
SUMMARY

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 also include responses to comments, a summary of revisions to the Draft EIR, and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the General Plan Update.

This chapter highlights the proposed actions and consequences in the environmental analysis for the General Plan Update, as required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15123. It also provides a brief description of the General Plan Update, project objectives, alternatives to the General Plan Update, areas of controversy, and issues to be resolved. In addition, Table S-1 at the end of this chapter provides the following information: 1) the direct and cumulative impacts that would occur from implementation of the General Plan Update; 2) the significance of impact before mitigation; 3) the recommended mitigation measures that would avoid or reduce significant environmental impacts; and 4) the significance of impact after mitigation measures are implemented. Finally, Table S-2 compares the anticipated impacts of the General Plan Update with those of each project alternative.

S.1 Overview

As required by CEQA, Volumes I and II of this EIR: 1) assess the potentially significant direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental effects of the General Plan Update; 2) identify potential feasible means of avoiding or substantially lessening significant adverse impacts; and 3) evaluate a range of reasonable alternatives to the General Plan Update, including the required No Project Alternative. The County of San Diego is the “lead agency” for the General Plan Update evaluated in Volumes I and II of this EIR, and has the principal responsibility for certifying the EIR and approving the General Plan Update. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Volumes I and II of this EIR consist of an EIR that evaluates the effects of the entire General Plan Update. This EIR will be used by the County of San Diego to evaluate the environmental implications of adopting the General Plan Update.

S.2 Project Description

San Diego County is located in the southwestern corner of California. It is bordered by Riverside and Orange Counties to the north; Imperial County to the east; the Federal Republic of Mexico to the south; and the Pacific Ocean to the west. The unincorporated area of the County encompasses approximately 2.3 million acres and is divided into 24 planning areas. Fifteen of the planning areas are referred to as Community Planning Areas (CPAs) and nine areas are called Subregional Planning Areas (Subregions). The 15 CPAs are Alpine, Bonsall, County Islands, Fallbrook, Julian, Lakeside, Pendleton/De Luz, Pepper Drive/Bostonia, Rainbow, Ramona, San Dieguito, Spring Valley, Sweetwater, Valle de Oro, and Valley Center. The nine Subregions are Central Mountain, Crest/Dehesa/Harbison, Canyon/Granite Hills, Desert, Jamul/Dulzura, Mountain Empire, North County Metro, North Mountain, Otay, and Pala/Pauma Valley. Pepper Drive/Bostonia will be merged into the Lakeside CPA with the adoption of the General Plan Update to reduce the total planning areas to 24. For the purpose of this EIR and the impact analysis, Pepper Drive/Bostonia is included in the Lakeside CPA. In some cases,

Subregions are further divided by planning sponsor group areas where a group has been formed pursuant to County policy to represent a specified area.

The purpose of the County of San Diego General Plan Update is to establish a blueprint for future land development projects in the unincorporated County that meets community desires and balances the environmental protection goals with the need for housing, agriculture, infrastructure, and economic vitality. The General Plan Update applies to all of the unincorporated portions of San Diego County and will direct population growth and plan for infrastructure needs, development, and resource protection. The update to the existing General Plan includes the adoption of new General Plan elements, which set the goals and policies that guide future development. The General Plan Update will focus population growth in the western areas of the County where infrastructure and services are available in order to reduce the potential for growth in the eastern areas. The objectives of this population distribution strategy are to: 1) facilitate efficient, orderly growth by containing development within areas potentially served by the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) or other existing infrastructure; 2) protect natural resources through the reduction of population capacity in sensitive areas; and 3) retain or enhance the character of communities within the unincorporated County. The SDCWA service area approximately covers the western one third of the unincorporated County. The SDWCA boundary generally represents where water and wastewater infrastructure currently exist. This area is more developed than the eastern areas of the unincorporated County, and would accommodate more growth under the proposed General Plan Update.

S.3 Project Objectives

The General Plan Update is based on a set of ten interrelated principles (objectives) that provide guidance for accommodating future growth while retaining and enhancing the County's rural character, economy, and unique communities, as well as minimizing the environmental impacts of future development. These principles serve as the proposed project objectives.

The proposed General Plan Update would:

1. Support a reasonable share of projected regional population growth.
2. Promote sustainability by locating new development near existing infrastructure, services, and jobs.
3. Reinforce the vitality, local economy, and individual character of existing communities while balancing housing, employment, and recreational opportunities.
4. Promote environmental stewardship that protects the range of natural resources and habitats that uniquely define the County's character and ecological importance.
5. Ensure that development accounts for physical constraints and the natural hazards of the land.
6. Provide and support a multi-modal transportation network that enhances connectivity and supports community development patterns.
7. Maintain environmentally sustainable communities and reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that contribute to climate change.

8. Preserve agriculture as an integral component of the region's economy, character, and open space network.
9. Minimize public costs of infrastructure and services and correlate their timing with new development.
10. Recognize community and stakeholder interests while striving for consensus.

S.4 Impact Summary

Volume I of this EIR examines the potential environmental effects from implementation of the General Plan Update, including information related to existing site conditions, analyses of the types and magnitude of individual and cumulative environmental impacts, and feasible mitigation measures that could reduce or avoid environmental impacts. In accordance with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the potential environmental effects of the General Plan Update are analyzed for the following issue areas:

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation and Traffic
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Global Climate Change

Table S-1, presented at the end of this chapter, provides a summary of the environmental impacts that could result from implementation of the General Plan Update and feasible mitigation measures that could reduce or avoid environmental impacts. For each impact, Table S-1 identifies the significance of the impact before mitigation, applicable mitigation measures, and the level of significance of the impact after the implementation of the mitigation measures.

S.5 Alternatives to the General Plan Update

The following alternatives were analyzed in Volume I of this EIR and compared to the Referral Map, which is the proposed project land use map for the General Plan Update. With the exception of the No Project Alternative, the Referral Map is the most environmentally impactful alternative. The objective of the alternatives analysis is to consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives to foster informed decision-making and public participation. The General Plan Update alternatives include:

- **Hybrid Map Alternative.** The Hybrid Map Alternative represents a balance between the proposed project and the Draft Land Use Map Alternative. It includes Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) refinements, road network land use changes, and other refinements to the proposed project.

- **Draft Land Use Map Alternative.** The Draft Land Use Map Alternative was endorsed by the County of San Diego Board of Supervisors (BOS). It includes additional residential land use refinements related to meeting the RHNA and additional land use modifications to achieve a road network that would better accommodate the land use map.
- **Environmentally Superior Map Alternative.** The Draft Environmentally Superior Map Alternative reflects a more stringent application of the planning concepts that take into account environmental considerations and constraints, and is more aggressive in restricting growth in portions of the semi-rural residential and the rural lands designations.
- **No Project Alternative.** The No Project Alternative assumes that the existing General Plan would remain in effect and is represented by the land use map, goals and policies for the existing General Plan.

Detailed descriptions and an analysis of the potential impacts of each alternative are presented in Chapter 4.0, Project Alternatives, in Volume I of this EIR. Table S-2 presents the significant environmental impacts of these alternatives compared to those of the General Plan Update. The environmentally superior alternative would be the Environmentally Superior Map Alternative. This alternative would take into account environmental considerations and constraints, and is more aggressive in restricting growth in the unincorporated County and would, therefore, reduce some of the significant impacts that would occur from the General Plan Update related to air quality, biological resources, and hydrology and water quality. The Environmentally Superior Map Alternative would accomplish all of the objectives identified for the proposed project with varying levels of fulfillment. For two of the ten project objectives, the Environmentally Superior Map Alternative would only partially fulfill the project objectives identified for the proposed project. For eight of the ten objectives the Environmentally Superior Map Alternative would adequately fulfill the objectives, similar to the proposed project.

S.6 Areas of Controversy and Issues to be Resolved by the Decision Making Body

Areas of Controversy Known to the Lead Agency

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

- Location and intensity of planned land uses and residential densities
- Perceived taking of property or development rights
- Absence of an equity mechanism such as transfer of development rights
- Impacts to roads within adjacent jurisdictions
- Impacts to facilities and other infrastructure in adjacent jurisdictions' spheres of influence
- Consistency with SB 375

-
- Finding balance between preservation of natural resources and risk from fire hazards
 - Water availability and supply
 - Consistency between community plans and other general plan components
 - Method of achieving conservation (compact or clustered) subdivision design
 - Compatibility with conservation plans and special area management plans
 - Treatment of Forest Conservation Initiative lands
 - Treatment of existing private development projects under consideration by County that are not consistent with the proposed project
 - Estimating population growth and adequately accommodating the growth that is projected
 - Perceived special treatment of certain properties or lack thereof

Issues to be Resolved by the Decision Making Body

The County of San Diego BOS serves as the decision making body for the General Plan Update. The following is a description of issues related to the General Plan Update that must be resolved by the BOS prior to or at the time of project approval and EIR certification. Prior to the BOS taking final action on these issues, recommendations will be developed by the Department of Planning and Land Use and the Planning Commission. In developing these recommendations and rendering a decision, the County will consider input provided by the public, other agencies, the community planning groups, and the General Plan Update advisory groups. Additionally, the decisions of the Planning Commission and BOS will be made in public hearings at which public comment is invited.

- **Final Composition of the General Plan Update Land Use Map.** The BOS must decide on the final composition of the General Plan Update land use map, specifically addressing which land use designations will be assigned to specific properties. This EIR evaluates the Referral Map as the proposed project, along with three land use map alternatives: the Hybrid Map Alternative, the Draft Land Use Map Alternative, and the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The proposed project and alternatives represent a range of development intensities with similar types of environmental effects but with differing degrees of impact. Detailed evaluations of the differences between the Referral Map and two of the alternatives are included in Appendix L of the EIR, Project Alternatives Areas of Difference, to inform the BOS' decision. It is likely that the BOS will approve a land use map that represents a combination of the alternatives where a designation on a particular property is the same as on one of the alternatives or within the range that is evaluated in the EIR. Should the BOS decide to approve a designation that is beyond the range that is considered in this EIR, additional analysis may be necessary prior to certification of the EIR.
- **General Plan Update Text, Roadway Network, and Other Components.** The BOS must decide on the final composition of the General Plan elements, circulation maps, and other components of the project. During the course of the project, the County has compiled countless comments and recommendations from advisory groups, community groups, agencies, and other stakeholders. DPLU has continually sought consensus but a variety of opposing opinions remain. The BOS will make a final ruling in these areas of differing opinion, which will be reflected in the text or maps of the General Plan or in the documents

of other components of the project. Specifically, items that will likely be considered include the wording of General Plan narrative, goals, and policies; the circulation network and road classifications; the land use maps; wording and content of the community plans; content of the General Plan Implementation Plan; and other related components. Any modification made by the BOS to these elements that are outside of the analysis contained in this EIR will require additional analysis prior to approval and certification of the EIR.

- **Proposed Mitigation.** The BOS will evaluate the full array of mitigation measures described in Chapter 7.0 of this EIR and determine whether they represent all feasible measures to substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in this EIR. The BOS may decide to add or alter measures to improve effectiveness in lessening significant environmental effects. Additionally, the BOS may decide that certain measures are inappropriate or infeasible. The BOS would prepare and adopt detailed findings on the feasibility of mitigation measures to substantially lessen or avoid the significant effects on the environment.
- **Consideration of Project Alternatives.** The BOS will evaluate the alternatives discussed in Chapter 5.0 of this EIR. As discussed above, the BOS may decide to adopt part or all of an alternative. For those alternatives that would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in this EIR, the BOS must either adopt the alternative or find it to be infeasible.
- **Benefits of the Project Compared to Environmental Risk.** This EIR has identified adverse environmental effects that are unavoidable. The BOS must determine if the adverse environmental effects are considered acceptable with consideration of economic, legal, social, technological, and other relevant benefits of the General Plan Update. In making this determination, it is relevant for the BOS to consider the existing General Plan in comparison to the proposed General Plan Update. The BOS would prepare a statement of overriding considerations as described in CEQA Section 15093 to reflect the ultimate balancing of competing public objectives if the BOS decides to approve the proposed project or alternatives, which have the potential to cause one or more significant effects on the environment.
- **Project Approval.** Ultimately, the BOS must decide whether or how to approve or carry out the General Plan Update.

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					
1. Scenic Vistas: The proposed General Plan Update would have the potential to result in the obstruction, interruption, or detraction of a scenic vista as a result of future development activity.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-6.2, LU-6.3, LU-6.4, LU-6.6, LU-6.7, LU-6.8, 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
2. Scenic Resources: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would allow development to occur that would have the potential to impact scenic vistas 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.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-6.2, LU-6.3, LU-6.4, LU-6.6, LU-6.7, LU-6.8, 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
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.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-1.6, LU-2.1, LU-2.2, LU-2.4, 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 the mitigation measures identified for Issue 1: Scenic Vistas	Significant and Unavoidable
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 adversely affect day or nighttime views.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	COS-13.1 and COS-13.2	Aes-4.1 and Aes-4.2	Significant and Unavoidable
2.2 Agricultural Resources					
1. Conversion of Agricultural Resources: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in the potential conversion of 55,963 acres of agricultural resources to non-agricultural land uses.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-6.4, LU-7.1, LU-7.2, COS-6.4	Agr-1.1 through Agr-1.5	Significant and Unavoidable
2. Land Use Conflicts: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would not result in 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
3. Indirect Conversion of Agricultural Resources: Implementation of the General Plan Update would redirect high density growth into areas containing agricultural resources and potentially cause some indirect conversion of agricultural resources to non-agricultural use.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	COS-6.2 and COS-6.3, and the policies identified for Issue 1: Conversion of Agricultural Resources	The mitigation measures identified for Issue 1: Conversion of Agricultural Resources would also reduce impacts to indirect conversion of agricultural resources	Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 (Continued)

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policies ⁽¹⁾	Mitigation Measure(s) ⁽¹⁾	Impact After Mitigation
2.3 Air Quality					
1. Air Quality Plans: The proposed General Plan Update would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the RAQS or SIP.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None	None Required	Less Than Significant
2. Air Quality Violations: The proposed General Plan Update would have the potential to result in a violation of an air quality standard.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	COS-14.1, COS-14.2, COS-14.8, COS-14.9, COS-14.10, COS-15.1, COS-15.3, COS-15.4, COS-15.5, COS-16.2, COS-16.3, COS-20.3	Air-2.1 through Air-2.13, and the mitigation measures identified for Issue 1: Compliance with AB 32 in Section 2.17, Global Climate Change	Significant and Unavoidable
3. Non-Attainment Criteria Pollutants: The proposed General Plan Update would have the potential to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in pollutants for which the SDAB is listed as non-attainment.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	COS-14.1, COS-14.2, COS-14.8, COS-14.9, COS-14.10, COS-15.1, COS-15.3, COS-15.4, COS-15.5, COS-16.2, COS-16.3, COS-20.3	The mitigation measures identified for Issue 2: Air Quality Violations would also reduce impacts to the non-attainment criteria pollutants.	Significant and Unavoidable
4. Sensitive Receptors: The proposed General Plan Update would have the potential to result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial amounts TACs or HAPs that would result in a potentially significant increase in cancer risk.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	None	Air-4.1	Significant and Unavoidable
5. Objectionable Odors: The proposed General Plan Update would comply with APCD regulations that require odor sources to reduce impacts to nearby receptors.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None	None Required	Less Than Significant
2.4 Biological Resources					
1. Special Status Species: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would have the potential to directly and indirectly result in impacts to special status species.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	COS-1.3, COS-1.6 through COS-1.11, COS-2.1, COS-2.2, LU-6.1, LU-6.2, LU-6.3, LU-6.4, LU-6.6, LU-6.7, LU-10.2	Bio-1.1 through Bio-1.7	Significant and Unavoidable
2. Riparian Habitat and Other Sensitive Natural Communities: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would have the potential to result in direct and indirect impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	COS-3.1 and the policies for Issue 1: Special Status Species	Bio-2.1 through Bio-2.4 and the mitigation measures identified for Issue 1: Special Status Species	Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 (Continued)

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policies ⁽¹⁾	Mitigation Measure(s) ⁽¹⁾	Impact After Mitigation
3. Federally Protected Wetlands: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would have the potential to result in a potentially significant direct impact to federally protected wetlands.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	COS-3.1 and COS-3.2	Bio-1.1, Bio-1.5, Bio-1.6, Bio-1.7, Bio-2.2, Bio-2.3, Bio-2.4	Less Than Significant
4. Wildlife Movement Corridors and Nursery Sites: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would have the potential to impact wildlife movement corridors.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	COS-1.1 through COS-1.5, LU-6.1, LU-6.7	Bio-1.1, Bio-1.2, Bio-1.3, Bio-1.4, Bio-1.5, Bio-1.6, Bio-1.7, Bio-2.3	Significant and Unavoidable
5. Local Policies and Ordinances: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would not conflict with local biological resources related policies and ordinances.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None	None Required	Less Than Significant
6. Habitat Conservation Plans and Natural Community Conservation Plans: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would not conflict with any applicable HCP or NCCP.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None	None Required	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-1.6	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-2.4	Less Than Significant
3. Paleontological Resources: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in new development that would have the potential to adversely impact unique paleontological resources.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	COS-9.1	Cul-3.1 and Cul-3.2	Less Than Significant
4. Human Remains: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in new development that would have the potential to disturb human remains, including those discovered outside of formal cemeteries.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	COS-7.5	Cul-1.1, Cul-1.6, Cul-4.1	Less Than Significant

Table S-1 (Continued)

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policies ⁽¹⁾	Mitigation Measure(s) ⁽¹⁾	Impact After Mitigation
2.6 Geology and Soils					
<p>1. Exposure to Seismic Related Hazards: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would designate land uses, which would allow development to occur in areas with geological risks, such as seismically induced ground shaking, liquefaction, and landslides. However, future development would be required to comply with all relevant federal, State and local regulations and building standards, including the CBC and the County required geotechnical reconnaissance reports and investigations.</p>	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None	None Required	Less Than Significant
<p>2. Soil Erosion or Top Soil Loss: The land uses proposed under the General Plan Update would allow construction and operational activities that would have the potential to expose topsoil to erosion from water or wind. This is considered a potentially significant impact. However, compliance with existing applicable regulations including the NPDES, CBC, and the County Grading Ordinance, would reduce potential impacts to below a significant level.</p>	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None	None Required	Less Than Significant
<p>3. Soil Stability: The proposed General Plan Update would have the potential to result in hazards associated with on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. However, future development associated with the land uses designated in the proposed General Plan Update would be required to comply with all applicable federal, State and local building standards and regulations, including the CBC and County required geotechnical reconnaissance reports and investigations.</p>	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None	None Required	Less Than Significant
<p>4. Expansive Soils: The General Plan Update would designate land uses that would allow for the development of structures on potentially expansive soils. Future projects located in areas with expansive soils would be required to comply with all applicable federal, State and local regulations, including the IBC, UBC and CBC. Compliance with such regulations would reduce impacts to a below a level of significance.</p>	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None	None Required	Less Than Significant

Table S-1 (Continued)

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policies ⁽¹⁾	Mitigation Measure(s) ⁽¹⁾	Impact After Mitigation
<p>5. Waste Water Disposal Systems: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would designate land uses that have the potential to allow development in areas where soils are incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems. However, future development projects would be required to comply with all applicable federal, State and local regulations related to septic tanks and waste water disposal, including County DEH standards. Compliance with such regulations would reduce the potential for septic systems to be located in soils incapable of supporting such systems.</p>	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None	None Required	Less Than Significant
<p>6. Unique Geologic Features: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would designate land uses that would allow development in areas that may have the potential to materially impair a unique geologic feature by destroying or altering the physical characteristics that convey the uniqueness of the resource. However, any future development would be required to follow regulations, including completion of a County required geological reconnaissance report.</p>	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None	None Required	Less Than Significant
<p>2.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials</p>					
<p>1. Transport, Use, and Disposal of Hazardous Materials: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in an increase in the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials. However, the project would be required to comply with federal, State and local regulatory requirements, including RCRA, CERCLA, Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, CFC, Title 22, CCR Title 27, and the County Consolidated Fire Code, which strictly regulate the transportation, use and disposal of hazardous materials.</p>	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None	None Required	Less Than Significant

Table S-1 (Continued)

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policies ⁽¹⁾	Mitigation Measure(s) ⁽¹⁾	Impact After Mitigation
<p>2. Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials: Implementation of the General Plan Update would result in land uses, such as limited impact industrial, medium impact industrial, and high impact industrial, that commonly store, use, and dispose of hazardous materials. Additionally, industries and businesses using hazardous materials may expand or increase to accommodate the projected population growth under the General Plan Update. However, all future development allowable under the proposed land uses of the General Plan Update, would be required to comply with applicable federal, State and local regulations related to the accidental release of hazardous materials.</p>	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None	None Required	Less Than Significant
<p>3. Hazardous to Schools: The proposed General Plan Update would result in land uses that have a high potential for hazardous materials to be located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school or daycare. However, compliance with General Plan Update policies and federal and State regulations pertaining to hazardous wastes, including the CEQA Guidelines, would ensure that risks associated with hazardous emissions and schools would be below a level of significance.</p>	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None	None Required	Less Than Significant
<p>4. Existing Hazardous Materials Sites: Under implementation of the proposed General Plan Update, land uses and development may be located on a site that may create potentially significant hazards to the public or environment, such as those pursuant to Government Code 65962.5, burn dump sites, active, abandoned or closed landfills, FUDS, areas with historic or current agriculture, or areas with petroleum contamination. However, future development of land uses proposed under the General Plan Update would be required to comply with applicable General Plan Update policies and existing federal, State, and local regulations related to existing on-site hazardous materials contamination.</p>	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None	None Required	Less Than Significant

Table S-1 (Continued)

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policies ⁽¹⁾	Mitigation Measure(s) ⁽¹⁾	Impact After Mitigation
<p>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.</p>	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	S-15.1, S-15.2, S-15.3	Haz-1.1 through Haz-1.5	Less Than Significant
<p>6. Private Airports: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update may result in land use designations that allow development within the two miles of a private airport.</p>	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	S-15.1, S-15.2, S-15.3, S-15.4	Haz-1.1 through Haz-1.5, Haz-2.1	Less Than Significant
<p>7. Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans: Implementation of the General Plan Update would increase land uses and development in areas of the County that may not have accounted for this growth in their existing emergency response and evacuation plans.</p>	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	S-1.3, M-1.2, M-3.3, M-4.3	Haz-3.1 through Haz-3.3	Less Than Significant
<p>8. Wildland Fires: Implementation of 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>	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-6.10, LU-11.2, S-3.1, S-3.2, S-3.3, S-3.4, S-3.6, S-4.1	Haz-4.1 through Haz-4.4	Significant and Unavoidable
<p>9. Vectors: Future development of land uses consistent with the General Plan Update would have the potential to increase human exposure to vectors. However, project compliance with existing regulations, policies, plans and guidelines associated with vector control would ensure that significant impacts do not occur.</p>	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None	None Required	Less Than Significant

Table S-1 (Continued)

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policies ⁽¹⁾	Mitigation Measure(s) ⁽¹⁾	Impact After Mitigation
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-6.8, 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>2. Groundwater Supplies and Recharge: At full buildout of land uses designated in the proposed General Plan Update, groundwater supply and recharge impacts would occur in: 1) areas that experience a 50 percent reduction of groundwater in storage; 2) areas that experience supply issues from additional large quantity or clustered groundwater users; 3) areas that experience a high frequency of low well yield; and 4) Borrego Valley.</p>	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-8.1, LU-8.2, LU-13.1, LU-13.2, COS-4.1 through COS-4.4, COS-5.2	Hyd-1.1, Hyd-1.2, Hyd-1.3, Hyd-1.4, Hyd-1.5, and Hyd-2.1 through Hyd-2.5	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-6.8, 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, 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, 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 Hazard Area: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would include land designated for residential land use within a 100-year flood plain.</p>	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	LU-6.11, 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, and Hyd-6.1	Less Than Significant
<p>7. Impeding or Redirecting Flood Flows: Implementation of the General Plan Update would impede or redirect flood flows.</p>	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	LU-6.11, 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

Table S-1 (Continued)

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policies ⁽¹⁾	Mitigation Measure(s) ⁽¹⁾	Impact After Mitigation
8. Dam Inundation and Flood Hazards: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in inundation risk associated with dam failure.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	COS-5.1, S-9.1 through S-9.3, S-9.6, S-10.1	Hyd-1.2, Hyd-1.5, Hyd-2.5, Hyd-4.1, Hyd-4.2, Hyd-4.3, Hyd-6.1, Hyd-8.1, and Hyd-8.2	Less Than Significant
9. Seiche, Tsunami, and Mudflow Hazards: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in an increased risk of exposing people or structures to damage in the event of a mudflow.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	COS-5.1, S-8.1, S-8.2, S-9.3, S-9.6	Hyd-3.1, Hyd-3.2, and Hyd-3.3	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, LU-2.1, LU-2.2, LU-2.4, 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-1.3 through Lan-1.3	Less Than Significant
2. Conflicts with Land Use Plans, Policies, and Regulations: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would not conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None	None Required	Less Than Significant
3. Conflicts with HCPs or NCCPs: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would conflict with any applicable HCP or NCCP.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None	None Required	Less Than Significant
2.10 Mineral Resources					
1. Mineral Resource Availability: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would have the potential to result in potentially significant impacts associated with the loss of availability of mineral resources.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	COS-10.1 through COS-10.4, COS-10.6, COS-10.8, COS-10.9	Min-1.1 through Min-1.3	Significant and Unavoidable
2. Mineral Resources Recovery Sites: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would have the potential to result in significant impacts associated with the loss of locally important mineral resource recovery sites.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	COS-10.1 through COS-10.4, COS-10.6, COS-10.8, COS-10.9	The mitigation measures identified for Issue 1: Mineral Resource Availability would also reduce impacts to mineral resource recovery sites	Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 (Continued)

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policies ⁽¹⁾	Mitigation Measure(s) ⁽¹⁾	Impact After Mitigation
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, 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
2. Excessive Groundborne Vibration: Implementation of the General Plan Update would have the potential to affect groundborne vibration sensitive land uses near the Sprinter Rail Line and where construction equipment would operate within vibration-sensitive land uses.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	N-3.1, N-4.7, N-5.2, N-6.3, N-6.4	Noi- 1.7, Noi-2.1 through Noi-2.4	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, 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
4. Temporary Increase in Ambient Noise Level: Implementation of the General Plan Update would have the potential to temporarily increase ambient noise from construction activity as well as other sources of temporary or nuisance noise.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	N-6.1 through N-6.6	Noi-4.1 and Noi-4.2	Less Than Significant
5. Excessive Noise Exposure from a Public or Private Airport: Implementation of the General Plan Update would have the potential to expose noise sensitive land use to excessive noise from a public or private airport.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	N-4.9, S-15.1, S-15.2, S-15.4	Noi-5.1 through Noi-5.3	Less Than Significant
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	None Required	Less Than Significant
2. Displacement of Housing: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would not displace a substantial amount of housing.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None	None Required	Less Than Significant
3. Displacement of People: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would not displace a substantial amount of people.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None	None Required	Less Than Significant

Table S-1 (Continued)

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policies ⁽¹⁾	Mitigation Measure(s) ⁽¹⁾	Impact After Mitigation
2.13 Public Services					
1. Fire Protection Services: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in a substantial adverse physical impact associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	LU-1.6, LU-6.4, LU-6.10, LU-12.3, LU-12.4, S-3.4, S-5.1, S-5.2, S-6.1 through S-6.5	Pub-1.1 through Pub-1.8	Less Than Significant
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-1.6, 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-1.6, 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-1.6, 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-1.12	Less Than Significant
2. Construction of New Recreational Facilities: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities to accommodate increased demand from forecasted population growth in the unincorporated County.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	LU-6.4, LU-9.7, LU-18.2, M-12.5, M-12.9, M-12.10, H-2.2, COS-21.2, COS-21.3, COS-21.4, COS-23.1, COS-23.3	Rec-1.1, Rec-1.2, Rec-1.3, Rec-1.4, Rec-1.8, Rec-1.9, Rec-1.12, and Rec-2.1 through Rec-2.6	Less Than Significant
2.15 Transportation and Traffic					
1. Unincorporated County Traffic and LOS Standards: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in a total of 158 deficient roadway segments throughout the unincorporated County (approximately 32 State highway segments and 126 Mobility Element segments).	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-5.1, M-5.2, M-9.1, M-9.2	Tra-1.1 through Tra-1.8	Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1 (Continued)

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policies ⁽¹⁾	Mitigation Measure(s) ⁽¹⁾	Impact After Mitigation
<p>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.</p>	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	M-4.3, M-4.6	Tra-1.1, Tra-1.2, Tra-1.3, Tra-1.4, Tra-1.7, Tra-1.8, and Tra-2.1	Significant and Unavoidable
<p>3. Rural Road Safety: 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>	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-2.7, LU-6.9, M-4.3, M-4.4, M-4.5, M-9.1	Tra-1.3, Tra-1.4, Tra-1.8, and Tra-3.1	Significant and 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-2.7, LU-6.9, 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-1.8, 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-1.6, Tra-5.1, 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

Table S-1 (Continued)

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					
1. Wastewater Treatment Requirements: The development of future land uses as designated in the proposed General Plan Update would result in the demand for wastewater treatment services to increase at a rate disproportionate to facility capabilities, which would result in a violation in wastewater treatment standards.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	LU-9.4, LU-12.1, LU-12.2, LU-14.1 through LU-14.4	USS-1.1 through USS-1.3	Less Than Significant
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-1.4, 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-6.8, COS-4.3	USS-3.1 through USS-3.5	Less Than Significant
4. Adequate Water Supplies: The development of future land uses as designated in the proposed General Plan Update could result in development with an inadequate water supply.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-8.1, LU-8.2, LU-13.1, LU-13.2, COS-4.1 through COS-4.4, COS-5.2, COS-5.5	USS-4.1 through USS-4.7	Significant and Unavoidable
5. Adequate Wastewater Facilities: The development of future land uses as designated in the proposed General Plan Update would generate additional demand on the existing wastewater system that may result in inadequate capacity to serve the projected demand.	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	LU-4.3	The mitigation measures identified for Issue 1: Wastewater Treatment Requirements would also mitigate impacts to adequate wastewater facilities	Less Than Significant
6. Sufficient Landfill Capacity: The development of future land uses as designated in the proposed General Plan Update has the potential to be served by a landfill with insufficient capacity to accommodate the solid waste disposal needs.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	LU-12.1, LU-12.2, LU-16.1, LU-16.2, LU-16.3, COS-17.1 through COS-17.4, COS-17.6, COS-17.7 and COS-17.8	USS-6.1 through USS-6.8	Significant and Unavoidable
7. Solid Waste Regulations: The development of future land uses as designated in the proposed General Plan Update would be required to comply with federal, State and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	None	None Required	Less Than Significant

Table S-1 (Continued)

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Proposed General Plan Update Policies ⁽¹⁾	Mitigation Measure(s) ⁽¹⁾	Impact After Mitigation
<p>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.</p>	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	COS-14.7, COS-15.1 through COS-15.5	USS-8.1 through USS-8.4	Less Than Significant
<p>2.17 Global Climate Change</p>					
<p>1. Compliance With AB 32: By the year 2020, 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.</p>	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	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-1.18	Significant and Unavoidable
<p>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.</p>	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	Significant and Unavoidable

⁽¹⁾ Refer to Chapter 7.0 for complete General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures.

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

Issue Areas	Referral Map		Alternatives to the Proposed Project			
	Without Mitigation	With Mitigation	Hybrid Map	Draft Land Use Map	Environmentally Superior	No Project
2.1 Aesthetics						
Scenic Vistas	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Scenic Resources	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Visual Character or Quality	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Lighting and Glare	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
2.2 Agricultural Resources						
Conversion of Agricultural Resources	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Land Use Conflicts	PS	LS	—	—	—	—
Indirect Conversion of Agricultural Resources	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
2.3 Air Quality						
Air Quality Plans	LS	LS	—	—	—	—
Air Quality Violations	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Non-attainment of Criteria Pollutants	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Sensitive Receptors	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Objectionable Odors	LS	LS	—	—	—	—
2.4 Biological Resources						
Special Status Plant and Wildlife Species	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Riparian Habitat and Other Sensitive Natural Communities	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Federally Protected Wetlands	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Wildlife Movement Corridors and Nursery Sites	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Local Policies and Ordinances	LS	LS	—	—	—	—
Habitat Conservation Plans and Natural Community Conservation Plans	LS	LS	—	—	—	—
2.5 Cultural Resources						
Historical Resources	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Archaeological Resources	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Paleontological Resources	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Human Remains	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
2.6 Geology and Soils						
Exposure to Seismic Related Hazards	LS	LS	—	—	—	—
Soil Erosion or Topsoil Loss	LS	LS	—	—	—	—
Soil Stability	LS	LS	—	—	—	—
Expansive Soils	LS	LS	—	—	—	—
Waste Water Disposal Systems	LS	LS	—	—	—	—
Unique Geologic Features	LS	LS	—	—	—	—

Table S-2. Continued

Issue Areas	Referral Map		Alternatives to the Proposed Project			
	Without Mitigation	With Mitigation	Hybrid Map	Draft Land Use Map	Environmentally Superior	No Project
2.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials						
Transport, Use, and Disposal of Hazardous Materials	LS	LS	○	○	○	○
Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials	LS	LS	—	—	—	—
Hazards to Schools	LS	LS	—	—	—	—
Existing Hazardous Materials Sites	LS	LS	—	—	—	—
Public Airports	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Private Airports	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Wildland Fires	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Vectors	LS	LS	—	—	—	▲
2.8 Hydrology and Water Quality						
Water Quality Standards and Requirements	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Groundwater Supplies and Recharge	PS	SU	▲	▲	▼	▲
Erosion or Siltation	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Flooding	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Exceed Capacity of Stormwater Systems	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Housing within a 100-year Flood Hazard Area	PS	LS	▲	▲	▲	▲
Impeding or Redirecting Flood Flows	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Dam Inundation and Flood Hazards	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Seiche, Tsunami, and Mudflow Hazards	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
2.9 Land Use						
Physical Division of an Established Community	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Conflicts with Land Use Plans, Policies, and Regulations	LS	LS	—	—	—	▲
Conflicts with HCPs or NCCPs	LS	LS	—	—	—	—
2.10 Mineral Resources						
Mineral Resource Availability	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Mineral Resource Recovery Sites	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
2.11 Noise						
Excessive Noise Levels	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Excessive Groundborne Vibration	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Temporary Increase in Ambient Noise Levels	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Excessive Noise Exposure from a Public or Private Airport	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
2.12 Population and Housing						
Population Growth	LS	LS	—	—	▲	—
Displacement of Housing	LS	LS	—	—	—	—
Displacement of People	LS	LS	—	—	—	—

Table S-2. Continued

Issue Areas	Referral Map		Alternatives to the Proposed Project			
	Without Mitigation	With Mitigation	Hybrid Map	Draft Land Use Map	Environmentally Superior	No Project
2.13 Public Services						
Fire Protection Services	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Police Protection Services	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
School Services	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Other Public Services	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
2.14 Recreation						
Deterioration of Parks and Recreational Facilities	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Construction of New Recreational Facilities	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
4.15 Transportation and Traffic						
Unincorporated County Traffic and Level of Service Standards	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Adjacent Cities Traffic and Level of Service Standards	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▼
Rural Road Safety	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Emergency Access	PS	LS	—	—	—	—
Parking Capacity	PS	LS	—	—	—	○
Alternative Transportation	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
2.16 Utilities and Service Systems						
Wastewater Treatment Requirements	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
New Water or Wastewater Treatment Facilities	PS	LS	▲	▲	▼	▲
Sufficient Stormwater Drainage Facilities	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Adequate Water Supplies	PS	SU	▲	▲	▼	▲
Adequate Wastewater Facilities	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Sufficient Landfill Capacity	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Solid Waste Regulations	LS	LS	—	—	—	—
Energy	PS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
2.17 Global Climate Change						
Compliance with AB 32	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Effects of Global Climate Change on the Proposed Project	PS	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲

- ▲ Alternative is likely to result in greater impacts to issue when compared to proposed project
 - Alternative is likely to result in a similar impacts to issue when compared to proposed project
 - ▼ Alternative is likely to result in less impacts to issue when compared to proposed project, however, impacts would still be significant before mitigation.
 - Alternative is likely to result in less impacts to issue when compared to proposed project and impacts would likely be less than significant and not require mitigation.
- PS Potentially significant impact
LS Less than significant impact
SU Potentially significant and unavoidable impact

This page is intentionally left blank.