

CHAPTER S.0 SUMMARY

This chapter is a summary of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed County of San Diego (County) Zoning Ordinance Amendment, prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

S.1 Overview

As required by CEQA, this EIR: (1) assesses the potentially significant direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental effects of the proposed project; (2) identifies potential feasible means of avoiding or substantially lessening significant adverse impacts; and (3) evaluates a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project, including the required No Project Alternative. The County is the “lead agency” for the proposed project evaluated in this EIR, and has the principal responsibility for certifying the EIR and approving the proposed project. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, this EIR consists of an evaluation of the effects of the entire proposed project. This EIR will be used by the County to evaluate the environmental implications of adopting the proposed project, the Zoning Ordinance Amendment.

S.2 Project Synopsis

S.2.1 Project Description

The project proposes an amendment to the County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance for equine uses. The amendment consists of clarifications, deletions, and revisions to provide an updated set of definitions, procedures, and standards for review and permitting of equine uses. The updated set of definitions helps to clarify the difference between horsekeeping and horse stables. The definition of horsekeeping is limited to the private use of horses by the owner or occupants of a premises and does not include horses kept for commercial use. Horse stables include, but are not limited to, animal enclosures, riding arenas, corrals, paddocks, pens and/or other structures used for the boarding, breeding, raising, rehabilitation, riding training and/or performing of horses, by persons other than the owners or the occupants of the premises, for commercial purposes. The amendment will implement a new tiered system of permitting for commercial horse stables with both ministerial and discretionary tiers of permitting.

The tiered permitting system for Horse Stable is as follows:

- Tier One: boarding (only) of up to three horses not owned by the property owner allowed without a ministerial or discretionary permit
- Tier Two: 10 horses per acre of usable area up to 50 horses and 5 acres allowed with a Zoning Verification Permit

- Tier Three: 10 horses per acre of usable area up to 100 horses and 10 acres allowed with an Administrative Permit
- Tier Four: More than 100 horses and more than 10 acres of usable area or more than 10 horses per acre, allowed with a Major Use Permit
- Horses counted under the tiers include both horses under Horsekeeping uses and Horse Stable uses combined. Additional regulations will be in the new Horse Stable section to follow the Animal Schedule.

The Horse Stable and Horsekeeping use types are permitted in areas with certain animal designators as indicated in the Animal Schedule. Animal designators are regulations pertaining to the keeping of animals by means of a letter designator. A description of the permits associated with the proposed project's tiered permitting process for horse stables is as follows:

- Zoning Verification Permit: Where a Tier Two horse stable is proposed in Animal Designators D–F, J, L–N, U, and V, a Zoning Verification Permit will be required. A Zoning Verification Permit is ministerial (not discretionary) and requires the applicant to go through a checklist of clearances for permit approval. The applicant will be required to provide information such as project location, usable area, and a site plan illustrating the proposed location of and access to the horse stables.
- Administrative Permit: Tier Three horse stables located in Animal Designators D–F, J, L–N, U, and V will be required to obtain an Administrative Permit. The processing requirements for an Administrative Permit are similar to those for a Major Use Permit (MUP) and will require evaluation on a case-by-case basis under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) during the MUP application process. Each application will be evaluated for consistency with neighborhood compatibility General Plan policies and environmental impacts as required in the Zoning Ordinance for an MUP; and conditions could be added to an Administrative Permit to address any site-specific concerns, just as conditions are added to an MUP. An Administrative Permit requires public notice, as well as an opportunity for the local Community Planning Group to review and provide a recommendation for the project. The permit also requires public notice to property owners within 300 feet and to a minimum of 20 different property owners. The final decision on an Administrative Permit is made by the Director of Planning and Development Services and may be appealed to the Planning Commission.
- Major Use Permit: Tier Four horse stables located in Animal Designators D–F, J, L–N, U and V will continue to require an MUP and the related case-by-case environmental review. This EIR will include environmental review related to the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment for Tier Four horse stables. However, all Tier Four horse stables will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) during the MUP application process.

As reflected in the amended ordinance, additional regulations on Horsekeeping and Horse Stable uses include, but are not limited to, restrictions on use and a requirement for manure management, a fire protection plan, and a vector control plan.

S.2.2 Project Objectives

During the Board of Supervisors Hearing on March 2, 2011 (Agenda Item No. 2), the County of San Diego (County) Board of Supervisors directed staff to work with the equine community to investigate options that would protect and promote equestrian operations, including exploring various permitting options. Under the current Zoning Ordinance, a Major Use Permit is required for the development of commercial equine uses in many areas throughout the County, regardless of size or operating characteristics. The cost and complexity of the MUP application process is often a barrier to compliance, especially for smaller equine uses, and a hindrance to the economic viability of the equine industry as a whole. Recognizing that equine facilities are long-term land uses that will continue to contribute economically and recreationally to the County, the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment (proposed project) would update equine regulations in order to better facilitate the development of equine uses. Specific objectives for the proposed project are as follows:

1. Streamline the permitting process for equine operations in order to better facilitate the development of such uses within the County, while ensuring compliance with local, state, and federal equine regulations where appropriate and utilizing sound management practices.
2. Develop a tiered permitting process for commercial horse stables.
3. Provide definitions for the types of equine facilities that are not defined in the Zoning Ordinance, and provide criteria for distinguishing between types.
4. Minimize the potential for land use conflicts that may arise through the development of equine uses.
5. Update regulations for equine uses to be consistent with current technology and design.
6. Increase the level of knowledge regarding proper management of horse stables among stable operators and County Staff.
7. Assist property owners in coming into compliance with County equine regulations.

S.2.3 Project Location

The proposed project would apply to properties located in the unincorporated portions of the County over which the County has land use jurisdiction. More specifically, the proposed project applies to properties that are zoned with an Animal Designator D–J, L–N, U, V, or X for a total of 344,665 acres.

Regional access within the project area is provided by Interstates 5, 15, and 805, running north and south throughout the western portion of the project area, and Interstate 8, running east and west throughout the central and southern portions of the project area. Additional access within the project area is provided by State Highways 54, 76, 78, and 94, generally running east and west across the project area, and State Highways 67, 79, 125, and 163, generally running north and south across the project area.

S.2.4 Environmental Setting

The project area has a generally semiarid environment that supports a wide range of habitats and biological communities. These habitats and communities range from grasslands to shrublands to coniferous forests. Additionally, these habitats and communities vary greatly depending on the ecoregion, soils and substrate, elevation, and topography. Terrain within the project area varies from west to east, sloping up from the ocean, transitioning to rolling hills, and then steep mountains that finally give way to flat to gently sloping deserts.

The urban portions of the project area are predominantly in the west, either surrounding the City of San Diego or interspersed between the City of San Diego and other incorporated areas. Farther east, the land is less developed, with the largest developed area in the eastern portion of the project area being the community of Borrego Springs. The areas that have been developed in the eastern portion of the County have been predominantly developed in a rural fashion, with large lot sizes, agricultural or related uses, and limited infrastructure and service availability. The project area has a broad range of property sizes with an average property size of approximately 4 acres and median of approximately 2 acres. The most common Use Regulations within the project area are Limited Agricultural (A70), General Agricultural (A72), and Rural Residential (RR). Figures 1-3 through 1-7 provide a few examples of the visual setting in select communities within the project area. The environmental setting for each environmental issue is further explained in the beginning of each section of Chapter 2.0, Environmental Effects of the Proposed Project.

S.3 Summary of Significant Effects and Mitigation Measures that Reduce or Avoid the Significant Effects

Table S-1 summarizes the results of the environmental analysis completed for the project in Chapter 2.0. Mitigation measures have been identified to reduce environmental impacts associated with aesthetics, agriculture, air quality, biology, cultural resources, hazards, noise and transportation and traffic and are included in Table S-1. The mitigation measures would reduce potentially significant impacts, but not below a significant level. Additional “infeasible” mitigation measures were considered in attempting to reduce impacts to below a level of significance. A detailed analysis of significant environmental effects, mitigation measures and infeasible mitigation measures is discussed in Chapter 2.0 of this EIR.

S.4 Areas of Controversy

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 proposed project that are relevant to the EIR are as follows:

- Development of equine uses could affect agricultural lands, cultural resources, and sensitive biological resources
- Odors associated with equine uses
- Adequacy of setbacks.

S.5 Issues to be Resolved by the Decision-Making Body

The County Board of Supervisors (BOS) serves as the decision making body for the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment. Issues to be resolved by the BOS include: (i) whether or how to mitigate the significant effects of the project, (ii) whether to reject or approve one of the alternatives to the proposed project and other environmental findings, and (iii) whether to reject or approve the proposed project.

As part of the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment, equine uses that meet the zoning verification requirements would be developed without discretionary review and boarding of up to three horses would be allowed without ministerial or discretionary review. Thus, there would be no means to ensure mitigation of significant effects since no discretionary permits would be required. However, it should be noted that both Tier One and Tier Two equine uses will be subject to several regulations, Zoning Ordinance provisions and statutes that will mitigate some of the negative effects of these facilities. Larger equine uses that fall under Tier Three and Tier Four, as previously defined, will continue to be subject to Administrative Permit and Major Use Permit procedures, respectively, and will require separate project-specific environmental review. However, it cannot be concluded at this stage that impacts related to future Tier Three and Tier Four equine uses developed pursuant to the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment would be avoided or mitigated to a level below significant. The BOS will decide if the significant and unmitigated effects associated with aesthetics, agricultural and forestry resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, hazards, noise, and transportation/traffic can be reduced.

Mitigation measures, as listed in Table S-1, will reduce direct and cumulative impacts associated with equine uses, but not to a level below significant. Other mitigation measures, as described in Chapter 2.0, would reduce impacts to less than significant; however, they were determined to be infeasible. For example, one infeasible mitigation measure would consist of adopting Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Plans for North County and East County that provide coverage for special-status species as well as protections for wildlife corridors, habitat linkages, and core habitat areas in those regions. Because the County is currently in the process of

preparing such plans, this measure is feasible and attainable. However, these conservation plans require approval at the federal and state levels, which the County cannot guarantee would occur prior to approval and implementation of the proposed project. In addition, the timing of these programs (e.g., MSCP adoption and implementation) may not coincide with the proposed project impacts in these areas. Therefore, this measure is considered infeasible mitigation for the proposed project. However, it is ultimately the decision of the BOS to determine if mitigation measures, such as these, are feasible or infeasible. In determining how to mitigate significant effects, the BOS may decide that some infeasible mitigation measures, such as the one previously described would still meet project objectives and would otherwise be feasible to reduce significant impacts to a level less than significant. The BOS will adopt detailed findings on the feasibility of mitigation measures to substantially lessen or avoid the significant effects on the environment. The BOS will also decide whether to adopt feasible mitigation measures, such as those presented in Table S-1.

In addition to mitigation measures, the BOS will decide whether or not to adopt the proposed project or any of the project alternatives that would reduce significant impacts while still meeting the project objectives. Regarding 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. The BOS may also want to consider whether to adopt specific components or a combination of the proposed project and project alternatives.

Because this EIR has identified adverse environmental effects that are unavoidable, the BOS must also determine if the adverse environmental effects are considered acceptable with consideration of economic, social, technological, and other relevant benefits of the proposed project. In making this determination, it is relevant for the BOS to consider the existing Zoning Ordinance in comparison to the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment. 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, project alternatives, or components of either, which have the potential to cause one or more significant effects on the environment.

S.6 Project Alternatives

CEQA requires, in Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines, that an EIR describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project or to the proposed project location that would feasibly attain most of the project objectives but would avoid or lessen any significant environmental impacts. An EIR should evaluate the environmental impacts of the alternatives compared to the proposed project. Chapter 4.0, Project Alternatives, of the EIR describes and evaluates project alternatives and is intended to implement the requirements set forth in the CEQA Guidelines. Chapter 4.0 also identifies the Environmentally Superior Project Alternative as required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2).

S.6.1 Four Hoses per Acre Alternative

The Four Horses per Acre Alternative would reduce the threshold of horses allowed in Tier Two and Tier Three from 10 horses per acre to 4 horses per acre. The main components of the Four Horses per Acre Alternative are described as follows:

- Tier One would remain the same. Boarding (only) of up to three horses not owned by the property owner would be allowed without a ministerial or discretionary permit.
- Tier Two would allow 4 horses per acre of usable area up to 20 horses and 5 acres with a ministerial Zoning Verification Permit.
- Tier Three would allow 4 horses per acre of usable area up to 40 horses and 10 acres with a discretionary Administrative Permit.
- Tier Four would allow more than 40 horses on more than 10 acres of usable area, or more than 4 horses per acre, with a discretionary Major Use Permit (MUP).

S.6.2 Reduced Project Area Alternative

The Reduced Project Area Alternative would only allow Tier One through Tier Four equine facilities on properties that are 1 acre or larger. All properties under 1 acre would not be included in the project area. The elimination of these properties would result in a reduced project area of 328,452 acres compared to 344,665 acres under the proposed project. The number of parcels within the project area would also be reduced from 85,326 under the proposed project to 50,712 under this alternative. The main components of the Reduced Project Area Alternative are described as follows:

- Tier One: boarding (only) of up to 3 horses not owned by the property owner would be allowed without a ministerial or discretionary permit on properties 1 acre or larger.
- Tier Two would allow 10 horses per acre of usable area up to 50 horses and 5 acres with a ministerial Zoning Verification Permit on properties 1 acre or larger.
- Tier Three would allow 10 horses per acre of usable area up to 100 horses and 10 acres with an Administrative Permit.
- Tier Four would allow more than 100 horses on more than 10 acres of usable area with a Major Use Permit.

S.6.3 No Project Alternative

In accordance with Section 15126.6(e) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the No Project Alternative includes a discussion of the existing conditions at the time the Notice of Preparation (NOP) was published. The No Project Alternative assumes that the existing Zoning Ordinance would remain

in effect. Under the No Project Alternative, the existing Zoning Ordinance would remain in effect, and any non-conforming uses established prior to 1978 would continue to be allowed to operate in their current state. The No Project Alternative would require an MUP for new equine uses, non-conforming uses built after 1978, or expansion of non-conforming uses established prior to 1978 within the project area; whereas the proposed project would allow for a tiered permitting system based on the size of the future equine use. Under the No Project Alternative, definitions and development parameters for review and permitting of equine facilities contained in the Zoning Ordinance would remain the same.

S.6.4 Environmentally Superior Alternative

As compared to the proposed project, the Four Horses per Acre Alternative, Reduced Project Area Alternative, and No Project Alternative would result in reduced environmental impacts as illustrated in Table 4-1. None of the alternatives would reduce impacts of the proposed project to less than significant. The Four Horses per Acre Alternative would result in fewer horses allowed under Tier Two and Tier Three and, therefore, would reduce the number of horse corrals, paddocks, or stalls needed, which would also result in less ground disturbance. The reduction in ground disturbance would lessen impacts to biological resources and cultural resources. Impacts relative to air quality, noise, and transportation and traffic would also be reduced due to fewer horses at a particular Tier Two or Tier Three facility and fewer VMT from visitors. The Reduced Project Area Alternative would result in less ground disturbance and likely fewer equine facilities, which would help to decrease environmental impacts. The reduced project area would lessen impacts to aesthetics, agricultural resources, biological resources, cultural resources, and hazards and hazardous materials. Similarly, impacts to air quality, noise, and transportation and traffic would be reduced due to a reduced number of equine facilities. Although the Four Horses per Acre and Reduced Project Area alternatives would lessen environmental impacts as compared to the proposed project, many of the same impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. The No Project Alternative would decrease environmental impacts by continuing to require discretionary review for equine facilities within the project area; however, this alternative would not meet any of the project objectives. As indicated in Table 4-1, the Reduced Project Area Alternative would lessen more impacts as compared to the Four Horses per Acre (such as those related to agriculture and forestry resources and wildland fires); therefore, this is the environmentally preferred alternative.

**Table S-1
Environmental Issue Areas Analyzed in Chapter 2.0**

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
<i>2.1 Aesthetics</i>				
<p>1. Scenic Vistas: <u>Tier One and Tier Two:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier One and Tier Two would not result in significant impacts to scenic vistas. <u>Tier Three and Tier Four:</u> Equine facilities developed under Tier Three and Tier Four would have the potential to interrupt or detract from a scenic vista that previously did not include infrastructure or development (AE-1, AE-3).</p>	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	<p>M-AE-1: During the environmental review process for future Administrative Permits and Major Use Permits for equine facilities developed under Tier Three and Tier Four, the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Visual Resources and Dark Skies and Glare shall be applied. When aesthetic impacts are determined to be significant, feasible and appropriate project-specific mitigation measures shall be incorporated. Examples of standard mitigation measures within the County Guidelines include siting/location considerations, minimizing development and grading of steep slopes, natural screening and landscaping, undergrounding utilities, inclusion of buffers, and lighting restrictions.</p>	Significant and Unavoidable
<p>2. Scenic Resources: <u>Tier One and Tier Two:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier One and Tier Two would not result in significant impacts to scenic resources. <u>Tier Three and Tier Four:</u> Equine facilities developed under Tier Three and Tier Four would have the potential to interrupt or detract from a scenic resource that previously did not include infrastructure or development through ground disturbance, removal of vegetation, and construction of structures near or within the viewshed of a scenic resource such as a State Scenic Highway. (AE-2, AE-4).</p>	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	See M-AE-1.	Significant and Unavoidable
<p>3. Visual Character or Quality: The proposed project would not result in significant impacts to visual character and quality.</p>	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less than Significant

**Table S-1
Environmental Issue Areas Analyzed in Chapter 2.0**

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
4. Light and Glare: The proposed project would not result in significant impacts from lighting or glare.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less than Significant
<i>2.2 Agriculture and Forest Resources</i>				
1. Conversion of Farmland: <u>Tier One and Tier Two:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier One and Tier Two would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts related to the conversion of farmland (AG-1, AG-5). <u>Tier Three and Tier Four:</u> Equine facilities developed under Tier Three and Tier Four would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts related to the conversion of farmland (AG-2, AG-6).	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	M-AG-1: During the environmental review process for future Administrative Permits or Major Use Permits for equine facilities under Tier Three or Tier Four, respectively, the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Agricultural Resources shall be applied. When impacts to Farmland are determined to be significant, feasible and appropriate project-specific mitigation measures shall be incorporated. Examples of standard mitigation measures within the County Guidelines include: avoidance of agricultural resources; preservation of agriculture; and inclusion of compatibility buffers near areas intended for agricultural uses.	Significant and Unavoidable
2. Agricultural Zoning and Williamson Act Contracts: The proposed project would not result in significant adverse effects related to conflicts with agricultural zoning and Williamson Act contracts.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less than Significant
3. Forest or Timberland Conflicts: The proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to forest land or timberland conflicts.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant

**Table S-1
Environmental Issue Areas Analyzed in Chapter 2.0**

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
<p>4. Loss or Conversion of Forest Land: <u>Tier One and Tier Two:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier One and Tier Two would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts related to the loss or conversion of forest land (AG-3, AG-7). <u>Tier Three and Tier Four:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier Three and Tier Four would potentially result in direct and cumulative impacts related to the loss or conversion of forest land (AG-4, AG-8).</p>	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	M-AG-2: During the environmental review process for future Administrative Permits or Major Use Permits for equine facilities under Tier Three and Tier Four, respectively, the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biological Resources shall be applied. When impacts to forest land are determined to be significant, feasible and appropriate project-specific mitigation measures shall be incorporated. Examples of standard mitigation measures within the County Guidelines include avoidance of sensitive resources, preservation of habitat, revegetation, and resource management.	Significant and Unavoidable
<p>5. Indirect Conversion of Farmland or Forest Land: The proposed project would not result in potentially significant impacts related to the indirect conversion of farmland or forest land.</p>	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant
<i>2.3 Air Quality</i>				
<p>1. Conformance to the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (SDRAQS) and State Implementation Plan (SIP): The proposed project would not conflict or obstruct the implementation of the SDRAQS and SIP, and therefore would not result in any potential significant impacts.</p>	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant
<p>2. Conformance to Federal and State Air Quality Standards: <u>Tier One and Tier Two</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier One and Tier Two would not exceed screening-level thresholds and would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of federal and state air quality standards. <u>Tier Three and Tier Four:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier Three and Tier Four may result in significant direct and cumulative impacts due to emissions from construction activities, which could potentially violate air quality standards (AQ-1, AQ-4).</p>	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	M-AQ-1: During the environmental review process for future discretionary permits for Tier Three and Tier Four projects, the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Air Quality shall be applied. When impacts are determined to be significant, feasible and appropriate project-specific mitigation measures shall be incorporated. Examples of standard mitigation measures within the County Guidelines include: dust control efforts, grading or fuel use restrictions, use of modified equipment, and restrictions on vehicle idling time.	Significant and Unavoidable

**Table S-1
Environmental Issue Areas Analyzed in Chapter 2.0**

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
<p>3. Non-Attainment Criteria Pollutants: <u>Tier One and Tier Two:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier One and Tier Two would not result in significant impacts associated with non-attainment criteria pollutants. <u>Tier Three and Tier Four:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier Three and Tier Four may result in significant direct and cumulative impacts due to emissions from construction activities, which could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment (AQ-2, AQ-5).</p>	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	See M-AQ-1.	Significant and Unavoidable
<p>4. Sensitive Receptors: The proposed project would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.</p>	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant
<p>5. Odors: <u>Tier One and Tier Two:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier One and Tier Two would not generate objectionable odors or result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to objectionable odors. <u>Tier Three and Tier Four:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier Three and Tier Four may generate objectionable odors or result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to objectionable odors (AQ-3, AQ-6).</p>	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	<p>M-AQ-2: The following mitigation measures shall be implemented regarding manure control and storage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regardless of equine facility Tier category designation, all locations where horses are boarded shall clean horse stalls at least once per day including the removal of animal waste and soiled bedding. • Animal waste shall be stockpiled in an enclosed, covered containment vessel to ensure anaerobic off-gassing and associated odor generation is minimized. The containment vessel shall protect animal waste stockpiles from heavy weather conditions, including wind and rain which may cause siltation and accelerate anaerobic decomposition of the waste. • If a project site is located in close proximity to residents and/or sensitive receptors, containment vessels storing 	Significant and Unavoidable

**Table S-1
Environmental Issue Areas Analyzed in Chapter 2.0**

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
			animal waste shall be located at the furthest feasible distance from nearby residents and/or sensitive receptors. • Require all equine facilities of any Tier category to ensure horse stalls are washed and cleaned twice per day, including removal of all animal waste and soiled bedding. • Prohibit the stockpiling of animal waste on site to ensure residents and/or sensitive receptors in close proximity to the individual site are not impacted by odors generated during anaerobic decomposition of stockpiled waste.	
6. Generation of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions: The proposed project would not result in significant impacts associated with the generation of GHG emissions.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant
7. Conformance to Applicable GHG Plan, Policy or Regulation: The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of a GHG plan, policy, or regulation, and therefore would not result in any potential significant impacts.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant
<i>2.4 Biological Resources</i>				
1. Candidate, Sensitive, or Special-Status Species: <u>Tier One and Tier Two:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier One and Tier Two would have the potential to result in direct and cumulative impacts to candidate, sensitive or special-status species due to removal of areas of sensitive habitat (BI-1, BI-8). <u>Tier Three and Tier Four:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier Three and Tier Four would have the potential to result in direct and cumulative impacts to candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in the County (BI-2, BI-9).	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	M-BI-1: During the environmental review process for future Administrative Permits and Major Use Permits for equine uses, the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biological Resources shall be applied. When impacts to biological resources are determined to be significant, feasible and appropriate project-specific mitigation measures shall be incorporated. Examples of standard mitigation measures within the County Guidelines include: avoidance of sensitive resources; preservation of habitat; revegetation; resource management; and restrictions on lighting, runoff, access, and/or noise.	Significant and Unavoidable

**Table S-1
Environmental Issue Areas Analyzed in Chapter 2.0**

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
<p>2. Riparian Habitat or Sensitive Natural Community: <u>Tier One and Tier Two:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier One and Tier Two would have the potential to result in significant direct and cumulative impacts to riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities due to removal of areas of sensitive habitat (BI-3, BI-10). <u>Tier Three and Tier Four:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier Three and Tier Four would have the potential to result in direct and cumulative impacts to riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities in the County (BI-4, BI-11).</p>	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	See M-BI-1.	Significant and Unavoidable
<p>3. Federally Protected Wetlands: The proposed project would not result in significant impacts to federally protected wetlands.</p>	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant
<p>4. Wildlife Movement: <u>Tier One and Tier Two:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier One and Tier Two would have the potential to result in significant direct and cumulative impacts due to the introduction of new structures, or due to ground disturbance that could interfere with wildlife movement or impede the use of nursery sites (BI-5, BI-12). <u>Tier Three and Tier Four:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier Three and Tier Four would have the potential to result in significant direct and cumulative impacts due to the introduction of new structures, or due to ground disturbance that could interfere with wildlife movement or impede the use of nursery sites (BI-6, BI-13).</p>	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	See M-BI-1.	Significant and Unavoidable

**Table S-1
Environmental Issue Areas Analyzed in Chapter 2.0**

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
<p>5. Local Policies, Ordinances, Adopted Plans: <u>Tier One and Tier Two:</u> The proposed project would allow for the development of equine facilities under Tier One without a ministerial or discretionary permit that would potentially be inconsistent with local policies, ordinances, and adopted plans (BI-7, BI-14). Development of equine facilities under Tier Two would not result in significant impacts relative to local policies, ordinances, and adopted plans. <u>Tier Three and Tier Four:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier Three and Tier Four would not result in significant impacts relative to local policies, ordinances, and adopted plans.</p>	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	No feasible mitigation identified.	Significant and Unavoidable
<i>2.5 Cultural Resources</i>				
<p>1. Historical Resources: <u>Tier One and Tier Two:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier One and Tier Two would have the potential to result in direct and cumulative impacts to a historical resource since it could potentially result in the physical demolition, destruction, or alteration of the historical resource through ground disturbance, or it could alter the setting of the resource when the setting contributes to the resource's significance by introducing new structures (CR-1, CR-9). <u>Tier Three and Tier Four:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier Three and Tier Four would have the potential to result in direct and cumulative impacts to a historical resource since it could potentially result in the physical demolition, destruction, or alteration of the historical resource through ground disturbance, or it could alter the setting of the resource when the setting contributes to the resource's significance by introducing new structures (CR-2, CR-10).</p>	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	<p>M-CR-1: The County shall provide incentives through the Mills Act to encourage the restoration, renovation, or adaptive reuse of historic resources. This will be done by reaching out to property owners with identified historic resources to participate.</p> <p>M-CR-2: During the environmental review process for future Administrative Permits and Major Use Permits for equine uses, any proposed Horse Stable of more than 50 horses shall complete a full records search with the South Central Information Center (SCIC). The SCIC shall provide a recommendation regarding potential cultural resources and may recommend consultation with appropriate tribe(s).</p>	Significant and Unavoidable

**Table S-1
Environmental Issue Areas Analyzed in Chapter 2.0**

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
<p>2. Archaeological Resources: <u>Tier One and Tier Two:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier One and Tier Two would have the potential to result in direct and cumulative impacts to an archaeological resource since it could potentially result in excavation and grading activities, which have the potential to damage or destroy archaeological resources that may be present on or below the ground surface (CR-3, CR-11). <u>Tier Three and Tier Four:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier Three and Tier Four would have the potential to result in direct and cumulative impacts to an archaeological resource since it could potentially result in excavation and grading activities, which have the potential to damage or destroy archaeological resources that may be present on or below the ground surface (CR-4, CR-12).</p>	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	See M-CR-2.	Significant and Unavoidable
<p>3. Human Remains: <u>Tier One and Tier Two:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier One and Tier Two would have the potential to result in direct and cumulative impacts to human remains since it could potentially result in excavation and grading activities, which have the potential to damage or destroy human remains (CR-5, CR-13). <u>Tier Three and Tier Four:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier Three and Tier Four would have the potential to result in direct and cumulative impacts to human remains since it could potentially result in excavation and grading activities, which have the potential to damage or destroy human remains (CR-6, CR-14).</p>	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	See M-CR-2.	Significant and Unavoidable

**Table S-1
Environmental Issue Areas Analyzed in Chapter 2.0**

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
<p>4. Paleontological Resources: <u>Tier One and Tier Two:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier One and Tier Two would have the potential to result in direct and cumulative impacts to a paleontological resource since it could result in earth-disturbing activities, which have the potential to damage or destroy fossils in the underlying rock units (CR-7, CR-15).</p> <p><u>Tier Three and Tier Four:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier Three and Tier Four would have the potential to result in direct and cumulative impacts to a paleontological resource since it could result in earth-disturbing activities, which have the potential to damage or destroy fossils in the underlying rock units (CR-8, CR-16).</p>	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	No feasible mitigation identified.	Significant and Unavoidable
<i>2.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>				
<p>1. Hazardous Substance Handling: The proposed project would not result in any potentially significant impacts to the transportation, use, and disposal of hazardous materials.</p>	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant
<p>2. Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials: The proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to the accidental release of hazardous materials.</p>	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant
<p>3. Hazards to Schools: The proposed project would not result in significant adverse effect to hazardous emissions or involve hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.</p>	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant
<p>4. Existing Hazardous Materials Sites: The proposed project would not result in significant adverse effects related to locating horse stables near existing hazardous materials sites.</p>	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant

**Table S-1
Environmental Issue Areas Analyzed in Chapter 2.0**

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
5. Airport Hazards: The proposed project would not result in significant adverse effects to an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant
6. Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans: The proposed project would not result in significant adverse effects to emergency response and evacuation plans.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant
7. Wildland Fires: <u>Tier One and Tier Two:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier One and Tier Two would have the potential to result in significant direct and cumulative impacts related to wildland fires (HZ-1, HZ-3). <u>Tier Three and Tier Four:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier Three and Tier Four would have the potential to result in significant direct and cumulative impacts related to wildland fires (HZ-2, HZ-4).	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	M-HZ-1: During the environmental review process for future discretionary permits for equine uses, the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Wildland Fire & Fire Protection shall be applied. When impacts are determined to be significant, feasible, and appropriate project-specific mitigation measures shall be incorporated. Examples of standard mitigation measures within the County Guidelines include: installation of fire suppression systems; sufficient on-site water storage; inclusion of fire management zones; and funded agreements with fire protection districts.	Significant and Unavoidable
8. Vector Sources: The proposed project would not result in significant adverse effects to vector sources.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant
<i>2.7 Noise</i>				
1. Excessive Noise Levels: <u>Tier One and Tier Two:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier One and Tier Two would not result in a significant adverse effect due to excessive noise levels. <u>Tier Three and Tier Four:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier Three and Tier Four may result in significant direct and cumulative noise impacts related to off-site noise generated from vehicular traffic and delivery trucks (N-1, N-4).	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	No feasible mitigation identified.	Significant and Unavoidable

**Table S-1
Environmental Issue Areas Analyzed in Chapter 2.0**

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
<p>2. Excessive Groundborne Vibration: The proposed project would not result in significant adverse effects due to exposing people to or generating excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.</p>	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant
<p>3. Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels: <u>Tier One and Tier Two:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier One and Tier Two would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the proposed project. <u>Tier Three and Tier Four:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier Three and Tier Four may result in significant direct and cumulative impacts to ambient noise levels related to off-site noise generated from vehicular traffic and delivery trucks (N-2, N-5).</p>	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	No feasible mitigation identified.	Significant and Unavoidable
<p>4. Temporary or Periodic Increase in Ambient Noise Levels: <u>Tier One and Tier Two:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier One and Tier Two would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the proposed project. <u>Tier Three and Tier Four:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier Three and Tier Four may result in significant direct and cumulative impacts relative to temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels due to vehicular traffic and construction trucks (N-3, N-6).</p>	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	<p>M-N-1: Prior to grading permit issuance, the County shall ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All construction equipment, fixed or mobile, is equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers. • Construction noise reduction methods such as shutting off idling equipment, installing temporary acoustic barriers around stationary construction noise sources, maximizing the distance between construction equipment staging areas and occupied residential areas, and use of electric air compressors and similar power tools, rather than diesel equipment, shall be used where feasible. • During construction, stationary construction equipment shall be located such that emitted noise is directed away from or shielded from sensitive noise receivers. • During construction, stockpiling and vehicle staging areas shall be located as far as practical from noise sensitive 	Significant and Unavoidable

**Table S-1
Environmental Issue Areas Analyzed in Chapter 2.0**

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
			receptors. • Construction shall only occur Mondays through Saturdays between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Construction shall not be allowed on Sundays or a holiday (January 1, the last Monday in May, July 4, the first Monday in September, December 25, and any day appointed by the president as a special national holiday or the governor of the state as a special state holiday). A person may, however, operate construction equipment on a Sunday or holiday between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. at the person's residence provided compliance with Section 36.409 and 36.410 of the County's Noise Ordinance.	
5. Excessive Noise Exposure from a Public or Private Airport: The proposed project would not result in significant adverse effects to an airport land use plan, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip that would expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant
<i>2.8 Transportation and Traffic</i>				
1. Conflict with Plan, Policy, or Ordinance: <u>Tier One and Tier Two:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier One and Tier Two would potentially exceed thresholds and therefore would potentially directly and cumulatively conflict with a plan, policy, or ordinance that establishes measures of the effectiveness of the circulation system performance (TR-1, TR-3). <u>Tier Three and Tier Four:</u> Development of equine facilities under Tier Three and Tier Four would potentially exceed thresholds and therefore would potentially directly and cumulatively conflict with a plan, policy, or ordinance that	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	M-TR-1: Payment of the appropriate Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) shall be required at issuance of any building permits for Tier One through Four equine facilities.	Less than Significant

**Table S-1
Environmental Issue Areas Analyzed in Chapter 2.0**

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact after Mitigation
establishes measures of the effectiveness of the circulation system performance (TR-2, TR-4).				
2. Conflict with Congestion Management Program (CMP) Guidelines for the Determination of Significance: The proposed project would not result in significant impacts relative to conflicts with the CMP.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant
3. Road Safety Guidelines for the Determination of Significance: The proposed project would not result in significant impacts relative to road safety.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant
4. Emergency Access: The proposed project will not result in significant impacts relative to emergency access.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant
5. Alternative Transportation: The proposed project will not result in significant impacts relative to alternative transportation.	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK