Issue 2: Conflicts with Land Use Plans, Policies, and Regulations</u>	April 2008, when the NOP for the General Plan Update EIR was published.
<u>Issue 3: Conflicts with Habitat Conservation Plans and Natural Community Conservation Plans</u>	
<u>2.10 Mineral Resources</u>	
<u>Issue 1: Mineral Resource Availability</u>	April 2008, when the NOP for the General Plan Update EIR was published.
<u>Issue 2: Mineral Resource Recovery Sites</u>	

<u>Environmental Topic/Issue</u>	<u>Baseline</u>
<u>2.11 Noise</u>	
<u>Issue 1: Excessive Noise Levels</u>	April 2008, when the NOP for the General Plan Update EIR was published.
<u>Issue 2: Excessive Groundborne Vibration</u>	
<u>Issue 3: Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels</u>	March 2008, when the Community Noise Survey was conducted.
<u>Issue 4: Temporary Increase in Ambient Noise Levels</u>	April 2008, when the NOP for the General Plan Update EIR was published.
<u>Issue 5: Excessive Noise Exposure from a Public or Private Airport</u>	
<u>2.12 Population and Housing</u>	
<u>Issue 1: Population Growth</u>	July 2008, when SANDAG released updated population forecasts for 2030.
<u>Issue 2: Displacement of Housing</u>	2005, the baseline year for the San Diego County Population Forecast Model and the General Plan Update Housing Element.
<u>Issue 3: Displacement of People</u>	
<u>2.13 Public Services</u>	
<u>Issue 1: Fire Protection Services</u>	April 2008, when the NOP for the General Plan Update EIR was published.
<u>Issue 2: Police Protection Services</u>	
<u>Issue 3: School Services</u>	
<u>Issue 4: Other Public Services</u>	
<u>2.14 Recreation</u>	
<u>Issue 1: Deterioration of Parks and Recreational Activities</u>	April 2008, when the NOP for the General Plan Update EIR was published.
<u>Issue 2: Construction of New Recreational Facilities</u>	
<u>2.15 Transportation and Traffic</u>	
<u>Issue 1: Unincorporated County Traffic and LOS Standards</u>	2007, the baseline year of the traffic model used for the County of San Diego General Plan Update Traffic and Circulation Assessment.
<u>Issue 2: Adjacent Cities Traffic and LOS Standards</u>	
<u>Issue 3: Rural Road Safety</u>	April 2008, when the NOP for the General Plan Update EIR was published.
<u>Issue 4: Emergency Access</u>	
<u>Issue 5: Parking Capacity</u>	
<u>Issue 6: Alternative Transportation</u>	
<u>2.16 Utilities and Service Systems</u>	
<u>Issue 1: Wastewater Treatment Requirements</u>	April 2008, when the NOP for the General Plan Update EIR was published.
<u>Issue 2: New Water or Wastewater Treatment Facilities</u>	
<u>Issue 3: Sufficient Stormwater Drainage Facilities</u>	
<u>Issue 4: Adequate Water Supplies</u>	2004, the baseline year for the 2005 Urban Water Management Plans prepared for the water districts that serve the County.
<u>Issue 5: Adequate Wastewater Facilities</u>	April 2008, when the NOP for the General Plan Update EIR was published.
<u>Issue 6: Sufficient Landfill Capacity</u>	2005, when the most recent San Diego County Integrated Waste Management Plan was published.
<u>Issue 7: Solid Waste Regulations</u>	April 2008, when the NOP for the General Plan Update EIR was published.
<u>Issue 8: Energy</u>	

<u>Environmental Topic/Issue</u>	<u>Baseline</u>
2.17 Global Climate Change	
<u>Issue 1: Compliance with AB 32</u>	2006, the baseline year for the regional GHG inventory published by the University of San Diego School of Law Energy Policy Initiative Center.
<u>Issue 2: Potential Effects of Climate Change on the Proposed General Plan Update</u>	November 2008, when the <i>San Diego Foundation Regional Focus 2050 Study: Climate Change Related Impacts in the San Diego Region by 2050</i> was published.

Section 2.1, Aesthetics

- On Draft EIR page 2.1-29, first paragraph, the following regulation has been added under the heading Local:

County Community Right-of-Way Development Standards

Board Policy J-36, adopted December 1989, provides a procedure by which communities can deviate from the established County Public Road Standards, and replace or augment them with standards tailored to their community. The Community Right-of Way Development Standards provide alternative right-of-way regulatory standards within the road right-of-way that supersede the County Public Road Standards. The purpose of these Standards is to ensure that the road right-of-way is designed to better enhance and retain the character of individual communities while maintaining the safety of the roadway. Community Right-of-Way Development Standards have been prepared for the communities of Borrego Springs, Fallbrook, Julian, and San Dieguito.

- On Draft EIR page 2.1-30, first paragraph, the following regulation has been added under the heading Local:

Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) and the County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Sections 86.501-86.509, Biological Mitigation Ordinance (BMO)

As a major program in the County that addresses land use, trails and its relationship with County parks, the MSCP, BMO, and supporting regulations help preserve the scenic value of lands within MSCP boundaries. These documents define how much native habitat, wildlife corridors, and linkage areas can be impacted or preserved.

- On Draft EIR page 2.1-33, last paragraph, Policy “LU-6.8” was changed to “LU-6.9.”
- On Draft EIR page 2.1-34, fourth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Proposed General Plan Update Goals and Policies:

The primary focus of the Conservation and Open Space Element is to provide direction to future growth and development in the County of San Diego with respect to the following: the conservation, management, and utilization of natural and cultural resources; the protection and preservation of open space; and the provision of park and recreation resources. ~~and~~

~~balance future growth with the conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources; protect and preserve open space; and provide park and recreation resources.~~

- On Draft EIR page 2.1-38, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under heading FCI Areas:

Some areas of the County ~~are currently~~were affected by the FCI, which includeds approximately 91,000 acres of land in the County through the establishment of a 1 du/40 acres minimum parcel size in order to preserve the land's unique resources, the rural environment and open space. This initiative required a General Plan Amendment and rezone that remaineded in effect until December 31, 2010. The CPAs and Subregions affected by this measure include Alpine, Central Mountain, Desert, Jamul/Dulzura, Julian, Mountain Empire, North Mountain, Pendleton/De Luz, and Ramona. The General Plan Update does not apply to the FCI affected lands because ~~of the current~~ mandate was in effect until recently. Therefore, the General Plan Update would not affect the visual character or quality of FCI lands. ~~After the FCI sunsets in 2010, a General Plan Amendment would~~ will be required to apply new land use designations to the FCI areas. If the proposed land uses would have potentially significant impacts that were not adequately addressed in this EIR, then additional CEQA environmental review would be required. Additional information regarding the FCI is provided in Section 2.9, Land Use.

- On Draft EIR page 2.1-48, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Valley Center CPA:

It is anticipated that the Valley Center town center, which is divided into northern and southern "nodes," will experience a ~~substantial reformation~~ significant increases in density under the General Plan Update.

- On Draft EIR page 2.1-48, fifth paragraph, Policy "LU-2.4" was changed to "LU-2.5" and Policy "LU-1.6" was changed to "LU-1.4."
- On Draft EIR page 2.1-52, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Lighting:

These CPA and Subregions are the Alpine CPA, Bonsall CPA, Central Mountain Subregion, Crest/Dehesa/Harbison Canyon/Granite Hills CPA, Desert Subregion, Fallbrook CPA, Jamul/Dulzura CPA, Mountain Empire Subregion, North County Metro Subregion, North Mountain Subregion, and Valley Center CPA. Of particular note is the Tierra Del Sol Observation Site within the Subregion of Mountain Empire and more specifically within the Boulevard planning area. There is an on-going effort to protect the aesthetic and scientific value of this area from light pollution. As described above in Section 2.1.3.3, Issue 3, General Plan Update goals and policies would be implemented to maintain community character, including dark sky communities.

- On Draft EIR page 2.1-53, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Federal, State and Local Regulations and Existing Regulatory Processes:

Sections 6324 and 6326 of the Zoning Ordinance establish limitations on outdoor lighting. Additionally, Section 1.10 of the County's MSCP Subarea Plan requires uses within or adjacent to MSCP Preserves to be minimized and shielded.

- On Draft EIR page 2.1-55, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under heading 2.1.4.3 Issue 3: Visual Character or Quality:

Examples of these projects include ~~Merriam Mountain in the Bonsall CPA~~, Warner Ranch in the Pala/Pauma Valley Subregion, Campus Park in the Fallbrook CPA, Star Ranch in Campo, and Harmony Grove Meadows in North County Metro Subregion. The ~~Merriam Mountains~~, Warner Ranch, Star Ranch, and Harmony Grove Meadows projects all propose large residential developments in relatively undeveloped areas of the unincorporated County and have the potential to impact the rural character of the project areas.

- On Draft EIR page 2.1-56, Policy “LU-6.8” was changed to “LU-6.9” and the text of Policies LU-6.3 and LU-6.4 were revised as follows:

Policy LU-6.3: Conservation Oriented Project Design. Support conservation-oriented project design ~~when appropriate and consistent with the applicable Community Plan~~. This can be achieved with mechanisms such as, but not limited to, Specific Plans, lot area averaging, and reductions in lot size with corresponding requirements for preserved open space (Planned Residential Developments). Projects that rely on lot size reductions should incorporate specific design techniques, perimeter lot sizes, or buffers, to achieve compatibility with community character. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]

Policy LU-6.4: Sustainable Subdivision Design. Require that residential subdivisions be planned to conserve open space and natural resources, protect agricultural operations including grazing, increase fire safety and defensibility, reduce impervious footprints, use sustainable development practices, and, when appropriate, provide public amenities ~~consistent with the applicable community plan~~. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]

- On Draft EIR page 2.1-57, Policy COS-11.4 has been revised under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy COS-11.4: Collaboration with Agencies and Jurisdictions. Coordinate with adjacent federal and State agencies, and local jurisdictions, and tribal governments to protect scenic resources and corridors that extend beyond the County’s land use authority, but are important to the welfare of County residents.

- On Draft EIR pages 2.1-60 to 2.1-61, Policy LU-1.6 has been revised under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy LU-1.46: Village Expansion. Permit new Village Regional Category designated land uses only where contiguous with an existing or planned Village and where all of the following criteria are met:

- Potential Village development would be compatible with environmental conditions and constraints, such as topography and flooding
- Potential Village development would be accommodated by the General Plan road network

- Public facilities and services can support the expansion without a reduction of services to other County residents
- The expansion ~~respects and enhances~~ is consistent with community character, the scale, and the orderly and contiguous growth of a Village area
- On Draft EIR page 2.1-61, Policies LU-2.2 and LU-2.4 have been renumbered as LU-2.3 and LU-2.5 respectively; and the following policy was added:

Policy LU-2.2: Relationship of Community Plans to the General Plan. Community Plans are part of the General Plan. These plans focus on a particular region or community within the overall General Plan area. They are meant to refine the policies of the General Plan as they apply to a smaller geographic region and provide a forum for resolving local conflicts. As legally required by State law, Community Plans must be internally consistent with General Plan goals and policies of which they are a part. They cannot undermine the policies of the General Plan. Community Plans are subject to adoption, review and amendment by the Board of Supervisors in the same manner as the General Plan.

- On Draft EIR page 2.1-61, Policy LU-11.2 has been revised under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy LU-11.2: Compatibility with Community Character. Require that commercial, office, and industrial development be located, scaled, and designed to ~~respect and enhance~~ be compatible with the unique character of the community.

- On Draft EIR page 2.1-62, Policies M-10.6 and H-2.1 were revised as follows:

Policy M-10.6: On-Street Parking. Minimize on-street vehicular parking outside Villages and Rural Villages where on-street parking is not needed, to reduce the width of paved shoulders and provide an opportunity for bicycle lanes to retain rural character in low-intensity areas. Where on-street parking occurs outside Villages and Rural Villages, require the design to be consistent with the rural character ~~and the applicable community plan.~~ [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]

Policy H-2.1: Development That Respects Community Character. Require that development in existing residential neighborhoods be well designed so as not to degrade or detract from the character of surrounding development consistent with the Land Use Element ~~and Community Plans.~~ [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]

- On Draft EIR page 2.1-62, mitigation measure Aes-3.2 has been added under the heading Mitigation Measures:

Aes-3.2 Implement existing and prepare new community right-of-way development standards, as appropriate, that supplement the County road standards in order to recognize the unique constraints and character of different communities.

- On Draft EIR page 2.1-63, Policy COS-13.3 has been added under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy COS-13.3: Collaboration to Retain Night Skies. Coordinate with adjacent federal and State agencies, local jurisdictions, and tribal governments to retain the quality of night skies by minimizing light pollution.

- On Draft EIR page 2.1-63, mitigation measure Aes-4.3 has been added under the heading Mitigation Measures:

Aes-4.3 Participate in regional planning and planning by agencies operating within or adjacent to the County to the extent practicable. This includes participation in SANDAG and other regional planning forums, reviewing and commenting on planning and environmental documents issued by other agencies, and ongoing collaboration with Native American tribes and adjacent jurisdictions.

- On Draft EIR page 2.1-65, Table 2.1-2, County Scenic Highway System Priority List, has been revised as follows:

Table 2.1-2. County Scenic Highway System Priority List

Highway	Segment
Second Priority Scenic Routes	
SR-76	East Grade Road <u>Interstate 15 east to SR-79</u>
Via de la Valle, El Esccondido <u>Paseo Delicias</u> , Del Dios Highway (S-6)	Highway 101 north to Via Rancho Parkway

Section 2.2, Agricultural Resources

- On Draft EIR page 2.2-6, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Water:

In exchange for that discount, enrolled farmers agree to take a 30 percent reduction in water deliveries in a time of drought or supply emergency before municipal and industrial users have their supplies reduced. However, the IAWP is currently being phased-out and will no longer be available after January of 2013.

- On Draft EIR page 2.2-11, first paragraph, the following heading has been revised under the heading Local:

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Sections 63.401 and through 63.4027, Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer Information Ordinance

- On Draft EIR page 2.2-19, fifth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Farming Program:

The Farming Program would streamline the regulatory environment for farmers, ~~provide economic incentives to restore, enhance, or create habitat for sensitive species,~~ provide recommendations for the proposed Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easements (PACE) program, and support County pest exclusion and pest detection efforts designed to

minimize the economic damage caused by quarantines and treatment protocols required for new and exotic pests.

- On Draft EIR pages 2.2-25 and 2.2-26, first and last paragraphs, the following text has been revised under the heading Impact Analysis:

Other indirect effects that would cause the conversion of agricultural resources to non-agricultural uses include various project features such as: 1) the proposed removal of non-contracted lands from County adopted Agricultural Preserves, which would remove a barrier to growth in the vicinity of agricultural operations; 2) the placement of public trails on agricultural lands; and 3) the additional competition for water from proposed residential, commercial, industrial uses. The removal of non-contracted lands from Agricultural Preserves may remove a barrier to growth in the vicinity of existing agricultural operations, thereby resulting in indirect conversion to non-agricultural uses for some areas. Trails adjacent to agricultural lands can result in increased trespassing, theft, and potential disease to crops. For example, trails in avocado orchards can increase exposure to avocado root rot. Although policies within the County Trails Master Plan and the proposed General Plan Update specifically require trails to be placed a certain distance and downhill from orchards to avoid root rot, it is difficult to restrict hikers from veering off established trails and into agricultural areas. Root rot is easily transmitted to avocados because the spores of the disease move naturally through the soil and are spread on horse hoofs and on the shoes of trail users. ~~Project features such as these would indirectly affect the viability of agricultural operations and induce the conversion of agricultural resources to non-agricultural uses. The competition over limited water resources in the region is an escalating issue that particularly affects farmers. Such water supply constraints may indirectly result in the conversion of existing agricultural resources to non-agricultural uses. Additional analysis regarding water supply in the County is included in Section 2.16.3.4, Issue 4: Adequate Water Supplies.~~

- On Draft EIR page 2.2-31, Policies LU-7.1 and COS-6.3 have been revised under the heading Proposed General Plan Update Policies:

Policy LU-7.1: Agricultural Land Development. Protect agricultural lands with lower density land use designations that will support continued agricultural operations.

Policy COS-6.3: Compatibility with Recreation and Open Space. Encourage siting compatible recreational and open space uses and multi-use trails that are compatible with agriculture adjacent to the agricultural lands when planning for development adjacent to agricultural land uses. ~~When mutually beneficial and conflicts with non-agricultural uses are minimized, encourage siting compatible recreational and open space uses and multi-use trails adjacent to the agricultural lands when planning for development adjacent to agricultural land uses.~~

- On Draft EIR page 2.2-32, Policy COS-6.3 has been revised under the heading Proposed General Plan Update Policies:

Policy COS-6.3: Compatibility with Recreation and Open Space. Encourage siting ~~compatible~~ recreational and open space uses and multi-use trails that are compatible with agriculture adjacent to the agricultural lands when planning for development adjacent to agricultural land uses.

Section 2.3, Air Quality

- On Draft EIR page 2.3-23, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the Summary heading:

While existing County policies and regulations and proposed General Plan Update goals and policies are intended to minimize impacts associated with ~~air quality violations~~ non-attainment criteria pollutants, specific measures that implement these policies and regulations are proposed to ensure that the intended environmental protections are achieved. Therefore, the proposed project is concluded to result in a potentially significant impact associated with ~~air quality violations~~ non-attainment criteria pollutants and specific implementation programs are identified as mitigation.

- On Draft EIR page 2.3-25, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the Summary heading:

While existing County policies and regulations and proposed General Plan Update goals and policies are intended to minimize impacts associated with ~~air quality violations~~ sensitive receptors, specific measures that implement these policies and regulations are proposed to ensure that the intended environmental protections are achieved. Therefore, the proposed project is concluded to result in a potentially significant impact associated with ~~air quality violations~~ sensitive receptors and specific implementation programs are identified as mitigation.

- On Draft EIR page 2.3-26, third paragraph, the Woods Valley Ranch Water Reclamation Facility was added to the list of wastewater treatment plants located in the unincorporated County.

- On Draft EIR page 2.3-31, fifth paragraph (first bullet point), the text has been revised as follows:

The CARB is currently implementing regulations that will require turnover of equipment to meet its regulatory standards ~~starting in 2010~~ for large vehicle fleets. The measure would limit which construction contractors would be allowed to work within the County and could result in undue costs to project applicants.

- On Draft EIR page 2.3-34, mitigation measure Air-2.1 has been revised as follows under the heading Mitigation Measures:

Air-2.1 Provide incentives such as preferential parking for hybrids or alternatively fueled vehicles such as compressed natural gas (CNG) vehicles or hydrogen- or electric-powered vehicles. The County shall also establish programs for priority or free parking on County streets or in County parking lots for hybrids or alternatively fueled vehicles.

- On Draft EIR page 2.3-38, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Issue 3: Non-Attainment Criteria Pollutants:

The proposed General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures, in combination with compliance with the RAQS and SIP, would reduce direct and cumulative impacts to ~~air quality violations associated with non-attainment criteria pollutants~~; however, not to a level below significance.

Section 2.4, Biological Resources

- On Draft EIR page 2.4-3, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Coastal Sage Scrub:

The California gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica californica*), California towhee (*Pipilo crissalis eremophilus*), coastal cactus wren (*Campylorhynchus brunneicapillus*), rufous-crowned sparrow (*Aimophila ruficeps canescens*), and California thrasher are representative birds of the coastal sage scrub communities.

- On Draft EIR page 2.4-5, seventh paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Grasslands:

Both native and non-native grasslands are important for a variety of wildlife including burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*), grasshopper sparrows (*Ammodramus savannarum*), horned larks (*Eremophila alpestris*), meadowlarks (*Sturnella* spp.), and small mammals that include the endangered Stephens' kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys stephensi*).

- On Draft EIR page 2.4-15, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading California Fish and Game (CFG) Code:

The CFG Code also includes protection of birds (3500 et seq.) and the California Native Plant Protection Act (NPPA) of 1977 (Sections 1900-1913), which directed CDFG to carry out the Legislature's intent to "preserve, protect and enhance rare and endangered plants in this State."

- On Draft EIR page 2.4-15, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading California Endangered Species Act (CESA):

Section 2081 allows CDFG to authorize take prohibited under Section 2080 provided that: 1) the taking is incidental to an otherwise lawful activity; 2) the taking will be minimized and fully mitigated; 3) the applicant ensures adequate funding for minimization and mitigation; and 4) the authorization will not jeopardize the continued existence of the listed species. In addition, Section 2800 et seq. of the CFG Code addresses Natural Community Conservation Planning (NCCP).

- On Draft EIR page 2.4-16, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Natural Community Conservation Planning (NCCP) Act of 1991:

The NCCP Act is designed to conserve natural communities at the ecosystem scale while accommodating compatible land uses. CDFG is the principal state agency implementing the NCCP Program. Section 2800 et seq. of the CFG Code addresses NCCPs and a 2835 permit is issued by CDFG for all NCCPs.

- On Draft EIR page 2.4-17, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP):

The County is currently developing additional MSCP Plans for the North County and East County areas. A Draft North County Plan was released for public review on February 19, 2009. The public may submit comments and a second draft of the plan, along with its EIR/EIS, is expected to be released in ~~fall 2009~~ early 2011. ~~The final North County Plan is expected to be brought to the BOS for approval by the end of 2010.~~ The draft Plan covers 63 plant and animal species in a 294,849-acre area in North County stretching from Camp Pendleton and the Riverside County line to the community of Ramona (County 2009).

- On Draft EIR page 2.4-20, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Direct Impacts:

As shown in these tables, the areas with the greatest total acreage impact are Desert Subregion (~~19,030~~ 19,101 acres), Mountain Empire Subregion (~~15,606~~ 15,617 acres), North Mountain Subregion (~~14,390~~ 14,392 acres), Ramona CPA (~~15,245~~ 15,289 acres), and Valley Center CPA (~~14,259~~ 14,264 acres)... The CPAs with the smallest estimated habitat impacts include County Islands CPA (32 acres), Spring Valley CPA (~~756~~ 757 acres), Sweetwater CPA (858 acres), and Valle de Oro CPA (~~1,199~~ 1,200 acres).

- On Draft EIR page 2.4-20, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Direct Impacts:

Table 2.4-2 provides the total acreage of each habitat/vegetation community impacted. As shown in this table, a total of approximately ~~174,638~~ 175,114 acres of habitat types would be impacted Countywide as a result of the proposed project. The most heavily impacted vegetation communities would be chaparral (~~55,058~~ 55,053 acres), Diegan coastal sage scrub (31,186 acres), non-native grassland (14,005 acres), and Desert Scrub/Sonoran creosote bush scrub (10,775 acres).

- On Draft EIR page 2.4-22, third bullet, the following text has been revised under the heading Indirect Impacts:

Edge effects would occur if blocks of habitat were fragmented. New construction and new roadways would have the potential to fragment habitats. Brush management and trail construction or use can also result in potentially significant edge effects to special status plants and wildlife species and/or their supporting habitats.

- On Draft EIR page 2.4-23, fourth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Federal, State and Local Regulations and Existing Regulatory Processes:

The County is allowed a loss of up to 5 percent of its coastal sage scrub habitat if it is actively developing a comprehensive NCCP for the area. The five percent allowed take amounted to 2,953.30 acres initially and the County currently has 1,793.49 acres remaining. The interim take refers to the authorization for removal of coastal sage scrub and/or any incidental impacts to target species (such as California gnatcatcher, coastal cactus wren and orange-throated whiptail) if achieved in accordance with findings set forth in the NCCP Process Guidelines.

- On Draft EIR page 2.4-24, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Proposed General Plan Update Goals and Policies:

This goal is supported by Policies LU-6.1 through LU-6.4, LU-6.6, ~~and~~ LU-6.7, and M-12.9. These policies support the protection of critical and sensitive natural resources and the long-term sustainability of the natural environment, assign low-density or low-intensity land use designations to areas with sensitive natural resources, support conservation-oriented project design when appropriate and consistent with the applicable community plan, require that trails are designed to minimize impacts to sensitive environmental resources, require that residential subdivisions be planned to conserve open space and natural resources, require incorporation of natural features into proposed development and avoidance of sensitive environmental resources, and encourage contiguous open space areas that protect wildlife habitat and corridors.

- On Draft EIR page 2.4-25, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Direct Impacts:

The General Plan Update would have the potential to impact 10,131 ~~40,324~~ acres of riparian habitat. The CPAs and Subregions with the greatest acreage of potential direct impacts are the Desert Subregion (1,357 ~~4,378~~ acres), Fallbrook CPA (1,176 acres), Mountain Empire Subregion (885 ~~898~~ acres), North County Metro Subregion (752 ~~764~~ acres), and Ramona CPA (636 ~~697~~ acres).

- On Draft EIR page 2.4-28, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Proposed General Plan Update Goals and Policies:

The General Plan Update includes policies in the Conservation and Open Space Element which would reduce the potential for adverse impacts to ~~sensitive natural communities~~ federally protected wetlands.

- On Draft EIR pages 2.4-32 and 2.4-33, first and last paragraphs, the following text has been revised under the heading Impact Analysis:

Additional adopted NCCPs and HCPs are located within the County of San Diego, but apply to other agency/special district activities, cover areas throughout the County. Future development in areas where adopted NCCPs and HCPs exist would comply with the applicable plan, are required by the CDFG and USFWS. Two examples of adopted NCCPs or HCPs in the County are the SDG&E Company Subregional Plan and the Sweetwater River HCP. Future development in areas where adopted NCCPs and HCPs exist would comply with the applicable plan, as required by the CDFG or USFWS. The NCCP/HCP Plan for SDG&E, approved in 1995, encompasses SDG&E's jurisdiction within the entire

unincorporated County west of the Anza-Borrego Desert and applies only to projects proposed by SDG&E or on SDG&E property rights-of-way and/or easements... ..Future development under the General Plan Update with the participating jurisdictions would be required to comply with all applicable NCCPs and HCPs that have been adopted at the time the development is proposed.

- On Draft EIR page 2.4-35, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Issue 3: Federally Protected Wetlands:

Adjacent jurisdictions, including incorporated cities, adjacent counties, tribal lands, and federal and State-managed lands, would be required to comply with applicable federal ~~and/or State~~ regulations such as Section 401 and 404 of the CWA ~~Section 1600 of the California Fish and Game Code~~.

- On Draft EIR page 2.4-45, the following revisions have been made to Table 2.4-1, Total Habitat Impacts by CPA and Subregion:

CPA/Subregion	Total Acres Impacted
Alpine CPA Total	<u>5,975</u> 5,984
Bonsall CPA Total	<u>6,503</u> 6,510
Central Mountain Subregion Total	<u>4,640</u> 4,644
Pine Valley Total	<u>1,743</u> 1,744
County Islands CPA Total	32
Crest/Dehesa Subregion Total	<u>3,999</u> 4,003
Desert Subregion Total	<u>19,030</u> 19,104
Borrego Springs Total	<u>15,182</u> 15,238
Desert Remainder Total	<u>3,848</u> 3,863
Jamul/Dulzura Subregion Total	<u>12,832</u> 12,862
Julian CPA Total	<u>6,125</u> 6,126
Lakeside CPA Total	<u>6,828</u> 6,838
Lake Morena/Campo Total	<u>4,980</u> 4,909
North County Metro Subregion Total	<u>12,947</u> 12,954
North Mountain Subregion Total	<u>14,390</u> 14,392
North Mountain Remainder Total	<u>12,519</u> 12,524
Otay Subregion Total	<u>3,861</u> 3,864
Pala/Pauma Subregion Total	<u>9,798</u> 9,842
Ramona CPA Total	<u>15,245</u> 15,289
Spring Valley CPA Total	<u>756</u> 757
Valle De Oro CPA Total	<u>1,199</u> 1,200
Valley Center CPA Total	<u>14,259</u> 14,264
Countywide Total	<u>174,750</u> 174,969

- On Draft EIR pages 2.4-46 and 2.4-47, the following revisions have been made to Table 2.4-2, Total Habitat Impacts by CPA and Subregion:

Habitat Impacted	Total Acres Impacted
Chaparral	<u>55,058</u> 55,053
Field/Pasture	<u>8,410</u> 8,510
Engelmann Oak Woodland	<u>3,261</u> 3,250
Freshwater	<u>420</u> 424
Montane Chaparral	<u>414</u> 418
Alkali Seep	<u>340</u> 343
Disturbed Wetland	<u>60</u> 243
Desert Dunes	<u>74</u> 427

- On Draft EIR page 2.4-48, the following revisions have been made to Table 2.4-3, Total Impacts to Riparian Habitat by CPA and Subregion:

CPA/Subregion	Total Acres Impacted
Alpine CPA Total	<u>454</u> 464
Bonsall CPA Total	<u>543</u> 554
Central Mountain Subregion Total	<u>175</u> 477
Pine Valley Total	<u>85</u> 87
Crest/Dehesa Subregion Total	<u>526</u> 532
Desert Subregion Total	<u>1,357</u> 1,378
Borrego Springs Total	<u>1,006</u> 1,040
Desert Subregion - Remainder Total	<u>351</u> 368
Jamul/Dulzura Subregion Total	<u>562</u> 593
Julian CPA Total	<u>172</u> 473
Lakeside CPA Total	<u>486</u> 497
Mountain Empire Subregion Total	<u>885</u> 898
Boulevard Total	<u>113</u> 444
Jacumba Total	<u>408</u> 409
Lake Morena/Campo Total	<u>220</u> 234
North County Metro Subregion Total	<u>752</u> 764
North County Metro Subregion - Remainder Total	<u>539</u> 548
North Mountain Subregion Total	<u>634</u> 637
North Mountain Subregion - Remainder Total	<u>503</u> 506
Otay Subregion Total	<u>59</u> 63
Pala/Pauma Subregion Total	<u>396</u> 411
Ramona CPA Total	<u>636</u> 697
Valle De Oro CPA Total	<u>112</u> 444
Valley Center CPA Total	<u>502</u> 498
Countywide Total	<u>10,131</u> 10,324

- On Draft EIR page 2.4-49, the following revisions have been made to Table 2.4-4, Total Impacts to Riparian Vegetation Communities:

Vegetation Community Impacted	Total Acres Impacted
Freshwater	<u>420</u> 424
Alkali Seep	<u>340</u> 343
Disturbed Wetland	<u>60</u> 243
Countywide Total	<u>10,131</u> 10,324

Section 2.5, Cultural and Paleontological Resources

- On Draft EIR page 2.5-6, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Significant Prehistoric Site:

The C.W. Harris Site Archaeological District is one of the most significant archaeological sites in the western U.S. and has been ~~placed on the NRHP~~ determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

- On Draft EIR page 2.5-7, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Native American Perspective:

The consultation is typically administered pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 18, described below in Section 2.5.2, Regulatory Framework. Some anthropologists and archaeologist concur with the Native American perspective of the continuity of descent from the earliest County inhabitants, and recognize the possibility that the descendents of the earlier cultures in the County and the later cultures resulted from the absorption and intermarriage with the earlier peoples.

- On Draft EIR page 2.5-8, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Historic Resources Surveys:

Additional historic sites have been identified as historic and may be eligible for designation, but have not yet been listed. ~~One~~ Three designated historic districts exist in unincorporated County, the Camp Lockett in Campo, the Mataguay Historic District, and the Glen Abbey Memorial Park in Bonita.

- On Draft EIR page 2.5-9, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Bancroft Rock House:

The Ranch ~~Rock~~ House was given the status of ~~National~~ California Historic Landmark No. 626 in 1958, and since has become a museum displaying artifacts from Spring Valley.

- On Draft EIR page 2.5-15, fifth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Human Remains:

Within the unincorporated County, the Ellis Cemetery, Glen Abbey Memorial Park, Fallbrook Masonic Cemetery, Oddfellows Cemetery, and Ramona Nuevo Memory Gardens Cemetery are included on the San Diego County Historic Property Listing.

- On Draft EIR page 2.5-22, fourth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Guidelines for Determination of Significance:

The County of San Diego Ordinance No. 9493, Section V (d) (2) (Types of Historical Resources and Criteria for Listing in the San Diego County Register of Historical Resources) states that one of the criteria for historical listing is “historical resources achieving significance within the past fifty (50) years.” However, the County’s Significance Guidelines state that “A resource less than fifty (50) years old may be considered if it can be determined that sufficient time has passed to understand its historical importance.”

- On Draft EIR page 2.5-25, second paragraph, the following text has been added under the heading Impact Analysis:

Impacts to communities with high concentrations of historic resources, and communities that have been surveyed for historic resources are at risk for direct and indirect impacts from development. To minimize impacts to historic resources, each Community Plan will include in the Conservation Section, a listing of historic buildings and sites that are important and significant to that community or, in the case of those with historic surveys, a reference to the survey will be made. All known historic buildings or sites have been flagged so that any permit activity relating to a property having known significant historic sites will be required to undergo additional review by an environmental specialist. All discretionary projects will be subject to a rigorous cultural review with the goal of identifying significant historic sites and conditioning their preservation.

- On Draft EIR page 2.5-26, fourth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Proposed General Plan Update Goals and Policies:

Policy COS-8.1 supports this goal by encouraging the preservation and/or appropriate adaptive re-use of historic structures and the preservation of historical landscaping as a means of protecting important historical resources while respecting the heritage, context, design, and scale of older structures and neighborhoods. In addition, mitigation measure Cul-1-7 would develop procedures to minimize the loss of historic structures through the Ministerial Permit process.

- On Draft EIR page 2.5-26, fifth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the Summary heading:

While existing County policies and regulations and proposed General Plan Update goals and policies are intended to protect historical resources, specific measures that implement these policies and regulations are proposed to ensure that the intended protections are achieved. The County has a 50-year threshold to review for consideration of mitigation for projects affecting historic resources to ensure their consistency with CEQA Guidelines and the requirements of the California Register of Historic Resources and the National Register of Historic Places.

- On Draft EIR page 2.5-29, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Proposed General Plan Update Goals and Policies:

Policy COS-7.3 requires ~~evaluation~~ appropriate treatment and preservation of collected archaeological resources. ~~at a San Diego facility that meet federal standards.~~

- On Draft EIR page 2.5-36, Policy COS-8.1 has been revised under the heading Proposed General Plan Update Policies:

Policy COS-8.1: Preservation and Adaptive Reuse. Encourage the preservation and/or adaptive reuse of historic sites, structures, and landscapes as a means of protecting important historic resources as part of the discretionary application process, and encourage the preservation of historic structures identified during the ministerial application process.

- On Draft EIR page 2.5-36, the following text has been added under the heading Mitigation Measures:

Mitigation measure Cul-2.6 is also relevant to this issue and is incorporated here by reference; however, it would not require consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and local tribal governments. In addition, the following mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce impacts to historical resources.

- On Draft EIR page 2.5-37, mitigation measures Cul-1.7 and Cul-1.8 have been added to the text under the heading Mitigation Measures:

Cul-1.7 Identify potentially historic structures within the County and enter the information in the Department of Planning and Land Use property database. Identification will occur by compiling information from all available sources (e.g., County surveys, Historic Site Board, information received from SOHO and community planning groups, information from other jurisdictions, etc.) and shall be updated at least every five years.

Cul-1.8 Revise the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) to apply to the demolition or alteration of identified significant historic structures.

- On Draft EIR page 2.5-37, Policy COS-7.3 has been revised under the heading Proposed General Plan Update Policies:

Policy COS-7.3: Archaeological Collections. Require the appropriate treatment and preservation of archaeological collections in a culturally appropriate manner. Require the appropriate treatment and preservation of archaeological collections in a culturally appropriate manner. Require all collections to be placed in a local curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR 79, with the exception of those required by law to be repatriated.

- On Draft EIR page 2.5-38, mitigation measures Cul-2.5 and Cul-2.6 have been added under the heading Mitigation Measures:

Cul-2.5 Protect undiscovered subsurface archaeological resources by requiring grading monitoring by a qualified archaeologist and a Native American monitor for ground disturbing activities in the vicinity of known archaeological resources, and also, when feasible, during initial surveys.

Cul-2.6 Protect significant cultural resources by facilitating the identification and acquisition of important resources through regional coordination with agencies, and institutions, such as the South Coast Information Center (SCIC) and consultation with the

Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and local tribal governments, including SB-18 review, while maintaining the confidentiality of sensitive cultural information.

- On Draft EIR page 2.5-38, Policy COS-7.5 has been revised under the heading Proposed General Plan Update Policies:

Policy COS-7.5: Treatment of Human Remains. Require human remains be treated with the utmost dignity and respect and that the disposition and handling of human remains will be done in consultation with the Most Likely Descendant (MLD) and under the requirements of Federal, State and County Regulations.

- On Draft EIR page 2.5-42, the following revisions have been made to Table 2.5-2, Significant Historical Sites:

Designation⁽¹⁾	Resource Name	CPA/Subregional Planning Area
HPL #20	Mataguay Historic District	Jamul/Dulzura
<u>HPL #2008-004</u>	<u>Lindo Lake Boat House</u>	<u>Lakeside</u>
<u>HLP # 2009-004</u>	<u>Sharp Estate</u>	<u>Pine Valley</u>
HLP # 2009-001	Osuna Adobe	San Dieguito
HLP # 2009-005	Angel/McCutcheon House	San Dieguito
HPL #020	Mataguay Historic District	Santa Ysabel
HPL #2008-003	James Hubbell Complex	Santa Ysabel
HLP #018	Thing Brothers Store (destroyed by 2007 fires)	Tecate
NRHP #6600227, NHL. CHL #626, HPL #004	Bancroft Ranch House	Spring Valley
<u>HPL #003</u>	<u>Mt. Helix Nature Center</u>	<u>Valle de Oro</u>
<u>HPL #2002-008</u>	<u>Reynolds/Warren House</u>	<u>Valle de Oro</u>
<u>HPL #2003-001</u>	<u>Holmgren House</u>	<u>Valle de Oro</u>
<u>HPL #2003-002</u>	<u>T.W. Lillie Residence</u>	<u>Valle de Oro</u>
<u>HPL #2004-002</u>	<u>William Gross House</u>	<u>Valle de Oro</u>
<u>HPL #2005-004</u>	<u>Bartlett House</u>	<u>Valle de Oro</u>
<u>HPL #2005-007</u>	<u>Hare House</u>	<u>Valle de Oro</u>
<u>HPL #2005-008</u>	<u>Glenn E. Murdock House</u>	<u>Valle de Oro</u>
<u>HPL #2005-009</u>	<u>Marie Schumann-Heink & Hubert Gut Residence</u>	<u>Valle de Oro</u>
<u>HPL #2006-007</u>	<u>C.W. Cadman Residence</u>	<u>Valle de Oro</u>
<u>HPL #2007-003</u>	<u>Hindman Residence</u>	<u>Valle de Oro</u>
<u>HPL #2007-006</u>	<u>Arthur & Lillian Gaynes House</u>	<u>Valle de Oro</u>
<u>HPL #2007-007</u>	<u>R. King Kauffman House</u>	<u>Valle de Oro</u>
<u>HPL #2008-002</u>	<u>Lee Packard/Ralph L. Frank House</u>	<u>Valle de Oro</u>
<u>HPL #2009-002</u>	<u>Cornelius Residence</u>	<u>Valle de Oro</u>

Section 2.6, Geology and Soils

- No changes were made to this section of the EIR.

Section 2.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- On Draft EIR page 2.7-12, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading McClellan-Palomar Airport:

McClellan-Palomar Airport primarily serves general aviation users, but also serves corporate aircraft. One commercial airline serves this airport, with Los Angeles as the sole service destination. Historically, Las Vegas, Laughlin, and Phoenix have been other destinations served by commercial carriers from McClellan-Palomar Airport, and two regularly scheduled airlines (America West and United Express), which provide non-stop service to Phoenix and Los Angeles.

- On Draft EIR page 2.7-13, fourth paragraph, the following text has been deleted under the heading Public Airport Hazard Prevention:

~~Table 2.7-6 describes the characteristics of the different Aircraft Safety Zones. and Table 2.7-7 generally describes compatibility requirements for public airports.~~

- On Draft EIR page 2.7-14, second paragraph, the following text has been deleted under the heading Military Airports Hazard Prevention:

~~In addition, military airports designate two APZs (APZ-1 and APZ-2), which extend beyond the Clear Zone. Land Use Compatibility for these APZs is listed in Table 2.7-8.~~

- On Draft EIR page 2.7-40, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Impact Analysis:

Figure 2.7-43 identifies the location of airports throughout the County.

- On Draft EIR page 2.7-40, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Impact Analysis:

Each of these airports have adopted ALUCPs that guide nearby property owners and local jurisdictions in determining what types of proposed new land uses are appropriate around airports. Brown Field Municipal Airport, located within and operated by the City of San Diego, also has an existing ALUCP whose compatibility requirements affect lands within County jurisdiction.

- On Draft EIR page 2.7-40, second paragraph, the following text has been deleted under the heading Impact Analysis:

~~However, each ALUCP is unique to the airport it serves. Table 2.7-7 provides an example of public airport safety zone compatibility requirements.~~

- On Draft EIR page 2.7-40, fifth paragraph, the following policy has been added under the heading Proposed General Plan Update Goals and Policies:

Goal LU-4 is coordination with the plans and activities of other agencies that relate to issues such as land use, community character, transportation, energy, other infrastructure, public safety, and resource conservation and management in the unincorporated County and the region. Policy LU-4.7 would coordinate with the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) and support review of Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans for development within Airport Influence Areas.

- On Draft EIR page 2.7-41, fourth paragraph, the following text has been deleted under the heading Impact Analysis:

~~Only USMC Camp Pendleton is located completely within the unincorporated area of the County, although a portion of the MCAS Miramar influence area is located within the unincorporated County area near I-15 and Pomerado Road. Land Use Compatibility of Military APZ zones are shown in Table 2.7-8.~~

- On Draft EIR page 2.7-45, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Proposed General Plan Update Goals and Policies:

~~Policy M-3.3 would require new development to provide multiple access/egress routes. If multiple safe routes are not achievable, require the new development projects to incorporate design, construction, and fuel management considerations that achieve the same practical affect. "Same practical effect" means to provide: 1) access for emergency wildland fire equipment; 2) safe civilian evacuation; 3) signage that avoids delays in emergency equipment responses; 4) available and accessible water to effectively attack wildfire or defend a structure from wildfire, and; 5) fuel modification sufficient for civilian and firefighter safety.~~

- On Draft EIR page 2.7-46, sixth paragraph, General Plan Update Policy LU-6.10 has been renumbered as LU-6.11.

- On Draft EIR page 2.7-47, second paragraph, the following text has been added under the heading Proposed General Plan Update Goals and Policies:

Goal COS-18 aims to provide alternate energy systems while minimizing environmental impacts. Policy COS-18.3 supports this goal by requiring alternative energy system operators to properly design and maintain these systems to minimize adverse impacts to the environment.

- On Draft EIR page 2.7-55, Policies LU-4.7 and M-7.1 have been added under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy LU-4.7: Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans (ALUCP). Coordinate with the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) and support review of Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans (ALUCP) for development within Airport Influence Areas.

Policy M-7.1: Meeting Airport Needs. Operate and improve airport facilities to meet air transportation needs in a manner that adequately considers impacts to environmental

resources and surrounding communities and to ensure consistency with Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans.

- On Draft EIR page 2.7-55, Policy S-15.3 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy S-15.3: Hazardous Obstructions within Airport Approach and Departure. Restrict development of potentially hazardous obstructions or other hazards to flight located within airport approach and departure areas or known flight patterns and discourage uses that may impact airport operations or do not meet Federal or State aviation standards. Specific concerns include heights of structures near airports and activities which can cause electronic or visual impairments to air navigation or which attract large numbers of birds (such as landfills, wetlands, water features, and cereal grain fields).

- On Draft EIR page 2.7-55, mitigation measure Haz-1.3 has been revised as follows under the heading Mitigation Measures:

Haz-1.3 Review the AICUZ when reviewing new development projects within the influence study area. Ensure that such development projects are consistent with the land use compatibility and safety policies therein.

- On Draft EIR page 2.7-58, Policies LU-6.10 and LU-11.2 have been revised as follows under the heading, General Plan Update Policies:

Policy LU-6.10 11: **Protection from Wildfires and Unmitigable Hazards.** Assign land uses and densities in a manner that minimizes development in extreme, very high and high hazard fire areas or other unmitigable hazardous areas.

Policy LU-11.2 10.2: **Development—Environmental Resource Relationship.** Require development in Semi-Rural and Rural areas to respect and conserve the unique natural features and rural character, and avoid sensitive or intact environmental resources and hazard areas. ~~Compatibility with Community Character. Require that commercial, office, and industrial development be located, scaled, and designed to respect and enhance the unique character of the community.~~

- On Draft EIR page 2.7-59, Policy S-4.1 has been revised and Policy COS-18.3 has been added under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy S-4.1: Fuel Management Programs. Support programs consistent with State law that require fuel management/modification within established defensible space boundaries and when strategic fuel modification is necessary outside of defensible space, balance fuel management needs to protect structures with the preservation of native vegetation and sensitive habitats.

Policy COS-18.3: Alternate Energy Systems Impacts. Require alternative energy system operators to properly design and maintain these systems to minimize adverse impacts to the environment.

- On Draft EIR page 2.7-68, Table 2.7-7, Public Airport Safety Zone Compatibility Requirements, has been deleted from the EIR.

- On Draft EIR page 2.7-68, Table 2.7-8, Land Use Compatibility in Accident Potential Zones, has been deleted from the EIR.
- On Draft EIR page 2.7-69, the following revisions were made to the title and source of Table 2.7-9, Existing Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Fire Threat in Acreage:

Table 2.7-9. Existing Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Fire Threat in Acreage
(Time period: 1/1/2004 to 12/31/2004)

Source: ~~DPLU GIS 2008~~ CalFIRE 2003

Section 2.8, Hydrology and Water Quality

- On Draft EIR page 2.8-5, fifth paragraph, the following text has been deleted under the heading Barona Indian Reservation (Ramona CPA):

Barona Indian Reservation (Ramona CPA)

~~More than 500 AF/yr of groundwater is pumped for a golf course, casino, and hotel. The amount of groundwater pumped in this area exceeds the sustainable yield of the basin and the Barona Tribe has reportedly trucked in water to supplement its depleted groundwater supply.~~

- On Draft EIR page 2.8-20, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Nitrates:

Potable water, whether from local or imported supplies, does not contain significant amounts of nitrates. Nitrate impacts in the County are most common from small lots and/or areas of shallow groundwater on septic systems, excess nitrate used in agricultural applications, and feed lots. ...The nitrate impacts can largely be attributed to agricultural uses and/or imported water being brought into these basins causing septic system failures.

- On Draft EIR page 2.8-33, third paragraph, the following text has been added under the heading Groundwater Quality:

In addition, the proposed General Plan Update would allow for the development of small lots on septic systems and agricultural operations, which have the potential to contribute nitrate in quantities that degrade water quality and contribute to the continual degradation of existing water quality impacted areas. For some future projects, mitigation could be implemented by providing a water treatment system that reduces impacts to below the MCL. To ensure proper water treatment in accordance with the California Safe Drinking Water Act, the County requires discretionary permits which require treatment to form or merge with a water system regulated by the County Department of Environmental Health (up to 200 service connections) or the State Department of Public Health (greater than 200 service connections). For smaller projects, the ongoing costs of a regulated water system may prove economically infeasible and for projects with less than five service connections, there is no feasible regulated water system category available. In some cases, such as aquifers contaminated with gasoline from a leaking underground fuel tank, the County may not approve projects reliant on groundwater in such areas. Therefore, it is likely there will be specific cases where water quality impacts would be significant and unmitigable.

- On Draft EIR pages 2.8-36, 2.8-44, 2.8-48, and 2.8-63 General Plan Update Policy LU-6.8 has been renumbered as LU-6.9.
- On Draft EIR page 2.8-38, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading 50 Percent Reduction in Groundwater in Storage:

The County General Plan Update Groundwater Study identified ~~40~~ 11 groundwater basins as potentially experiencing substantial groundwater in storage depletion from build-out of the proposed General Plan Update. These include the Ballena Basin, Barona Basin, Engineer Springs Basin, Guatay Basin, Las Lomas Muertas Basin, Lee Basin, Lyon Basin, Morena South Basin, Pine South Basin, San Felipe South Basin, and Spencer Basin... .Therefore, this would be considered a potentially significant impact. However, it is important to understand that due to the sheer size and complexity of the 1,885 square mile study area, the long-term groundwater availability results (being based on a limited amount of readily available information) are subject to substantial error and uncertainty. Therefore, a conservative approach was mandatory in the study to bias any potential errors towards overestimation of potential impacts. It should further be understood that due to the nature of fractured rock aquifers, impacts to these basins would likely be limited to localized areas of higher groundwater use and do not necessarily extend basin-wide into areas with adequately spaced groundwater users. As discussed below, large quantity/clustered groundwater users identified within these 11 basins are areas where localized groundwater impacts are most likely to occur. Site-specific groundwater investigations would be necessary for future groundwater-dependent projects in these potentially impacted basins to provide specific details of the significance of groundwater impacts that cannot be provided at the screening level scale in which the study was conducted.

- On Draft EIR page 2.8-39, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Large Quantity/Clustered Groundwater Users:

~~Areas identified as potentially experiencing localized groundwater impacts include parcels smaller than four acres and irrigated agricultural lands. and the Barona Indian Reservation. While no historical groundwater information is available for Barona Indian Reservation, it was included as having the potential for localized groundwater problems due to greater than 500 AF of groundwater per year being pumped, which exceeds the sustainable yield of its basin~~

- On Draft EIR pages 2.8-46 and 2.8-69 General Plan Update Policy LU-6.9 has been renumbered as LU-6.10.
- On Draft EIR page 2.8-49, fifth paragraph, the following text has been revised as follows under the heading Impact Analysis:

Impacts resulting from flooding include the loss of life and/or property; health and safety hazards; disruption of commerce, water, power, and telecommunications services; loss of agricultural lands; and infrastructure damage. ~~and flood relief.~~

- On Draft EIR pages 2.8-50, 2.8-52, 2.8-70, and 2.8-72 General Plan Update Policy LU-6.11 has been renumbered as LU-6.12.

- On Draft EIR page 2.8-63, Policy LU-14.4 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy LU-14.4: Sewer Facilities. Prohibit sewer facilities that would induce unplanned growth. Require sewer systems to be planned, developed, and sized to serve the land use pattern and densities depicted on the Land Use Map. Sewer systems and services shall not be extended beyond either Village boundaries (or extant Urban Limit Lines), whichever is more restrictive, except:

- ~~When~~ When necessary for public health, safety, or welfare;
 - When within existing sewer district boundaries;
 - When necessary for a conservation subdivision adjacent to existing sewer facilities; or
 - Where specifically allowed in the Community Plan.
- On Draft EIR page 2.8-63, Policy COS-4.3 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy COS-4.3: Stormwater Filtration. Maximize stormwater filtration and/or infiltration in areas that are not subject to high groundwater by maximizing the natural drainage patterns and the retention of natural vegetation and other pervious surfaces. This policy shall not apply in areas with high groundwater, where raising the water table could cause septic system failures, ~~and/or~~ moisture damage to building slabs, and/or other problems.

- On Draft EIR page 2.8-64, Policy COS-5.5 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy COS-5.5: Impacts of Development to Water Quality. Require development projects to avoid impacts to the water quality in local reservoirs, groundwater resources, and recharge areas, watersheds, and other local water sources.

- On Draft EIR page 2.8-66, third bullet, the following text has been added and revised under the heading Infeasible Mitigation Measures:

Implement a Countywide moratorium on building permits and development applications in any areas of the County that would have the potential to adversely impact groundwater supplies and recharge. This would effectively result in no new impacts to groundwater supplies and recharge within the unincorporated County. However, due to the size and complexity of the groundwater dependent portion of the County, it is not possible to specifically identify at a parcel by parcel scale where significant impacts to groundwater resources would occur. Site-specific groundwater investigations are necessary to provide details of impacts that cannot be provided at the scale in which the General Plan Update Groundwater Study was conducted. Therefore, there is not enough technical evidence in which to impose a moratorium. ~~However~~ Additionally, this measure would impede the County's ability to implement the General Plan Update because it would prohibit future development in areas identified for increased growth in the General Plan Update.

- On Draft EIR page 2.8-67, Policy LU-8.2 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy LU-8.2: Groundwater Resources. Require development to identify adequate groundwater resources in groundwater dependent areas, as follows:

- In areas dependent on currently identified groundwater overdrafted basins, prohibit new development from exacerbating overdraft conditions. Encourage programs to alleviate overdraft conditions in Borrego Valley.
 - In areas without current overdraft groundwater conditions, ~~prohibit~~ evaluate new groundwater-dependent development to assure a sustainable long-term supply of groundwater is available that will not adversely impact existing groundwater users. where overdraft conditions are foreseeable.
 - ~~A groundwater basin is considered in an overdraft condition when, during average conditions over a number of years, the amount of water being withdrawn from the basin exceeds the amount of water that recharges the basin.~~
- On Draft EIR page 2.8-67, Policy COS-4.1 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy COS-4.1: Water Conservation. Require development to ~~R~~reduce the waste of potable water through use of efficient technologies and conservation efforts that minimize the County’s dependence on imported water and conserve groundwater resources.

- On Draft EIR page 2.8-71, Policies S-9.4 and S-9.5 have been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy S-9.4: Development in Villages. Allow new uses and development within the floodplain fringe (land within the floodplain outside of the floodway) only when environmental impacts and hazards are mitigated. This policy does not apply to floodplains with unmapped floodways. Require land available outside the floodplain to be fully utilized before locating development within a floodplain. Development within a floodplain may be denied if it will cause significant adverse environmental impacts or is prohibited in the community plan. Channelization of floodplains is allowed within villages only when specifically addressed in community plans.

Policy S-9.5: Development in the Floodplain Fringe. Prohibit development in the floodplain fringe when located on Semi-Rural and Rural Lands to maintain the capacity of the floodplain. For parcels located entirely within a floodplain or without sufficient space for a building pad outside the floodplain, development is limited to a single family home on an existing lot or those uses that do not compromise the environmental attributes of the floodplain or require further channelization. ~~This policy shall not apply when the lot is entirely within the floodplain or when sufficient land for development on a project site is not available and where clustering is not feasible to minimize encroachment on floodplains. In those instances, require development to minimize impacts to the capacity of the floodplain.~~

- On Draft EIR page 2.8-76, the following revisions have been made to Table 2.8-1, Water Bodies Identified as Impaired under the Clean Water Act:

Watershed Management Area	Water Body Name	Pollutant/Stressor
Carlsbad WMA	<u>Lake San Marcos</u>	<u>Ammonia as Nitrogen, Nutrients, Phosphorus</u>

	San Marcos Creek	DDE, Phosphorus, Sediment Toxicity
--	------------------	------------------------------------

- On Draft EIR page 2.8-83, the following revisions have been made to Table 2.8-6, Groundwater Basins Experiencing Significant Impacts in Storage:

Estimated Minimum Groundwater in Storage (Worst Month in a 34-Year Period Analyzed)		
Groundwater Basin	Existing (percent)	General Plan Update at Buildout (percent)
Pine South	63	37

Section 2.9, Land Use

- On Draft EIR page 2.9-2, fourth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Alpine CPA:

The Cleveland National Forest comprises most of the land in the eastern and northern portions of the Alpine CPA. Privately held lands within these areas ~~are~~ were subject to the Forest Conservation Initiative (FCI) until December 31, 2010, described in (see Section 2.9.2 Regulatory Framework).

- On Draft EIR page 2.9-5, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Crest/Dehesa/Harbison Canyon/Granite Hills Subregion:

The City of El Cajon and the Valle de Oro CPA are located to the west, the Jamul/Dulzura CPA is located to the south, the Alpine CPA is located to the east, and the Lakeside CPA is located to the north. ~~In addition, a~~ Approximately 600 818 acres in the southeast portion of the Subregion are under the ownership of the Sycuan Indian Reservation, either as part of the Reservation or held in trust by the Tribe. Sycuan also owns an additional 2,037 acres of fee land that it is seeking to have taken into trust.

- On Draft EIR page 2.9-8, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Jamul/Dulzura Subregion:

Approximately 1,400 acres in the northeastern portion of the Subregion near the Barrett Lake ~~are~~ were affected by the subject to the FCI and will be remapped in a separate General Plan Amendment.

- On Draft EIR page 2.9-10, seventh paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Lakeside CPA:

The reservation has built a large casino, hotel, and golf course. The resulting demand for water has depleted reserves in its on-reservation basin. Approximately 20 nearby shared with local residents along Old Barona Road reported their wells going dry a few years after watering began for the golf course. It should be noted that there is no data available to definitively determine whether the dry wells were impacted by high water demand at the reservation. The lack of recharge from drought conditions, clustered wells on small residential parcels, and low storage capacity of the aquifer are other potential causal factors

to be considered with regard to the depleted wells along Old Barona Road. The primary access route to the reservation is from Wildcat Canyon Road.

- On Draft EIR page 2.9-13, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading North Mountain Subregion:

Other distinctive neighborhoods include Ranchita, Palomar Mountain, Mesa Grande, San Felipe, Sunshine Summit, and Oak Grove. Each has a very small, isolated area of rural commercial uses to serve the needs of local residents. Because of the isolated, rural character of the area, the General Plan Update does not propose additional commercial development in the Subregion ~~further commercial and industrial development is not anticipated.~~

- On Draft EIR page 2.9-19, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Sweetwater CPA:

Much of the Sweetwater River floodplain is preserved for County parkland. Since 2004, shoreline fishing has been allowed on a limited basis on the south side of the Sweetwater Reservoir, along the CPA's northern boundary. The Sweetwater Reservoir Riding and Hiking Trail, operated through an easement granted to the County of San Diego, also runs along the south side of the reservoir. ~~, although the Sweetwater Reservoir (along the CPA's northern border) is not open for public use.~~

- On Draft EIR page 2.9-20, sixth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Spheres of Influence:

Territory must first be located within a city's or district's SOI in order to be annexed. Pursuant to California Government Code Section 56425(g), SOI are required to be reviewed and updated, as necessary, every five years; however, they may also be periodically amended.

- On Draft EIR page 2.9-21, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Spheres within San Diego County:

There are several designations associated with SOI.

A ~~non~~ expanded **larger-than-agency** SOI implies that the city or district will, at some time, expand its physical sphere indicates territory outside of the current jurisdictional boundaries and that is projected to receive services from the subject agency within the next 10-15 years;

A **zero** SOI indicates that future dissolution of the city or district is either anticipated or desired. sphere is a transitional designation that indicates the subject agency's services will ultimately be provided by another agency;

A status quo SOI **coterminous** sphere indicates that the city or district does not want or cannot provide there is no anticipated need for the subject agency's services outside of its existing boundaries, or there is insufficient information to support inclusion of the current service areas outside . In SOI of this nature, district the agency's boundaries and SOI boundaries are coterminous at the time of the sphere establishment or update;

If more than one agency appears equally qualified to serve an area, and if fiscal considerations and community input do not clearly favor a specific agency, an **overlapping** sphere may be designated; and

If territory within an agency's service area does not need all of the services of the subject agency, a **service-specific** sphere may be designated.

- On Draft EIR page 2.9-22, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO):

California Government Code Section 56000 (et seq.), titled the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000, provides LAFCO with its powers, procedures and functions. This law gives LAFCO power to “approve or, disapprove with or without amendment, wholly, partially or conditionally” proposals concerning the formation of cities and special districts, and other changes in jurisdiction or organization of local governmental agencies. LAFCO regulates local agency boundary changes including annexation and detachment of territory, incorporation of cities, formation of special districts, and consolidation, merger, and dissolution of districts. LAFCO is also charged with developing and updating SOI for each city and special district within the County.

~~A new LAFCO regulation was established by~~ ~~the~~ Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 discourages urban sprawl and to encourage orderly and efficient provision of services, such as water, sewer, and fire protection. As a result, San Diego LAFCO, a State-mandated agency with countywide regulatory authority, independent of county government, completed the North County Inland Municipal Service Review (MSR) and SOI Update Study in September 2003 (LAFCO 2003). This study analyzes the proposed and recommended spheres for the affected local agencies, identifies the relevant service review determinations, and focuses on the expansion of the Escondido SOI to the southeast, retention of Escondido's SOI in the west and north, and updates to the Valley Center Municipal Water District and Rincon del Diablo Municipal Water District SOI.

Other MSR and SOI Updates completed since 2003 include:

- Borrego Valley – contains a review of the provision of municipal services and the status of adopted spheres of influence of the local governmental agencies in the Borrego Valley study area
 - County Sanitation Districts – assesses the adequacy of public services in a specific geographic region
 - Southern San Diego County Water and Sewer Service – evaluates the status of the region's current water and sewer service systems and assesses the region's potential to efficiently meet future demands
 - Agencies Providing Floodwater and Sewage Control, Waterworks Construction, and Groundwater Management, Protection, and Exploration in the Tijuana Watershed
- On Draft EIR page 2.9-23, fourth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP):

The RCP, prepared by SANDAG, is the strategic planning framework for the San Diego region. The plan takes into account build out of the existing general plans prepared for the ~~unincorporated County and each of the incorporated cities, along with the most recent information from the County's General Plan Update for the unincorporated area (available at the time of the RCP's preparation),~~ and forecasts future population and number of housing units for the entire County.

- On Draft EIR page 2.9-24, fourth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Forest Conservation Initiative (FCI):

The FCI, enacted in 1993, ~~affecteds~~ approximately 91,000 acres of privately owned land within the Cleveland National Forest through the establishment of 40 acres as the minimum parcel size for dwelling units. The goal of this initiative ~~is was~~ to restrict the development of new housing, in order to preserve the area's lands' unique resources, and preserve the rural environment, and open space. Existing town center areas located within the Cleveland National Forest ~~are were~~ exempt from this initiative because they represent established, historical residential areas. This initiative required a General Plan Amendment and rezone that ~~shall remained~~ in effect until December 31, 2010. The CPAs and Subregions affected by this measure ~~included~~ Alpine, Central Mountain, Desert, Jamul/Dulzura, Julian, Mountain Empire, North Mountain, Pendleton/De Luz, and Ramona, as shown in Table 2.9-3. The General Plan Update does not apply to the ~~FCI affected lands because of the current mandate~~ lands that were affected by the FCI. After the FCI expires in 2010, ~~a~~ General Plan Amendment ~~would will~~ be required to apply new land use designations to the FCI areas. If the proposed land uses would have potentially significant impacts that were not adequately addressed in this EIR, then additional CEQA environmental review ~~would will~~ be required.

- On Draft EIR page 2.9-28, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading General Plan Update Goals and Policies:

Additionally, Section 2.1.3.3, Issue 3: Visual Character or Quality identifies the following policies from the Land Use, Mobility, and Housing Elements that would require future development to be consistent with community character. These General Plan Update Policies include LU-1.64, LU-2.1, LU-2.23, LU-2.45, LU-4.1 through LU-4.4, LU-11.2, LU-12.4, M-10.6, and H-2.1.

- On Draft EIR page 2.9-32, third paragraph, the following text has been deleted:

Forest Conservation Initiative (FCI)

~~The CPAs and Subregions affected by the FCI include Alpine, Central Mountain, Desert, Jamul/Dulzura, Julian, Mountain Empire, North Mountain, Pendleton/ De Luz, and Ramona. The General Plan Update does not apply to the FCI affected lands because of the current mandate. After the FCI expires at the end of 2010, a General Plan Amendment would be required to apply new land use designations to the FCI areas. If the proposed land uses would have potentially significant impacts that were not adequately addressed in this EIR, then additional CEQA environmental review would be required. Therefore, the General Plan Update would not conflict with the FCI.~~

- On Draft EIR page 2.9-33, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Sphere of Influence (SOI):

The Poway SOI extends into the Ramona CPA to the east and southeast of the City. The SOI of Carlsbad, Lemon Grove, Oceanside, San Diego, Santee, and Solana Beach do not extend beyond the City boundaries; therefore, no SOI land uses are proposed in the unincorporated County for these cities. ~~Lemon Grove did not establish land uses for its SOI, which extends into the Spring Valley CPA.~~

- On Draft EIR page 2.9-33, fourth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Sphere of Influence (SOI):

As shown on Figure 2.9-4, there are 124 disparate areas in the Escondido SOI, most of which are proposed for higher density or intensity under the General Plan Update (see Table 2.9-6).

- On Draft EIR page 2.9-34, fourth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Specific Plans:

The proposed General Plan Update includes a specific plan land use designation that only applies to areas that have specific plans ~~in place~~ that have either already been approved or implemented.

- On Draft EIR page 2.9-37, General Plan Policy LU-1.6 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy LU-1.64: Village Expansion. Permit new Village Regional Category designated land uses only where contiguous with an existing or planned Village and where all of the following criteria are met:

- Potential Village development would be compatible with environmental conditions and constraints, such as topography and flooding
 - Potential Village development would be accommodated by the General Plan road network
 - Public facilities and services can support the expansion without a reduction of services to other County residents
 - The expansion ~~respects and enhances~~ is consistent with community character, the scale, and the orderly and contiguous growth of a Village area
- On Draft EIR page 2.9-38, General Plan Policies LU-2.2 and LU-2.4 have been renumbered as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy LU-2.23: Development Densities and Lot Sizes. Assign densities and minimum lot sizes in a manner that is compatible with the character of each unincorporated community.

Policy LU-2.45: Greenbelts to Define Communities. Identify and maintain greenbelts between communities to reinforce the identity of individual communities.

- On Draft EIR page 2.9-38, General Plan Policies M-10.6 and H-2.1 have been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy M-10.6: On-Street Parking. Minimize on-street vehicular parking outside Villages and Rural Villages where on-street parking is not needed, to reduce the width of paved shoulders and provide an opportunity for bicycle lanes to retain rural character in low-intensity areas. Where on-street parking occurs outside Villages and Rural Villages, require the design to be consistent with the rural character ~~and the applicable community plan.~~ [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]

Policy H-2.1: Development that Respects Community Character. Require that development in existing residential neighborhoods be well designed so as not to degrade or detract from the character of surrounding development consistent with the Land Use Element ~~and Community Plans.~~ [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]

- On Draft EIR page 2.9-38, General Plan Policy LU-11.2 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy LU-11.2: Compatibility with Community Character. Require that commercial, office, and industrial development be located, scaled, and designed to be compatible with respect and enhance the unique character of the community.

- On Draft EIR page 2.9-47, the following revisions have been made to Table 2.9-6, Proposed Sphere of Influence (SOI) Land Use Differences:

City	CPA/Subregion within SOI	Area Name ⁽¹⁾	City Designation	General Plan Update Designation
Escondido	North County Metro	E11	1 du/1,2,4,20 du /ac	2 du/ac
		<u>E12</u>	<u>1 du/4,8,20 ac</u>	<u>High Impact Industrial</u>
	Valley Center	<u>E132</u>	Specific Plan	1 du/4,8,16 ac and 1 du/20 ac

- Draft EIR Figure 2.9-2, Countywide Spheres of Influence, has been revised to show the City of Escondido' sphere of influence.

Section 2.10, Mineral Resources

- On Draft EIR page 2.10-18, the sixth paragraph has been revised as follows under the heading 2.10.4.1 Issue 1: Mineral Resource Availability:

However, planned and projected growth in the region would result in a reasonably foreseeable loss of mineral resources due to the encroachment of incompatible uses that would limit future areas from being permitted for mining operations. ~~For example, the Merriam Mountains General Plan Amendment in the Bonsall CPA, which is included in the cumulative project list in Section 1.14.2.4, is a private project that proposes 1,200 dwelling units in an area that has been classified as containing known mineral resources (MRZ-2). The development of this residential project would preclude the extraction of mineral resources on this site. It is reasonably foreseeable that other cumulative projects in the region would also result in the loss of availability of known mineral resources. Therefore, a significant cumulative impact to mineral resource availability would occur.~~

- On Draft EIR page 2.10-19, the second paragraph has been revised as follows under the heading 2.10.4.2 Issue 2: Mineral Resource Recovery Sites

Projected growth in the region would result in a reasonably foreseeable loss of mineral resource recovery sites due to the encroachment of incompatible uses that would preclude the extraction of mineral resources. ~~For example, the Merriam Mountains General Plan Amendment in the Bonsall CPA proposes development of residential land uses in an area where mineral resources are known to occur (MRZ-2). The development of this residential project would preclude the extraction of mineral resources on this site.~~ It is reasonably foreseeable that other cumulative projects in the region would also result in the loss of availability of known mineral resources.

- On Draft EIR page 2.10-20, General Plan Policy COS-10.1 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy COS-10.1: Siting of Development. Encourage the conservation (i.e., protection from incompatible land uses) of areas ~~that designated as having~~ substantial potential for mineral extraction. Discourage development that would substantially preclude the future development of mining facilities in these areas. Design development or uses to minimize the potential conflict with existing or potential future mining facilities. For purposes of this policy, incompatible land uses are defined by SMARA Section 3675.

- On Draft EIR page 2.10-21, General Plan Policy COS-10.2 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy COS-10.2: Protection of State-Classified or Designated Lands. Discourage development or the establishment of other incompatible land uses on or adjacent to areas classified or designated by the State of California as having important mineral resources (MRZ-2), as well as potential mineral lands identified by other government agencies. The potential for the extraction of substantial mineral resources from lands classified by the State of California as areas that contain mineral resources (MRZ-3) shall be considered by the County in making land use decisions.

- On Draft EIR pages 2.10-21 and 2.10-22, Mitigation Measure Min-1.2 has been revised as follows under the heading Mitigation Measures:

Min-1.2 Revise and update the County ordinances to designate areas of known importance for mineral resources as follows:

- Update the Zoning Ordinance with the addition of a Mining Compatibility Designator or Overlay that identifies parcels with a high potential for mineral resources. The purpose is to take into account the potential mineral resources, not to preclude the potential mining use place land use restrictions on areas in the vicinity of extractive uses to ensure incompatible uses do not impeded mining operations. In addition, specify that notification of potential mining use is provided to all parcels within a 1,500 foot radius of parcels with a Mining Compatibility Designator/Overlay.
- Revise the Zoning Ordinance to facilitate recycling of salvaged concrete, asphalt, and rock ~~by allowing this activity to occur by right~~ at permitted mining facilities.

- Revise the Zoning Ordinance and Grading Ordinance to authorize surface mining operations with a Surface Mining Permit rather than a MUP. Incorporate findings of approval that reflect Mineral Compatibility Designator, SMARA Sections 2762 and 2763, and the inherent nature of surface mining operations. Parcels with a high potential for mineral resources could include those areas designated as MRZ-2 or other areas identified as containing mineral resources that are located where a sufficient buffer is available so that extraction activities are feasible.

Section 2.11, Noise

- On Draft EIR page 2.11-7, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Industrial, Commercial, Extractive and Agricultural Sources:

It is estimated that of the County's approximately 2.7 million acres of land, 308,991 ~~366,500~~ acres are in active agricultural use (AWM 2008). ~~(DPLU 2007b)~~.

- On Draft EIR page 2.11-7, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Temporary and/or Nuisance Noise:

Intermittent or temporary neighborhood noise from amplified music, public address systems, barking dogs, landscape maintenance, stand-by power generators, motorized recreation, and construction activities are disturbing to residents but are difficult to attenuate and control.

- On Draft EIR page 2.11-11, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading California Airport Land use Planning Handbook:

The California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook provides guidance for the assessment of noise compatibility of land uses near airports. Guidance is based on existing federal and State regulations and policies. The handbook states that 65 dBA is the basic limit of acceptable noise exposure for residential and other noise sensitive land uses and recommends an annual CNEL standard of 60 dBA to be used for new residential development; however, this standard has been set with respect to relatively noisy urban areas and ~~would~~ may be too high of a noise level to be appropriate as a standard for land use compatibility planning. The level of noise deemed acceptable in one community is not necessarily the same in another. A noise level above 60 dBA CNEL may be considered incompatible with some residential uses. According to the handbook, noise compatibility standards typically place primary emphasis on residential areas because residential development is one of the most noise sensitive land uses and usually covers the greatest proportion of urban land. Three CNELs are commonly used as the limit for acceptable residential noise exposure: CNEL 65 dBA, 60 dBA, or 55 dBA. The conditions in which each CNEL would be the suggested noise standard are listed in Table 2.11-7. The handbook also includes normalization factors as a method for adjusting aircraft noise levels used for determining and predicting community reactions. These factors are listed in Table 2.11-8. Because the acceptable residential noise level standard may vary between communities, noise compatibility issues are addressed in the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans (ALUCPs) prepared for individual airports. ~~The handbook recommends an annual CNEL standard of 60 dBA to be used for new residential development.~~

- On Draft EIR page 2.11-20, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Construction:

As shown in Table 2.11-15, construction typically results in ground-borne vibration in that ranges from 0.003 to 0.01 in/sec RMS at a distance of 50 feet from the source. With respect to Table 2.11-14, it is more likely that heavy equipment operations may produce vibration impact levels exceeding the threshold of Category 1 land uses than the higher thresholds of Categories 2 and 3 land uses and because of separation distance, event frequency, and other site-specific conditions. Category 1 land uses include research and manufacturing facilities for products with high tolerances required in their design and fabrication. These vibration levels would exceed the significance threshold for infrequent events for Category 1 land uses, but would not exceed the threshold level for the land uses within Categories 2 and 3, as defined in Table 2.11-14. For isolated and infrequent events such as blasting, impacts have the potential to result in a PPV that exceeds 1.0 in/sec RMS, which would exceed groundborne vibration standards for all three land use categories.

- On Draft EIR pages 2.11-18, 2.11-27, 2.11-37, and 2.11-41 General Plan Update Policy LU-2.7 has been renumbered as LU-2.8.
- On Draft EIR page 2.11-26, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Industrial, Agricultural, or other Noise-Generating Uses:

~~As shown in Table 2.11-5,~~ The short-term community noise survey measured a noise level of 66 dBA Leq at approximately 60 feet from the centerline of an access road to Sycuan Casino (Dehesa Road); however, it is recognized that casino traffic is not the only traffic using this road.

- On Draft EIR page 2.11-30, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Nuisance Noise:

Continuing enforcement of the County Noise Ordinance would reduce potential nuisance noise impacts in all areas of the unincorporated County to the extent feasible. The County updated its noise regulations in 2008 and shall endeavor in the future to maintain the same high levels of compliance by public outreach, education, and continued enforcement activities. As society changes, so will the County's response to the public concern about noise and its effects upon County residents.

- On Draft EIR pages 2.11-37 and 2.11-41, General Plan Policy LU-2.7 has been renumbered and revised under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy LU-2.78: Mitigation of Development Impacts. Require measures that minimize significant impacts to surrounding areas from uses or operations that cause excessive noise, vibration, dust, odor, aesthetic impairment and/or are detrimental to human health and safety.

- On Draft EIR page 2.11-44, mitigation measure Noi-5.1 has been revised under the heading Mitigation Measures:

Noi-5.1 Use the applicable Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan's (ALUCP) as guidance/reference during development review of projects that are planned within an Airport Influence Area (AIA). Any projects that are found incompatible with the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan noise criteria ~~should within the AIA shall be submitted to the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (SDCRAA) for review. ed by the SDCAA.~~

- On Draft EIR page 2.11-49, the following deletions have been made to Table 2.11-5, Summary of Community Noise Levels:

Major Noise Sources	Noise Level (Leq) ⁽¹⁾
Casino	66 dBA

- On Draft EIR page 2.11-52, the following footnote has been added to Table 2.11-9, Noise Compatibility Guidelines:

Table 2.11-9. Noise Compatibility Guidelines⁽²⁾

⁽¹⁾ Denotes facilities used for part of the day; therefore, an hourly standard would be used rather than CNEL

⁽²⁾ For projects located within an Airport Influence Area of an adopted Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), additional Noise Compatibility Criteria restrictions may apply as specified in the ALUCP.

- On Draft EIR page 2.11-53, the following footnote has been added to Table 2.11-10, Noise Standards:

Note: Exterior Noise Level compatibility guidelines for Land Use Categories A-H are identified in Table 2.11-9, Noise Compatibility Guidelines.

Section 2.12, Population and Housing

- On Draft EIR page 2.12-11, fifth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading State Housing Element Law:

Provide sites with appropriate zoning and development standards and with services and facilities to accommodate the jurisdiction's Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) for each income level. The RHNA is the only population and/or housing requirement that applies to the General Plan Update. The County's RHNA is 12,358 residential units for the 2005 – 2010 Housing Element Cycle.

- On Draft EIR page 2.12-115, fourth paragraph, General Plan Update Policy LU-2.7 has been renumbered as LU-2.8.

Section 2.13, Public Services

- On Draft EIR page 2.13-3, fifth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Ramona Municipal Water District:

The Fire Department is managed by the RMWD. RMWD has a year-to-year contract with CAL FIRE to operate the RMWD fire department under the direction of the RMWD General

~~Manager. was managed by the District until July 1, 1993, when the Board entered into a cooperative fire protection agreement with CAL FIRE to provide the fire and paramedic services.~~ RMWD operates out of three stations and provides EMT/ paramedic level service.

- On Draft EIR page 2.13-9, fifth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Police Protection:

SDSD is the fourth largest Sheriff's Department in the U.S. It has a service area of approximately ~~4,200~~3,360 square miles and serves a population of over 870,000 people.

- On Draft EIR page 2.13-10, fourth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Command Areas:

The SDSD Law Enforcement Operations Command Areas have further been divided into beat ~~districts~~ areas which serve the unincorporated County. Table 2.13-6, identifies the existing population served by each beat ~~area~~ district.

- On Draft EIR page 2.13-10, sixth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Response Times:

Response times ~~standards~~ are used as guidelines to ~~establish~~ measure adequate levels of service.

- On Draft EIR pages 2.13-17, 2.13-20, 2.13-22, 2.13-25, 2.13-28, 2.13-31, 2.13-32, and 2.13-33, General Plan Update Policy LU-1.6 has been renumbered as LU-1.4.

- On Draft EIR pages 2.13-17, third paragraph, General Plan Update Policy LU-1.6 has been renumbered as LU-1.4.

- On Draft EIR page 2.13-18, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Impact Analysis:

SDSD staffing goals and facility plans are based upon population. Generally, SDSD has a goal of providing one patrol position per 10,000 residents~~1 officer per 1,000 persons.~~

- On Draft EIR pages 2.13-18 and 2.13-19, last and first paragraphs, the following text has been deleted under the heading Impact Analysis:

~~Since SDSD uses the threshold of 1 officer to 1,000 persons, population changes of less than 1,000 persons generally would not affect staffing or facility ratios.~~

- On Draft EIR pages 2.13-28, 2.13-31, 2.13-32 and 2.13-33, General Plan Policy LU-1.6 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy LU-1.64: Village Expansion. Permit new Village Regional Category designated land uses only where contiguous with an existing or planned Village and where all of the following criteria are met:

- Potential Village development would be compatible with environmental conditions and constraints, such as topography and flooding;

- Potential Village development would be accommodated by the General Plan road network;
 - Public facilities and services can support the expansion without a reduction of services to other County residents; and
 - The expansion ~~respects and enhances~~ is consistent with community character, the scale, and the orderly and contiguous growth of a Village area.
- On Draft EIR page 2.13-28, General Plan Policy LU-6.4 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy LU-6.4: Sustainable Subdivision Design. Require that residential subdivisions be planned to conserve open space and natural resources, protect agricultural operations including grazing, increase fire safety and defensibility, reduce impervious footprints, use sustainable development practices, and, when appropriate, provide public amenities ~~consistent with the applicable community plan.~~ [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]

- On Draft EIR page 2.13-28, General Plan Policy LU-6.10 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy LU-6.10: Protection from Wildfires and Unmitigable Hazards. Assign land uses and densities in a manner that minimizes development in extreme, very high and high hazard fire areas or other unmitigable hazardous areas.

- On Draft EIR pages 2.13-29 2.13-31, 2.13-32 and 2.13-34, General Plan Policy LU-12.3 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy LU-12.3: Infrastructure and Services Compatibility. Provide public facilities and services that are sensitive to the environment with characteristics of the unincorporated communities. Encourage the collocation of infrastructure facilities, where appropriate.

- On Draft EIR page 2.13-30, mitigation measure Pub-1.9 has been added under the heading Mitigation Measures:

Pub-1.9 Implement procedures to ensure new development projects fund their fair share toward fire services facilities including the development of a long-term financing mechanism, such as an impact fee program or community facilities development, as appropriate. Large development projects are required to provide their fair share contribution to fire services either by providing additional funds and/or development of infrastructure.

- On Draft EIR pages 2.13-32 and 2.13-34, General Plan Policy LU-9.7 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy LU-9.7: Town Center Planning and Design. Plan and guide the development of Town Centers and transportation nodes as the major focal point and activity node for Village areas. Utilize design guidelines to ~~respect and enhance~~ be compatible with the unique character of a community. Roadways, streetscapes, building facades, landscaping, and signage within the town center should be pedestrian oriented. Wherever possible, locate

public facilities, such as schools, libraries, community centers, and parks in Town Centers and Villages.

- On Draft EIR page 2.13-33, General Plan Policy LU-9.4 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy LU-9.4: Infrastructure Serving Villages and Community Cores. Prioritize infrastructure improvements and the provision of public facilities for Villages and community cores and sized for the intensity of development allowed by the Land Use Map.

- On Draft EIR pages 2.13-34 and 2.13-35, subsections 2.13.4.x have been renumbered to 2.13.7.x.
- On Draft EIR page 2.13-38, the following revisions were made to Table 2.13-2, Fire Protection Agencies Existing and Future (Proposed Project Build-out) Housing and Population Forecast:

Fire Protection Agencies	Existing Housing Units (2004)	Existing Population (2004)	Proposed Housing Units	Proposed Population	Housing Growth (percent)	Population Growth (percent)
17. Ramona MWD	7,768 16,502	24,947 50,656	13,052 22,446	36,759 68,897	68-36	67-36

- Draft EIR Figure 2.13-3, Law Enforcement Facilities and Command Areas, has been revised to show the correct Northern, Rural and Southern Command Areas.

Section 2.14, Recreation

- On Draft EIR page 2.14-5, first paragraph, the following text has been added under the heading Tribal Lands Policies:

Recreational Amenities By Other Entities (Non-County)

In addition to the County, there are numerous agencies that provide park and recreation facilities that are open to the public. These may include school districts, community service districts, park and recreation districts, as well as non-profit agencies. In many instances, the County provides funding to these agencies for the construction of recreation facilities. In exchange for receiving the funding, the agency agrees to operate and maintain the facility as a public recreation amenity. Such agreements have facilitated the construction of recreation facilities in locations where the County would not otherwise be able to construct facilities due to a lack of operation and maintenance funding.

- On Draft EIR page 2.14-8, fourth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading California State Government Code 66477 (The Quimby Act):

The County implemented the Quimby Act by adopting the PLDO. Revenues generated through the Quimby Act cannot be used for the operation and maintenance of park facilities.

- On Draft EIR page 2.14-8, seventh paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972:

The Landscaping and Lighting Act enables cities, counties, and special districts to acquire land for parks, recreation, and open space. ~~In addition a~~A local government may also use the assessments to pay for improvements and maintenance to these areas. In addition to local government agencies (i.e., counties and cities), park and recreation facilities may be provided by other public agencies, such as community service districts, park and recreation districts, water districts, etc. If so empowered, such an agency may acquire, develop, and operate recreation facilities for the general public.

- On Draft EIR page 2.14-10, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading County of San Diego Trails Program (CTP):

The components of the CTP include a Community Trails Master Plan (CTMP) and Regional Trails Plan as described below.

- On Draft EIR page 2.14-11, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Regional Trails Plan:

The Regional Trails Plan identifies County-approved general alignment corridors of regional trails in the County.

- On Draft EIR page 2.14-11, fifth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP):

The MSCP is important to recreation because it conserves San Diego's natural areas and quality of life and supports compatible recreation uses within the preserve areas while accommodating future growth by streamlining building regulations. MSCP documents regulate uses where sensitive biological resources occur. For example, Section 1.9 of the Subarea Plan addresses recreational uses within MSCP preserves.

- On Draft EIR page 2.14-16, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Impact Analysis:

~~Recreational facilities that would not be as likely to experience deterioration from implementation of the proposed General Plan Update are those located in the eastern portion of the unincorporated County, where s~~Substantial increases in population growth are not planned in the eastern portion of the unincorporated County.

- On Draft EIR page 2.14-22, General Plan Policy LU-12.2 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy LU-12.2: Maintenance of Adequate Services. Require development to mitigate significant impacts to existing service levels of public facilities or services for existing residents and businesses. Provide improvements for Mobility Element roads in accordance with the Mobility Element Network Appendix matrices, which may result in ultimate build-out conditions that achieve an improved a-higher LOS but do not achieve a LOS of D or better.

- On Draft EIR page 2.14-23, General Plan Policy LU-12.1 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy M-12.1: County Trails System. Implement a County Trails Program by developing the designated ~~proposed~~ trail and pathway alignments and implementing goals and policies identified in the Community Trails Master Plan.

- On Draft EIR page 2.14-23, General Plan Policy M-12.4 has been deleted under the heading General Plan Update Policies.
- On Draft EIR page 2.14-23, General Plan Policy M-12.2 has been deleted under the heading General Plan Update Policies.
- On Draft EIR pages 2.14-23 and 2.14-26, General Plan Policy M-12.10 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy M-12.10: Recreational and Educational Resources. Design trail routes that meet a public need and highlight the County's biological, recreational and educational resources, including natural, scenic, cultural, and historic resources.

- On Draft EIR pages 2.14-24 and 2.14-27, General Plan Policy COS-23.1 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy COS-23.1: Public Access. Provide public access to natural and cultural (where allowed) resources through effective planning that conserves the County's native wildlife, ~~and~~ enhances and restores a continuous network of connected natural habitat and protects water resources.

- On Draft EIR page 2.14-24, mitigation measure Rec-1.3 has been revised as follows under the heading Mitigation Measures:

Rec-1.3 Prepare a design manual to provide concepts for park and recreation facility components. ~~To reflect locational considerations. The manual shall also include concepts for providing primitive low impact public access to open space areas. The needs for such accesses shall be identified through continued coordination with community groups.~~

- On Draft EIR page 2.14-25, mitigation measure Rec-1.6 has been revised as follows under the heading Mitigation Measures:

Rec-1.6 Acquire trail routes across private lands through direct purchase, easements, and dedication, or by other means from a willing property owner/seller. ~~Develop and incentive program to e~~ Encourage the voluntary dedication of easements and/or gifts of land for trails through private-owned lands, including agricultural and grazing lands. ~~Also, develop guidelines for trails in areas with active agricultural operations or active grazing lands that will minimize potential impacts and accommodate operational necessities through proper location, design, construction, and active management.~~

- On Draft EIR page 2.14-25, mitigation measure Rec-1.7 has been revised as follows under the heading Mitigation Measures:

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

- On Draft EIR page 2.14-25, mitigation measure Rec-1.10 has been deleted under the heading Mitigation Measures. Mitigation measures Rec-1.11 and Rec-1.12 were renumbered as Rec-1.10 and Rec-1.12, respectively.
- On Draft EIR page 2.14-25, mitigation measure Rec-1.12 has been revised as follows under the heading Mitigation Measures:

Rec-1.112 Prioritize open space acquisition needs through coordination with government agencies and private organizations. Once prioritized, acquire open space lands through negotiation with private land owners and through MSCP regulatory requirements. The operation and management of such acquisitions will continue to be ~~implemented~~ achieved by preparing, implementing, and updating Resource Management Plans and MSCP Area Specific Management Directives (ASMDs) for each open space area.

- On Draft EIR page 2.13-26, General Plan Policy LU-6.4 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy LU-6.4: Sustainable Subdivision Design. Require that residential subdivisions be planned to conserve open space and natural resources, protect agricultural operations including grazing, increase fire safety and defensibility, reduce impervious footprints, use sustainable development practices, and, when appropriate, provide public amenities consistent with the applicable community plan. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]

- On Draft EIR page 2.14-26, General Plan Policy LU-9.7 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy LU-9.7: Town Center Planning and Design. Plan and guide the development of Town Centers and transportation nodes as the major focal point and activity node for Village areas. Utilize design guidelines to ~~respect and enhance~~ be compatible with the unique character of a community. Roadways, streetscapes, building facades, landscaping, and signage within the town center should be pedestrian oriented. Wherever possible, locate public facilities, such as schools, libraries, community centers, and parks in Town Centers and Villages.

- On Draft EIR page 2.14-26, General Plan Policy M-12.9 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy M-12.9: Environmental and Agricultural Resources. Site and design specific trail segments to minimize impacts to sensitive environmental resources, ecological systems, and agricultural lands. Within the MSCP preserves, conform siting and use of trails to County MSCP Subarea Plans and wildlife agency approved MSCP management plans.

- On Draft EIR page 2.14-26, General Plan Policy COS-21.3 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy COS-21.3: Park Design. Design parks that reflect community character and identity, incorporate local natural and cultural landscapes and features, and consider the surrounding land uses and urban form and cultural and historic resources.

- On Draft EIR page 2.14-27, mitigation measure Rec-2.3 has been revised as follows under the heading Mitigation Measures:

Rec-2.3 Amend the Subdivision Ordinance to require new residential development to be integrated with existing neighborhoods by providing connected and continuous road, environmentally-sensitive pathway/trail and recreation/open space networks. Also add new conservation-oriented design guidelines for rural lands projects as part of this amendment. These measures will assist in the planning for recreational facilities as new development is proposed while minimizing impacts to sensitive resources and community character.

- On Draft EIR pages 2.14-29 and 2.14-30, the following revisions have been made to Table 2.14-1, Existing Local Parks and Recreational Facilities:

Park/Facility Name	Location	Park Operator	Acreage
Lonnie Brewer	<u>Rancho San Diego Spring Valley</u>	County DPR	5
Valley Center Community Park	Valley Center	<u>Valley Center Parks & Recreation District County DPR</u>	14
Ramona Wellfield Park	Ramona	<u>Ramona Municipal Water District County DPR</u>	146
Avacado Elementary School Park	Valle de Oro	<u>Cajon Valley Union School District</u>	5
Borrego Springs	<u>Borrego Springs</u>	County DPR	32
Del Parque	Spring Valley	County DPR	10
Lamar Street Park	Spring Valley	County DPR	9

- On Draft EIR page 2.14-31, the following revisions have been made to Table 2.14-2, Regional Parks:

Park/Facility Name	Location	Park Operator	Acreage	Camping
<u>Heritage Park (Old Town)</u>	<u>San Diego</u>	<u>Private entity</u>		No
<u>Lake Jennings</u>	<u>Lakeside</u>	County DPR	468	Yes
Otay Valley Regional Park ⁽³⁾	San Diego	County DPR, City of San Diego, and City of Chula Vista	512	No
Quail Botanical Gardens	Encinitas	<u>Quail Botanical Gardens, Inc. County DPR</u>	29	No

- On Draft EIR page 2.14-32, the following revisions have been made to Table 2.14-3, County-Owned Preserves:

Open Space Preserve	Location	Acreage
---------------------	----------	---------

El Capitan	Lakeside	2,840
Goodan Ranch	Poway	324
Hollenbeck Canyon Lawrence and Barbara Daley Preserve	Jamul	598
Mount Gower Open Space Preserve	Ramona	1,592
Ramona Grasslands and Santa Maria Creek Preserve	Ramona	460
San Vicente Highlands	Ramona	1,594
Sycamore Canyon / Goodan Ranch	Poway	1,865
Total		26,487

Note: These parks may contain trails, restroom facilities, and other amenities as secondary functions. Data has been rounded to nearest whole number.

~~Note: Data has been rounded to nearest whole number.~~

Source: DPLU 2007b

Section 2.15, Transportation and Traffic

- On Draft EIR page 2.15-4, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Existing Roadway Network Performance:

The majority of LOS F roadway segments are located in the northwestern and southwestern communities, while practically no LOS ~~E~~ roadway segments occur in the eastern communities.

- On Draft EIR page 2.15-8, fourth paragraph, the following text has been added under the heading Rail Service:

Freight Rail Service

A freight line, the San Diego & Arizona Eastern Railway's Desert Line, is the primary rail line that traverses the unincorporated County. Existing rail lines, such as the Desert Line, may be underutilized at their current capacities. For these lines to remain economically feasible for continued operation, their usage should be maximized to provide an alternative to trucks, especially on SR-94, whenever feasible. In addition, BNSF is the operator of a freight line that runs from Oceanside to Escondido.

Passenger Rail Service

Passenger rail service includes both long distance passengers and regional (Southern California) commuter services as described below.

Commuter Rail Service

In San Diego County commuter rail services are provided by NCTD and MTS, as described below.

- On Draft EIR page 2.15-8, sixth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Sprinter:

NCTD operates the SPRINTER Light Rail system ~~on the San Diego Los Angeles San Luis Obispo Corridor~~ between Oceanside and Escondido on a rail line that runs approximately parallel to SR-78.

- On Draft EIR page 2.15-10, fourth paragraph, the following text has been deleted under the heading Rural Road Safety:

In many instances, these roads have segments with horizontal and vertical curves that are sharper than allowed by existing standards. ~~Approximately 75 percent of drivers involved in fatal crashes on rural roads are rural and small town residents. Because of this fact, it can be assumed that the drivers in these crashes are generally familiar with the roads on which they are driving. Therefore, rural road safety is a concern for the County.~~

- On Draft EIR page 2.15-15, third paragraph, the following regulation has been added under the heading Local:

County Community Right-of-Way Development Standards

Board Policy J-36, adopted December 1989, provides a procedure by which communities can deviate from the established County Public Road Standards, and replace or augment them with standards tailored to their community. The Community Right-of Way Development Standards provide alternative right-of-way regulatory standards within the road right-of-way that supersede the County Public Road Standards. The purpose of these Standards is to ensure that the road right-of-way is designed to better enhance and retain the character of individual communities while maintaining the safety of the roadway. Community Right-of-Way Development Standards have been prepared for the communities of Borrego Springs, Fallbrook, Julian, and San Dieguito.

- On Draft EIR page 2.15-16, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP):

Changes in anticipated cost and revenue have resulted in an update of the 2030 RTP that was approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors in 2006. The 2030 RTP, also known as MOBILITY 2030 RTP: Pathways for the Future, was adopted in November 2007 and serves as a blueprint to address the mobility challenges created by the San Diego region's growing population and employment. It incorporated a new regional growth forecast and contains an integrated set of public policies, strategies, and investments to maintain, manage, and improve the transportation system in the region. ~~The 2030 RTP was approved on March 28, 2003. Additional updates and approvals were obtained in late 2007, to incorporate a new regional growth forecast, strategic initiatives and several other white papers on topics not previously covered in the RTP.~~

- On Draft EIR page 2.15-16, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Congestion Management Plan (CMP):

State Proposition 111, passed by voters in 1990, established a requirement that urbanized areas prepare and regularly update a CMP, which is a part of SANDAG's RTP. The purpose of the CMP is to monitor the performance of the region's transportation system, develop programs to address near-term and long-term congestion, and better integrate transportation and land use planning. ~~SANDAG, as the designated Congestion Management Agency for San Diego region, must develop, adopt, and update the CMP in response to specific legislative requirements. SANDAG, local jurisdictions, and transportation operators such as Caltrans, MTB, and NCTD, are responsible for implementing and monitoring the CMP. The San Diego region has elected to be exempt from the State CMP and, as a result,~~

the County Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution electing to be exempt from the State CMP. Existing CMP monitoring, threshold levels, guidelines and mitigation strategies will be incorporated into other SANDAG plans and/or programs as a result.

- On Draft EIR page 2.15-19, fourth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Projected Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT):

Typically more dispersed and segregated land uses result in greater VMT. VMT data used to evaluate existing conditions and the proposed project was based upon information provided by SANDAG that was derived from the GP Update traffic forecast model. Table 2.15-7 identifies daily VMT for the proposed General Plan Update. Any analysis of this data also needs to consider the associated population, which directly impacts the number of vehicles and vehicle trips. When compared to the existing VMT of 15,922,149, the proposed project would result in 9,448,742 additional VMT, which is approximately a 60 percent increase in VMT as compared to the existing condition. ~~Under implementation of the proposed project, the northwestern communities are projected to result in 13,844,846 VMT, southwestern communities are projected to result in 8,507,893 VMT, and eastern communities would result in 3,018,152 VMT for a total proposed VMT of 25,370,891. The northwestern communities would experience more than half of all total VMT. Planning areas that are projected to have the highest VMT include: Pendleton/De Luz CPA (3,799,101 VMT), North County Metro Subregion (2,815,934 VMT), Fallbrook CPA (2,373,498 VMT), Lakeside CPA (2,183,047 VMT), and Bonsall CPA (2,087,790 VMT).~~

- On Draft EIR page 2.15-22, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Regional Roadway Facilities:

In addition to other performance measures, impacts were evaluated based upon a comparison of peak period freeway congestion, the percent of work/education trips accessible in 30 minutes, and the percent of non-work trips accessible within 15 minutes.

- On Draft EIR page 2.15-23, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Federal, State and Local Regulations and Existing Regulatory Processes:

Other regional transportation plans that the proposed General Plan Update would be required to follow include the 2006 RTIP, a prioritized program designed to implement the region's overall strategy for providing mobility and improving the efficiency and safety of efforts to attain federal and State air quality standards for the region, and the plans and/or programs developed by SANDAG to incorporate the monitoring, threshold levels, guidelines and mitigation strategies that address requirements of State Proposition 111. To monitor the performance of the region's transportation system, develop programs to address near term and long term congestion, and better integrate transportation and land use planning.

- On Draft EIR page 2.15-26, fourth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Methodology of Adjacent Cities Traffic Assessment:

The Cities of Carlsbad, Del Mar, El Cajon, Encinitas, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, National City, Oceanside, Poway, ~~San Diego~~, San Marcos, Santee, Solana Beach and Vista utilize the SANTEC/ITE Guidelines for Traffic Impact Studies (TIS) in the San Diego Region (Amended February 2004) as the basis for defining project impacts. These thresholds are generally based upon an acceptable increase in the V/C ratio for roadway segments. Table 2.15-23 summarizes the impact significance thresholds as identified by the SANTEC/ITE Guidelines.

The following ~~two~~ three jurisdictions have modified requirements from those stated in Table 2.15-23.

The City of San Diego considers D to be the acceptable LOS for freeways, roadways and intersections, except in undeveloped locations where LOS C is considered to be acceptable. The City of San Diego uses the same thresholds identified in Table 2.15-23, SANTEC/ITE Measures of Significant Project Traffic Impacts, for projects resulting in LOS E. However, the City of San Diego applies the following thresholds for projects resulting in LOS F: 1) freeways are allowed up to a 0.005 change in V/C or 0.5 mph; 2) roadways are allowed up to a 0.01 change in V/C or 0.5 mph; 3) intersections are allowed a 1.0 second delay; and 4) ramp meters are allowed a 1.0 second delay.

- On Draft EIR pages 2.15-31, 2.15-33, 2.15-49 and 2.15-50, General Plan Update Policy LU-2.7 has been renumbered as LU-2.8.
- On Draft EIR pages 2.15-31, 2.15-33, 2.15-49 and 2.15-50, General Plan Update Policy LU-6.9 has been renumbered as LU-6.10.
- On Draft EIR page 2.15-33, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Impact Analysis:

To the extent feasible, significant environmental impacts occurring from construction of new roadway segments under the General Plan Update would be mitigated to below a level of significance. However, some environmental impacts associated with the construction of roadway facilities may be significant and unavoidable, such as impacts associated with noise, hydrology/water quality, and biology. Transportation hazards such as impaired emergency access. These impacts are discussed in detail in other sections of this EIR. Therefore, this would be considered a potentially significant impact and mitigation would be required.

- On Draft EIR pages 2.15-44 and 2.15-50, General Plan Policy LU-12.2 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy LU-12.2: Maintenance of Adequate Services. Require development to mitigate significant impacts to existing service levels of public facilities or services for existing residents and businesses. Provide improvements for Mobility Element roads in accordance with the Mobility Element Network Appendix matrices, which may result in ultimate build-out conditions that achieve an improved ~~a higher~~ LOS but do not achieve a LOS of D or better.

- On Draft EIR page 2.15-45, General Plan Policy M-2 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy M-2.1: Level of Service Criteria. Require development projects to provide associated road improvements necessary to achieve a level of service of “D” or higher on all Mobility Element roads except for those where a failing level of service has been accepted by the County pursuant to the criteria specifically identified ~~Appendix I~~ in the accompanying text box (Criteria for Accepting a Road Classification with Level of Service E/F). When development is proposed on roads where a failing level of service has been accepted, require feasible mitigation in the form of road improvements or a fair share contribution to a road improvement program, consistent with the Mobility Element road network.

- On Draft EIR pages 2.15-45 and 2.15-53, General Plan Policy M-3.1 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy M-3.1: Public Road Rights-of-Way. Require development to dedicate right-of-way for public roads and other transportation routes identified in the Mobility Element roadway network (see Mobility Element Network Appendix), Community Plans, or Road Master Plans. Require the provision of sufficient right-of-way width, as specified in the County Public Road Standards and Community Trails Master Plan, to adequately accommodate all users, including transit riders, pedestrians, bicyclists, and equestrians.

- On Draft EIR page 2.15-46, mitigation measures Tra-1.5 and Tra-1.6 have been deleted from the text under the heading Mitigation Measures. Mitigation measures Tra-1.7 was renumbered as Tra-1.5.
- On Draft EIR page 2.15-47, mitigation measure Tra-1.7 has been revised as follows under the heading Mitigation Measures:

Tra-1.5 Implement the Congestion Management Strategies identified in the Regional Transportation Plan SANDAG CMP and require large projects to mitigate impacts to the ~~CMP network, including State highways and freeways.~~

- On Draft EIR page 2.15-47, mitigation measure Tra-1.6 has been added under the heading Mitigation Measures:

Tra-1.6 Develop project review procedures to require large commercial and office development to use Transportation Demand Management Programs to reduce single-occupant vehicle traffic generation and to prepare and forward annual reports to the County on the effectiveness of the program.

- On Draft EIR page 2.15-48, mitigation measure Tra-2.1 has been revised as follows under the heading Mitigation Measures:

Tra-2.1 Establish coordination efforts with other jurisdictions when development projects will result in a significant impact on city roads. When available, use the applicable jurisdiction's significance thresholds and recommended mitigation measures to evaluate and ~~alleviate~~ mitigate impacts.

- On Draft EIR pages 2.15-49 and 2.15-50, General Plan Policy LU-2.7 has been renumbered and revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy LU-2.78: Mitigation of Development Impacts. Require measures that minimize significant impacts to surrounding areas from uses or operations that cause excessive noise, vibrations, dust, odor, aesthetic impairment and/or are detrimental to human health and safety.

- On Draft EIR pages 2.15-49 and 2.15-53, General Plan Policy M-4.3 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy M-4.3: Rural Roads Compatible with Rural Character. Design and construct public roads to meet travel demands in Semi-Rural and Rural Lands that are consistent with rural character while safely accommodating transit stops when deemed necessary, along with bicyclists, pedestrians, and equestrians. Where feasible, utilize rural road design features (e.g., no curb and gutter improvements) to maintain community character ~~consistent with community plans.~~ [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]

- On Draft EIR page 2.15-51, mitigation measure Tra-4.1 has been revised as follows under the heading Mitigation Measures:

Tra-4.1 Update Community Plans to identify local public road and ~~fire access road~~ community emergency evacuation route networks and pedestrian routes as appropriate.

- On Draft EIR pages 2.15-51 and 2.15-54, General Plan Policy M-8.6 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy M-8.6: Park and Ride Facilities. Coordinate with SANDAG, Caltrans, and tribal governments to study transit connectivity and address improving regional opportunities for park-and-ride facilities and transit service to gaming facilities and surrounding rural areas to reduce congestion on rural roads.

- On Draft EIR page 2.15-52, mitigation measure Tra-5.3 has been added under the heading Mitigation Measures:

Tra-5.3 Revise the Public Road Standards to include standards for the provision of parallel and diagonal on-street parking, according to Regional Category.

- On Draft EIR page 2.15-53, General Plan Policy LU-9.8 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy LU-9.8: Village Connectivity and Compatibility with Adjoining Areas. Require new development within Villages to include road networks, pedestrian routes, and amenities that create or maintain connectivity; and site, building, and landscape design that is compatible with ~~the Community Plan and~~ surrounding areas. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]

- On Draft EIR page 2.15-53, General Plan Policy M-8.1 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy M-8.1: Maximize Transit Service for ~~Transit Dependent~~ Populations Opportunities. Coordinate with SANDAG, the CTSA, NCTD, and MTS to provide capital facilities and funding, where appropriate, to:

- Maximize opportunities for transit services in unincorporated communities
- Maximize the speed and efficiency of transit service through the development of transit priority treatments such as transit signal priority, transit queue jump lanes, and dedicated transit only lanes

- Provide for transit-dependent segments of the population, such as the disabled, seniors, low income, and children, where possible
- Reserve adequate rights-of-way to accommodate existing and planned transit facilities including bus stops
- On Draft EIR page 2.15-54, General Plan Policy M-8.2 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy M-8.2: Transit Service to Key Community Facilities and Services. Locate key county facilities, healthcare services, educational institutions, and other civic facilities so that they are accessible by transit in areas where transit is available. Require those facilities to be designed so that they are easily accessible by transit.

- On Draft EIR page 2.15-54, General Plan Policies M-8.6 and M-8.7 have been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy M-8.6: Park and Ride Facilities. Coordinate with SANDAG, Caltrans, and tribal governments to study transit connectivity and address improving regional opportunities for park-and-ride facilities and transit service to gaming facilities and surrounding rural areas to reduce congestion on rural roads.

Policy M-8.7: Inter-Regional Travel Modes. Coordinate with SANDAG, Caltrans, and the California High-Speed Rail Authority, where appropriate, to identify alternative methods for inter-regional travel to serve the unincorporated County residents.

- On Draft EIR page 2.15-55, General Plan Policy M-11.4 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy M-11.4: Pedestrian and Bicycle Network Connectivity. Require development in Villages and Rural Villages to provide comprehensive internal pedestrian and bicycle networks that connect to existing or planned adjacent community and countywide networks. ~~And ensure that Village development incorporated these networks where applicable.~~

- On Draft EIR page 2.15-56, mitigation measure Tra-6.7 has been revised as follows under the heading Mitigation Measures:

Tra-6.7 Implement and revise the County Bicycle Transportation Plan every five years, or as necessary, to identify a long range County bicycle network and qualify for State or other funding sources. Coordinate revisions to the County Bicycle Transportation Plan with the County Trails Program.

- On Draft EIR page 2.15-72, the following revisions were made to Table 2.15-16, Existing Conditions Roadway LOS by Jurisdiction:

Roadway	Segment	Cross-Section	Capacity (LOS E)	ADT	LOS
San Diego					
Airway Rd	Michael Faraday Dr to SR-905	2-lane Collector	40,000 9,000	6,600	C
Siempre Viva Rd	La Media Rd to SR-905-425	6-lane Major Arterial	50,000	10,900	A
	SR-905 425 to Enrico Fermi Dr	4-lane Major Arterial	40,000	19,400	B A

General Notes:

Bold letters indicate substandard LOS.

CLTL = Continuous left-turn lane.

Note 1: The segment of Siempre Viva Road between La Media Rd and Avenida Costa Brava/Melksee Street is not currently constructed to a 6-lane major arterial, and would have a LOS E capacity of 22,500 ADT, resulting in an acceptable LOS B along this segment.

Source: Wilson and Company 2009a

- On Draft EIR page 2.15-73, the following revisions were made to Table 2.15-17, Interregional/International Crossings in the Unincorporated County:

Crossing	Roadway	CPA or Subregion	ADTs (000) ⁽¹⁾		Percent Increase (2000-2030)
			2000	2030	
Jacumba (under consideration)	N/A	Mountain Empire	N/A	1 or 66 ⁽³⁾	N/A

- On Draft EIR page 2.15-91, the following revisions were made to Table 2.15-24, Significant Traffic Impacts to Adjacent Cities Resulting from the Proposed Project:

Roadway	Segment	Existing			General Plan Update			Δ in V/C
		ADT	V/C	LOS	ADT	V/C	LOS	
San Diego								
Siempre Viva Road	SR-125 to Enrico Fermi Dr	19,400	0.39	A B	59,300	1.19	F	0.80

- On Draft EIR page 2.15-95, the following revisions were made to Table 2.15-27, Cumulative Significant Traffic Impacts Existing Conditions vs. Existing General Plans:

Roadway	Segment	Existing			General Plan Update			Δ in V/C
		ADT	V/C	LOS	ADT	V/C	LOS	
San Diego								
Siempre Viva Rd	SR-905 125 to Enrico Fermi Dr	19,400	0.39	A B	50,700	1.01	F	0.62

- On Draft EIR page 2.15-96, the following revisions were made to Table 2.15-28, Criteria for Accepting LOS E/F Roads:

	Constraints	Criteria	Possible Options
Town-Centers	Construction Costs Established Land Development Patterns	Within established or planned town center Community willing to accept a lower LOS Improvements would require removing a significant number of existing businesses or residences	Bypass roads when feasible Alternate routes for local residents Couplets to improve traffic flow Operational improvements Land use modifications, where feasible
Regional Connectivity	Construction Costs Environmental Impacts Established Land	Connects major interregional corridors Provides alternate routes to interregional corridors with failing LOS Improvements to increase capacity	Region-wide solutions to housing and traffic problems Improvements to I-15 and regional arterials

	Development	attract additional overflow traffic from interregional corridors and still produce failing LOS Improvements would have substantial impacts on environmental resources Community willing to accept a lower LOS	Wider ROW along routes that parallel I-15 and if needed to minimize impacts to local roads
Marginal Deficiencies	Environmental Impacts Construction Costs Established Land Development	Only a short segment of the road fails Underutilized, alternate routes exist	Operational improvements Traffic monitoring every 5–10 years Reclassify two-lane roads to retain wider ROW Operational improvements
Environmental Constraints	Construction Costs Environmental Impacts	Proposed alignment or widening would impact significant Tier I habitat, MSCP preserves, historic landmarks, wetlands, or significant archaeological sites Located in area with steep slopes that would require excessive grading Improvements would substantially impact major public facilities (reservoirs, power lines, etc.) Community willing to accept a lower LOS	Land use modifications Alternate routes Road classification that maximizes road capacity within the ROW Operational improvements

Identified below are the applicable situations, and potential improvement options, for accepting a road classification where a Level of Service E / F is forecast. The instances described below specify when the adverse impacts of adding travel lanes do not justify the resulting benefit of increased traffic capacity. In addition, adding capacity to roads can be growth inducing in areas where additional growth is currently not planned, which is not consistent with County Global Climate Change strategies.

Marginal Deficiencies	<p>When This Would Apply—Marginal deficiencies are characterized when only a short segment of a road is forecast to operate at LOS E or F, or the forecasted traffic volumes are only slightly higher than the LOS D threshold. Classifying the road with a designation that would add travel lanes for the entire road would be excessive and could adversely impact community character and / or impede bicycle and pedestrian circulation. Also, in some instances, although underutilized alternate routes exist that could accommodate the excess traffic, they were not included in the traffic forecast model.</p> <p>Potential Improvement Options—Rather than increase the number of travel lanes for the entire road segment to achieve a better LOS, it is more prudent to apply operational improvements only on the portion of the road operating at LOS E and F. This may require specifying a road classification “With Improvement Options” to retain sufficient right-of-way to construct any necessary operational improvements.</p>
Town Center Impacts	<p>When This Would Apply—This situation would apply when the right-of-way required to add travel lanes would adversely impact established land development patterns and / or impede bicycle and pedestrian circulation. The Community Development Model (see the General Plan’s Guiding Principle #2) concept strives to establish a land development pattern with compact villages and town centers surrounded by areas of low and very low density development. The construction of large multi-lane roads would divide an established town center, even though the intent of the road would be to connect areas within the community or improve access to areas within or surrounding the community.</p> <p>Potential Improvement Options—Traffic congestion impacts can be mitigated without adding travel lanes by establishing alternate parallel routes that would distribute the traffic volumes, such as a network of local public roads. Other means of mitigating traffic congestion impacts other than increasing the number of traffic lanes include promoting the use of alternate modes of travel in town centers to reduce single-occupant vehicle trips or maximizing the efficiency of a roadway with operational improvements, such as intersection improvements.</p>
Regional Connectivity	<p>When This Would Apply—Regional connectivity issues would apply when congestion on State freeways and highways causes regional travelers to use County roads, resulting in</p>

	<p>congestion on the County road network. Rather than widening County roads to accommodate this traffic, the deficiencies in the regional road network should be addressed.</p>
	<p>Potential Improvement Options—Coordinate with SANDAG to identify the necessary improvements to the regional transportation network and to support appropriate priority in the Regional Transportation Plan to improve these congested freeways and highways, rather than contributing to increased congestion on County roads.</p>
<p>Impacts to Environmental and Cultural Resources</p>	<p>When This Would Apply—This situation would occur when adding travel lanes to a road that would adversely impact environmental and cultural resources such as significant habitat, wetlands, MSCP preserves, wildlife movement, historic landmarks, stands of mature trees, or archaeological sites. This situation would also occur in areas with steep slopes where widening roads would require massive grading, which would result in adverse environmental impacts and other degradation of the physical environment.</p> <p>Potential Improvement Options—Provide improvement options, such as passing lanes, to areas without significant environmental or cultural constraints. This may require specifying a road classification “With Improvement Options” to retain sufficient right-of-way to construct any necessary operational improvements.</p>

Source: County DPLU 2009

Section 2.16, Utilities and Service Systems

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-2, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading MWD, SDCWA and SDCWA Member Water Districts:

In 2008, MWD provided approximately 71 percent of the total water supply for the entire San Diego County, including incorporated areas.

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-2, fifth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Planning for Future Water Supply:

Single year, normal year and multiple dry water year 2005 UWMP supply and demand assessments for MWD, SDCWA and SDCWA member districts are included in Appendix ~~H~~ J of this EIR.

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-3, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Planning for Future Water Supply:

In the 2005 UWMPs, MWD, SDCWA and all 15 SDCWA member agencies that serve the unincorporated County determined that adequate water supplies would be available to serve existing service areas under normal water year, single dry water year and multiple dry water year conditions through the year 2030, if Water Authority and member agency supplies are developed as planned, along with implementation of MWD’s IRP.

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-3, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Imported Water Supply Issues:

Factors such as cutbacks in water importation supplies from MWD and SDCWA ~~and the Statewide drought~~ were not accounted for in the 2005 UWMP supply and demand projections.

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-3, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Imported Water Supply Issues:

As a result, local water agencies have had to rely on contingency and emergency sources of water, including local groundwater and storage supplies, as well as voluntary and mandatory restrictions, to lessen direct impacts on water availability for their customers.

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-4, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Metropolitan Water District (MWD):

MWD's long-term strategy for a sustainable water supply is outlined in its IRP (2004), which is currently being updated. ~~The State has initiated funding of water projects as a result of Proposition 50 (and subsequently Proposition 84) but requires that any agencies wishing to benefit from funding participate in an Integrated Water Resources Management Plan (IWRMP).~~ This plan requires that an agency develop a water management plan for incorporation in a regional process to integrate its plan with other agencies having responsibilities for water management.

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-5, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA):

Because of the County's semi-arid climate and limited local water supplies, SDCWA provides up to 90 percent of the water used in the San Diego region ~~importing from~~ by way of imported water from MWD, a transfer agreement with Imperial Irrigation District (IID) and agreements for the lining of the All American and Coachella Canals, via the Quantification Settlement Agreement of October 2003. A single supplier, MWD

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-5, fourth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA):

The 2002 ~~2004~~ Regional Water Facilities Master Plan, planned to be updated in ~~2009~~ 2012, analyzes future water demands and different ways to meet those demands.

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-5, fourth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA):

In addition to the 2004 Regional Water Facilities Master Plan, the SDCWA, County of San Diego and City of San Diego collaboratively maintain an Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP) for the San Diego region. The Final San Diego IRWMP, adopted in 2007, reflects a comprehensive approach to water resources planning that integrates ongoing local planning efforts in order to maximize regional water management benefits and resolve any existing or potential conflicts. The San Diego IRWMP identifies programs and projects that best achieve the region's goals to optimize water supply reliability, and protect and enhance water quality, while providing stewardship of natural resources. The 2007 San Diego IRWMP includes a description of the region and participants, regional objectives and priorities, water management strategies, implementation, impacts and benefits, data management, financing, stakeholder involvement, relationship to local planning, and State and federal coordination. IRWMP planning was derived from California Proposition 50, approved by the voters in 2002, which set aside \$380 million for IRWMP-related grants (SDIRWM 2010).

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-6, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA):

The SDCWA's most recent planning documents, the 2005 Urban Water Management Plan and 2006-2007 Annual Report, concluded that water supplies would be sufficient through 2030, if Water Authority and member agency supplies are developed as planned, along with the implementation of MWD's IRP. However, with the majority of its supplies coming from MWD, the SDCWA has also been affected by the federal court decision regarding the Delta smelt and the Statewide drought.

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-8, fourth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Ramona Municipal Water District (Ramona MWD):

The Ramona MWD provides water service to approximately 57 percent of the Ramona CPA. Ramona MWD covers 45,796 acres and has approximately 9,477 connections. Ramona MWD operates 272 ~~250~~ miles of pipeline, 13 water pump lift ~~lift~~ stations, and the Lake Ramona Reservoir, which has a storage capacity of 12,000 ~~13,400~~ AF. RMWD also has one treatment facility, the John C. Bargar Water Treatment Plant. This plant has a treatment capacity of 5.3 mgd; however, the plant is currently not in operation and although rated at 5.3 mgd, has been unable to operate above 3.0 mgd as a result of recent changes in drinking water standards. The average daily consumption for Ramona MWD is 10.86 mgd.

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-9, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Sweetwater Authority/South Bay Irrigation District:

The SA/SB provides water service to National City, the northern part of Bonita, and the western portion of Chula Vista. SA/SB serves approximately 32,560 ~~33,785~~ connections over a service area of 20,480 acres. Depending upon the amount of rainfall received, as much as ~~Approximately~~ 45 ~~70~~ percent of the water supply is obtained from the SDCWA and while the remaining 55 as little as 30 percent is obtained from local sources. SA/SB operates 390 ~~388~~ miles of pipelines, 23 pump stations, 149 ~~groundwater production~~ wells, the Perdue Water Treatment Plant Facility (30 mgd capacity), the ~~Demin Treatment~~ Reynolds Groundwater Desalination Facility (4 mgd capacity), Sweetwater Reservoir (28,079 AF capacity), and Loveland Reservoir (25,387 AF capacity). SA/SB provides 88 percent of its water service to residential land uses, 180 percent to commercial land uses, two nine percent to government land uses, two percent to ~~both~~ industrial land uses, and less than one percent to agricultural land uses. Average daily consumption for SA/SB is 19.5 ~~22.5~~ mgd.

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-15, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Indian Reservations:

There is also an existing proposal to annex the Sycuan Casino into the HWD OWD. All other Sycuan trust lands and lands owned by the Sycuan Band in fee are within the boundaries of either the PDMWD or the OWD.

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-23, second paragraph, fourth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Ramona Municipal Water District (Ramona MWD):

~~The~~ Ramona MWD is an independent sanitation district authorized to provide operate two sewer service ~~to two~~ areas: 1) San Diego Country Estates, which utilizes the San Vicente Wastewater Treatment Plant; and 2) the Ramona Town Center area, which utilizes the Santa Maria Wastewater Treatment Plant. Ramona MWD provides wastewater service over an area of 9,708 acres. It operates 78 ~~400~~ miles of sewer pipelines, six ~~five~~ pump lift stations and conveys wastewater locally to the Santa Maria and San Vicente Wastewater Treatment Facilities. The pass-through capacity for each facility is 1.75 mgd with an average flow of 1.45 mgd. The rated plant capacity for Santa Maria is 1.00 mgd and for San Vicente is 0.80 mgd. The annual moving average flow rate is 0.81 mgd for Santa Maria and 0.61 for San Vicente. However, the Santa Maria Wastewater Treatment Plant exceeded its rated capacity on several occasions during the last ten years and in 2005 experienced 30-day moving average flow of 1.14 mgd. These facilities also have a water reclamation capacity of 0.35 mgd and an average flow of reclaimed water at 0.33 mgd. Effluent is used for golf course irrigation. Information regarding Ramona MWD water service is discussed in Section 2.16.1.1, Potable Water Supply and Distribution.

- On Draft EIR pages 2.16-23 and 2.16-24, last and first paragraphs, the following text has been revised under the heading Valley Center Municipal Water District (VCMWD):

The majority of VCMWD service area is served by individual septic systems. VCMWD is an independent district that provides wastewater service ~~over a service area~~ to a small portion of its 62,100 acres service area. VCMWD also provides water service, as discussed in Section 2.16.1.1, Potable Water Supply and Distribution. The VCMWD service area includes the following: 1) the I-15 corridor area, including Hidden Meadows, the Lawrence Welk Specific Plan Area and Castle Creek Country Club, which is served by the Lower Moosa Canyon Water Reclamation Facilities (WRF); and 2) the Skyline Ranch Country Club and a mobile home park on Paradise Mountain; and 2) the Woods Valley Ranch subdivision which is served by the Woods Valley Ranch WRF. VCMWD operates these two water reclamation facilities. ~~Lower Moosa Canyon Water Reclamation Facility and Skyline Ranch Country Club Water Reclamation Facility.~~ The Lower Moosa Facility has a capacity of 0.5 mgd and an average flow of 0.35 mgd. The Woods Valley Skyline Ranch Facility has a capacity of ~~50,000~~ 70,000 gpd and an average flow of ~~45,000~~ 35,000 gpd.

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-25, fourth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Transfer Stations:

Solid waste not dumped directly in a landfill is deposited temporarily in several privately operated transfer stations ~~or rural bin sites~~ located throughout the County. ~~Nine~~ Seven transfer stations in the County assist with solid waste disposal services. Table 2.16-6 identifies these stations, their operators and permitted annual throughput. The region's transfer stations play a vital role in accommodating throughput to landfills, serving as collection and separation points of solid waste and recyclables. Transfer stations help reduce traffic congestion and provide the flexibility to haul waste to distant landfills or processing plants outside of the San Diego region. The network currently handles approximately 60 percent of the region's solid waste and services. The network has a permitted throughput of approximately three million tons per year, and currently utilizes about two million tons per year, or 67 percent of network capacity. ~~The rural bin site system~~

~~may be abandoned in the near future by Allied Waste Services since they are deemed to not be profitable, and this would present new challenges to services in the remote back county.~~

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-34, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading San Diego County Department of Environmental Health (DEH):

As a result of the passage of AB 885, the County DEH is working with the SWRCB to develop Statewide performance and design standards for conventional and alternative OWTS. These standards are projected to be available for adoption in ~~2010~~March of 2012. Additionally, the County DEH is the primary agency charged with conducting inspections and providing technical assistance to the small drinking water systems in San Diego County.

- On Draft EIR page 2.16.42, General Plan Update Policy LU-1.4 has been renumbered as LU-1.2.
- On Draft EIR pages 2.16-44 and 2.16-68, General Plan Update Policy LU-6.8 has been renumbered as LU-6.9.
- On Draft EIR page 2.16-46, fourth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Urban Water Management Plans:

In the 2005 UWMPs, MWD, SDCWA and all 15 SDCWA member agencies that serve the unincorporated County determined that adequate water supplies would be available to serve existing service areas under normal water year, single dry water year and multiple dry water year conditions through the year 2030, if Water Authority and member agency supplies are developed as planned, along with the implementation of MWD's IRP.

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-47, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Urban Water Management Plans:

Many of the State's major reservoirs have been drawn down to very low water levels as a result. The 2005 UWMPs' supply and demand projections accounted for multiple dry water year drought conditions, but did not account for the current regulatory restrictions on pumping from the State Water Project. ~~Circumstances such as these have resulted in conditions that were not accounted for in 2005 UWMPs' supply and demand projections.~~ In April 2009, the SDCWA, in response to reduced water supplies caused by regulatory restrictions on water deliveries from Northern California, lingering drought, and cutbacks from MWD, approved cutting water deliveries to its member water agencies by 8 percent (effective July 1, 2009).

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-48, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Future Water Supply:

However, as discussed above, unexpected climatic and legal factors and the regulatory constraints (i.e., cutbacks) on pumping of MWD water supplies from the State Water Project have increased the uncertainty that projects included in MWD planning documents will be able to adequately serve future demand.

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-49, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Alternative Water Supplies:

For these reasons, it is unlikely this alternative would be feasibly implemented by SDCWA. ~~However, SDCWA and other local and regional water agencies are~~ currently implementing increased short-term and long-term water conservation measures to overcome water shortage obstacles and increase water supplies. For example, SDCWA has implemented a number of short-term conservation strategies, which include limiting irrigation of landscaping to certain days; prohibiting the washing down of paved surfaces; regulating individual car washing procedures; requiring the use of recycled or non-potable water during construction; prohibiting the use of ornamental fountains that do not utilize recycled water; and regulating restaurant and hotel operations.

Long-term water conservation strategies occur on both local and regional levels and are outlined in respective UWMPs, IRPs, Drought Management Plans and Regional IRWMPs. Additionally, in 2008, Governor Schwarzenegger created a new State water conservation goal to achieve a 20 percent reduction in per capita water use statewide by 2020. To achieve this goal, the Governor created a “20 x 2020 Agency Team on Water Conservation” with the focus of developing a Water Conservation Plan to achieve this water conservation goal. Several agencies will help the 20 x 2020 Agency Team on Water Conservation create the Water Conservation Plan, including: the DWR, the SWRCB, the California Energy Commission, the Department of Public Health, the California Public Utilities Commission, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the California Water Conservation Council. In addition to the creation of a Water Conservation Plan, the Governor has identified the following existing long-term water conservation tools that water users and water agencies may use to achieve the 20 percent reduction in per capita water use statewide by 2020 (SWRCB 2010):
The California Water Plan. The latest update published in 2005 provides a strategic plan for water management, laying the foundation for water conservation and other resource management activities.

Bond funding. There is grant funding (Proposition 50 and Proposition 84) available to help agencies and regions plan and implement water management programs.

Access to funds. A new law enacted in 2007, Assembly Bill (AB) 1420, requires most water agencies to implement a series of water conservation measures in order to be eligible for water management grant funds.

Efficiency standards. Showerheads, faucets, toilets, and clothes washers are all more water-efficient because California has led the nation in establishing strong standards. New laws will require even more efficient toilets in the future, new standards for irrigation controllers are planned, and other new building and appliance standards are possible in the future.

New programs and tools. The California DWR is working on programs that will help communities and customers conserve water. A Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance was developed in 2009 that local governments can adopt as their own. Landscape conservation offers more potential savings than any other single conservation measure. Also, DWR is upgrading the California Irrigation Management Information System, a network of automated weather stations around the State that measure how much water landscapes

or crops need. System upgrades will enable the system to communicate with a new generation of automated irrigation controllers.

Collaboration. Hundreds of water agencies, environmental organizations, and others work together under the banner of the California Urban Water Conservation Council (CUWCC). Since 1991, this organization has set voluntary standards for conservation programs. CUWCC's approach and standards ensure that California conservation programs are cost-effective and achieve the required savings.

Regulatory protection. The SWRCB is entrusted with the responsibility to ensure beneficial use of water in California and prevent waste and unreasonable use.

Although there are many long-term water conservation programs and plans that currently exist, it is likely new programs and approaches would be developed (outside of the 20 x 2020 Agency Team Water Conservation Plan) to meet the Governor's target and help ensure water supply reliability. For example, the California Public Utilities Commission is conducting several water conservation/efficiency pilots to determine associated energy savings pairing water and energy utilities' programs. The option of curtailing development (i.e., no project alternative) in the unincorporated County in locations where sufficient water is potentially not available at build-out would be the responsibility of the County, which has the land use authority to approve or deny proposed development projects.

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-51, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Future Water Supply:

The complete study is provided in Appendix GD, County of San Diego General Plan Update Groundwater Study.

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-53, fifth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Summary:

Although multiple planning documents exist to ensure a reliable water supply is available for future growth within the County, issues such as cutbacks in imported water due to regulatory restrictions on pumping from the State Water Project and unprecedented drought years were unaccounted for in these documents.

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-55, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Impact Analysis:

Wastewater districts that would serve the largest populations and increases number of housing units under implementation of the General Plan Update include OWD (79,539 housing units and 236,309 persons); PDMWD (74,422 housing units and 211,348 persons); SVSD (28,199 housing units and 86,999 persons); and Ramona MWD (14,174 27,273 housing units and 43,510 83,719 persons).

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-55, fourth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Impact Analysis:

As discussed in Section 2.16.1.2, the following wastewater districts have a greater number of allocated EDUs than available EDUs, indicating insufficient facilities to service the

community at build out: ASD; Lakeside Sanitation District, PDMWD, Ramona MWD, SVSD, WGSMD, BWD, BSD, CWSMD, FPUD, and JSD.

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-58, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Impact Analysis:

The recently approved Master Plan for the approval of the tentatively reserved expansion for the Sycamore Canyon Landfill would also add 116.6 million tons to the capacity in the County.

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-65, second paragraph, the text has been revised as follows under the heading Issue 8: Energy:

As discussed above, prior to mitigation, the proposed project has the potential to increase energy demand and require the construction or expansion of energy facilities, which would result in potentially significant direct environmental impacts. ~~Therefore, t~~The proposed project, in combination with the identified cumulative projects, would also have the potential to contribute to result in a significant cumulative impact. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable.

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-66, General Plan Update Policy LU-9.4 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy LU-9.4: Infrastructure Serving Villages and Community Cores. Prioritize infrastructure improvements and the provision of public facilities for Villages and community cores ~~and sized~~ for the intensity of development allowed by the Land Use Map.

- On Draft EIR pages 2.16-66 and 2.16-73, General Plan Update Policy LU-12.2 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy LU-12.2: Maintenance of Adequate Services. Require development to mitigate significant impacts to existing service levels of public facilities or services for existing residents and businesses. Provide improvements for Mobility Element roads in accordance with the Mobility Element Network Appendix matrices, which may result in ultimate build-out conditions that achieve a ~~higher~~ an improved LOS but do not achieve a LOS of D or better.

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-66, General Plan Update Policy LU-14.4 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy LU-14.4: Sewer Facilities. Prohibit sewer facilities that would induce unplanned growth. Require sewer systems to be planned, developed, and sized to serve the land use pattern and densities depicted on the Land Use Map. Sewer systems and services shall not be extended beyond either Village boundaries or extant Urban Limit Lines, whichever is more restrictive, except:

- When necessary for public health, safety, or welfare;
- When within existing sewer district boundaries;
- When necessary for a conservation subdivision adjacent to existing sewer facilities; or
- Where specifically allowed in the Community Plan.

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-67, General Plan Policy LU-1.4 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy LU-1.24: Leapfrog Development. Prohibit leapfrog development which is inconsistent with the Community Development Model ~~and Community Plans.~~ Leapfrog Development restrictions do not apply to new villages that are designed to be consistent with the Community Development Model, that provide necessary services and facilities, and that are designed to meet the LEED-Neighborhood Development Certification or an equivalent. For purposes of this policy, leapfrog development is defined as village densities located away from established Villages or outside established water and sewer service boundaries. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-67, General Plan Update Policy H-1.3 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy H-1.3: Housing near Public Services. ~~Encourage the development of~~ Maximize housing in areas served by transportation networks, within close proximity to job centers, and where public services and infrastructure are available.

- On Draft EIR pages 2.16-68 and 2.16-70, General Plan Update Policy COS-4.3 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy COS-4.3: Stormwater Filtration. Maximize stormwater filtration and/or infiltration in areas that are not subject to high groundwater by maximizing the natural drainage patterns and the retention of natural vegetation and other pervious surfaces. This policy shall not apply in areas with high groundwater, where raising the water table could cause septic system failures, ~~and/or~~ moisture damage to building slabs, and/or other problems.

- On Draft EIR pages 2.16-69 and 2.16-70, General Plan Update Policy LU-8.2 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy LU-8.2: Groundwater Resources. Require development to identify adequate groundwater resources in groundwater dependent areas, as follows:

- In areas dependent on currently identified groundwater overdrafted basins, prohibit new development from exacerbating overdraft conditions. Encourage programs to alleviate overdraft conditions in Borrego Valley.
- In areas without current overdraft groundwater conditions, ~~prohibit~~ evaluate new groundwater-dependent development to assure a sustainable long-term supply of groundwater is available that will not adversely impact existing groundwater users. Where overdraft conditions are foreseeable.
- ~~A groundwater basin is considered in an overdraft condition when, during average conditions over a number of years, the amount of water being withdrawn from the basin exceeds the amount of water that recharges the basin.~~
- On Draft EIR page 2.16-70, General Plan Update Policy COS-4.1 has been revised as follows under the heading, General Plan Update Policies:

Policy COS-4.1: Water Conservation. Require development to reduce the waste of potable water through use of efficient technologies and conservation efforts that minimize the County’s dependence on imported water and conserve groundwater resources.

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-70, General Plan Update Policy COS-5.5 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy COS-5.5: Impacts of Development to Water Quality. Require development projects to avoid impacts to the water quality in local reservoirs, groundwater resources, and recharge areas, watersheds, and other local water sources.

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-73, General Plan Update Policy COS-17.1 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Policy COS-17.1: Reduction of Solid Waste Materials. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and future landfill capacity needs through reduction, reuse, or recycling of all types of solid waste that is generated. Divert solid waste from landfills in compliance with ~~the California Integrated Waste Management Act (AB 939) that requires each local jurisdiction in the state to divert at least 50 percent of its solid waste from being placed into landfills~~ State law.

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-78, second paragraph, the text has been revised as follows under the heading Issue 8: Energy:

The development of future land uses as designated in the proposed General Plan Update would require energy facilities to be constructed or expanded, which would have the potential to result in significant environmental effects. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a potentially significant direct impact. Additionally, the proposed project would result in a potentially ~~cumulatively considerable contribution to~~ significant cumulative impact. However, implementation of the proposed General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures, in addition to the California Energy Efficiency Standards for residential and non-residential buildings would reduce direct impacts related to the need for the expansion or construction of energy facilities to a level below significance. Additionally, with implementation of the proposed General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures, the proposed project’s cumulative contribution would be reduced to a less than significant level. ~~would not contribute to a significantly cumulative impact associated with energy regulations.~~

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-79, the following revisions have been made to Table 2.16-1, SDCWA Member Water Districts Existing and Future Housing and Population:

SDCWA Member Water Districts	Housing Units (2004)	Population (2004)	Housing Units – (Proposed Project)	Population (Proposed Project)	Growth in Housing (percent)	Growth in Population (percent)
Helix Water District	<u>28,075</u> 28,893	<u>83,033</u> 85,374	<u>31,097</u> 31,915	<u>91,954</u> 94,295	<u>11</u> 40	<u>11</u> 40
Olivenhain Municipal Water District	<u>5,273</u> 5,982	<u>13,646</u> 15,482	<u>6,005</u> 6,949	<u>15,541</u> 17,984	<u>14</u> 46	<u>14</u> 46
Otay Water District	<u>20,783</u> 70,362	<u>62,687</u> 208,820	<u>23,267</u> 79,539	<u>70,187</u> 236,309	<u>12</u> 43	<u>12</u> 43
Padre Dam Municipal	<u>22,270</u>	<u>63,562</u>	<u>28,407</u>	<u>80,755</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>27</u>

Water District	<u>57,046</u>	<u>462,729</u>	<u>74,422</u>	<u>211,348</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>
Rainbow Municipal Water District	<u>7,106</u> <u>7,768</u>	<u>20,083</u> <u>21,947</u>	<u>11,803</u> <u>13,052</u>	<u>33,265</u> <u>36,759</u>	<u>66</u> <u>68</u>	<u>66</u> <u>67</u>
Ramona Municipal Water District	<u>8,337</u> <u>16,502</u>	<u>25,592</u> <u>50,656</u>	<u>14,174</u> <u>27,273</u>	<u>43,510</u> <u>83,719</u>	<u>41</u> <u>65</u>	<u>41</u> <u>65</u>
Rincon del Diablo Municipal Water District	<u>4,199</u> <u>9,887</u>	<u>12,596</u> <u>29,694</u>	<u>8,403</u> <u>18,915</u>	<u>25,250</u> <u>56,884</u>	<u>100</u> <u>94</u>	<u>100</u> <u>92</u>
Vallecitos Water District	<u>3,731</u> <u>11,125</u>	<u>11,083</u> <u>33,409</u>	<u>5,648</u> <u>14,812</u>	<u>16,660</u> <u>44,327</u>	<u>51</u> <u>-33</u>	<u>50</u> <u>33</u>
Yuima Municipal Water District	<u>719</u> <u>907</u>	<u>2,150</u> <u>2,710</u>	<u>2,037</u> <u>2,354</u>	<u>6,090</u> <u>7,027</u>	<u>183</u> <u>159</u>	<u>183</u> <u>159</u>

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-80, the following revisions have been made to Table 2.16-2, Groundwater Dependent Water Districts Existing and Future Housing and Population:

Groundwater Dependant Districts	Housing Units (2004)	Population (2004)	Housing Units (Proposed Project)	Population (Proposed Project)	Growth in Housing (percent)	Growth in Population (percent)
Borrego Water District	<u>989</u> <u>1,300</u>	<u>1,526</u> <u>1,006</u>	<u>8,624</u> <u>13,832</u>	<u>13,308</u> <u>21,342</u>	<u>772</u> <u>964</u>	<u>772</u> <u>964</u>

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-81, the following revisions have been made to Table 2.16-4, Wastewater Districts Existing and Future Housing and Population:

Wastewater Districts	Housing Units (2004)	Population (2004)	Housing Units (Proposed Project)	Population (Proposed Project)	Growth in Housing (percent)	Growth in Population (percent)
Padre Dam Municipal Water District	<u>22,270</u> <u>57,046</u>	<u>63,562</u> <u>162,729</u>	<u>28,407</u> <u>74,422</u>	<u>80,755</u> <u>211,348</u>	<u>28</u> <u>-30</u>	<u>27</u> <u>30</u>
Borrego Water District	<u>989</u> <u>1,300</u>	<u>1,526</u> <u>2,006</u>	<u>8,624</u> <u>13,832</u>	<u>13,308</u> <u>21,342</u>	<u>772</u> <u>964</u>	<u>772</u> <u>964</u>
Olivenhain Municipal Water District	<u>5,273</u> <u>5,982</u>	<u>13,646</u> <u>5,482</u>	<u>6,005</u> <u>949</u>	<u>15,541</u> <u>7,984</u>	<u>14</u> <u>46</u>	<u>14</u> <u>46</u>
Ramona Municipal Water District	<u>8,337</u> <u>16,502</u>	<u>25,592</u> <u>50,656</u>	<u>14,174</u> <u>27,273</u>	<u>43,510</u> <u>83,719</u>	<u>41</u> <u>65</u>	<u>41</u> <u>65</u>

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-82, the following deletions have been made to Table 2.16-6, Solid Waste Transfer Stations Serving Unincorporated San Diego County:

Transfer Stations	Operator	Permitted Annual Throughput (tons)
Campe	Allied Waste Industries	775
Viejas	Allied Waste Industries	5,616

- On Draft EIR page 2.16-84, the following revisions have been made to Table 2.16-8, Power Plants Located in San Diego County (as of 2006):

Name	Peak (MWs)	Owner
Qualifying Facility/Cogeneration/Renewables		
<u>Landfill Gas (Otay)</u>	<u>7.4</u>	<u>Covanta</u>
<u>Landfill Gas (Sycamore)</u>	<u>3.5</u>	<u>Fortistar</u>

Section 2.17, Global Climate Change

- On Draft EIR page 2.17-1, the Global Climate Change Summary of Impacts Table has been revised as follows:

Issue Number	Issue Topic	Project Direct Impact	Project Cumulative Impact	Impact After Mitigation
1	Compliance with AB 32	Potentially Significant	Significant Cumulative Contribution	<u>Significant and Unavoidable Less than Significant</u>
2	Potential Effects of Global Climate Change on the Proposed General Plan Update	Potentially Significant	Significant Cumulative Contribution	<u>Significant and Unavoidable Less than Significant</u>

- On Draft EIR page 2.17-12, sixth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Guidelines for Determination of Significance:

In order for the proposed General Plan Update to not conflict with the goals and strategies of AB 32, the Plan County needs to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. As a result, achievement of 1990 emission levels by 2020 has been selected as the significance threshold for this project.

- On Draft EIR page 2.17-13, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Impact Analysis:

Although the horizon year for the General Plan Update is 2030 may be as far out as 2050 based on the draft SANDAG 2050 forecasts adopted in 2010, AB 32 requirements indicate the year 2020 as the limit by which GHG emissions need to be reduced to 1990 levels.

- On Draft EIR page 2.17-23, fourth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Climate.

Experts generally conclude that rainfall will continue to vary widely from year to year, leaving San Diego County highly vulnerable to drought. The changes in climate would have the potential to impact future development under the General Plan Update because the majority of the unincorporated County is located inland, where more extreme temperature increases are expected. Therefore, the unincorporated County would be vulnerable to potential

drought, wildfires, and public health risks resulting from changes in climate in the County, as described below.

- On Draft EIR page 2.17-24, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Sea Level:

Wetlands and estuaries could be devastated, leaving beaches exposed to more pollutants that endanger human and marine life. While most of the unincorporated County is located inland and would not be directly impacted by sea level rise, future development under the General Plan Update in the San Dieguito CPA would have the potential to be at risk for flooding because of its proximity to the coast. The coastal area of the Pendleton/De Luz CPA would also be at risk for flooding associated with sea level rise; however, this area is within the jurisdiction of USMC Camp Pendleton, not the County of San Diego.

- On Draft EIR page 2.17-24, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Water Supply:

Even with plans in place to conserve, recycle, and augment our available water, it is estimated San Diego County could face an 18 percent shortfall in water supply by 2050 (San Diego Foundation 2008). As discussed in Section 2.16.3.4, Issue 4: Adequate Water Supplies, due to uncertainties surrounding the implementation of future water supply projects, water supplies may be inadequate to serve the build out of the proposed General Plan Update. Additional reductions in water supply as a result of climate change would further impact the availability of water to support future development under the General Plan Update.

- On Draft EIR page 2.17-24, third paragraph, the following text has been added under the heading Water Supply:

Water Quality

Increased temperatures and changes in precipitation patterns can also affect the quality of water supplies (EPA 2009a). For example, changes in runoff patterns can result in additional pollution and sedimentation in surface waters; and changes in evaporation rates or sea level rise can increase salinity within freshwater bodies and within groundwater basins.

As discussed in Section 2.8.1.4, Water Quality, increased pollutants can lead to contaminated drinking water for humans and animals, potentially leading to adverse public health issues. Moreover, excessive sedimentation can adversely affect aquatic organisms, hinder photosynthesis, and disrupt lifecycle and behavioral activities of wildlife.

- On Draft EIR page 2.17-25, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Wildfires:

A simultaneous occurrence of all of these factors will increase the likelihood of more devastating firestorms similar to those that destroyed many homes and lives in the unincorporated County during 2003 and 2007. As discussed in Section 2.7.3.8, Issue 8: Wildland Fires, the vast majority of the unincorporated County is already ranked as having a high or very high fire hazard risk. Future development under the General Plan Update would increase the population in the unincorporated County, which would result in greater wildland fire risks to people and structures. Climate change has the potential to increase the already

high fire hazard risk to future development projects occurring under the General Plan Update.

- On Draft EIR page 2.17-25, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Ecosystems:

Top predators like coyotes may be lost if habitat patches become too small or isolated, and that can lead to an increase in smaller predators that prey on native songbirds. As discussed in Section 2.4.3.1, Issue 1: Special Status Plant and Wildlife Species, future development under the General Plan Update would have the potential to impact plant and wildlife species in the County through direct removal of habitat or indirectly through impacts such as water quality, fugitive dust emissions, and introduction of non-native species. Climate change would increase the severity of impacts to biological resources that would occur from future development under the General Plan Update.

- On Draft EIR page 2.17-25, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Public Health:

Wildfire smoke contains numerous toxic and hazardous pollutants that are dangerous to breathe and can worsen lung disease and other respiratory conditions. As discussed above, the project area is already at risk for wildfire and climate change would potentially increase the risk. Therefore, future development proposed under the General Plan Update would be exposed to air pollution and associated health risks as a result of increased wildfires. Additionally, future development proposed under the General Plan Update would be exposed to a regional increase in ozone air pollution levels and associated health impacts as a result of climate change.

- On Draft EIR page 2.17-25, fourth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Public Health:

Warmer temperatures year-round could lead to growing mosquito populations, increasing the occurrence of West Nile Virus in the San Diego region. Hot weather could also bring tropical diseases such as malaria and dengue fever to the region for the first time. In coastal waters, conditions are likely to favor more frequent “red tides” or harmful algal blooms, which can harbor toxic bacteria and other diseases. In 2050, with an aging population and more residents living in areas with extreme-heat conditions and poor air quality, the San Diego region will face intensified public health concerns. As discussed above, inland areas of the County are expected to experience greater increases in temperature than coastal areas. The majority of the unincorporated County is located in inland areas; therefore, future development under the General Plan Update would potentially be exposed to increased health risks from increased temperature due to climate change.

- On Draft EIR page 2.17-26, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Energy Needs:

Hotter summers and more frequent, longer and intense heat waves will increase peak demand for electricity, which could result in blackouts and power outages without adequate planning. As discussed in Section 2.16.3.8, Issue 8: Energy, the construction or expansion of energy facilities would be required to support future development under the General Plan Update. Additionally, the majority of the unincorporated County is located inland, where temperature increases are expected to be the greatest. Climate change would increase the need for new or expanded energy facilities in the County to provide summer cooling for

future development projects proposed under the General Plan Update. It would also increase the potential for future development under the General Plan Update to be subject to blackouts and power outages.

- On Draft EIR page 2.17-27, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Issue 1: Compliance with AB 32:

However, as detailed in the State's Scoping Plan, in order to achieve AB 32 levels, action will be required at all levels of government. Several federal and State programs will have a significant role in reducing ~~programs~~ emissions. Many of these programs are already underway; however, some are in their infancy and full implementation has not yet been realized and others are merely anticipated. While the State's commitment to AB 32 provides some assurances that these efforts will come to complete fruition, they are beyond the authority of the County. Without them, a greater burden would be placed on the County ~~will not be able in order to independently~~ achieve the AB 32 targets. Nevertheless, the County has committed to achieving the 1990 emission levels by 2020 in the proposed General Plan Update. This commitment is supported by numerous General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures listed below. ~~Therefore, impacts related to GHG emissions and compliance with AB 32 would be reduced to a less than significant level. are considered significant and unavoidable.~~

- On Draft EIR page 2.17-27, fourth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

Implementation of the following General Plan Update policies, in combination with those listed in Table I-1 of the proposed General Plan Update, and mitigation measures listed below would reduce proposed project impacts related to compliance with AB 32, ~~but not~~ to below a significant level of significance.

- On Draft EIR page 2.17-27, General Plan Update Policy COS-10.7 has been added under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

COS-10.7: Recycling of Debris. Encourage the installation and operation of construction and demolition (C&D) debris recycling facilities as an accessory use at permitted (or otherwise authorized) mining facilities to increase the supply of available mineral resources.

- On Draft EIR page 2.17-28, General Plan Update Policy COS-17.1 has been revised as follows under the heading General Plan Update Policies:

COS-17.1: Reduction of Solid Waste Materials. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and future landfill capacity needs through reduction, reuse, or recycling of all types of solid waste that is generated. Divert solid waste from landfills in compliance with ~~the California Integrated Waste Management Act (AB 939) that requires each local jurisdiction in the state to divert at least 50 percent of its solid waste from being placed into landfills~~ State law.

- On Draft EIR page 2.17-32, mitigation measure CC-1.19 has been added under the heading Mitigation Measures:

CC-1.19 Revise the Zoning Ordinance to facilitate recycling salvaged concrete, asphalt, and rock.

- On Draft EIR page 2.17-32, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Issue 2: Effects of Global Climate Change on the General Plan Update.

The proposed General Plan Update policies and corresponding mitigation measures identified above in Section 2.17.6.1, Issue 1: Compliance with AB 32, in combination with applicable regulations including the CAA, Lieberman-Warner Climate Security Act, CARB standards, Title 24 standards, Executive Order S-3-05, AB 32, Executive Order S-01-07, SB 97, SB 1368, SB 1078, APCD standards and existing County programs and policies, would mitigate direct and cumulative impacts to development from adverse effects of climate change. ~~However, as with Issue 1, addressing the adverse effects of climate change requires action at all levels of government. Because the County must depend on action taken by these other entities, this is considered a significant and unavoidable impact.~~ Additional relevant proposed General Plan Update policies and corresponding mitigation measures that would address impacts from climate change on the General Plan Update are identified in the respective issue sections in this EIR. Because climate change is a global issue, the efforts made by the County and even the State to reduce GHG emissions will not avoid the consequences of excessive GHG emissions throughout the world. However, with AB 32, the State of California has committed to addressing its share of the issue and with the General Plan Update, the County would be committing to their share as well. Additionally, the policies and mitigation measures proposed with the General Plan Update enable the County to readily respond to adverse consequences from global climate change. Therefore, the impacts related to affects of climate change on the General Plan Update would be reduced to a less than significant level.

- On Draft EIR page 2.17-32, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Issue 1: Compliance with AB 32:

Therefore, the proposed project would result in a potentially significant impact related to compliance with AB 32. Additionally, the proposed project would result in a potentially significant cumulative impact. The proposed General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce direct and cumulative impacts related to compliance with AB 32 and would mitigate these impacts to a level below significant. ~~However, as detailed in the State's Scoping Plan, in order to achieve AB 32 levels, action will be required at all levels of government. While the State's commitment to AB 32 provides some assurances that such efforts will come to complete fruition at all levels, they are beyond the authority of the County. Without them, the County will not be able to independently achieve the AB 32 targets. Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable, and the project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable.~~

- On Draft EIR page 2.17-33, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Issue 2: Effects of Global Climate Change on the General Plan Update:

The proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures discussed above, in addition to compliance with applicable regulations such as the CAA, Lieberman-Warner Climate Security Act, CARB standards, Title 24 standards, Executive Order S-3-05, AB 32, Executive Order S-01-07, SB 97, SB 1368, SB 1078, APCD standards and existing County programs and policies, would mitigate the potential direct and cumulative impacts of global climate change to a level below significant. ~~However, as with Issue 1, addressing the adverse effects of climate change requires action at all levels of government. Because the~~

~~County must depend on action taken by these other entities, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable, and the project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable.~~

Chapter 3.0, Other CEQA Considerations

- On Draft EIR page 3-4, first paragraph, General Plan Update Policy LU-1.4 has been renumbered to LU-1.2.
- On Draft EIR page 3-4, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Employment Growth.

~~Policy LU-3.3 requires new large developments to establish a complete neighborhood which would include a neighborhood commercial center within easy walking distance of surrounding residences when consistent with the area's Community Plan.~~

- On Draft EIR page 3-8, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes:

~~The proposed project would also result in significant unavoidable effects related to air emissions including emissions of greenhouse gases (see Section 2.3, Air Quality Section 2.17, Climate Change).~~

- On Draft EIR page 3-16, all paragraphs, the following text has been deleted under the heading Global Climate Change:

Global Climate Change

~~**Issue 1 — Compliance with AB 32:** By the year 2020, GHG emissions are projected to increase to 7.1 MMT CO₂e (from 5.3 MMT CO₂e in 1990) under a BAU scenario, which for the purposes of this analysis is the development of the General Plan Update without incorporation of any GHG-reducing policies or mitigation measures., GHG emissions Countywide are projected to increase to 7.15 MMT CO₂e. This amount represents an increase of 24 percent over 2006 levels, and a 36 percent increase from estimated 1990 levels. The proposed General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce direct impacts related to compliance with AB 32. However, as detailed in the State's Scoping Plan, in order to achieve AB 32 levels, action will be required at all levels of government. While the State's commitment to AB 32 provides some assurances that such efforts will come to complete fruition at all levels, they are beyond the authority of the County. Without them, the County will not be able to independently achieve the AB 32 targets. Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.~~

~~**Issue 2 — Effects of Global Climate Change on the General Plan Update:** Climate change impacts that would be most relevant to the unincorporated County, and the proposed General Plan Update, include effects on water supply, wildfires, energy needs, and impacts to public health. The proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures, in addition to compliance with applicable regulations such as the CAA, Lieberman-Warner Climate Security Act, CARB standards, Title 24 standards, Executive Order S-3-05, AB 32,~~

~~Executive Order S-01-07, SB 97, SB 1368, SB 1078, APCD standards and existing County programs and policies, would mitigate the potential direct impacts of global climate change. However, addressing the adverse effects of climate change requires action at all levels of government. Because the County must depend on action taken by these other entities, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.~~

~~**Cumulative Impact — Compliance with AB 32:** The General Plan Update would have a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact in the region associated with compliance with AB 32. The proposed General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce cumulative impacts related to compliance with AB 32, but not to below a level of significance.~~

~~**Cumulative Impact — Effects of Global Climate Change on the General Plan Update:** The General Plan Update would have a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact in the region associated with effects of global climate change. The proposed General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce cumulative impacts related to the effects of global climate change, but not to below a level of significance.~~

Chapter 4.0, Project Alternatives

- On Draft EIR page 4-4, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Backcountry Development Alternative:

Additionally, allowing for higher intensity growth in the backcountry does not meet five of the ten project objectives because it would: 1) produce additional burdens on infrastructure capacities since infrastructure is less available in the backcountry; 2) increase public costs by not concentrating development within the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) boundary; 3) not help retain land for agriculture and sensitive resources grazing; 4) not locate growth near infrastructure, services, and jobs; and 5) not accurately reflect the actual development capacity of the land.

- On Draft EIR page 4-8, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Hybrid Map Alternative Description and Setting:

The Hybrid Alternative would support build-out of 68,224 residential dwelling units, or 3,000 less than the proposed project (see Table 4-7).

- On Draft EIR page 4-13, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Special Status Plant and Wildlife Species:

~~This As shown in Table 4-8, this alternative would result in an estimated 157,139 acres of direct impacts to habitats that would have the potential to support special status plant and wildlife species, compared to 174,638 175,444 acres under the proposed project (DPLU GIS 2008). The most substantial reductions in direct impacts to habitat would occur for chaparral (5,981 acres), coastal sage scrub (2,348 acres), red shank chaparral (1,610 acres), Engelmann oak woodland (1,263 acres), and coast live oak woodland (1,178 acres). Additionally, this alternative would result in fewer indirect impacts to special status species~~

because it would accommodate fewer commercial, industrial, and high density residential land uses, which are associated with intensive nighttime lighting and noise, both of which can adversely affect wildlife species.

- On Draft EIR page 4-21, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Groundwater Supplies and Recharge:

When compared to the proposed project, the Hybrid Map would reduce total housing within outside the SDCWA service area by ~~4,484~~ 2,217 dwelling units (see Table 4-6). ~~and would accommodate 1,165 additional homes outside the SDCWA boundary.~~ Therefore, the Hybrid Map would result in a greater lesser impact to groundwater ~~because it would accommodate a greater proportion of growth in groundwater dependent areas.~~ As such, impacts would be greater as compared to the proposed project. Impacts would be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 would be required.

- On Draft EIR page 4-33, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Wastewater Treatment Requirements:

The Hybrid Map Alternative would accommodate a lower population in the SDCWA boundary than the proposed project (~~4,484~~ 1,102 fewer residential units) and would result in a reduced demand for wastewater treatment services within the SDCWA. This alternative would also result in an decreased ~~increased~~ demand for wastewater treatments services in areas dependent on septic systems ~~rather than existing wastewater treatment facilities (1,165 additional 2,217 fewer residential units).~~ ~~However~~ Therefore, overall demand for wastewater treatment would decrease under this alternative ~~because it would have 3,000 fewer residential units total compared to the proposed project and impacts would be lessened.~~

- On Draft EIR page 4-33, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading New Water and Wastewater Facilities:

As shown in Table 4-6, when compared to the proposed project, the Hybrid Map Alternative would reduce total housing within the SDCWA service area by ~~4,484~~ 1,102 dwelling units. ~~The Hybrid Map Alternative would result in a lesser concentration of housing in areas with existing infrastructure, which would result in an increased need for new water or wastewater facilities to be constructed to meet future demands. Therefore, impacts would be greater as compared to the proposed project.~~ Therefore, overall impacts related to water and wastewater treatment facilities would decrease under this alternative because demand would be lower than for the proposed project.

- On Draft EIR page 4-34, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Adequate Water Supplies:

As shown in Table 4-6, when compared to the proposed project, the Hybrid Map Alternative would reduce housing densities within the service area of the SDCWA by ~~4,484~~ 1,102 dwelling units, and would further result in 2,218 less units outside the SDCWA. Therefore, this alternative would result in a lesser concentration of housing units occurring in areas that import water or ~~a greater number of housing units to occur in areas that are~~ groundwater dependent. ~~This would result in an increased potential for inadequate water supplies to occur.~~ Therefore As such, impacts would be greater lessened as compared to the proposed

project. Impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 would be required. It is unlikely that impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance; thus, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

- On Draft EIR page 4-34, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Adequate Wastewater Facilities:

As shown in Table 4-6, when compared to the proposed project, the Hybrid Map Alternative would reduce housing within the SDCWA member agency service area by ~~4,484~~ 1,102 dwelling units. Therefore, impacts related to adequate wastewater facilities would be reduced under this alternative because demand for wastewater facilities within the SDCWA boundary would be lessened. This alternative would ~~increase~~ also decrease impacts to wastewater service providers outside of the SDCWA boundaries and impacts to areas dependent on septic systems because this alternative proposes ~~4,165~~ 2,217 additional fewer residential units outside the SDCWA boundary. ~~However, the Hybrid Map Alternative would have less development throughout the unincorporated County (3,000 fewer residential units) and would reduce overall demand for wastewater facilities.~~

- On Draft EIR page 4-35, fourth paragraph, the following text has been deleted under the heading Compliance with AB 32:

Therefore, impacts would be lessened as compared to the proposed project. However, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 would be required. ~~It is unlikely that impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance; thus, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.~~

- On Draft EIR page 4-36, first paragraph, the following text has been deleted under the heading Adverse Climate Change Impacts:

Therefore, impacts would be lessened as compared to the proposed project. However, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 would be required. ~~It is unlikely that impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance; thus, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.~~

- On Draft EIR page 4-36, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Fulfillment of Project Objectives:

For one of the 10 objectives, 1) support reasonable share of projected regional growth, the proposed project is considered to better fulfill this objective ~~Hybrid Map Alternative would not be considered to fully meet the objective~~ because the Hybrid Alternative would accommodate a smaller population than the proposed project. For ~~seven~~ nine of the 10 objectives, the Hybrid Map Alternative would be considered to better fulfill the objectives. This alternative would reduce land consumption and promote sustainability (objective 2) because less development is proposed under this alternative; reinforce the vitality, local economy, and character of communities (objective 3) because reduced development would result in fewer potential impacts to community character; protect natural resources and habitats of ecological importance (objective 4) because potential impacts to biological resources are reduced under this alternative; account for physical constraints and natural hazards of the land (objective 5) because this alternative proposes lower density development in some areas such as Valley Center to reflect environmental constraints; provide and support multi-modal transportation network (objective 6) because less dwelling

units would be constructed in the auto-dependent areas of the unincorporated County; sustainable communities/reduced greenhouse gas emissions (objective 7) because potential GHG emissions from vehicles would be reduced under this alternative; preserve agriculture (objective 8) because this alternative would result in reduced potential impacts related to direct and indirect conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use; and minimize public costs of infrastructure and services (objective 9) because less infrastructure and services would be required under this alternative due to reduced development; and recognize community and stakeholder interests (objective 10). ~~For two of the 10 objectives, 6) provide and support multi-modal transportation network, and 10) recognize community and stakeholder interests, the Hybrid Map Alternative would equally fulfill the objectives as compared to the proposed project.~~

- On Draft EIR pages 4-36 and 4-37, last and first paragraphs, the following text has been revised under the heading Draft Land Use Map Alternative Description and Setting:

The Draft Land Use Map Alternative would support build-out of 67,803 residential dwelling units, or 3,700 less units than the proposed project (see Table 4-7).

- On Draft EIR page 4-39, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Biological Resources:

Impacts to special status plant and wildlife species, riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities, federally protected wetlands, wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites, local policies and ordinances, and HCPs and NCCPs would be similar to those discussed for the Hybrid Map Alternative but to a lesser degree because of the overall decrease in development. As shown in Table 4-8 For comparison purposes, the Draft Land Use Map Alternative would impact approximately 22,858 23,364 fewer acres of sensitive natural habitats potentially supporting special status plant and wildlife species, 833 4,046 fewer acres of riparian habitat, and 121 fewer total acres of federally protected wetlands than the proposed project. Impacts to wildlife corridors and nursery sites would be reduced as compared to the proposed project because this alternative would impact fewer acres of sensitive natural habitat that would potentially contain wildlife corridors and nursery sites. In addition, based on a comparative impact report prepared by the Conservation Biology Institute (CBI 2005), indirect impacts to habitat would be substantially reduced under the Draft Land Use Map Alternative when compared to the proposed project.

- On Draft EIR page 4-41, fourth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Hydrology and Water Quality:

When compared to the proposed project, the Draft Land Use Map would reduce total housing within the SDCWA service area by ~~4,777~~ 1,004 dwelling units (see Table 4-6) and would ~~increase~~ also decrease development outside of the SDCWA boundary by ~~4,165~~ 2,736 residential units. Therefore, the Draft Land Use Map would result in a ~~greater~~ lesser impact to groundwater because it would ~~more~~ result in less growth in groundwater dependent areas.

- On Draft EIR page 4-45, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Utilities and Service Systems:

The Draft Land Use Map Alternative would accommodate a lower population than the proposed project within the SDCWA boundary (4,777 ~~1,004~~ fewer residential units) and would accommodate 1,040 ~~additional~~ 2,736 fewer residential units outside of the SDCWA boundary. ~~However~~ Therefore, overall impacts related to wastewater treatment requirements and adequate wastewater facilities would decrease under this alternative ~~because it proposes 3,700 fewer total residential units that the proposed project.~~ Therefore and impacts would be lessened as compared to the proposed project.

- On Draft EIR pages 4-45 and 4-46, last and first paragraphs, the following text has been deleted under the heading Climate Change:

~~However, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 would be required. It is unlikely that impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance; thus, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.~~

- On Draft EIR page 4-46, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Fulfillment of Project Objectives:

~~For one of the 10 objectives, 1) support reasonable share of projected regional population growth, the proposed project is considered to better fulfill this objective ~~the Draft Land Use Map Alternative would not be considered to fully meet the objective because the Draft Land Use Map Alternative~~ it would accommodate a smaller population than the proposed project. With regard to objective 10, recognize community and stakeholder interests, ~~the Draft Land Use Map Alternative would be considered to better fulfill the objective compared to the proposed project because this alternative was derived more directly from the stakeholder process.~~ For eight of the objectives, the Draft Land Use Map Alternative would equally fulfill the objectives as compared to the proposed project. These include the following objectives: 2) reduce land consumption and promote sustainability; 3) reinforce the vitality, local economy, and character of communities; 4) protect natural resources and habitats of ecological importance; 5) account for physical constraints and natural hazards of the land; 6) provide and support multi-modal transportation network; 7) sustainable communities/reduced greenhouse gas emissions; 8) preserve agriculture; and 9) minimize public costs of infrastructure and services. For nine of the ten objectives, the Draft Land Use Map Alternative would be considered to better fulfill the objectives. This alternative would reduce land consumption and promote sustainability (objective 2) because less development is proposed under this alternative; reinforce the vitality, local economy, and character of communities (objective 3) because reduced development would result in fewer potential impacts to community character; protect natural resources and habitats of ecological importance (objective 4) because potential impacts to biological resources would be reduced under this alternative; account for physical constraints and natural hazards of the land (objective 5) because this alternative proposes lower density development in some areas such as Valley Center to reflect environmental constraints; provide and support multi-modal transportation network (objective 6) because less dwelling units would be constructed in the auto-dependent areas of the unincorporated County; support sustainable communities/reduced greenhouse gas emissions (objective 7) because potential GHG emissions from vehicles would be reduced under this alternative; preserve agriculture (objective 8) because this alternative would result in reduced potential impacts related direct and indirect conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use; minimize public costs of infrastructure and services (objective 9) because less infrastructure and services would be~~

required under this alternative due to reduced development; and recognize community and stakeholder interests (objective 10).

- On Draft EIR page 4-46, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Environmentally Superior Map Alternative Description and Setting:

The Environmentally Superior Map Alternative would support build-out of 56,839 residential dwelling units, or 14,700 less units than the proposed project (see Table 4-7).

- On Draft EIR page 4-48, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Agricultural Resources:

It is unlikely that impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance; thus, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Similar to the proposed project, implementation of the proposed Environmentally Superior Map Alternative would remove the agricultural preserve designator from any lands not currently under Williamson Act Contract. The removal of the agricultural preserve designator would potentially result in a conflict with existing Williamson Act Contracts or the provisions of the Williamson Act. This is because the Environmentally Superior Map would remove non-contracted lands from County-adopted Agricultural Preserves and would also remove the "A" designator from these lands. By removing lands from a preserve at the boundary of a Contract area, new incompatible land uses could be developed adjacent to existing agricultural resources. Similar to the proposed project, this would be considered a potentially significant land use conflict to Williamson Act Contract lands. Implementation of the proposed Environmentally Superior Map Alternative would also potentially result in a conflict with existing Williamson Act Contracts or with existing agricultural zoning.

- On Draft EIR page 4-48, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Biological Resources:

~~For comparison purposes~~ As shown in Table 4-8, the Environmentally Superior Map Alternative would impact approximately 51,094 ~~54,592~~ fewer acres of sensitive natural habitats potentially supporting special status plant and wildlife species, 2,522 ~~2,702~~ fewer acres of riparian habitat, and 404 fewer total acres of federally protected wetlands than the proposed project.

- On Draft EIR page 4-49, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Cultural Resources:

However, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 would be required to reduce the impacts to a level of less than significant.

- On Draft EIR page 4-50, fifth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Hydrology and Water Quality:

When compared to the proposed project, the Environmentally Superior Map Alternative would reduce total housing within the SDCWA service area by 8,946 ~~7,182~~ dwelling units (see Table 4-6) and decrease development outside the SDCWA boundary by 5,755 ~~7,531~~ dwelling units.

- On Draft EIR page 4-53, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Recreation:

However, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 would be required to reduce the impacts to a level of less than significant.

- On Draft EIR page 4-54, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Transportation and Traffic:

It is unlikely that the application of mitigation measures would reduce impacts ~~would be reduced~~ to below a level of significance; thus, traffic impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

- On Draft EIR page 4-54, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Utilities and Service Systems:

The Environmentally Superior Map Alternative would accommodate a lower population than the proposed project within the SDCWA boundary (~~8,946~~ 7,182 fewer residential units) and outside of the SDCWA boundary (~~5,755~~ 7,531 fewer residential units).

- On Draft EIR page 4-55, second paragraph, the following text has been deleted under the heading Global Climate Change:

However, impacts would still be considered significant and the mitigation identified in Chapter 7.0 would be required. ~~It is unlikely that impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance; thus, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.~~

- On Draft EIR page 4-55, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Fulfillment of Project Objectives:

As with the proposed project, the Environmentally Superior Map Alternative would meet all of the objectives identified for the proposed project with varying levels of fulfillment. For objectives 1 (support a reasonable share of projected regional population growth); 3 and 10 (reinforce the vitality, local economy, and character of communities); and 10 (recognize community and stakeholder interests), the Environmentally Superior Map Alternative would be considered in less fulfillment of the objectives because this alternative proposes a smaller population than the proposed project and because this alternative does not reflect community and stakeholder interests to the extent of the proposed project. For seven of the 10 objectives, the Environmentally Superior Map Alternative would be considered to better fulfill the objectives. For the remaining eight objectives, This alternative would reduce land consumption and promote sustainability (objective 2) and protect natural resources and habitats of ecological importance (objective 4) because potential impacts to biological resources would be reduced under this alternative; account for physical constraints and natural hazards of the land (objective 5) because this alternative proposes lower density development in some areas such as Valley Center to reflect environmental constraints; provide and support multi-modal transportation network (objective 6) because less dwelling units would be constructed in the auto-dependent areas of the unincorporated County; promote sustainable communities/reduced greenhouse gas emissions (objective 7) because potential GHG emissions from vehicles would be reduced under this alternative; preserve agriculture (objective 8) because this alternative would result in reduced potential impacts

~~related direct and indirect conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use; and minimize public costs of infrastructure and services (objective 9) because less infrastructure and services would be required under this alternative due to reduced development. These include the following: 1) support a reasonable share of projected regional population growth; 2) reduce land consumption and promote sustainability; 4) protect natural resources and habitats of ecological importance; 5) account for physical constraints and natural hazards of the land; 6) provide and support multi-modal transportation network; 7) sustainable communities / reduced greenhouse gas emissions; 8) preserve agriculture; and 9) minimize public costs of infrastructure and services.~~

- On Draft EIR page 4-58, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Biological Resources:

Additionally, the development capacity of the existing General Plan is greater (119,033 additional future dwelling units) than the proposed General Plan Update (71,540 additional future dwelling units) (see Table 4-7).

- On Draft EIR page 4-56, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading No Project Alternative Description and Setting:

Additionally, the development capacity of the existing General Plan is greater (112,167 ~~119,033~~ additional future dwelling units) than the proposed General Plan Update (71,540 additional future dwelling units) (see Table 4-7). Many more of these future dwelling units would be built in the eastern areas of the County under the No Project Alternative as compared to the proposed project. Therefore, the No Project Alternative generally allows higher densities in areas outside of the SDCWA boundary as compared to the proposed project.

- On Draft EIR page 4-56, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading No Project Alternative Description and Setting:

As shown in Table 4-1, when compared to the proposed project, the No Project Alternative would represent a decrease in the acreages of the following land uses Countywide: village residential (-3,371 acres); rural lands (-463,235); commercial (-423 acres); industrial (-680 acres); village core mixed use (-50 acres); State and federal lands (-245,378 ~~109,594~~ acres) and tribal lands (-6,499 acres).

- On Draft EIR page 4-58, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Biological Resources:

Compared to the proposed project, the No Project Alternative would result in greater impacts to sensitive natural habitats potentially supporting special status plant and wildlife species, riparian habitat, federally protected wetlands, and wildlife corridors and nursery sites because this alternative proposes overall greater density development. Table 4-8 shows estimated habitat impacts for the No Project Alternative in comparison to the other project alternatives. Higher density developments ~~such as village residential or commercial land uses~~ result in greater direct impacts to biological resources than lower density development ~~such as rural land~~ because more vegetation would be removed or disturbed.

- On Draft EIR page 4-58, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Cultural Resources:

On a particular site, ~~H~~-high intensity development would have a higher potential to impact the significance of cultural resources on that site because it would require more ground-disturbing construction activities than lower intensity development.

- On Draft EIR page 4-59, fifth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Hydrology and Water Quality:

The No Project Alternative would also result in greater demand and dependence on groundwater supplies because it would accommodate ~~51,232~~ 34,102 additional residential units outside of the SDCWA boundary.

- On Draft EIR page 4-60, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Land Use:

This would be a greater impact compared to the proposed project. ~~The No Project Alternative would not result in impacts associated with the FCI because under the No Project Alternative, these areas would revert to the existing the General Plan land use designation and would not require a general plan amendment like the proposed project.~~ Similar to the proposed project, future development under the No Project Alternative would be required to demonstrate compliance with any applicable HCP or NCCP adopted for the project site.

- On Draft EIR page 4-62, fifth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Utilities and Service Systems:

In many cases, the No Project Alternative does not reflect the actual development capacity of the unincorporated County when the availability of infrastructure is taken into account. The No Project Alternative would accommodate ~~a lower population than the proposed project within the SDCWA boundary (10,605 fewer residential units), but would accommodate 51,232 additional~~ more residential units both inside and outside of the SDCWA boundary (see Table 4-6).

- On Draft EIR page 4-63, fourth paragraph, subsection numbering has been corrected from 4.4.2.18 to 4.5.2.18.

- On Draft EIR pages 4-76 through 4-78, the following revisions have been made to Table 4-3, Comparison of Alternatives – Environmental Impacts:

Table 4-3. Comparison of Alternatives – Environmental Impacts

Issue Areas	Referral Map (Proposed Project)		Alternatives to the Proposed Project			
	Without Mitigation	With Mitigation	Hybrid Map	Draft Land Use Map	Environmentally Superior Map	No Project
2.8 Hydrology and Water Quality						
Groundwater Supplies and Recharge	PS	SU	▼▲	▼▲	▼	▲
2.16 Utilities and Service Systems						
New Water or Wastewater Treatment Facilities	PS	LS	▼▲	▼▲	▼	▲
Adequate Water Supplies	PS	SU	▼▲	▼▲	▼	▲
2.17 Global Climate Change						
Compliance with AB 32	PS	SU LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Effects of Global Climate Change on the Proposed Project	PS	SU LS	▼	▼	▼	▲

- On Draft EIR page 4-81, Table 4-6, Comparison of Alternatives - Projected Housing within the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) Service Area, was deleted and replaced with the following table:

Table 4-6. Comparison of Alternatives – Projected Housing within the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) Service Area⁽¹⁾

	<u>Proposed Project</u>	<u>Hybrid Map Alternative</u>	<u>Draft Land Use Map Alternative</u>	<u>Environmentally Superior Map Alternative</u>	<u>No Project Alternative</u>
Units Inside SDCWA	54,742	53,640	53,738	47,560	55,634
Units Outside SDCWA	23,664	21,447	20,928	16,133	57,766
Total	78,406	75,087	74,666	63,693	113,400

⁽¹⁾ Note: For the purpose of this analysis, the SDCWA service area is considered to include unincorporated areas that import water supplies from SDCWA.
Source: DPLU GIS 2008

- On Draft EIR page 4-81, Table 4-7. Comparison of Alternatives – Future Housing Units by CPA and Subregion, has been added to the section:

Table 4-7. Comparison of Alternatives – Future Housing Units by CPA and Subregion

CPA/Subregion	<u>Proposed Project (Referral Map)</u>	<u>Hybrid Map Alternative</u>	<u>Draft Land Use Map Alternative</u>	<u>Environmentally Superior Map Alternative</u>	<u>No Project Alternative (Existing General Plan)</u>
Alpine	3,626	3,583	3,589	2,783	2,665
Bonsall	2,080	1,971	1,840	1,696	2,872
Central Mountain	742	713	709	613	1,878
County Islands	123	174	174	174	1
Crest-Dehesa	541	517	511	411	1,236
Desert	9,237	8,751	8,244	6,776	22,432
Fallbrook	5,546	5,800	6,726	4,745	6,268
Jamul-Dulzura	2,544	2,297	2,294	1,781	5,569
Julian	614	483	441	406	1,510
Lakeside	3,880	3,880	3,880	3,486	5,592
Mountain Empire	3,416	3,426	3,424	2,091	12,101
North County Metro	13,190	12,345	12,182	11,525	8,617
North Mountain	2,421	1,530	1,428	1,320	7,197
Otay	2,243	2,243	2,243	2,243	2,371
Pala-Pauma	2,395	1,940	1,816	1,521	5,743
Pendelton De Luz	366	366	366	193	1,852
Rainbow	616	615	612	548	1,514
Ramona	6,208	6,321	6,235	6,066	9,396
San Dieguito	1,734	1,496	1,486	1,442	2,427
Spring Valley	1,441	1,452	1,452	1,452	1,229
Sweet Water	756	756	756	756	1,619
Valle De Oro	758	758	758	751	770
Valley Center	7,064	6,807	6,636	4,062	7,309
Countywide Total	71,540	68,224	67,803	56,839	112,167

Note: Data has been rounded to nearest whole number.

Source: DPLU GIS 2008

- On Draft EIR page 4-81, Table 4-8. Comparison of Alternatives – Habitat Impacts, has been added to the section:

Table 4-8. Comparison of Alternatives – Habitat Impacts

<u>Habitat Impacted</u>	<u>Proposed Project (Referral Map)</u>	<u>Hybrid Map Alternative</u>	<u>Draft Land Use Map Alternative</u>	<u>Environmentally Superior Map Alternative</u>	<u>No Project Alternative (Existing General Plan)</u>
Acacia Scrub	142	125	123	106	940
Alkali Marsh	47	48	47	47	369
Alkali Meadows and Seeps	3	2	1	1	56
Alkali Playa Community	185	162	162	163	482
Alkali Seep	340	340	338	176	749

Habitat Impacted	Proposed Project (Referral Map)	Hybrid Map Alternative	Draft Land Use Map Alternative	Environmentally Superior Map Alternative	No Project Alternative (Existing General Plan)
Alluvial Fan Scrub	77	69	61	41	342
Black Oak Forest	70	56	56	34	253
Black Oak Woodland	548	474	474	416	809
Chaparral	55,058	49,077	47,546	36,176	160,499
Coast Live Oak Forest	206	111	100	78	484
Coast Live Oak Woodland	9,601	8,423	8,230	6,390	21,991
Coast Range, Klamath and Peninsular Coniferous Forest	2	1	1	1	2
Coastal Sage-Chaparral Scrub	2,864	2,745	2,675	2,135	17,364
Coastal Scrub	22	22	22	22	33
Colorado Desert Wash Scrub	212	205	204	108	439
Desert Dry Wash Woodland	259	296	213	151	1,008
Desert Dunes	74	57	55	50	330
Desert Saltbush Scrub	3,030	2,912	2,736	2,207	6,653
Desert Sink Scrub	126	106	106	83	709
Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	31,186	28,838	28,463	25,287	88,992
Disturbed Wetland	60	61	60	56	220
Dry Montane Meadows	29	17	17	15	103
Encelia Scrub	503	411	338	241	3,139
Engelmann Oak Woodland	3,261	1,998	1,669	1,401	10,494
Estuarine	1	1	1	1	4
Field/Pasture	8,406	8,212	7,813	6,754	14,676
Flat-topped Buckwheat	711	663	625	470	2,946
Foothill/Mountain Perennial Grassland	1,443	1,065	1,000	516	17,317
Freshwater	420	402	397	352	5,466
Freshwater Marsh	120	117	116	101	750
Freshwater Seep	152	152	150	110	595
Great Basin Scrub	433	375	380	245	1,955
Interior Live Oak Chaparral	18	11	7	7	77
Jeffrey Pine Forest	104	103	103	98	257
Lower Montane Coniferous Forest	5,293	4,721	4,506	4,134	8,293
Mafic Chaparral	141	142	138	118	437
Marine	0	0	0	0	43
Maritime Succulent Scrub	6	6	6	6	6
Meadow and Seep	46	38	36	36	332
Mesquite Bosque	613	484	468	334	2,369
Mixed Evergreen Forest	610	432	432	334	2,229
Mixed Oak Woodland	1,389	958	915	731	5,508
Mojavean Desert Scrub	128	118	118	92	336
Montane Chaparral	414	239	219	207	2,467

Habitat Impacted	Proposed Project (Referral Map)	Hybrid Map Alternative	Draft Land Use Map Alternative	Environmentally Superior Map Alternative	No Project Alternative (Existing General Plan)
Montane Meadow	30	25	23	23	171
Mule Fat Scrub	170	151	150	130	598
Native Grassland	4,233	4,004	3,930	3,472	36,913
Non-Native Grassland	14,005	13,336	13,084	11,643	34,686
Non-Vegetated Channel, Floodway, Lakeshore Fringe	292	285	283	271	2,187
Oak Woodland	15	15	15	15	194
Open Water	11	11	11	8	1,496
Pasture	4	4	4	4	4
Peninsular Pinon and Juniper Woodlands	161	139	127	118	2,317
Red Shank Chaparral	4,325	2,715	2,652	2,048	16,998
Riparian and Bottomland Habitat	3	3	3	3	3
Riparian Forests	13	13	13	13	16
Riparian Woodlands	22	20	19	17	180
Riversidian Sage Scrub	16	8	8	8	76
Scrub Oak Chaparral	186	134	134	120	1,262
Semi-Desert Chaparral	1,952	1,805	1,741	1,324	22,603
Sonoran Creosote Bush Scrub	10,775	10,236	9,239	6,938	25,932
Sonoran Desert Mixed Scrub	2,287	2,129	2,020	1,339	9,673
Sonoran Wash Scrub	119	110	96	65	633
Southern Arroyo Willow Riparian Forest	5	5	4	4	141
Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest	3,085	2,903	2,874	2,361	6,564
Southern Cottonwood-willow Riparian Forest	1,206	1,149	1,133	1,010	4,334
Southern Foredunes	0	0	0	0	259
Southern Interior Cypress Forest	17	17	17	11	91
Southern Maritime Chaparral	337	334	334	334	349
Southern Riparian Forest	337	317	306	179	1,163
Southern Riparian Scrub	965	925	910	766	3,025
Southern Sycamore-alder Riparian Woodland	595	577	574	483	2,452
Southern Willow Scrub	396	386	383	348	5,241
Stabilized Alkaline Dunes	2	2	2	1	8
Tamarisk Scrub	29	29	29	29	95
Undifferentiated Woodland	150	82	63	57	286
Upper Sonoran Ceanothus Chaparral	200	200	200	141	3,042
Upper Sonoran Subshrub	102	101	101	65	3,618

Habitat Impacted	Proposed Project (Referral Map)	Hybrid Map Alternative	Draft Land Use Map Alternative	Environmentally Superior Map Alternative	No Project Alternative (Existing General Plan)
Scrub					
Vernal Pool	12	12	12	12	225
Wet Montane Meadow	194	130	128	122	3,436
White Alder Riparian Forest	34	32	31	31	85
Total Impacts	174,638	157,139	151,780	123,544	572,879

Note: Data has been rounded to nearest whole number.
Source: DPLU GIS 2008

Chapter 5.0, References

- On Draft EIR page 5-2, the following reference has been added:

Beddow, Donna (Beddow 2004). Criteria for Determining the Significance of Cultural Resources for San Diego County. San Diego State University, San Diego, CA: 2004.
- On Draft EIR page 5-4, the following reference has been added:

California Environmental Protection Agency, State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB 2010). 20x2020 Agency Team on Water Conservation. Accessed on January 27, 2010. Online URL: http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/water_issues/hot_topics/20x2020/index.shtml
- On Draft EIR page 5-5, the following reference has been revised:

Conservation Biology Institute (CBI 2005). Analysis of General Plan-2020 San Diego County. Prepared for Endangered Habitats League. December 2005. Online URL: http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu/gpupdate/docs/drafteir/cbi_report.pdf
- On Draft EIR page 5-12, the following reference has been added:

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 2009a) United States. Climate Change: *Health and Environmental Effects – Water Quality*. Last updated September 8, 2009. Online URL: <http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/effects/water/quality.html>
- On Draft EIR page 5-15, the following reference has been revised:

Metropolitan Transit System (MTS 2008). San Diego Trolley, Inc. Fact Sheet. Dated January 2008. Accessed May 15, 2008. Online URL: <http://www.sdmts.com/Trolley/documents/SDTrolleyInc08.pdf> ~~Service information. Accessed May 15, 2008. Online URL: www.transit.511sd.com~~
- On Draft EIR page 5-17, the following reference has been revised:

San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG 2007). 2030 San Diego Regional Transportation Plan: Pathways for the Future. November 2007. Online URL:

<http://www.sandag.org/index.asp?projectid=292&fuseaction=projects.detail>
www.sandag.com

- On Draft EIR page 5-18, the following reference has been added to the section:

San Diego Integrated Regional Water Management (SDIRWM 2010). Final Integrated Regional Water Management Plan. Accessed January 27, 2010. Online URL: <http://www.rmwater.com/clients/sdirwmp/plan.html>

Chapter 6.0, Preparers and Persons Contacted

- On Draft EIR page 6-1, the following preparers have been added:

Cultural Resources

<u>Dennis Gallegos, Statistical Research, Inc.</u>	<u>Contributing Author</u>
<u>Donna Beddow, AICP, RPA</u>	<u>Contributing Author</u>

- On Draft EIR page 6-2, the following reviewer has been added:

<u>Donna Beddow, AICP, RPA</u>	<u>Land Use Environmental Planner</u>
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------

Chapter 7.0, Proposed General Plan Update Policies and Mitigation Measures

- On Draft EIR pages 7-1 and 7-8 General Plan Update Policy LU-6.3 has been revised as follows:

Policy LU-6.3: Conservation-Oriented Project Design. Support conservation-oriented project design ~~when appropriate and consistent with the applicable Community Plan.~~ This can be achieved with mechanisms such as, but not limited to, Specific Plans, lot area averaging, and reductions in lot size with corresponding requirements for preserved open space (Planned Residential Developments). Projects that rely on lot size reductions should incorporate specific design techniques, perimeter lot sizes, or buffers, to achieve compatibility with community character. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]

- On Draft EIR pages 7-1, 7-4, 7-8, 7-28, and 7-34 General Plan Update Policy LU-6.3 has been revised as follows:

Policy LU-6.4: Sustainable Subdivision Design. Require that residential subdivisions be planned to conserve open space and natural resources, protect agricultural operations including grazing, increase fire safety and defensibility, reduce impervious footprints, use sustainable development practices, and, when appropriate, provide public amenities ~~consistent with the applicable community plan.~~ [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]

- On Draft EIR pages 7-1, 7-14, 7-16, 7-17, and 7-43 General Plan Update Policy LU-6.8 has been renumbered to LU-6.9:
- On Draft EIR page 7-2, General Plan Update Policy COS-11.4 has been revised as follows under the heading Issue 1: Scenic Vistas:

Policy COS-11.4: Collaboration with Agencies and Jurisdictions. Coordinate with adjacent federal and State agencies, ~~and~~ local jurisdictions, and tribal governments to protect scenic resources and corridors that extend beyond the County's land use authority, but are important to the welfare of County residents.

- On Draft EIR pages 7-3, 7-21, 7-28, 7-29, 7-30 and 7-31, General Plan Update Policy LU-1.6 has been renumbered and revised as follows:

Policy LU-1.46: Village Expansion. Permit new Village Regional Category designated land uses only where contiguous with an existing or planned Village and where all of the following criteria are met:

- Potential Village development would be compatible with environmental conditions and constraints, such as topography and flooding;
 - Potential Village development would be accommodated by the General Plan road network;
 - Public facilities and services can support the expansion without a reduction of services to other County residents; and
 - The expansion ~~respects and enhances~~ is consistent with community character, the scale, and the orderly and contiguous growth of a Village area
- On Draft EIR page 7-3, the following General Plan Update Policy was added as follows:

LU-2.2: Relationship of Community Plans to the General Plan. Community Plans are part of the General Plan. These plans focus on a particular region or community within the overall General Plan area. They are meant to refine the policies of the General Plan as they apply to a smaller geographic region and provide a forum for resolving local conflicts. As legally required by State law, Community Plans must be internally consistent with General Plan goals and policies of which they are a part. They cannot undermine the policies of the General Plan. Community Plans are subject to adoption, review and amendment by the Board of Supervisors in the same manner as the General Plan.

- On Draft EIR pages 7-3 and 7-22 General Plan Update policies LU-2.2 and LU-2.4 were renumbered to LU-2.3 and LU-2.5 respectively.
- On Draft EIR pages 7-4, 7-13 and 7-22, General Plan Update Policy LU-11.2 has been revised as follows:

Policy LU-11.2: Compatibility with Community Character. Require that commercial, office, and industrial development be located, scaled, and designed to be compatible with ~~respect and enhance~~ the unique character of the community.

- On Draft EIR pages 7-4 and 7-22 General Plan Update Policy M-10.6 has been revised as follows:

Policy M-10.6: On-Street Parking. Minimize on-street vehicular parking outside villages and Rural Villages where on-street parking is not needed, to reduce the width of paved shoulders and provide an opportunity for bicycle lanes to retain rural character in low-intensity areas. Where on-street parking occurs outside Villages and Rural Villages, require the design to be consistent with the rural character ~~and the applicable community plan.~~ [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]

- On Draft EIR pages 7-4 and 7-22 General Plan Update Policy H-2.1 has been revised as follows:

Policy H-2.1: Development That Respects Community Character. Require that development in existing residential neighborhoods be well designed so as not to degrade or detract from the character of surrounding development consistent with the Land Use Element ~~and Community Plans.~~ [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]

- On Draft EIR page 7-4, General Plan Update Policy COS-13.3 was added under the heading Issue 4: Light or Glare:

Policy COS-13.3: Collaboration to Retain Night Skies. Coordinate with adjacent federal and State agencies, local jurisdictions, and tribal governments to retain the quality of night skies by minimizing light pollution.

- On Draft EIR page 7-5, General Plan Update Policy COS-6.3 has been revised as follows under the heading Issue 2: Direct Conversion of Agricultural Resources:

Policy COS-6.3: Compatibility with Recreation and Open Space. Encourage siting ~~compatible~~ recreational and open space uses and multi-use trails that are compatible with agriculture adjacent to the agricultural lands when planning for development adjacent to agricultural land uses.

- On Draft EIR page 7-10, General Plan Update Policy COS-7.3 has been revised as follows under the heading Issue 2: Archaeological Resources:

Policy COS-7.3: Archaeological Collections. Require the appropriate treatment and preservation of archaeological collections in a culturally appropriate manner. ~~Require all collections to be placed in a local curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79, with the exception of those required by law to be repatriated.~~

- On Draft EIR page 7-11, General Plan Update Policy COS-7.5 has been revised as follows under the heading Issue 4: Human Remains:

Policy COS-7.5: Treatment of Human Remains. Require human remains be treated with the utmost dignity and respect and that the disposition and handling of human remains will be done in consultation with the Most Likely Descendant (MLD) and under the requirements of Federal, State and County Regulations.

- On Draft EIR page 7-12, General Plan Update Policies LU-4.7 and M-7.1 have been added under the heading Issue 5: Public Airports:

Policy LU-4.7: Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans (ALUCP). Coordinate with the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) and support review of Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans (ALUCP) for development within Airport Influence Areas.

Policy M-7.1: Meeting Airport Needs. Operate and improve airport facilities to meet air transportation needs in a manner that adequately considers impacts to environmental resources and surrounding communities and to ensure consistency with Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans.

- On Draft EIR page 7-12, General Plan Update Policy S-15.3 has been revised as follows under the heading Issue 5: Public Airports:

Policy S-15.3: Hazardous Obstructions within Airport Approach and Departure. Restrict development of potentially hazardous obstructions or other hazards to flight located within airport approach and departure areas or known flight patterns and discourage uses that may impact airport operations or do not meet Federal or State aviation standards. Specific concerns include heights of structures near airports and activities which can cause electronic or visual impairments to air navigation or which attract large numbers of birds (such as landfills, wetlands, water features, and cereal grain fields).

- On Draft EIR pages 7-13, 7-37 and 7-40, General Plan Update Policy M-4.3 has been revised as follows:

Policy M-4.3: Rural Roads Compatible with Rural Character. Design and construct public roads to meet travel demands in Semi-Rural and Rural Lands that are consistent with rural character while safely accommodating transit stops when deemed necessary, along with bicyclists, pedestrians, and equestrians. Where feasible, utilize rural road design features (e.g., no curb and gutter improvements) to maintain community character ~~consistent with community plans.~~ [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]

- On Draft EIR pages 7-13 and 7-28, General Plan Update Policy LU-6.10 has been revised as follows:

Policy LU-6.10: Protection from Wildfires and Unmitigable Hazards. Assign land uses and densities in a manner that minimizes development in extreme, very high and high hazard fire areas or other unmitigable hazardous areas.

- On Draft EIR page 7-14, General Plan Update Policy S-4.1 has been revised as follows under the heading Issue 8: Wildland Fires:

Policy S-4.1: Fuel Management Programs. Support programs consistent with state law that require fuel management/modification within established defensible space boundaries and when strategic fuel modification is necessary outside of defensible space, balance fuel management needs to protect structures with the preservation of native vegetation and sensitive habitats.

- On Draft EIR page 7-14, General Plan Update Policy COS-18.3 has been added under the heading Issue 8: Wildland Fires:

Policy COS-18.3: Alternative Energy Systems Impacts. Require alternative energy system operators to properly design and maintain these systems to minimize adverse impacts to the environment.

- On Draft EIR pages 7-14 and 7-43, General Plan Update Policy LU-14.4 has been revised as follows:

Policy LU-14.4: Sewer Facilities. Prohibit sewer facilities that would induce unplanned growth. Require sewer systems to be planned, developed, and sized to serve the land use pattern and densities depicted on the Land Use Map. Sewer systems and services shall not be extended beyond either Village boundaries or (extant Urban Limit Lines), whichever is more restrictive, except:

- When necessary for public health, safety, or welfare;
 - When within existing sewer district boundaries;
 - When necessary for a conservation subdivision adjacent to existing sewer facilities; or
 - Where specifically allowed in the Community Plan.
- On Draft EIR pages 7-15, 7-16, 7-17, and 7-44, General Plan Update Policy COS-4.3 has been revised as follows:

Policy COS-4.3: Stormwater Filtration. Maximize stormwater filtration and/or infiltration in areas that are not subject to high groundwater by maximizing the natural drainage patterns and the retention of natural vegetation and other pervious surfaces. This policy shall not apply in areas with high groundwater, where raising the water table could cause septic system failures, and/or moisture damage to building slabs, and/or other problems.

- On Draft EIR pages 7-15 and 7-45, General Plan Update Policy COS-5.5 has been revised as follows:

Policy COS-5.5: Impacts of Development to Water Quality. Require development projects to avoid impacts to the water quality in local reservoirs, groundwater resources, and recharge areas, watersheds, and other local water sources.

- On Draft EIR pages 7-15 and 7-44, General Plan Update Policy LU-8.2 has been revised as follows:

Policy LU-8.2: Groundwater Resources. Require development to identify adequate groundwater resources in groundwater dependent areas, as follows:

- In areas dependent on currently identified groundwater overdrafted basins, prohibit new development from exacerbating overdraft conditions. Encourage programs to alleviate overdraft conditions in Borrego Valley.
- In areas without current overdraft groundwater conditions, ~~prohibit~~ evaluate new groundwater-dependent development to assure a sustainable long-term supply of

groundwater is available that will not adversely impact existing groundwater users. where overdraft conditions are foreseeable

- ~~A groundwater basin is considered in an overdraft condition when, during average conditions over a number of years, the amount of water being withdrawn from the basin exceeds the amount of water that recharges the basin.~~

- On Draft EIR pages 7-16 and 7-44, General Plan Update Policy COS-4.1 has been revised as follows:

Policy COS-4.1: Water Conservation. Require development to reduce the waste of potable water through use of efficient technologies and conservation efforts that minimize the County's dependence on imported water and conserve groundwater resources.

- On Draft EIR pages 7-17, 7-37, and 7-38 General Plan Update Policy LU-6.9 has been renumbered to LU-6.10.
- On Draft EIR pages 7-18 and 7-19 General Plan Update Policy LU-6.11 has been renumbered to LU-6.12.
- On Draft EIR page 7-19, General Plan Update Policy S-9.4 has been revised as follows under the heading Issue 6: Housing within a 100-year Flood Hazard Area:

Policy S-9.4: Development in Villages. Allow new uses and development within the floodplain fringe (land within the floodplain outside of the floodway) only when environmental impacts and hazards are mitigated. This policy does not apply to floodplains with unmapped floodways. Require land available outside the floodplain to be fully utilized before locating development within a floodplain. Development within a floodplain may be denied if it will cause significant adverse environmental impacts or is prohibited in the community plan. Channelization of floodplains is allowed within villages only when specifically addressed in community plans.

- On Draft EIR pages 7-19 and 7-20, General Plan Update Policy S-9.5 has been revised as follows:

Policy S-9.5: Development in the Floodplain Fringe. Prohibit development in the floodplain fringe when located on Semi-Rural and Rural Lands to maintain the capacity of the floodplain, unless specifically allowed in a community plan. For parcels located entirely within a floodplain or without sufficient space for a building pad outside the floodplain, development is limited to a single family home on an existing lot or those uses that do not compromise the environmental attributes of the floodplain or require further channelization. ~~This policy shall not apply when the lot is entirely within the floodplain or when sufficient land for development on a project site is not available and where clustering is not feasible to minimize encroachment on floodplains. In those instances, require development to minimize impacts to the capacity of the floodplain.~~

- On Draft EIR page 7-23, General Plan Update Policy COS-10.1 has been revised as follows under the heading Issue 1: Mineral Resource Availability:

Policy COS-10.1: Siting of Development. Encourage the conservation (i.e., protection from incompatible land uses) of areas ~~that~~ designated as having substantial potential for mineral extraction. Discourage development that would substantially preclude the future development of mining facilities in these areas. Design development or uses to minimize the potential conflict with existing or potential future mining facilities. For purposes of this policy, incompatible land uses are defined by SMARA Section 3675.

- On Draft EIR page 7-23, General Plan Update Policy COS-10.2 has been revised as follows under the heading Issue 1: Mineral Resource Availability:

Policy COS-10.2: Protection of State-Classified or Designated Lands. Discourage development or the establishment of other incompatible land uses on or adjacent to areas classified or designated by the State of California as having important mineral resources (MRZ-2), as well as potential mineral lands identified by other government agencies. The potential for the extraction of substantial mineral resources from lands classified by the State of California as areas that contain mineral resources (MRZ-3) shall be considered by the County in making land use decisions.

- On Draft EIR pages 7-24, 7-26, 7-37, and 7-38, General Plan Update Policy LU-2.7 has been renumbered and revised as follows:

Policy LU-2.7~~8~~: **Mitigation of Development Impacts.** Require measures that minimize significant impacts to surrounding areas from uses or operations that cause excessive noise, vibrations, dust, odor, aesthetic impairment and/or are detrimental to human health and safety.

- On Draft EIR page 7-25, General Plan Update Policy N-4.8 has been revised as follows under the heading Issue 1: Excessive Noise Levels:

Policy N-4.8: **Train Horn Noise.** Establish train horn “quiet zones” with new rail projects consistent with federal regulations, where applicable. Promote community programs for existing at-grade crossings by working with rail operators.

- On Draft EIR page 7-27, General Plan Update Policy LU-4.9 was added under the heading Issues 5 and 6: Excessive Noise Exposure from a Public or Private Airport:

Policy LU-4.9: **Airport Compatibility.** Assure the noise compatibility of any development projects that may be affected by noise from public or private airports and helipads during project review by coordinating, as appropriate, with appropriate agencies such as the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (SDCRAA) and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA).

- On Draft EIR pages 7-29, 7-30, 7-32, General Plan Update Policy LU-12.3 has been revised as follows:

Policy LU-12.3: **Infrastructure and Services Compatibility.** Provide public facilities and services that are sensitive to the environment with characteristics of the unincorporated communities. Encourage the collocation of infrastructure facilities, where appropriate.

- On Draft EIR pages 7-30, 7-31 and 7-34, General Plan Update Policy LU-9.7 has been revised as follows:

Policy LU-9.7: Town Center Planning and Design. Plan and guide the development of Town Centers and transportation nodes as the major focal point and activity node for Village areas. Utilize design guidelines to ~~respect and enhance~~ be compatible with the unique character of a community. Roadways, streetscapes, building facades, landscaping, and signage within the town center should be pedestrian oriented. Wherever possible, locate public facilities, such as schools, libraries, community centers, and parks in Town Centers and Villages.

- On Draft EIR page 7-31, General Plan Update Policy LU-17.2 has been revised as follows under the heading Issue 3: School Services:

Policy LU-17.2: Compatibility of Schools with Adjoining Uses. Encourage school districts to minimize conflicts between schools and adjacent ~~development~~ land uses through appropriate siting and adequate mitigation, addressing such issues as student drop-off/pick up locations, parking access, and security.

- On Draft EIR pages 7-31 and 7-42, General Plan Update Policy LU-9.4 has been revised as follows:

Policy LU-9.4: Infrastructure Serving Villages and Community Cores. Prioritize infrastructure improvements and the provision of public facilities for Villages and community cores ~~and sized~~ for the intensity of development allowed by the Land Use Map.

- On Draft EIR pages 7-32, 7-35, 7-38, 7-42 and 7-45, General Plan Update Policy LU-12.2 has been revised as follows:

Policy LU-12.2: Maintenance of Adequate Services. Require development to mitigate significant impacts to existing service levels of public facilities or services for existing residents and businesses. Provide improvements for Mobility Element roads in accordance with the Mobility Element Network Appendix matrices, which may result in ultimate build-out conditions that achieve an improved ~~a higher~~ LOS but do not achieve a LOS of D or better.

- On Draft EIR page 7-32, General Plan Update Policy M-12.1 has been revised as follows under the heading Issue 1: Deterioration of Parks and Recreational Facilities:

Policy M-12.1: County Trails System. Implement a County Trails Program by developing the ~~proposed~~ designated trail and pathway alignments and implementing goals and policies identified in the Community Trails Master Plan.

- On Draft EIR pages 7-33 and 7-34, General Plan Update Policy M-12.10 has been revised as follows:

Policy M-12.10: Recreational and Educational Resources. Design trail routes that meet a public need and highlight the County's biological, recreational and educational resources, including natural, scenic, cultural, and historic resources.

- On Draft EIR pages 7-33 and 7-35, General Plan Update Policy COS-23.1 has been revised as follows:

Policy COS-23.1: Public Access. Provide public access to natural and cultural (where allowed) resources through effective planning that conserves the County's native wildlife, enhances and restores a continuous network of connected natural habitat and protects water resources.

- On Draft EIR page 7-34, General Plan Update Policy M-12.9 has been revised as follows under the heading Issue 2: Construction of New Recreational Facilities:

Policy M-12.9: Environmental and Agricultural Resources. Site and design specific trail segments to minimize impacts to sensitive environmental resources, ecological systems, and agricultural lands. Within the MSCP preserves, conform siting and use of trails to County MSCP Subarea Plans and wildlife agency approved MSCP management plans.

- On Draft EIR page 7-35, General Plan Update Policy COS-21.3 has been revised as follows under the heading Issue 2: Construction of New Recreational Facilities:

Policy COS-21.3: Park Design. Design parks that reflect community character and identity, incorporate local natural and cultural landscapes and features, and consider the surrounding land uses and urban form and cultural and historic resources.

- On Draft EIR page 7-36, General Plan Update Policy M-2.1 has been revised as follows under the heading Issue 1: Unincorporated County Traffic and Level of Service Standards:

Policy M-2.1: Level of Service Criteria. Require development projects to provide associated road improvements necessary to achieve a level of service of "D" or higher on all Mobility Element roads except for those where a failing level of service has been accepted by the County pursuant to the criteria specifically identified in the accompanying text box (Criteria for Accepting a Road Classification with Level of Service E/F). When development is proposed on roads where a failing level of service has been accepted, require feasible mitigation in the form of road improvements or a fair share contribution to a road improvement program, consistent with the Mobility Element road network.

- On Draft EIR pages 7-36 and 7-40, General Plan Update Policy M-3.1 has been revised as follows:

Policy M-3.1: Public Road Rights-of-Way. Require development to dedicate right-of-way for public roads and other transportation routes identified in the Mobility Element roadway network (see Mobility Element Network Appendix), Community Plans, or Road Master Plans. Require the provision of sufficient right-of-way width, as specified in the County Public Road Standards and Community Trails Master Plan, to adequately accommodate all users, including transit riders, pedestrians, bicyclists, and equestrians.

- On Draft EIR pages 7-39 and 7-41, General Plan Update Policy M-8.6 has been revised as follows:

Policy M-8.6: Park and Ride Facilities. Coordinate with SANDAG, Caltrans, and tribal governments to study transit connectivity and address improving regional opportunities for

park-and-ride facilities and transit service to gaming facilities and surrounding rural areas to reduce congestion on rural roads.

- On Draft EIR page 7-40 General Plan Update Policy LU-9.8 has been revised as follows:

Policy LU-9.8: Village Connectivity and Compatibility with Adjoining Areas. Require new development within Villages to include road networks, pedestrian routes, and amenities that create or maintain connectivity; and site, building, and landscape design that is compatible with ~~the Community Plan~~ and surrounding areas. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]

On Draft EIR page 7-40, General Plan Update Policy M-8.1 has been revised as follows under the heading Issue 6: Alternative Transportation:

Policy M-8.1: Maximize Transit Service for Transit-Dependent Populations Opportunities. Coordinate with SANDAG, the CTSA, NCTD, and MTS to provide capital facilities and funding, where appropriate, to:

- Maximize opportunities for transit services in unincorporated communities
 - Maximize the speed and efficiency of transit service through the development of transit priority treatments such as transit signal priority, transit queue jump lanes, and dedicated transit only lanes
 - Provide for transit-dependent segments of the population, such as the disabled, seniors, low income, and children, where possible
 - Reserve adequate rights-of-way to accommodate existing and planned transit facilities including bus stops
- On Draft EIR page 7-41, General Plan Update Policy M-8.2 has been revised as follows under the heading Issue 6: Alternative Transportation:

Policy M-8.2: Transit Service to Key Community Facilities and Services. Locate key county facilities, healthcare services, educational institutions, and other civic facilities so that they are accessible by transit in areas where transit is available. Require those facilities to be designed so that they are easily accessible by transit, whenever possible.

- On Draft EIR page 7-41, General Plan Update Policy M-8.7 has been revised as follows under the heading Issue 6: Alternative Transportation:

Policy M-8.7: Inter-Regional Travel Modes. Coordinate with SANDAG, Caltrans, and the California High-Speed Rail Authority, where appropriate, to identify alternative methods for inter-regional travel to serve the unincorporated County residents.

- On Draft EIR page 7-42, General Plan Update Policy M-11.4 has been revised as follows under the heading Issue 6: Alternative Transportation:

Policy M-11.4: Pedestrian and Bicycle Network Connectivity. Require development in Villages and Rural Villages to provide comprehensive internal pedestrian and bicycle networks that connect to existing or planned adjacent community and countywide networks. ~~and ensure that Village development incorporates these networks where applicable.~~

- On Draft EIR page 7-43, General Plan Update Policy LU-1.4 has been renumbered and revised as follows under the heading Issue 2: New Water and Wastewater Facilities:

Policy LU-1.24: Leapfrog Development. Prohibit leapfrog development which is inconsistent with the Community Development Model ~~and Community Plans.~~ Leapfrog Development restrictions do not apply to new villages that are designed to be consistent with the Community Development Model, that provide necessary services and facilities, and that are designed to meet the LEED-Neighborhood Development Certification or an equivalent. For purposes of this policy, leapfrog development is defined as village densities located away from established Villages or outside established water and sewer service boundaries. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]

- On Draft EIR page 7-43, General Plan Update Policy H-1.3 has been revised as follows under the heading Issue 2: New Water and Wastewater Facilities:

Policy H-1.3: Housing near Public Services. ~~Encourage the development of~~ Maximize housing in areas served by transportation networks, within close proximity to job centers, and where public services and infrastructure are available.

- On Draft EIR pages 7-45 and 7-47, General Plan Update Policy COS-17.1 has been revised as follows:

Policy COS-17.1: Reduction of Solid Waste Materials. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and future landfill capacity needs through reduction, reuse, or recycling of all types of solid waste that is generated. Divert solid waste from landfills in compliance with State law. The California Integrated Waste Management Act (AB 939) that requires each local jurisdiction in the state to divert at least 50 percent of its solid waste from being placed into landfills

- On Draft EIR page 7-47, General Plan Update Policy COS-10.7 was added under the heading Issue 1: Compliance with AB 32:

COS-10.7: Recycling of Debris. Encourage the installation and operation of construction and demolition (C&D) debris recycling facilities as an accessory use at permitted (or otherwise authorized) mining facilities to increase the supply of available mineral resources.

- On Draft EIR page 7-50, mitigation measure Aes-3.2 was added under the heading Issue 3: Visual Character or Quality:

Aes-3.2 Implement existing and prepare new community right-of-way development standards, as appropriate, that supplement the County road standards in order to recognize the unique constraints and character of different communities.

- On Draft EIR page 7-50, mitigation measure Aes-4.3 was added to under the heading Issue 4: Light or Glare:

Aes-4.3 Participate in regional planning and planning by agencies operating within or adjacent to the County to the extent practicable. This includes participation in SANDAG and other regional planning forums, reviewing and commenting on planning and environmental

documents issued by other agencies, and ongoing collaboration with Native American tribes and adjacent jurisdictions.

- On Draft EIR page 7-56, mitigation measure Cul-1.7 was added under the heading Issue 1: Historical Resources:

Cul-1.7 Identify potentially historic structures within the County and enter the information in the Department of Planning and Land Use property database. Identification will occur by compiling information from all available sources (e.g., County surveys, Historic Site Board, information received from SOHO and community planning groups, information from other jurisdictions, etc.) and shall be updated at least every five years.

- On Draft EIR page 7-56, mitigation measure Cul-1.8 was added under the heading Issue 1: Historical Resources:

Cul-1.8 Revise the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) to apply to the demolition or alteration of identified significant historic structures.

- On Draft EIR page 7-57, mitigation measure Cul-2.5 was added under the heading Issue 2: Archaeological Resources:

Cul-2.5 Protect undiscovered subsurface archaeological resources by requiring grading monitoring by a qualified archaeologist and a Native American monitor for all ground disturbing activities, and also, when feasible, during initial surveys.

- On Draft EIR page 7-57, mitigation measure Cul-2.6 was added under the heading Issue 2: Archaeological Resources:

Cul-2.6 Protect significant cultural resources by facilitating the identification and acquisition of important resources through regional coordination with agencies, and institutions, such as the South Coast Information Center (SCIC) and consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and local tribal governments, including SB-18 review, while maintaining the confidentiality of sensitive cultural information.

- On Draft EIR page 7-58, mitigation measure Haz-1.3 has been revised as follows under the heading, Issue 5: Public Airports:

Haz-1.3 Review the AICUZ when reviewing new development projects within the influence study area. Ensure that such development projects are consistent with the land use compatibility and safety policies therein.

- On Draft EIR page 7-64, mitigation measure Min-1.2 has been revised as follows under the heading Issue 1: Mineral Resource Availability:

Min-1.2 Revise and update the County ordinances to designate areas of known importance for mineral resources as follows:

- Update the Zoning Ordinance with the addition of a Mining Compatibility Designator or Overlay that identifies parcels with a high potential for mineral resources. The purpose is to take into account the potential mineral resources not to preclude the potential

~~mining use. place land use restrictions on areas in the vicinity of extractive uses to ensure incompatible uses do not impede mining operations.~~ In addition, specify that notification of potential mining use is provided to all parcels within a 1,500 foot radius of parcels with a Mining Compatibility Designator/Overlay.

- Revise the Zoning Ordinance to facilitate recycling of salvaged concrete, asphalt, and rock by allowing this activity to occur by right at permitted mining facilities.
- Revise the Zoning Ordinance and Grading Ordinance to authorize surface mining operations with a Surface Mining Permit rather than a MUP. Incorporate findings of approval that reflect Mineral Compatibility Designator, SMARA Sections 2762 and 2763, and the inherent nature of surface mining operations. Parcels with a high potential for mineral resources could include those areas designated as MRZ-2 or other areas identified as containing mineral resources that are located where a sufficient buffer is available so that extraction activities are feasible.
- On Draft EIR page 7-67, mitigation measure Noi-5.1 has been revised as follows under the heading Issues 5 and 6: Excessive Noise Exposure from a Public or Private Airport:

Noi-5.1 Use the applicable Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan's (ALUCP) as guidance/reference during development review of projects that are planned within an Airport Influence Area (AIA). Any projects that are within the AIA shall be submitted to the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (SDCRAA) for review. ~~Found incompatible with the Airport Land Use Compatibility noise criteria should~~
- On Draft EIR page 7-69, mitigation measure Pub-1.9 was added under the heading Issue 1: Fire Protection Services:

Pub-1.9 Implement procedures to ensure new large development projects fund their fair share toward fire services facilities and explore, and if feasible, establish an impact fee program or Mello-Roos District for all new development to fund their fair share contribution toward fire service facilities. Large development projects are required to provide their fair share contribution to fire services either by providing additional funds and/or development of infrastructure.
- On Draft EIR page 7-70, mitigation measure Rec-1.6 has been revised as follows under the heading Issue 1: Deterioration of Parks and Recreational Facilities:

Rec-1.6 Acquire trail routes across private lands through direct purchase, easements, and dedication, or by other means from a willing property owner/seller. ~~Develop an incentive program to e~~ Encourage the voluntary dedication of easements and/or gifts of land for trails through privately-owned lands, including agricultural and grazing lands. ~~Also, develop guidelines for trails in areas with active agricultural operations or active grazing lands that will minimize potential impacts and accommodate operational necessities through proper location, design, construction, and active management.~~
- On Draft EIR page 7-70, mitigation measure Rec-1.7 has been revised as follows under the heading Issue 1: Deterioration of Parks and Recreational Facilities:

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

- On Draft EIR page 7-71, mitigation measure Rec-1.10 was deleted under the heading Issue 1: Deterioration of Parks and Recreational Facilities. Mitigation measures Rec-1.11 and Rec-1.12 were renumbered as Rec-1.10 and Rec-1.11, respectively.
- On Draft EIR page 7-71, text related to the following mitigation measure has been revised under the heading Issue 1: Deterioration of Parks and Recreational Facilities:

Rec-1.11~~2~~ Prioritize open space acquisition needs through coordination with government agencies and private organizations. Once prioritized, acquire open space lands through negotiation with private land owners and through MSCP regulatory requirements. The operation and management of such acquisitions will continue to be ~~implemented~~ achieved by preparing, implementing, and updating Resource Management Plans and MSCP Area Specific Management Directives (ASMDs) for each open space area.

- On Draft EIR page 7-71, mitigation measure Rec-2.3 has been revised as follows under the heading Issue 2: Construction of New Recreational Facilities:

Rec-2.3 Amend the Subdivision Ordinance to require new residential development to be integrated with existing neighborhoods by providing connected and continuous road, environmentally-sensitive pathway/trail and recreation/open space networks. Also add new conservation-oriented design guidelines for rural lands projects as part of this amendment. These measures will assist in the planning for recreational facilities as new development is proposed while minimizing impacts to sensitive resources and community character.

- On Draft EIR page 7-72, mitigation measures Tra-1.5 and Tra-1.6 were deleted under the heading Issue 1: Unincorporated County Traffic and Level of Service Standards.
- On Draft EIR page 7-73, mitigation measures Tra-1.7 and Tra-1.8 were renumbered as Tra-1.5 and Tra-1.7, respectively and a new mitigation measure Tra-1.6 was added under the heading Issue 1: Unincorporated County Traffic and Level of Service Standards:

Tra-1.5~~7~~ Implement the Congestion Management Strategies identified in the Regional Transportation Plan SANDAG CMP and require large projects to mitigate impacts to ~~the CMP network, including State highways and freeways.~~

Tra-1.6 Develop project review procedures to require large commercial and office development to use Transportation Demand Management Programs to reduce single-occupant vehicle traffic generation and to prepare and forward annual reports to the County on the effectiveness of the program.

Tra-1.7~~8~~ Implement the San Diego County TIF Ordinance, which defrays the costs of constructing planned transportation facilities necessary to accommodate increased traffic generated by future development.

- On Draft EIR page 7-74, mitigation measure Tra-5.3 was added under the heading Issue 5: Parking Capacity:

Tra-5.3 Revise the Public Road Standards to include standards for the provision of parallel and diagonal on-street parking, according to Regional Category.

Appendix A, NOP, Comments Received on the NOP, and Materials from the Scoping Meeting

- No revisions were made to this appendix.

Appendix B, Air Quality Technical Report

- No revisions were made to this appendix.

Appendix C, Biological Resources Tables

- In Appendix C of the Draft EIR, pages C-13 through C-34, a new data column (Total Existing Habitat Acreage) was added to Table C-3, Impacts to Vegetation Communities by CPA and Subregion. The data listed under the Total Acres Impacted column has also been rounded from three decimal places to two decimal places; however, this change is not shown in tracking mode in the table below.

CPA/Subregion	Habitat Impacted	Total Acres Impacted	Total Existing Habitat Acreage
Alpine CPA	Chaparral	4,078.53	<u>39,324.19</u>
	Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	530.97	<u>3,550.15</u>
	Native Grassland	427.26	<u>662.64</u>
	Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest	405.42	<u>1,473.03</u>
	Coastal Sage-Chaparral Scrub	143.70	<u>2,343.97</u>
	Black Oak Woodland	128.50	<u>918.19</u>
	Engelmann Oak Woodland	103.48	<u>1,438.58</u>
	Coast Live Oak Woodland	64.27	<u>826.49</u>
	Mafic Chaparral	18.34	<u>1,349.42</u>
	Field/Pasture	14.39	<u>39.52</u>
	Southern Cottonwood-willow Riparian Forest	12.51	<u>228.29</u>
	Freshwater	9.50	<u>719.34</u>
	Southern Riparian Forest	9.21	<u>351.38</u>
	Non-Native Grassland	6.65	<u>831.40</u>
	Disturbed Wetland	5.99	<u>379.96</u>
	Southern Riparian Scrub	5.03	<u>45.50</u>
	Southern Sycamore-alder Riparian Woodland	4.84	<u>6.45</u>
	Southern Willow Scrub	4.39	<u>35.17</u>
	Flat-topped Buckwheat*	4.20	<u>73.79</u>
Riparian Woodlands	3.86	<u>122.14</u>	

CPA/Subregion	Habitat Impacted	Total Acres Impacted	Total Existing Habitat Acreage
	Freshwater Marsh	0.12	<u>0.97</u>
	Non-Vegetated Channel, Floodway, Lakeshore Fringe	0.09	<u>121.48</u>
	Mule Fat Scrub	0.01	<u>4.53</u>
	Open Water	0.01	<u>399.78</u>
	Alpine CPA Total	5,981.27	<u>55,246.36</u>
Bonsall CPA	Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	2,106.07	<u>3,016.71</u>
	Chaparral	1,762.07	<u>2,945.30</u>
	Non-Native Grassland	1,526.80	<u>1,948.43</u>
	Field/Pasture	271.33	<u>663.27</u>
	Coast Live Oak Woodland	243.20	<u>395.70</u>
	Southern Cottonwood-willow Riparian Forest	160.25	<u>600.22</u>
	Southern Willow Scrub	89.56	<u>141.32</u>
	Southern Sycamore-alder Riparian Woodland	79.17	<u>113.43</u>
	Southern Riparian Scrub	68.26	<u>94.21</u>
<i>Bonsall CPA Continued</i>	Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest	52.18	<u>63.59</u>
	Mule Fat Scrub	44.85	<u>231.89</u>
	Freshwater	29.03	<u>59.51</u>
	Native Grassland	28.45	<u>35.21</u>
	Coastal Sage-Chaparral Scrub	13.48	<u>17.68</u>
	Riparian Forests	12.36	<u>12.36</u>
	Non-Vegetated Channel, Floodway, Lakeshore Fringe	7.74	<u>49.24</u>
	Disturbed Wetland	6.84	<u>0</u>
	Mafic Chaparral	5.01	<u>6.68</u>
	Oak Woodland	2.05	<u>2.05</u>
	Tamarisk Scrub	0.82	<u>7.73</u>
	Freshwater Seep	0.07	<u>0.01</u>
	Bonsall CPA Total	6,509.58	<u>10,404.54</u>
	Central Mountain Subregion - Cuyamaca	Lower Montane Coniferous Forest	816.70
Chaparral		137.13	<u>15,755.29</u>
Englemann Oak Woodland		90.38	<u>1,833.72</u>
Foothill/Mountain Perennial Grassland*		40.18	<u>942.69</u>
Montane Chaparral		32.53	<u>1,949.47</u>
Jeffrey Pine Forest		21.41	<u>4,681.27</u>
Scrub Oak Chaparral		17.02	<u>304.57</u>
Native Grassland		16.26	<u>244.71</u>
Coast Live Oak Woodland		14.31	<u>1,371.99</u>
Montane Meadow		13.80	<u>677.40</u>
Coastal Sage-Chaparral Scrub		7.72	<u>416.70</u>
Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest		6.55	<u>296.64</u>
Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub		4.88	<u>651.71</u>

CPA/Subregion	Habitat Impacted	Total Acres Impacted	Total Existing Habitat Acreage
	Black Oak Forest	4.61	<u>92.04</u>
	Mafic Chaparral	4.40	<u>1,586.92</u>
	Flat-topped Buckwheat*	2.45	<u>218.86</u>
	Southern Riparian Forest	1.81	<u>383.38</u>
	Mixed Evergreen Forest	1.70	<u>351.14</u>
	Freshwater Seep	1.58	<u>268.68</u>
	Mixed Oak Woodland*	1.48	<u>126.44</u>
	Coast Live Oak Forest	1.36	<u>37.38</u>
	Freshwater	1.05	<u>17.61</u>
	Southern Riparian Scrub	0.82	<u>26.22</u>
	Open Water	0.76	<u>93.46</u>
	Freshwater Marsh	0.56	<u>70.38</u>
	Non-Native Grassland	0.24	<u>132.88</u>
	Black Oak Woodland	0.14	<u>121.37</u>
	Great Basin Scrub	0.02	<u>58.95</u>
<i>Central Mountain Subregion – Cuyamaca Continued</i>	White Alder Riparian Forest	0.01	<u>0.09</u>
	Dry Montane Meadows	0.01	<u>1,056.98</u>
	Cuyamaca Total	1,241.86	<u>41,154.14</u>
Central Mountain Subregion - Descanso	Chaparral	603.39	<u>14,558.57</u>
	Coast Live Oak Woodland	371.99	<u>2,097.36</u>
	Englemann Oak Woodland	49.10	<u>472.67</u>
	Foothill/Mountain Perennial Grassland*	25.48	<u>280.61</u>
	Southern Riparian Scrub	20.75	<u>135.58</u>
	Non-Native Grassland	20.56	<u>98.11</u>
	Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest	15.59	<u>390.04</u>
	Freshwater Seep	10.88	<u>55.64</u>
	Mafic Chaparral	5.38	<u>598.14</u>
	Undifferentiated Open Woodland*	4.85	<u>135.47</u>
	Native Grassland	4.08	<u>75.76</u>
	Freshwater	1.22	<u>12.32</u>
	Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	1.21	<u>90.56</u>
	Southern Cottonwood-willow Riparian Forest	1.14	<u>83.49</u>
	Coastal Sage-Chaparral Scrub	0.68	<u>50.39</u>
	White Alder Riparian Forest	0.63	<u>8.12</u>
	Flat-topped Buckwheat*	0.53	<u>5.21</u>
	Montane Chaparral	0.48	<u>79.39</u>
	Southern Riparian Forest	0.22	<u>55.24</u>
	Jeffrey Pine Forest	0.14	<u>227.76</u>
	Descanso Total	1,138.29	<u>19,540.40</u>
Central Mountain Subregion - Pine	Chaparral	811.50	<u>46,840.81</u>
	Lower Montane Coniferous Forest	220.79	<u>488.70</u>

CPA/Subregion	Habitat Impacted	Total Acres Impacted	Total Existing Habitat Acreage
Valley	Coast Live Oak Woodland	176.60	<u>3,876.51</u>
	Great Basin Scrub	82.41	<u>787.99</u>
	Jeffrey Pine Forest	75.33	<u>8,472.22</u>
	Mafic Chaparral	75.04	<u>8,383.10</u>
	Foothill/Mountain Perennial Grassland*	55.22	<u>1,016.26</u>
	Flat-topped Buckwheat*	35.34	<u>2,571.67</u>
	Englemann Oak Woodland	27.19	<u>584.52</u>
	Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest	26.03	<u>962.13</u>
	Freshwater Seep	23.60	<u>442.64</u>
	Red Shank Chaparral	23.13	<u>1,512.72</u>
	Native Grassland	21.68	<u>478.32</u>
	Black Oak Forest	19.88	<u>957.06</u>
	Southern Riparian Scrub	13.46	<u>143.29</u>
	Non-Native Grassland	11.67	<u>256.85</u>
	Freshwater	8.68	<u>81.07</u>
Central Mountain Subregion - Pine Valley Continued	Montane Chaparral	8.34	<u>6,236.52</u>
	Wet Montane Meadow	7.58	<u>806.63</u>
	Montane Meadow	3.28	<u>109.63</u>
	Southern Riparian Forest	3.15	<u>61.77</u>
	Semi-Desert Chaparral	2.73	<u>1,345.76</u>
	Interior Live Oak Chaparral	2.48	<u>573.17</u>
	Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	2.05	<u>187.80</u>
	Coast Live Oak Forest	1.77	<u>49.05</u>
	Oak Woodland	1.06	<u>5.90</u>
	Non-Vegetated Channel, Floodway, Lakeshore Fringe	0.93	<u>14.85</u>
	Undifferentiated Open Woodland*	0.92	<u>40.91</u>
	Scrub Oak Chaparral	0.66	<u>533.50</u>
	Disturbed Wetland	0.55	<u>0</u>
	Mixed Oak Woodland*	0.39	<u>2,123.38</u>
	Freshwater Marsh	0.23	<u>1.30</u>
Pine Valley Total	1,743.68	<u>89,946.03</u>	
Central Mountain Subregion - Remainder	Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	188.12	<u>11,496.84</u>
	Chaparral	153.11	<u>21,994.15</u>
	Englemann Oak Woodland	53.20	<u>2,429.52</u>
	Coast Live Oak Woodland	51.71	<u>2,128.93</u>
	Foothill/Mountain Perennial Grassland*	15.83	<u>133.92</u>
	Coastal Sage-Chaparral Scrub	13.76	<u>2,727.49</u>
	Black Oak Woodland	12.86	<u>522.12</u>
	Wet Montane Meadow	7.80	<u>64.40</u>
	Undifferentiated Open Woodland*	7.05	<u>228.59</u>
	Non-Native Grassland	4.69	<u>351.28</u>

CPA/Subregion	Habitat Impacted	Total Acres Impacted	Total Existing Habitat Acreage
	Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest	3.07	<u>754.57</u>
	Field/Pasture	1.94	<u>18.78</u>
	Freshwater	1.23	<u>315.11</u>
	Native Grassland	1.18	<u>78.41</u>
	Mixed Oak Woodland*	0.85	<u>263.79</u>
	Flat-topped Buckwheat*	0.51	<u>223.26</u>
	Southern Riparian Forest	0.24	<u>842.15</u>
	Freshwater Seep	0.04	<u>5.68</u>
	Central Mountain Remainder	517.19	<u>44,578.99</u>
	Central Mountain Subregion Total	4,641.014	<u>195,219.56</u>
County Islands CPA	Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	20.55	<u>26.14</u>
	Chaparral	6.89	<u>23.32</u>
	Freshwater Marsh	3.99	<u>3.99</u>
	Southern Riparian Scrub	0.24	<u>0.25</u>
	County Islands CPA Total	31.67	<u>53.70</u>
Crest/Dehesa Subregion	Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	2,063.90	<u>7,504.93</u>
	Chaparral	1,195.75	<u>5,986.54</u>
	Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest	310.95	<u>639.93</u>
	Non-Vegetated Channel, Floodway, Lakeshore Fringe	149.96	<u>156.16</u>
	Native Grassland	115.42	<u>337.30</u>
	Coastal Sage-Chaparral Scrub	55.53	<u>695.56</u>
	Black Oak Woodland	37.34	<u>174.09</u>
	Southern Riparian Scrub	28.52	<u>29.10</u>
	Freshwater	24.88	<u>24.92</u>
	Southern Riparian Forest	12.82	<u>14.40</u>
	Disturbed Wetland	4.57	<u>0</u>
	Coast Live Oak Woodland	3.18	<u>64.59</u>
	Riparian Woodlands	0.24	<u>27.86</u>
	Open Water	0.08	<u>0.08</u>
	Non-Native Grassland	0.02	<u>0.02</u>
Crest/Dehesa Subregion Total	4,003.15	<u>15,655.48</u>	
Desert Subregion - Borrego Springs	Sonoran Creosote Bush Scrub	8,940.25	<u>33,651.54</u>
	Desert Saltbush Scrub	2,800.52	<u>10,634.39</u>
	Sonoran Desert Mixed Scrub	1,422.84	<u>4,876.13</u>
	Field/Pasture	627.16	<u>990.70</u>
	Mesquite Bosque	571.02	<u>3,029.62</u>
	Encelia Scrub*	327.58	<u>5,414.44</u>
	Desert Dry Wash Woodland	137.23	<u>1,160.84</u>
	Desert Dunes	108.99	<u>456.40</u>
	Sonoran Wash Scrub*	96.35	<u>676.09</u>
	Colorado Desert Wash Scrub*	80.82	<u>234.51</u>

CPA/Subregion	Habitat Impacted	Total Acres Impacted	Total Existing Habitat Acreage
	Desert Sink Scrub	64.75	<u>955.39</u>
	Alkali Playa Community	54.19	<u>1,867.43</u>
	Disturbed Wetland	2.99	<u>0</u>
	Freshwater	1.98	<u>1.98</u>
	Acacia Scrub	0.53	<u>4.22</u>
	Peninsular Pinon and Juniper Woodlands	0.47	<u>4.05</u>
	Non-Vegetated Channel, Floodway, Lakeshore Fringe	0.45	<u>4.11</u>
	Tamarisk Scrub	0.03	<u>0.04</u>
	Borrego Springs Total	15,238.13	<u>63,961.88</u>
Desert Subregion - Remainder	Sonoran Creosote Bush Scrub	1,833.84	<u>184,745.89</u>
	Red Shank Chaparral	279.32	<u>8,944.71</u>
	Sonoran Desert Mixed Scrub	264.50	<u>52,091.14</u>
	Chaparral	210.65	<u>25,014.44</u>
	Semi-Desert Chaparral	166.72	<u>41,609.21</u>
Desert Subregion – Remainder Continued	Encelia Scrub*	163.86	<u>59,953.76</u>
	Alkali Playa Community	130.36	<u>139.99</u>
	Mojavean Desert Scrub	127.82	<u>9,275.86</u>
	Desert Dry Wash Woodland	113.39	<u>10,229.42</u>
	Peninsular Pinon and Juniper Woodlands	103.23	<u>39,493.79</u>
	Montane Chaparral	80.09	<u>6,710.91</u>
	Non-Native Grassland	78.98	<u>1,319.78</u>
	Coast Live Oak Forest	64.89	<u>653.60</u>
	Desert Sink Scrub	60.93	<u>687.38</u>
	Flat-topped Buckwheat*	49.60	<u>9,892.29</u>
	Acacia Scrub	26.07	<u>4,264.45</u>
	Sonoran Wash Scrub*	21.75	<u>5,676.52</u>
	Desert Dunes	17.93	<u>385.28</u>
	Disturbed Wetland	15.65	<u>0</u>
	Interior Live Oak Chaparral	14.76	<u>420.24</u>
	Mesquite Bosque	11.32	<u>2,128.66</u>
	Colorado Desert Wash Scrub*	6.26	<u>94.12</u>
	Lower Montane Coniferous Forest	3.27	<u>439.50</u>
	Southern Sycamore-alder Riparian Woodland	2.80	<u>115.76</u>
	Desert Saltbush Scrub	2.43	<u>1,257.77</u>
	Coast Live Oak Woodland	1.89	<u>17.71</u>
	Non-Vegetated Channel, Floodway, Lakeshore Fringe	1.86	<u>526.36</u>
	Montane Meadow	1.62	<u>15.14</u>
	Great Basin Scrub	1.54	<u>391.37</u>
Stabilized Alkaline Dunes*	1.53	<u>12.27</u>	
Alluvial Fan Scrub	1.08	<u>46.65</u>	

CPA/Subregion	Habitat Impacted	Total Acres Impacted	Total Existing Habitat Acreage
	White Alder Riparian Forest	0.92	<u>52.15</u>
	Freshwater	0.60	<u>4.81</u>
	Unvegetated Habitat	0.45	<u>7.21</u>
	Tamarisk Scrub	0.42	<u>64.82</u>
	Field/Pasture	0.35	<u>4.82</u>
	Southern Arroyo Willow Riparian Forest	0.31	<u>133.15</u>
	Alkali Seep	0.23	<u>4.33</u>
	Southern Riparian Forest	0.00	<u>38.70</u>
	Remainder Total	3,863.24	<u>466,863.96</u>
	Desert Subregion Total	19,101.37	<u>530,825.84</u>
Fallbrook CPA	Non-Native Grassland	2,779.07	<u>3,171.99</u>
	Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	2,051.71	<u>4,072.84</u>
	Coast Live Oak Woodland	1,077.03	<u>1,478.86</u>
	Chaparral	945.79	<u>3,063.72</u>
	Field/Pasture	525.97	<u>586.58</u>
<i>Fallbrook CPA Continued</i>	Southern Cottonwood-willow Riparian Forest	446.38	<u>870.98</u>
	Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest	203.34	<u>290.05</u>
	Southern Sycamore-alder Riparian Woodland	188.94	<u>441.56</u>
	Southern Willow Scrub	127.36	<u>211.96</u>
	Southern Riparian Scrub	60.34	<u>105.23</u>
	Mule Fat Scrub	49.97	<u>106.83</u>
	Freshwater	49.47	<u>72.81</u>
	Native Grassland	29.16	<u>30.08</u>
	Coastal Sage-Chaparral Scrub	24.43	<u>142.10</u>
	Non-Vegetated Channel, Floodway, Lakeshore Fringe	21.66	<u>168.43</u>
	Freshwater Marsh	20.69	<u>22.46</u>
	Coast Live Oak Forest	16.86	<u>21.92</u>
	Disturbed Wetland	7.84	<u>0</u>
	Southern Arroyo Willow Riparian Forest	0.31	<u>0.31</u>
	Alluvial Fan Scrub	0.04	<u>3.30</u>
Fallbrook CPA Total	8,626.35	<u>14,862.34</u>	
Jumul/Dulzura Subregion	Chaparral	6,592.60	<u>49,828.61</u>
	Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	3,831.35	<u>29,629.18</u>
	Coast Live Oak Woodland	691.07	<u>2,871.20</u>
	Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest	491.91	<u>1,968.84</u>
	Native Grassland	458.11	<u>1,214.96</u>
	Coastal Sage-Chaparral Scrub	329.01	<u>2,091.99</u>
	Engelmann Oak Woodland	156.81	<u>816.74</u>
	Non-Native Grassland	70.12	<u>241.15</u>
	Field/Pasture	55.85	<u>130.14</u>
	Disturbed Wetland	30.51	<u>77.30</u>

CPA/Subregion	Habitat Impacted	Total Acres Impacted	Total Existing Habitat Acreage
	Coast Live Oak Forest	21.60	<u>92.07</u>
	Southern Riparian Scrub	18.75	<u>232.11</u>
	Flat-topped Buckwheat*	18.64	<u>45.81</u>
	Scrub Oak Chaparral	17.69	<u>2,290.95</u>
	Alkali Marsh	16.90	<u>88.04</u>
	Mafic Chaparral	16.56	<u>2,216.95</u>
	Non-Vegetated Channel, Floodway, Lakeshore Fringe	11.37	<u>71.45</u>
	Southern Interior Cypress Forest	9.91	<u>1,035.85</u>
	Southern Riparian Forest	8.85	<u>168.55</u>
	Freshwater	7.50	<u>790.63</u>
	Freshwater Marsh	7.23	<u>54.73</u>
	Jamul/Dulzura Subregion Total	12,862.32	<u>95,957.25</u>
	Julian CPA	Lower Montane Coniferous Forest	3,588.55
Chaparral		676.58	<u>5,890.26</u>
Mixed Oak Woodland*		529.91	<u>2,943.95</u>
Coast Live Oak Woodland		265.70	<u>1,089.27</u>
Foothill/Mountain Perennial Grassland*		236.52	<u>1,256.26</u>
Engelmann Oak Woodland		210.81	<u>1,429.01</u>
Native Grassland		180.36	<u>1,238.22</u>
Field/Pasture		146.02	<u>499.62</u>
Wet Montane Meadow		65.00	<u>236.46</u>
Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub		43.12	<u>578.54</u>
Montane Chaparral		33.39	<u>279.60</u>
White Alder Riparian Forest		32.42	<u>100.93</u>
Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest		24.11	<u>175.09</u>
Dry Montane Meadows		20.57	<u>264.42</u>
Non-Native Grassland		19.17	<u>851.04</u>
Southern Riparian Forest		16.54	<u>198.08</u>
Undifferentiated Open Woodland*		16.21	<u>68.60</u>
Freshwater		11.50	<u>68.87</u>
Great Basin Scrub		3.07	<u>78.37</u>
Jeffrey Pine Forest		1.70	<u>13.57</u>
Montane Meadow		1.10	<u>8.96</u>
Freshwater Seep		1.05	<u>8.47</u>
Flat-topped Buckwheat*		1.03	<u>2.05</u>
Southern Riparian Scrub		1.02	<u>6.79</u>
Disturbed Wetland		0.12	<u>0</u>
Unvegetated Habitat	0.02	<u>0.14</u>	
Julian CPA Total	6,125.60	<u>31,562.27</u>	
Lakeside CPA	Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	3,941.55	<u>11,930.16</u>
	Chaparral	1,621.95	<u>14,721.92</u>

CPA/Subregion	Habitat Impacted	Total Acres Impacted	Total Existing Habitat Acreage
	Native Grassland	350.87	<u>679.59</u>
	Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest	268.89	<u>531.59</u>
	Black Oak Woodland	226.65	<u>737.45</u>
	Coastal Sage-Chaparral Scrub	139.74	<u>592.97</u>
	Southern Riparian Scrub	115.33	<u>284.00</u>
	Freshwater	41.15	<u>879.38</u>
	Coast Live Oak Woodland	38.80	<u>718.90</u>
	Southern Riparian Forest	33.96	<u>38.57</u>
	Disturbed Wetland	17.04	<u>16.12</u>
	Non-Native Grassland	16.65	<u>100.05</u>
	Non-Vegetated Channel, Floodway, Lakeshore Fringe	10.68	<u>118.13</u>
	Riparian Woodlands	5.27	<u>30.53</u>
<i>Lakeside CPA Continued</i>	Field/Pasture	3.60	<u>22.00</u>
	Open Water	3.53	<u>161.86</u>
	Engelmann Oak Woodland	0.93	<u>0.93</u>
	Freshwater Marsh	0.84	<u>6.40</u>
	Freshwater Seep	0.16	<u>0.91</u>
	Mule Fat Scrub	0.07	<u>5.10</u>
	Southern Cottonwood-willow Riparian Forest	0.01	<u>0.23</u>
	Southern Willow Scrub	0.01	<u>2.68</u>
	Lakeside CPA Total	6,837.68	<u>31,579.47</u>
Mountain Empire Subregion - Boulevard	Chaparral	1,989.08	<u>27,262.08</u>
	Red Shank Chaparral	618.24	<u>8,240.37</u>
	Semi-Desert Chaparral	422.89	<u>8,942.77</u>
	Coast Live Oak Woodland	268.62	<u>2,000.02</u>
	Field/Pasture	116.06	<u>947.13</u>
	Flat-topped Buckwheat*	74.25	<u>2,032.96</u>
	Alkali Seep	47.93	<u>326.47</u>
	Non-Native Grassland	42.43	<u>776.65</u>
	Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest	26.13	<u>190.18</u>
	Great Basin Scrub	17.20	<u>309.80</u>
	Upper Sonoran Subshrub Scrub	13.02	<u>242.95</u>
	Freshwater Seep	9.82	<u>218.99</u>
	Southern Riparian Scrub	7.36	<u>69.43</u>
	Native Grassland	6.99	<u>111.79</u>
	Alkali Marsh	5.24	<u>87.06</u>
	Wet Montane Meadow	5.07	<u>40.58</u>
	Freshwater	4.78	<u>61.25</u>
	Freshwater Marsh	3.60	<u>69.57</u>
	Southern Riparian Forest	3.41	<u>13.65</u>
Encelia Scrub*	3.10	<u>436.94</u>	

CPA/Subregion	Habitat Impacted	Total Acres Impacted	Total Existing Habitat Acreage
	Acacia Scrub	2.14	<u>223.97</u>
	Coast Live Oak Forest	1.30	<u>23.22</u>
	Disturbed Wetland	0.32	<u>0</u>
	Non-Vegetated Channel, Floodway, Lakeshore Fringe	0.25	<u>7.67</u>
	Boulevard Total	3,689.22	<u>52,635.50</u>
Mountain Empire Subregion - Jacumba	Semi-Desert Chaparral	985.27	<u>9,550.44</u>
	Sonoran Desert Mixed Scrub	598.38	<u>2,535.35</u>
	Field/Pasture	315.61	<u>319.45</u>
	Desert Saltbush Scrub	227.21	<u>731.84</u>
	Alkali Seep	204.37	<u>204.37</u>
	Colorado Desert Wash Scrub*	124.31	<u>244.36</u>
	Acacia Scrub	76.37	<u>139.27</u>
Mountain Empire Subregion – Jacumba Continued	Upper Sonoran Subshrub Scrub	65.37	<u>3,309.78</u>
	Peninsular Pinon and Juniper Woodlands	54.62	<u>2,634.78</u>
	Red Shank Chaparral	37.20	<u>326.79</u>
	Mesquite Bosque	30.20	<u>75.82</u>
	Southern Riparian Forest	24.98	<u>38.45</u>
	Tamarisk Scrub	13.61	<u>76.05</u>
	Southern Riparian Scrub	9.02	<u>24.56</u>
	Encelia Scrub*	8.39	<u>242.56</u>
	Freshwater	2.61	<u>5.43</u>
	Flat-topped Buckwheat*	1.81	<u>551.15</u>
	Coast Live Oak Woodland	0.47	<u>7.44</u>
	Mojavean Desert Scrub	0.41	<u>6.48</u>
	Desert Dry Wash Woodland	0.14	<u>0.14</u>
	Chaparral	0.12	<u>1.89</u>
	Disturbed Wetland	0.11	<u>0</u>
	Alkali Marsh	0.03	<u>0.54</u>
	Jacumba Total	2,780.61	<u>21,026.94</u>
Mountain Empire Subregion - Lake Morena/Campo	Chaparral	3,662.56	<u>9,214.18</u>
	Coast Live Oak Woodland	478.72	<u>3,735.59</u>
	Field/Pasture	387.20	<u>1,631.26</u>
	Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest	81.66	<u>460.12</u>
	Coastal Sage-Chaparral Scrub	76.77	<u>1,177.74</u>
	Alkali Seep	59.91	<u>418.50</u>
	Great Basin Scrub	49.94	<u>800.63</u>
	Freshwater Seep	29.57	<u>369.42</u>
	Non-Native Grassland	27.96	<u>1,615.04</u>
	Southern Riparian Scrub	27.62	<u>363.93</u>
	Scrub Oak Chaparral	26.64	<u>922.63</u>
	Foothill/Mountain Perennial Grassland*	26.42	<u>233.30</u>

CPA/Subregion	Habitat Impacted	Total Acres Impacted	Total Existing Habitat Acreage
	Flat-topped Buckwheat*	13.88	<u>268.91</u>
	Freshwater Marsh	12.17	<u>113.02</u>
	Disturbed Wetland	7.13	<u>0</u>
	Freshwater	5.89	<u>278.64</u>
	Red Shank Chaparral	4.61	<u>579.68</u>
	Native Grassland	3.07	<u>143.38</u>
	Southern Willow Scrub	2.63	<u>75.90</u>
	Southern Cottonwood-willow Riparian Forest	1.61	<u>20.90</u>
	Southern Riparian Forest	1.50	<u>17.35</u>
	Alluvial Fan Scrub	1.29	<u>58.74</u>
<i>Mountain Empire Subregion - Lake Morena/Campo Continued</i>	Non-Vegetated Channel, Floodway, Lakeshore Fringe	1.12	<u>135.52</u>
	Riparian Forests	0.33	<u>5.29</u>
	Lake Morena/Campo Total	4,990.20	<u>22,639.67</u>
Mountain Empire Subregion - Potrero	Chaparral	1,858.27	<u>17,323.53</u>
	Coast Live Oak Woodland	265.40	<u>846.63</u>
	Coastal Sage-Chaparral Scrub	217.34	<u>1,706.70</u>
	Non-Native Grassland	186.88	<u>1,049.97</u>
	Flat-topped Buckwheat*	95.61	<u>373.47</u>
	Field/Pasture	66.08	<u>137.54</u>
	Freshwater Seep	53.36	<u>438.11</u>
	Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	46.61	<u>321.62</u>
	Englemann Oak Woodland	26.40	<u>118.51</u>
	Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest	26.09	<u>155.24</u>
	Coast Live Oak Forest	23.00	<u>81.10</u>
	Southern Riparian Scrub	10.87	<u>54.68</u>
	Freshwater Marsh	8.88	<u>21.80</u>
	Freshwater	7.93	<u>32.95</u>
	Disturbed Wetland	3.48	<u>30.49</u>
	Non-Vegetated Channel, Floodway, Lakeshore Fringe	3.28	<u>26.22</u>
	Scrub Oak Chaparral	1.55	<u>116.25</u>
Potrero Total	2,901.01	<u>22,834.81</u>	
Mountain Empire Subregion - Tecate	Chaparral	644.18	<u>4,267.45</u>
	Coastal Sage-Chaparral Scrub	67.86	<u>401.19</u>
	Flat-topped Buckwheat*	45.91	<u>79.89</u>
	Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	38.12	<u>311.23</u>
	Coast Live Oak Forest	11.66	<u>40.92</u>
	Non-Native Grassland	5.59	<u>32.67</u>
	Coast Live Oak Woodland	3.06	<u>29.87</u>
	Southern Interior Cypress Forest	1.24	<u>9.95</u>
	Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest	0.60	<u>4.80</u>

CPA/Subregion	Habitat Impacted	Total Acres Impacted	Total Existing Habitat Acreage
	Freshwater	0.26	<u>1.17</u>
	Tecate Total	818.48	<u>5,179.14</u>
Mountain Empire Subregion - Remainder	Chaparral	196.10	<u>26,821.81</u>
	Semi-Desert Chaparral	109.81	<u>20,914.35</u>
	Montane Chaparral	35.51	<u>2,064.73</u>
	Coast Live Oak Woodland	21.52	<u>1,089.35</u>
	Southern Riparian Scrub	9.46	<u>56.66</u>
	Upper Sonoran Subshrub Scrub	7.21	<u>249.04</u>
	Non-Native Grassland	6.14	<u>143.01</u>
	Flat-topped Buckwheat*	5.41	<u>3,438.97</u>
Mountain Empire Subregion – Remainder Continued	Jeffrey Pine Forest	5.35	<u>191.56</u>
	Freshwater Seep	5.19	<u>117.99</u>
	Scrub Oak Chaparral	4.31	<u>1,250.94</u>
	Great Basin Scrub	3.83	<u>195.96</u>
	Native Grassland	3.27	<u>54.11</u>
	Montane Meadow	3.19	<u>52.59</u>
	Acacia Scrub	2.96	<u>1,211.98</u>
	Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest	2.71	<u>80.34</u>
	Red Shank Chaparral	2.54	<u>892.47</u>
	Coast Live Oak Forest	2.18	<u>199.99</u>
	Freshwater	1.47	<u>8.64</u>
	Sonoran Wash Scrub*	1.17	<u>2,352.75</u>
	Southern Cottonwood-willow Riparian Forest	1.15	<u>167.09</u>
	Southern Riparian Forest	1.09	<u>103.10</u>
	Freshwater Marsh	1.00	<u>22.35</u>
	Sonoran Desert Mixed Scrub	0.99	<u>9,925.09</u>
	Upper Sonoran Ceanothus Chaparral	0.86	<u>33.78</u>
	Southern Arroyo Willow Riparian Forest	0.79	<u>33.76</u>
	Alkali Seep	0.54	<u>11.87</u>
	Interior Live Oak Chaparral	0.53	<u>108.34</u>
	Sonoran Creosote Bush Scrub	0.46	<u>38,038.74</u>
	Encelia Scrub*	0.34	<u>20,559.05</u>
	Non-Vegetated Channel, Floodway, Lakeshore Fringe	0.22	<u>105.88</u>
	Black Oak Forest	0.21	<u>10.09</u>
	Colorado Desert Wash Scrub*	0.12	<u>62.14</u>
	Remainder Total	437.61	<u>130,568.52</u>
Mountain Empire Subregion Total	15,617.12	<u>254,884.58</u>	
North County Metro Subregion - Hidden Meadows	Chaparral	1,912.48	<u>2,865.82</u>
	Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	1,276.57	<u>1,642.58</u>
	Non-Native Grassland	333.28	<u>353.89</u>
	Coast Live Oak Woodland	195.42	<u>292.93</u>

CPA/Subregion	Habitat Impacted	Total Acres Impacted	Total Existing Habitat Acreage
	Field/Pasture	136.13	<u>139.44</u>
	Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest	79.22	<u>84.04</u>
	Southern Willow Scrub	20.64	<u>33.78</u>
	Coastal Sage-Chaparral Scrub	20.02	<u>33.83</u>
	Southern Cottonwood-willow Riparian Forest	14.31	<u>25.06</u>
	Southern Sycamore-alder Riparian Woodland	8.00	<u>28.78</u>
	Freshwater	3.82	<u>4.05</u>
	Englemann Oak Woodland	3.28	<u>3.28</u>
	Riparian Woodlands	2.42	<u>2.42</u>
<i>North County Metro Subregion – Hidden Meadows Continued</i>	Disturbed Wetland	0.24	<u>0</u>
	Southern Riparian Scrub	0.12	<u>0.12</u>
	Hidden Meadows Total	4,005.93	<u>5,510.02</u>
North County Metro Subregion - Twin Oaks	Chaparral	1,240.62	<u>3,085.92</u>
	Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	438.48	<u>862.65</u>
	Field/Pasture	134.39	<u>186.44</u>
	Non-Native Grassland	108.87	<u>147.19</u>
	Coastal Sage-Chaparral Scrub	107.29	<u>243.59</u>
	Coast Live Oak Woodland	37.17	<u>63.09</u>
	Southern Sycamore-alder Riparian Woodland	35.27	<u>58.58</u>
	Southern Willow Scrub	21.36	<u>27.38</u>
	Southern Cottonwood-willow Riparian Forest	12.08	<u>12.91</u>
	Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest	8.94	<u>18.29</u>
	Native Grassland	5.47	<u>10.94</u>
	Freshwater	4.34	<u>5.93</u>
	Non-Vegetated Channel, Floodway, Lakeshore Fringe	1.68	<u>3.35</u>
	Twin Oaks Total	2,155.94	<u>4,726.26</u>
North County Metro Subregion - Remainder	Chaparral	2,257.84	<u>12,745.71</u>
	Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	1,747.69	<u>3,769.83</u>
	Non-Native Grassland	607.73	<u>2,342.66</u>
	Field/Pasture	602.49	<u>739.91</u>
	Native Grassland	420.33	<u>626.17</u>
	Coast Live Oak Woodland	402.87	<u>1,968.82</u>
	Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest	317.41	<u>975.10</u>
	Engelmann Oak Woodland	163.43	<u>1,137.92</u>
	Southern Riparian Scrub	100.66	<u>158.78</u>
	Southern Cottonwood-willow Riparian Forest	65.85	<u>140.25</u>
	Freshwater	29.64	<u>209.13</u>
	Coastal Sage-Chaparral Scrub	22.21	<u>183.58</u>

CPA/Subregion	Habitat Impacted	Total Acres Impacted	Total Existing Habitat Acreage
	Non-Vegetated Channel, Floodway, Lakeshore Fringe	11.94	<u>59.57</u>
	Coastal Scrub	11.36	<u>11.36</u>
	Disturbed Wetland	7.89	<u>0</u>
	Freshwater Marsh	6.67	<u>26.88</u>
	Flat-topped Buckwheat*	6.05	<u>51.21</u>
	Southern Sycamore-alder Riparian Woodland	4.53	<u>6.77</u>
	Oak Woodland	2.59	<u>2.91</u>
	Southern Riparian Forest	1.28	<u>10.26</u>
<i>North County Metro Subregion – Remainder Continued</i>	Southern Willow Scrub	0.96	<u>14.94</u>
	Riparian Woodlands	0.88	<u>0.88</u>
	Meadow and Seep	0.19	<u>1.49</u>
	Mule Fat Scrub	0.10	<u>0.40</u>
	Remainder Total	6,792.58	<u>25,184.53</u>
	North County Metro Subregion Total	12,954.45	<u>35,420.81</u>
<i>North Mountain Subregion - Palomar Mountain</i>	Mixed Evergreen Forest	608.22	<u>10,721.52</u>
	Lower Montane Coniferous Forest	389.56	<u>548.94</u>
	Red Shank Chaparral	193.71	<u>19,149.44</u>
	Black Oak Woodland	131.46	<u>1,338.36</u>
	Chaparral	113.26	<u>17,638.40</u>
	Wet Montane Meadow	97.76	<u>1,023.96</u>
	Scrub Oak Chaparral	87.65	<u>3,726.81</u>
	Foothill/Mountain Perennial Grassland*	84.99	<u>763.11</u>
	Coast Live Oak Woodland	44.59	<u>3,356.01</u>
	Montane Chaparral	23.03	<u>1,125.10</u>
	Non-Native Grassland	20.67	<u>546.05</u>
	Native Grassland	11.14	<u>563.57</u>
	Flat-topped Buckwheat*	9.70	<u>79.38</u>
	Southern Cottonwood-willow Riparian Forest	9.66	<u>192.74</u>
	Dry Montane Meadows	8.58	<u>69.93</u>
	Englemann Oak Woodland	7.46	<u>166.49</u>
	Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	6.53	<u>1,041.59</u>
	Freshwater	5.95	<u>51.36</u>
	Black Oak Forest	5.67	<u>3,326.87</u>
	Southern Riparian Scrub	5.61	<u>46.65</u>
	Southern Sycamore-alder Riparian Woodland	1.79	<u>167.49</u>
	Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest	1.77	<u>752.59</u>
	Field/Pasture	1.48	<u>19.37</u>
Coast Live Oak Forest	0.66	<u>192.06</u>	
Palomar Mountain Subregion	1,870.87	<u>66,607.79</u>	
North Mountain	Red Shank Chaparral	3,166.37	<u>44,477.84</u>

CPA/Subregion	Habitat Impacted	Total Acres Impacted	Total Existing Habitat Acreage
Subregion - Remainder	Chaparral	2,518.32	<u>57,924.44</u>
	Coast Live Oak Woodland	1,156.99	<u>11,027.54</u>
	Engelmann Oak Woodland	946.03	<u>11,759.40</u>
	Foothill/Mountain Perennial Grassland*	927.96	<u>19,526.08</u>
	Mixed Oak Woodland*	856.27	<u>9,489.47</u>
	Field/Pasture	580.85	<u>4,902.48</u>
	Great Basin Scrub	274.58	<u>1,994.55</u>
	Non-Native Grassland	272.18	<u>5,475.33</u>
	Semi-Desert Chaparral	264.98	<u>5,758.35</u>
North Mountain Subregion – Remainder Continued	Flat-topped Buckwheat*	240.81	<u>1,921.23</u>
	Montane Chaparral	205.04	<u>8,827.14</u>
	Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest	196.55	<u>1,877.99</u>
	Southern Riparian Forest	164.69	<u>1,003.92</u>
	Lower Montane Coniferous Forest	126.52	<u>7,943.85</u>
	Undifferentiated Open Woodland*	106.52	<u>414.56</u>
	Native Grassland	102.71	<u>1,789.89</u>
	Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	94.44	<u>3,534.92</u>
	Southern Riparian Scrub	82.79	<u>1,098.11</u>
	Coast Live Oak Forest	52.40	<u>1,775.13</u>
	Acacia Scrub	34.12	<u>3,455.15</u>
	Upper Sonoran Subshrub Scrub	16.39	<u>971.10</u>
	Riversidian Sage Scrub	15.62	<u>220.01</u>
	Coastal Sage-Chaparral Scrub	14.56	<u>5,361.04</u>
	Scrub Oak Chaparral	13.38	<u>1,541.68</u>
	Freshwater	13.09	<u>819.96</u>
	Alluvial Fan Scrub	12.09	<u>196.40</u>
	Mafic Chaparral	11.83	<u>3,533.83</u>
	Wet Montane Meadow	10.97	<u>3,027.29</u>
	Desert Dry Wash Woodland	8.07	<u>472.81</u>
	Montane Meadow	6.61	<u>81.40</u>
	Southern Sycamore-alder Riparian Woodland	6.24	<u>240.87</u>
	Southern Cottonwood-willow Riparian Forest	3.99	<u>214.57</u>
	Riparian Woodlands	3.34	<u>164.29</u>
	Peninsular Pinon and Juniper Woodlands	3.08	<u>1,091.80</u>
	Non-Vegetated Channel, Floodway, Lakeshore Fringe	2.85	<u>258.62</u>
	Freshwater Seep	2.63	<u>20.40</u>
	Disturbed Wetland	2.38	<u>0</u>
	Southern Arroyo Willow Riparian Forest	1.44	<u>48.91</u>
	Black Oak Forest	0.74	<u>1,357.63</u>
Mesquite Bosque	0.31	<u>1,017.98</u>	
Interior Live Oak Chaparral	0.15	<u>1,081.08</u>	

CPA/Subregion	Habitat Impacted	Total Acres Impacted	Total Existing Habitat Acreage
	Sonoran Desert Mixed Scrub	0.11	<u>62.71</u>
	Sonoran Desert Mixed Scrub	0.10	<u>0.85</u>
	Upper Sonoran Ceanothus Chaparral	0.04	<u>0.31</u>
	Remainder Total	12,521.10	<u>227,762.91</u>
	North Mountain Subregion Total	14,391.97	<u>294,370.70</u>
Otay Subregion	Non-Native Grassland	1,700.50	<u>2,019.10</u>
	Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	1,249.82	<u>7,929.82</u>
	Native Grassland	539.18	<u>1,529.51</u>
	Chaparral	294.04	<u>8,514.41</u>
<i>Otay Subregion Continued</i>	Alkali Marsh	20.98	<u>129.82</u>
	Tamarisk Scrub	14.07	<u>50.93</u>
	Vernal Pool	11.72	<u>423.24</u>
	Maritime Succulent Scrub	6.39	<u>18.68</u>
	Southern Interior Cypress Forest	5.50	<u>4,719.73</u>
	Mafic Chaparral	4.68	<u>5.18</u>
	Disturbed Wetland	3.96	<u>1.34</u>
	Riparian and Bottomland Habitat	3.20	<u>3.20</u>
	Mule Fat Scrub	2.94	<u>33.00</u>
	Freshwater	2.66	<u>848.51</u>
	Southern Willow Scrub	1.64	<u>4.58</u>
	Estuarine	1.38	<u>3.75</u>
	Freshwater Marsh	0.76	<u>29.24</u>
	Scrub Oak Chaparral	0.24	<u>0.71</u>
	Coastal Sage-Chaparral Scrub	0.10	<u>123.55</u>
	Non-Vegetated Channel, Floodway, Lakeshore Fringe	0.04	<u>4.27</u>
	Otay Subregion Total	3,863.79	<u>26,392.57</u>
Pala/Pauma CPA	Chaparral	3,932.20	<u>26,332.12</u>
	Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	1,859.98	<u>10,676.50</u>
	Non-Native Grassland	1,004.49	<u>4,821.52</u>
	Coast Live Oak Woodland	982.93	<u>4,943.62</u>
	Engelmann Oak Woodland	830.88	<u>6,248.72</u>
	Native Grassland	306.99	<u>1,171.60</u>
	Lower Montane Coniferous Forest	147.49	<u>2,717.75</u>
	Field/Pasture	112.07	<u>403.78</u>
	Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest	104.92	<u>778.88</u>
	Southern Cottonwood-willow Riparian Forest	85.07	<u>400.49</u>
	Coastal Sage-Chaparral Scrub	66.09	<u>880.44</u>
	Alluvial Fan Scrub	58.43	<u>464.12</u>
	Mule Fat Scrub	54.39	<u>492.48</u>
	Non-Vegetated Channel, Floodway, Lakeshore Fringe	49.24	<u>126.44</u>

CPA/Subregion	Habitat Impacted	Total Acres Impacted	Total Existing Habitat Acreage
	Black Oak Forest	38.82	<u>246.69</u>
	Southern Willow Scrub	34.71	<u>230.82</u>
	Foothill/Mountain Perennial Grassland*	23.65	<u>190.83</u>
	Flat-topped Buckwheat*	21.18	<u>183.78</u>
	Freshwater	21.15	<u>52.64</u>
	Southern Riparian Scrub	11.68	<u>67.70</u>
	Southern Sycamore-alder Riparian Woodland	11.57	<u>116.02</u>
	Meadow and Seep	10.72	<u>84.28</u>
	Disturbed Wetland	10.51	<u>0</u>
<i>Pala/Pauma CPA Continued</i>	Coast Live Oak Forest	8.12	<u>113.72</u>
	Scrub Oak Chaparral	5.72	<u>45.78</u>
	Freshwater Marsh	4.60	<u>36.92</u>
	Open Water	4.47	<u>35.77</u>
	Southern Riparian Forest	4.37	<u>57.10</u>
	Alkali Meadows and Seeps	3.34	<u>26.69</u>
	Coast Range, Klamath and Peninsular Coniferous Forest*	1.93	<u>14.06</u>
	Pala/Pauma CPA Total	9,811.71	<u>61,961.26</u>
<i>Pendleton/De Luz Subregion</i>	Chaparral	1,489.24	<u>27,060.09</u>
	Upper Sonoran Ceanothus Chaparral	199.45	<u>4,461.91</u>
	Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	127.58	<u>43,131.76</u>
	Southern Sycamore-alder Riparian Woodland	101.05	<u>1,833.21</u>
	Coast Live Oak Woodland	79.70	<u>1,847.59</u>
	Coastal Sage-Chaparral Scrub	77.55	<u>10,620.27</u>
	Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest	57.19	<u>1,284.24</u>
	Field/Pasture	43.08	<u>329.71</u>
	Native Grassland	35.02	<u>30,144.17</u>
	Englemann Oak Woodland	22.28	<u>3,096.94</u>
	Southern Riparian Scrub	5.78	<u>329.36</u>
	Freshwater	3.95	<u>287.33</u>
	Scrub Oak Chaparral	2.93	<u>573.27</u>
	White Alder Riparian Forest	0.87	<u>20.17</u>
	Non-Native Grassland	0.47	<u>13,850.80</u>
	Pendleton/De Luz Subregion Total	2,246.16	<u>138,870.82</u>
<i>Rainbow CPA</i>	Chaparral	1,302.23	<u>4,396.47</u>
	Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	368.47	<u>841.45</u>
	Non-Native Grassland	211.00	<u>420.35</u>
	Coast Live Oak Woodland	141.72	<u>357.57</u>
	Southern Cottonwood-willow Riparian Forest	58.93	<u>105.80</u>
	Field/Pasture	12.20	<u>12.22</u>
	Freshwater	6.21	<u>9.56</u>
	Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest	0.57	<u>2.28</u>

CPA/Subregion	Habitat Impacted	Total Acres Impacted	Total Existing Habitat Acreage
	Southern Willow Scrub	0.55	<u>2.19</u>
	Disturbed Wetland	0.24	<u>0</u>
	Rainbow CPA Total	2,102.13	<u>6,147.89</u>
Ramona CPA	Chaparral	5,498.76	<u>31,510.29</u>
	Field/Pasture	2,788.50	<u>4,672.78</u>
	Non-Native Grassland	2,008.55	<u>5,560.94</u>
	Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	1,366.14	<u>7,283.23</u>
	Coastal Sage-Chaparral Scrub	1,215.39	<u>3,854.17</u>
	Coast Live Oak Woodland	802.58	<u>4,148.91</u>
<i>Ramona CPA Continued</i>	Native Grassland	565.81	<u>1,442.65</u>
	Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest	319.23	<u>1,292.70</u>
	Engelmann Oak Woodland	242.25	<u>1,871.85</u>
	Southern Riparian Scrub	147.26	<u>388.27</u>
	Flat-topped Buckwheat*	82.79	<u>169.51</u>
	Disturbed Wetland	72.98	<u>21.79</u>
	Southern Cottonwood-willow Riparian Forest	40.97	<u>83.00</u>
	Meadow and Seep	34.62	<u>47.30</u>
	Alkali Seep	29.83	<u>259.86</u>
	Undifferentiated Open Woodland*	14.29	<u>129.63</u>
	Freshwater Marsh	12.45	<u>15.38</u>
	Freshwater Seep	12.19	<u>28.08</u>
	Freshwater	11.80	<u>318.55</u>
	Foothill/Mountain Perennial Grassland*	6.74	<u>53.94</u>
	Non-Vegetated Channel, Floodway, Lakeshore Fringe	5.15	<u>23.36</u>
	Southern Sycamore-alder Riparian Woodland	3.89	<u>15.50</u>
	Southern Arroyo Willow Riparian Forest	2.06	<u>6.30</u>
	Mule Fat Scrub	1.68	<u>2.47</u>
	Southern Willow Scrub	1.39	<u>10.88</u>
	Open Water	0.77	<u>1.49</u>
	Southern Riparian Forest	0.76	<u>51.02</u>
Vernal Pool	0.18	<u>0.17</u>	
Ramona CPA Total	15,288.98	<u>63,264.02</u>	
San Dieguito CPA	Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	2,849.32	<u>6,066.42</u>
	Chaparral	2,124.73	<u>5,200.15</u>
	Non-Native Grassland	454.86	<u>681.01</u>
	Field/Pasture	447.60	<u>472.49</u>
	Southern Maritime Chaparral	336.76	<u>395.67</u>
	Native Grassland	145.00	<u>269.12</u>
	Southern Sycamore-alder Riparian Woodland	117.11	<u>258.83</u>
	Coastal Sage-Chaparral Scrub	103.77	<u>332.23</u>
	Southern Riparian Scrub	93.78	<u>207.45</u>

CPA/Subregion	Habitat Impacted	Total Acres Impacted	Total Existing Habitat Acreage
	Coast Live Oak Woodland	66.76	<u>131.92</u>
	Freshwater	47.89	<u>306.30</u>
	Disturbed Wetland	27.32	<u>37.88</u>
	Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest	21.10	<u>37.45</u>
	Coastal Scrub	10.60	<u>22.15</u>
	Oak Woodland	9.69	<u>15.77</u>
	Southern Willow Scrub	8.72	<u>34.13</u>
	Scrub Oak Chaparral	8.18	<u>8.57</u>
	Freshwater Marsh	6.69	<u>85.50</u>
<i>San Dieguito CPA Continued</i>	Non-Vegetated Channel, Floodway, Lakeshore Fringe	4.91	<u>62.58</u>
	Alkali Marsh	3.82	<u>33.75</u>
	Mule Fat Scrub	1.82	<u>10.35</u>
	Freshwater Seep	1.64	<u>5.22</u>
	Englemann Oak Woodland	1.34	<u>5.08</u>
	Tamarisk Scrub	0.52	<u>0.52</u>
	Southern Riparian Forest	0.09	<u>0.11</u>
	Southern Arroyo Willow Riparian Forest	0.000	<u>21.37</u>
	San Dieguito CPA Total	6,894.00	<u>14,702.02</u>
Spring Valley CPA	Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	553.80	<u>896.04</u>
	Native Grassland	117.65	<u>196.07</u>
	Southern Riparian Scrub	49.73	<u>58.59</u>
	Chaparral	32.24	<u>43.52</u>
	Freshwater Marsh	1.29	<u>6.14</u>
	Non-Native Grassland	1.07	<u>0.73</u>
	Freshwater	0.88	<u>0.88</u>
	Spring Valley CPA Total	756.66	<u>1,201.97</u>
Sweetwater CPA	Native Grassland	289.83	<u>868.89</u>
	Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	279.32	<u>2,220.58</u>
	Non-Native Grassland	183.17	<u>244.83</u>
	Southern Riparian Scrub	40.00	<u>83.41</u>
	Coast Live Oak Woodland	23.81	<u>26.42</u>
	Freshwater Marsh	20.00	<u>29.17</u>
	Chaparral	6.13	<u>295.64</u>
	Disturbed Wetland	5.76	<u>21.91</u>
	Southern Riparian Forest	5.61	<u>57.91</u>
	Freshwater	3.25	<u>3.26</u>
	Open Water	0.58	<u>444.80</u>
	Non-Vegetated Channel, Floodway, Lakeshore Fringe	0.05	<u>0.05</u>
	Southern Willow Scrub	0.00	<u>0</u>
Sweetwater CPA Total	857.53	<u>4,296.87</u>	

CPA/Subregion	Habitat Impacted	Total Acres Impacted	Total Existing Habitat Acreage
Valle De Oro CPA	Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	1,019.88	<u>3,176.79</u>
	Native Grassland	46.48	<u>231.74</u>
	Southern Riparian Forest	41.97	<u>83.64</u>
	Southern Riparian Scrub	30.82	<u>47.33</u>
	Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest	23.40	<u>142.17</u>
	Black Oak Woodland	11.23	<u>14.98</u>
	Riparian Woodlands	5.69	<u>208.13</u>
	Chaparral	4.35	<u>17.48</u>
Valle De Oro CPA Continued	Non-Vegetated Channel, Floodway, Lakeshore Fringe	4.31	<u>10.01</u>
	Disturbed Wetland	3.39	<u>17.60</u>
	Freshwater	3.17	<u>5.31</u>
	Non-Native Grassland	3.12	<u>3.12</u>
	Open Water	1.18	<u>17.36</u>
	Coast Live Oak Woodland	0.70	<u>8.27</u>
	Freshwater Marsh	0.53	<u>0.53</u>
	Valle De Oro CPA Total	1,200.22	<u>3,984.46</u>
Valley Center CPA	Chaparral	5,180.51	<u>11,432.80</u>
	Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	3,077.35	<u>7,215.23</u>
	Non-Native Grassland	2,291.60	<u>3,124.46</u>
	Coast Live Oak Woodland	1,628.11	<u>2,973.30</u>
	Field/Pasture	1,119.71	<u>1,402.25</u>
	Engelmann Oak Woodland	314.34	<u>643.99</u>
	Southern Cottonwood-willow Riparian Forest	291.94	586.80
	Coastal Sage-Chaparral Scrub	146.56	687.90
	Southern Willow Scrub	82.06	139.56
	Freshwater	55.28	130.96
	Southern Sycamore-alder Riparian Woodland	29.60	47.20
	Mule Fat Scrub	13.94	26.40
	Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest	9.95	33.29
	Freshwater Marsh	7.81	15.98
	Disturbed Wetland	5.20	0.41
	Alluvial Fan Scrub	4.52	9.03
	Non-Vegetated Channel, Floodway, Lakeshore Fringe	2.52	10.55
	Flat-topped Buckwheat*	1.45	2.22
	Native Grassland	1.24	1.65
	Riparian Woodlands	0.01	0.01
Valley Center CPA Total	14,263.67	28,483.99	

Appendix D, Groundwater Study

- In Appendix D of the Draft EIR, page 12, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Indian Reservations:

Estimated water demand ranges from none on undeveloped lands (Capitan Grande, Cuyapaipe, and Inaja Cosmit Indian Reservations) to over 500 acre-feet per year (afy) on the Barona, Pala, and Rincon Indian Reservations. Barona Indian Reservation, with an estimated groundwater demand of greater than 500 afy has historically exceeded the sustainable yield of its basin. In the 2002 Report on the Need for Emergency Water Supply prepared for the Barona Tribal Authority, the report documented the depleted groundwater supply at the Reservation and concluded that “the groundwater basin will not be able to supply the current demand without significantly exceeding the safe yield.” (Civiltec Engineering, Inc., 2002) Groundwater levels were reported to be at historic lows and some of their existing wells were reported to only operate for short times during a 24-hour period without losing suction due to low pumping levels. In recent years, the tribe has reportedly trucked in water to supplement its declining groundwater supply (Sweeney, 2007).

- In Appendix D of the Draft EIR, page 24, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Lakeside Community Planning Group:

Based upon water level records from these wells, the fractured rock aquifer that underlies this area likely has a very low storage capacity that is subject to rapid declines in water table elevation and groundwater availability. It should be noted that there is no data available to definitively correlate whether the depleted and dry wells were impacted by water demand at the Barona Indian Reservation. The lack of recharge from drought conditions, clustered wells on small residential parcels, and low storage capacity of the aquifer are other potential causal factors to be considered for the depleted wells along Old Barona Road.

- In Appendix D of the Draft EIR, page 31, third paragraph, the following text has been deleted under the heading Large Quantity/Clustered Groundwater Users:

As was discussed in Section 2.4 and Section 2.7.3, the following areas have been identified as having the potential for localized groundwater problems (especially at the height of extended drought periods) from pumping large amounts of groundwater:

1. Ballena Valley: This valley has historically used up to 800 acre-feet of groundwater per principally for agricultural uses. DPLU has records indicating water level declines up to 500 feet in a single summer.
2. ~~Barona Indian Reservation: Greater than 500 acre-feet of groundwater per year is pumped for a golf course, casino, and hotel. The amount of groundwater pumped exceeds the sustainable yield of its basin and the tribe has reportedly trucked in water to supplement its declining groundwater supply.~~

- In Appendix D of the Draft EIR, page 34, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading 50 % Reduction in Storage:

To evaluate potential cumulative impacts to a given basin, the County often requires proposed discretionary projects to conduct a water balance analysis of the basin which involves estimating groundwater recharge through at least a 30-year period, comparing

yearly recharge with proposed extraction for each of those years, tracking cumulative depletion of storage during successive years of storage depletion (drought), and determining if extraction is in excess of sustained yield if the cumulative depletion of storage exceeds 50% of the total storage capacity of a given basin. Because drought conditions cannot be accurately predicted, the utilization of 30 years of historical precipitation data ensures that a reasonably foreseeable drought condition will be evaluated..... To assure sustainable groundwater use through drought conditions, the resulting sustainable yield for a basin as calculated from the water balance analysis is a fraction of average annual groundwater recharge. Further details regarding the conservative nature of the 50% criterion are contained within the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance – Groundwater Resources (DPLU, 2007, p.22-24).

- In Appendix D of the Draft EIR, page 35, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Guideline for Determining Significance:

For land uses proposed at the maximum build-out allowed under the GP Update, groundwater impacts will be considered potentially significant if a soil moisture balance, conducted using at least 304 years of precipitation data, concludes that at any time groundwater in storage within a basin is reduced to a level of 50% or less of maximum theoretical storage as a result of groundwater extraction.

- In Appendix D of the Draft EIR, page 35, third paragraph, the following text has been added under the heading Methodology:

To estimate cumulative impacts to each basin, the soil moisture balance methodology was used to calculate groundwater recharge on a monthly basis for a 34-year time period (July 1971 through June 2005). The County had previously compiled over 50,000 precipitation records from the years 1971 through 2001 that were readily available for this study. The study included an additional four years beyond the 30 year period to ensure inclusion of the below average period of rainfall that occurred from 1998 to 2004 and the above average rainfall year in 2004-2005.

- In Appendix D of the Draft EIR, page 36, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Methodology:

Section 2.9.1 identified ~~five~~four areas (Ballena Valley, ~~Barona Indian Reservation~~, Guatay, Julian Town Center, and Morena Village) as having the potential for localized groundwater problems from pumping large amounts of groundwater.

- In Appendix D of the Draft EIR, page 42, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Indian Reservations:

The Barona Indian Reservation historically has exceededs the sustainable yield of its basin and has reportedly trucked in water to supplement its declining water supply. Since the Reservation is known to have ~~be exceeded~~ing its sustainable yield, this must be accounted for in future groundwater resources planning for the unincorporated land adjacent to the Barona Reservation. Additionally, approximately 20 off-Reservation residences along Old Barona Road have reported seriously depleted to dry wells. It should be noted that there is no data available to definitively correlate whether the depleted and dry wells were impacted by water demand at the Barona Indian Reservation. The lack of recharge from drought

conditions, clustered wells on small residential parcels, and low storage capacity of the aquifer are other potential causal factors to be considered for the depleted wells along Old Barona Road. ~~As shown in Table 3-9, the Barona Indian Reservation is estimated to use greater than 500 acre-feet of groundwater per year for its golf course, casino, and hotel (Table 3-9).~~

- In Appendix D of the Draft EIR, page 47, fourth paragraph, the following text has been deleted under the heading Methodology:

These areas were then compared to any historical groundwater level data available to identify areas with the potential for localized groundwater problems. Based on historical water levels, Section 2.9.1 identified Ballena Valley, Guatay, Julian Town Center, and Morena Village as having the potential for localized groundwater problems from pumping large amounts of groundwater. ~~While no historical groundwater information is available for Barona Indian Reservation, it was also included as having potential for localized groundwater problems due to greater than 500 acre-feet of groundwater per year being pumped, which exceeds the sustainable yield of its basin. Additionally, the tribe has reportedly trucked in water to supplement its declining groundwater supply.~~ For many of the generally susceptible areas shown on Figure 3-9, no data or information was available, so groundwater conditions were reported as unknown.

- In Appendix D of the Draft EIR, page 50, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Existing Conditions:

2. Barona (42%): The results indicate that groundwater in storage on average is estimated to be approximately 80% of maximum theoretical storage during the 34-years evaluated and impacts may occur within the basin during the driest years. Of the estimated existing demand of 645 afy, approximately 557 afy is estimated to be pumped from the Barona Indian Reservation. The amount of groundwater pumped by the Barona Reservation has historically exceeded ~~the~~ sustainable yield of its basin and the tribe has reportedly trucked in water to supplement its declining depleted ~~declining~~ groundwater supply. It should be noted that there is no data available to definitively correlate whether the depleted and dry wells in nearby residences along Old Barona Road have been impacted by water demand at the Barona Indian Reservation. ~~Development adjacent and nearby the Reservation may be impacted by tribal pumping.~~

- In Appendix D of the Draft EIR, page 54, second paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Large Quantity/Clustered Groundwater Users:

1. Ballena Valley
~~2. Barona Indian Reservation~~
~~3. Guatay~~
~~4. Julian Town Center~~
~~5. Morena Village~~

- In Appendix D of the Draft EIR, page 59, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Indian Reservations:

As discussed in Section 3.1.2.3, this study has not included any groundwater recharge or storage from Indian Reservations in the basin-by-basin analysis ~~with the exception of the~~

~~Barona Reservation. As such, this water is not considered in this study as a potential benefit for future groundwater users in the unincorporated portion of the County.~~

- In Appendix D of the Draft EIR, page 68, first paragraph, the following text has been deleted under the heading 50 % Reduction in Storage:

~~In addition, some of these basins may be receiving substantial septic or irrigation return flows from imported water within the adjacent CWA area. The Pala/Pauma area is particularly troublesome as it is also artificially constrained by Indian Reservations and there are many large agricultural users located in the adjacent CWA area, which is not accounted for. Results in these areas should be used with caution as there may be more or less long-term availability of groundwater resources than the results indicate.~~

- In Appendix D of the Draft EIR, page 68, second paragraph, the following text has been added under the heading 50 % Reduction in Storage:

The Pala and Pauma basins are particularly troublesome as each is artificially constrained by both the CWA and Indian Reservations. Within the adjacent CWA area there are many large agricultural users which are not accounted for. Only 35% of the Pauma basin and 30% of the Pala basin was actually within the study boundaries. Each basin was cut into multiple noncontiguous pieces. Based on these limitations, the results in these areas cannot be relied upon for a screening level assessment of either basin.

- In Appendix D of the Draft EIR,, page 68, third paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading 50 % Reduction in Storage:

~~Basin Boundaries: The study was conducted in 86 hydrologic basins to provide a generalized assessment of groundwater resources within the study area. To more accurately reflect longterm groundwater availability would require many of the larger basins to be sub-divided into smaller basins. This would likely result in hundreds of individual sub-basins, which is well beyond the time and resources allocated to this study. Therefore, site-specific groundwater investigations are necessary for future groundwater-dependent discretionary permits in which the specific project's tributary basin would be analyzed. However, this study did include the subdivision of basins to aid in the calibration process (Morena Village, Pine Valley) or in which there was data that indicated the potential for localized groundwater problems (Guatay, Morena Village, and Julian). ~~or, to aid in the calibration process (Pine Valley) . Furthermore, site-specific groundwater investigations are necessary for future groundwater-dependent discretionary permits in which the specific project's tributary basin would be analyzed.~~~~

- In Appendix D of the Draft EIR, page 68, fourth paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading 50 % Reduction in Storage:

~~This provides a generalized estimate of demand, but is subject to substantial error. One demand category which was not quantified due to lack of readily available data was groundwater exportation activities such as those taking place on Palomar Mountain. Additionally, it is impossible at this scale to catch all of the small details of local groundwater pumping which is occurring, which is only possible through site-specific groundwater investigations.~~

- In Appendix D of the Draft EIR, page 70, the following reference has been added under the heading References:

Civiltec Engineering, Inc. Report on the Need for Emergency Water Supply. Prepared for the Barona Tribal Water Authority. May 28, 2002.

- In Appendix D of the Draft EIR, page 72, the following reference has been added under the heading References:

SWRCB, Hydrologic Units for Region 7.
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/coloradoriver/publications_forms/publications/docs/rwgcb_basin_1986.pdf
http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/sandiego/water_issues/programs/basin_plan/docs/sdrwgcb_basinplanmap.pdf

Appendix E, Proposed Road Construction/Widening Table

- In Appendix E of the Draft EIR, page E-2, the Proposed Road Construction/Widening table has been revised as follows:

CPA/Subregion	Road	Segment	Existing Number of Lanes	Proposed Number of Lanes
Mountain Empire	State Route 188	SR 94 south to Tecate, MX	2	4-6
	State Route 94	Boundary with Jamul to Buckman Springs Road	≥ 4	≥ 4

Appendix F, Noise Technical Report

- No revisions were made to this appendix.

Appendix G, Traffic and Circulation Assessment

- In Appendix G of the Draft EIR, page 10, third paragraph, the following text has been added under the heading Unincorporated County:

Road 3A was added to the Referral Map and the Cumulative Analysis within the Valley Center Community Planning Area (CPA) as the only network variation from the Board-Endorsed network. Road 3A is a two-lane Light Collector road which traverses from Old Highway 395 to West Lilac Road in the Valley Center Community Planning Area.

Appendix H, Traffic Impacts to Adjacent City Jurisdiction Report

- In Appendix H of the Draft EIR, page 7, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Impact Significance Criteria:

The cities of Carlsbad, Del Mar, El Cajon, Encinitas, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, National City, Oceanside, Poway, ~~San Diego~~, San Marcos, Santee, Solana Beach, and Vista utilize the *SANTEC/ITE Guidelines for Traffic Impact Studies (TIS) in the San Diego Region* as the basis for defining project impacts.

- In Appendix H of the Draft EIR, page 8, first sentence, the following text has been revised under the heading Impact Significance Criteria:

The following ~~two~~ three jurisdictions have modified requirements from those stated above:

- In Appendix H of the Draft EIR, page 8, fourth paragraph, the following text has been added:

City of San Diego

The City of San Diego considers D to be the acceptable LOS for freeways, roadways and intersections, except in undeveloped locations where LOS C is considered to be acceptable. The City of San Diego uses the same thresholds identified in Table 2.15-23, SANTEC/ITE Measures of Significant Project Traffic Impacts, for projects resulting in LOS E. However, the City of San Diego applies the following thresholds for projects resulting in LOS F: 1) freeways are allowed up to a 0.005 change in V/C or 0.5 mph; 2) roadways are allowed up to a 0.01 change in V/C or 0.5 mph; 3) intersections are allowed a 1.0 second delay; and 4) ramp meters are allowed a 1.0 minute delay.

- In Appendix H of the Draft EIR, pages 9 through 16, the following revisions have been made to Table 3.1, Roadway Level of Service by Jurisdiction Existing Conditions:

Roadway	Segment	Classification	Capacity (LOS E)	ADT	LOS
San Diego					
Airway Rd	Michael Faraday Dr to SR-905	2-lane Collector	40 9,000	6,600	C
Siempre Viva Rd	La Media Rd to SR- 905 <u>125</u>	6-lane Major Arterial ⁽¹⁾	50,000	10,900	A
	SR- 905 <u>125</u> to Enrico Fermi Dr	6 <u>4</u> -lane Major Arterial	5 40,000	19,400	B -A

Notes:

Bold letters indicate substandard LOS.

CLTL = Continuous left-turn lane.

⁽¹⁾ The segment of Siempre Viva Road between La Media Road and Avenida Costa Brava/Melksee Street is not currently constructed to a 6-lane major arterial, and would have a LOS E capacity of 22,500 ADT, resulting in an acceptable LOS B along this segment.

- In Appendix H of the Draft EIR, pages 18 through 25, the following revisions have been made to Table 4.1, 2030 Forecast Roadway level of Service by Jurisdiction Existing County of San Diego General Plan:

Roadway	Segment	Classification	Capacity (LOS E)	ADT	LOS
San Diego					
Airway Rd	Michael Faraday Dr to SR-905	2-lane Collector	49,000	16,100	F
Siempre Viva Rd	La Media Rd to SR- 905-125	6-lane Major Arterial	50,000	18,000	A
	SR- 905-125 to Enrico Fermi Dr	6 4-lane Major Arterial	540,000	50,700	F
San Marcos					
Twin Oaks Valley Rd	Deer Springs Rd to Buena Creek Rd	4-lane Major Secondary Arterial	340,000	22,000	D C
	Buena Creek Rd to Olive St	4-lane Major Arterial	40,000	20,900	B
La Cieniega Rd	Twin Oak Valley Rd to Mulberry Dr	4-lane Secondary Arterial 2-lane Collector	30,000 15,000	6,300	B A
Mulberry Dr	Olive St to La Cieniega Rd	4-lane Secondary Arterial 2-Lane Collector	30,000 15,000	6,200	B A

- In Appendix H of the Draft EIR, pages 27 through 33, the following revisions have been made to Table 4.3, 2030 Forecast Roadway level of Service by Jurisdiction County of San Diego General Plan Update (Referral Map):

Roadway	Segment	Classification	Capacity (LOS E)	ADT	LOS
City of San Diego					
Airway Rd	Michael Faraday Dr to SR-905	2-lane Collector	49,000	17,500	F
Siempre Viva Rd	La Media Rd to SR- 905-125	6-lane Major Arterial	50,000	19,500	A
	SR- 905-125 to Enrico Fermi Dr	6 4-lane Major Arterial	540,000	59,300	F
San Marcos					
Twin Oaks Valley Rd	Deer Springs Rd to Buena Creek Rd	4-lane Major Secondary Arterial	30,000 40,000	25,000	C E
	Buena Creek Rd to Olive St	4-lane Major Arterial	40,000	20,100	B
La Cieniega Rd	Twin Oak Valley Rd to Mulberry Dr	4-lane Secondary Arterial 2-lane Collector	15,000	5,600	B A
Mulberry Dr	Olive St to La Cieniega Rd	4-lane Secondary Arterial 2-lane Collector	30, 15,000	3,700	A

- In Appendix H of the Draft EIR, page 34, first paragraph, the following text has been revised:

As shown, a total of ~~412~~ out of 197 analyzed roadway segments in the adjacent incorporated jurisdictions are projected to operate at substandard LOS.

- In Appendix H of the Draft EIR, page 34, the following revisions have been made to Table 4.4, Summary of Roadway Segments Operating at Substandard LOS County of San Diego General Plan Update (Referral Map):

Jurisdiction	Total Number Analyzed	Number of Deficient Roadway Segments
San Marcos	11	<u>3</u> 4
Total	197	<u>41</u> 42

- In Appendix H of the Draft EIR, pages 35 through 44, the following revisions have been made to Table 5.1, Significant Traffic Impacts Existing County of San Diego General Plan vs. Existing Conditions (Existing Plan to Ground):

Roadway	Segment	Existing			Existing GP			Δ in V/C	Significant Impact?
		ADT	V/C	LOS	ADT	V/C	LOS		
San Diego									
Airway Rd	Michael Faraday Dr to SR-905	6,600	<u>0.73</u> 0.66	C	16,100	<u>1.78</u> 1.61	F	<u>1.05</u> 0.95	Yes
Siempre Viva Rd	La Media Rd to SR- 905 425	10,900	0.22 ⁽¹⁾	A ⁽¹⁾	18,000	0.36	A	0.14	No
	SR- 905 425 to Enrico Fermi Dr	19,400	<u>0.49</u> 0.39	B A	50,700	<u>1.27</u> 1.01	F	<u>0.78</u> 0.62	Yes
San Marcos									
Twin Oaks Valley Rd	Deer Springs Rd to Buena Creek Rd	16,800	1.12	F	22,000	<u>0.55</u> 0.73	C D	<u>-0.57</u> 0.39	No
	Buena Creek Rd to Olive St	11,800	0.79	D	20,900	0.52	B	-0.27	No
La Cieniega Rd	Twin Oak Valley Rd to Mulberry Dr	5,100	0.34	B	6,300	<u>0.42</u> 0.21	B A	<u>0.08</u> -0.13	No
Mulberry Dr	Olive St to La Cieniega Rd	1,800	0.12	A	6,200	<u>0.41</u> 0.21	B A	<u>0.29</u> 0.09	No

Notes:

Bold letters indicate substandard LOS.

Δ in V/C = The change in the volume to capacity ratio between the two scenarios.

N/A = This segment does not currently exist.

⁽¹⁾ The segment of Siempre Viva Road between La Media Rd and Avenida Costa Brava/Melksee Street is not currently constructed to a 6-lane major arterial, and would have a LOS E capacity of 22,500 ADT, resulting in an acceptable LOS B along this segment and a V/C ratio of .48.

- In Appendix H of the Draft EIR, pages 46 through 54, the following revisions have been made to Table 5.3, Significant Traffic Impacts County of San Diego General Plan Update (Referral Map) vs. Existing Conditions (Proposed Plan to Ground):

Roadway	Segment	Existing			Existing GP			Δ in V/C	Significant Impact?
		ADT	V/C	LOS	ADT	V/C	LOS		
San Diego									
Airway Rd	Michael Faraday Dr to SR-905	6,600	0.73 0.66	C	17,500	1.94 1.75	F	1.21 1.09	Yes
Siempre Viva Rd	La Media Rd to SR-905 425	10,900	0.22 ⁽¹⁾	A ⁽¹⁾	19,500	0.39	A	0.17	No
	SR-905 425 to Enrico Fermi Dr	19,400	0.48 0.39	B A	59,300	1.48 1.19	F	1.00 0.80	Yes
San Marcos									
Twin Oaks Valley Rd	Deer Springs Rd to Buena Creek Rd	16,800	1.12	F	25,000	0.62 0.83	C E	-0.50 -0.29	No
	Buena Creek Rd to Olive St	11,800	0.79	D	20,100	0.50	B	-0.289	No
La Cieniega Rd	Twin Oak Valley Rd to Mulberry Dr	5,100	0.34	B	5,600	0.39 0.19	B A	0.03 0.15	No
Mulberry Dr	Olive St to La Cieniega Rd	1,800	0.12	A	3,700	0.24 0.12	A	0.12 0.00	No

Notes:

Bold letters indicate substandard LOS.

Δ in V/C = The change in the volume to capacity ratio between the two scenarios.

N/A = This segment does not currently exist.

⁽¹⁾ The segment of Siempre Viva Road between La Media Rd and Avenida Costa Brava/Melksee Street is not currently constructed to a 6-lane major arterial, and would have a LOS E capacity of 22,500 ADT, resulting in an acceptable LOS B along this segment and a V/C ratio of .48.

- In Appendix H of the Draft EIR, pages 56 through 64, the following revisions have been made to Table 5.5, Significant Traffic Impacts County of San Diego General Plan Update (Referral Map) vs. Existing County of San Diego General Plan (Proposed Plan to Existing Plan):

Roadway	Segment	Existing GP			GP Update			Δ in V/C	Significant Impact?
		ADT	V/C	LOS	ADT	V/C	LOS		
San Diego									
Airway Rd	Michael Faraday Dr to SR-905	16,100	<u>1.78</u> 1.64	F	17,500	<u>1.94</u> 1.75	F	<u>0.16</u> 0.14	Yes
Siempre Viva Rd	La Media Rd to SR-905 425	18,000	0.36	A	19,500	0.39	A	0.03	No
	SR-905 425 to Enrico Fermi Dr	50,700	<u>1.26</u> 1.04	F	59,300	<u>1.48</u> 1.19	F	<u>0.22</u> 0.18	Yes
San Marcos									
Twin Oaks Valley Rd	Deer Springs Rd to Buena Creek Rd	22,000	<u>0.55</u> 0.73	C	25,000	<u>0.62</u> 0.83	C	<u>0.07</u> 0.10	No Yes
	Buena Creek Rd to Olive St	20,900	0.52	B	20,100	0.50	B	-0.02	No
La Cieniega Rd	Twin Oak Valley Rd to Mulberry Dr	6,300	<u>0.42</u> 0.24	<u>B</u> A	5,600	<u>0.37</u> 0.19	<u>B</u> A	<u>-0.04</u> 0.02	No
Mulberry Dr	Olive St to La Cieniega Rd	6,200	<u>0.41</u> 0.24	<u>B</u> A	3,700	<u>0.24</u> 0.12	A	<u>-0.17</u> 0.09	No

- In Appendix H of the Draft EIR, page 65, the following revisions have been made to Table 5.6, Summary of Significantly Impacted Segments County of San Diego General Plan Update (Referral Map) vs. Existing County of San Diego General Plan (Proposed Plan to Existing Plan):

Jurisdiction	Total Number Analyzed	Number of Significantly Impacted Segments
San Marcos	11	<u>2</u> 3
Total	197	<u>13</u> 14

- In Appendix H of the Draft EIR, pages 65, second paragraph, the following text has been revised:

As shown, a total of 13 ~~14~~ roadway segments within the adjacent incorporated jurisdictions would be significantly impacted based upon the comparison of the County's proposed General Plan (Referral Map) to the Existing General Plan.

- In Appendix H of the Draft EIR, page 67, the following revisions have been made to Table 6.1, Summary of Roadway Segments Operating at Substandard LOS:

Jurisdiction	Existing Conditions	Existing General Plan	General Plan Update
San Marcos	1	3	<u>4</u> 3
Total	56	43	<u>41</u> 42

- In Appendix H of the Draft EIR, pages 68 and 69, the following revisions have been made to Table 6.2, Significantly Impacted Roadway Segments Existing County of San Diego General Plan vs. Existing Conditions (Existing Plan to Ground):

Roadway	Segment	Existing			Existing GP			Δ in V/C
		ADT	V/C	LOS	ADT	V/C	LOS	
San Diego								
Airway Rd	Michael Faraday Dr to SR-905	6,600	<u>0.73</u> 0.66	C	16,100	<u>1.78</u> 1.64	F	<u>1.05</u> 0.95
Siempre Viva Rd	SR-905 425 to Enrico Fermi Dr	19,400	<u>0.49</u> 0.39	<u>B</u> A	50,700	<u>1.27</u> 1.04	F	<u>0.78</u> 0.62

- In Appendix H of the Draft EIR, pages 70 and 71, the following revisions have been made to Table 6.3, Significantly Impacted Roadway Segments County of San Diego General Plan Update (Referral Map) vs. Existing Conditions (Proposed Plan to Ground):

Roadway	Segment	Existing			GP Update			Δ in V/C
		ADT	V/C	LOS	ADT	V/C	LOS	
San Diego								
Airway Rd	Michael Faraday Dr to SR-905	6,600	<u>0.73</u> 0.66	C	17,500	<u>1.94</u> 1.75	F	<u>1.21</u> 1.09
Siempre Viva Rd	SR-905 425 to Enrico Fermi Dr	19,400	<u>0.48</u> 0.39	<u>B</u> A	59,300	<u>1.48</u> 1.19	F	<u>1.00</u> 0.80

- In Appendix H of the Draft EIR, pages 72 and 73, the following revisions have been made to Table 6.4, Significantly Impacted Roadway Segments County of San Diego General Plan Update (Referral Map) vs. Existing County of San Diego General Plan (Proposed Plan to Existing Plan):

Roadway	Segment	Existing GP			GP Update			Δ in V/C
		ADT	V/C	LOS	ADT	V/C	LOS	
San Diego								
Airway Rd	Michael Faraday Dr to SR-905	16,100	<u>1.78</u> 1.64	F	17,500	<u>1.94</u> 1.75	F	<u>0.16</u> 0.14
Siempre Viva Rd	SR-905 to Enrico Fermi Dr	50,700	<u>1.26</u> 1.04	F	59,300	<u>1.48</u> 1.19	F	<u>0.22</u> 0.18
San Marcos								
Twin Oaks Valley Rd	Deer Springs Rd to Buena Creek Rd	22,000	0.73	D	25,000	0.83	E	0.10

Appendix I, Rationale for Accepting Roadways with Level of Service E/F

- In Appendix I of the Draft EIR, the Impacted Roadway Segment and Supporting Rationale for LOS E/F Level Acceptance table has been revised as follows:

Roadway/Segment Limits	Proposed Classification/ Forecast	Alternative Classification (LOS D or Better)	Rational for Proposed Classification and LOS E/F
Alpine			
Alpine Boulevard Willows Rd to New Viejas Road at New Interchange	2.1E 2-Ln Community Collector LOS E (12.7K ADT)	2.1C 2-Ln Community Collector with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Constraints – Located in area with steep slopes and biologically sensitive vegetation.
Ramona			
Main Street/SR-78 9th St to 11th St	4-Ln State Highway 4.1B: 4-Ln Major Road with Intermittent Turn Lanes / 4.2B: 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes LOS E (31.0K ADT)	6.2 4.1A: 6 4-Ln Major Road with Raised Median Prime Arterial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Town Center – Widening Main Street / SR-78 to six lanes would adversely impact existing businesses. Marginal Deficiency - LOS failing only in short segment. Address traffic congestion through operational improvements such as right-turn lanes. Community Consensus – Planning Group preference is to retain road at four lanes.
Sweetwater			
Sweetwater Road Willow St to Orchard Hill Rd	2.1C.4A 2-Ln Community Collector with Raised Median Intermittent Turn Lanes LOS E (16.5K ADT)	4.2B 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Established Land Development Patterns – Widening road to four lanes would adversely impact existing dwelling units and County Park. Community Consensus – Consistent with community preference.

Appendix J, Single Year, Normal-Year and Multiple Dry Water Years UWMP Supply and Demand Assessments

- No revisions were made to this appendix.

Appendix K, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory

- No revisions were made to this appendix.

Appendix L, Project Alternatives Areas of Difference

- In Appendix L of the Draft EIR, page 3.17, the following revisions have been made to the Bonsall Table, BO5: Site Analysis:

Property Description	Site Analysis	Land Use Alternatives
Context: Four areas used as mostly extractive industry and undeveloped land. In between the two areas lie open-space parks public lands owned by the City of Oceanside and the <u>San Diego Water Authority</u> as well as agricultural vineyard.	Other: N/A	CSG Recommendation: None

- In Appendix L of the Draft EIR, page 8.11, FB3, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Discussion:

The Referral and Hybrid Maps reflect plans that would yield approximately 1,111 ~~1,400~~ units whereas the Draft Land Use Map would yield approximately 1,892 ~~1,800~~ units.

- In Appendix L of the Draft EIR, page 12.8, ME3: Site Analysis, has been revised as follows:

Property Description
Referral Name [#] Starkey [164]
Location/Description: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 146.9 <u>162</u> ac (1 parcel) Outside CWA boundary North of I-8 and east of La Posta Truck Trail
Existing General Plan: (17) 1 du/ 2,4 <u>8</u> ac
Context: This AOD is comprised of <u>two residential dwelling units</u> along with irrigated agricultural land uses <u>undeveloped land</u> bordered to the west by rural residential land.

- In Appendix L of the Draft EIR, page 22.10, VC3: Site Analysis, has been revised as follows:

Site Analysis
Other: Fire Service Deficiency – This site is an area of transition from a 13-minute to 23-minute response region. This conflicts with the Referral and Hybrid Map designations of SR-2 which requires a response time of at least 13-minutes; <u>however, a fire station is planned nearby at Cole Grade Road.</u>

- In Appendix L of the Draft EIR, page 22.10, VC3, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Discussion:

The Referral and Hybrid Maps provide an SR-2 designation consistent with the area to the east. The Draft Land Use Map has an RL-20 designation consistent with the area to the

west. The Mobility Element road network proposes a new east-west road to the south of this property that would connect Cole Grade Road with Old Highway 395.

- In Appendix L of the Draft EIR, page 22.36, VC10, first paragraph, the following text has been revised under the heading Discussion:

The AOD is not a specific referral but contains mapping differences for the same rationale as VC9, 11 and 20. An east-west Mobility Element road is proposed to the south of this AOD and would connect Old Highway 395 and Cole Grade Road.

Appendix M, Environmentally Superior Map Comparison to Referral Map

- No revisions were made to this appendix.

This page intentionally left blank.