Attachment G
Environmental Findings

Environmental Findings

CEQA Findings Regarding Significant Effects for the County of San Diego Wind Energy Ordinance Amendment POD 10-007

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT GUIDELINES SECTION 15091
FINDINGS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS OF THE PROJECT

WIND ENERGY ORDINANCE AMENDMENT
(POD 10-007; LOG No. 09-00-003)
SCH No. 2010091030

May 8, 2013

The following Findings are made for the County of San Diego Wind Energy Ordinance. The environmental effects of the Wind Energy Ordinance Amendment (hereinafter referred to as the "project") are addressed in the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) dated October 31, 2012, which is incorporated by reference herein.

The FEIR evaluated potentially significant effects for the following environmental areas of concern: 1) Aesthetics; 2) Agricultural and Forestry Resources; 3) Air Quality; 4) Biological Resources; 5) Cultural and Paleontological Resources; 6) Hazards and Hazardous Materials; 7) Land Use and Planning; 8) Noise; and 9) Transportation and Traffic.

All of the nine environmental subject areas will involve potentially significant impacts. Moreover, the environmental issues evaluated are significant and unavoidable. Overriding considerations exist which make the impacts acceptable.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code §21000 *et. seq.* and the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, California Code of Regulations, §15000 *et. seq.*) require that no public agency shall approve or carry out a project which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of a project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:

(1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effects on the environment;
(2) Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been or can or should be adopted by that other agency; or
(3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or

alternatives identified in the EIR (CEQA, §21081(a); Guidelines, §15091(a)).

For each significant effect identified for the project, Finding #3 above applies. These impacts are discussed under Section A below. The findings regarding alternatives are discussed in Section B below and provide rationale as to why the proposed project is preferred over the alternatives in the FEIR.

Section A – Finding (3)

Finding: Pursuant to Section 15091(a)(3) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the County Board of Supervisors finds that, for each of the following significant effects identified in the FEIR, specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make the mitigation measures or project alternatives infeasible:

AESTHETICS

1 **AES-1 Significant Effect – Scenic Vistas (Small Turbines/MET Facilities):** The proposed project may result in a potentially significant adverse impact to a scenic vista since it could potentially introduce new vertical elements within the viewshed of a scenic vista that would have the potential to interrupt or detract from a scenic vista that previously did not include infrastructure or development.

Facts in Support of Finding: The County contains visual resources affording opportunities for scenic vistas in every community. Although there are no formally designated scenic vistas, various communities have identified Resource Conservation Areas that have aesthetic value. Visual access to these resources is available via public roads, parks, and trails. If future small wind turbines or related infrastructure are developed that are incompatible with these vistas, they could obstruct, interrupt or detract from the scenic value and would cause a significant impact.

The project includes environmental design criteria as part of the zoning verification process for small wind turbines and MET facilities that help protect scenic vistas. Small wind turbines and MET facilities that meet the zoning verification requirements would be limited to a height of no more than 80 feet for small turbines and 200 feet for MET facilities, would have relatively small blades on a vertical or horizontal axis, and would be prohibited on ridgelines. In addition, these structures cannot include guy wires for structural support or aboveground

power lines. These environmental design criteria would reduce potential obstruction, interruption, or detraction of scenic vistas, but not to a level below significant.

The following measures in the FEIR that reduce impacts to scenic vistas to below significant were also considered. However, the County has determined that these measures would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, the following mitigation measures will not be implemented.

(1) Measure: Require a visual resource study for all small wind turbine projects and temporary MET facilities to ensure that impacts to scenic resources will be avoided or mitigated.

Rationale for Rejection: This measure is not feasible as it would directly conflict with the two project objectives to allow development of small wind turbines and temporary MET facilities without a discretionary permit.

(2) Measure: Prohibit small wind turbines and temporary MET facilities within the viewshed of scenic vistas.

Rationale for Rejection: This measure is not feasible as it would conflict with the project objectives of facilitating the use of renewable wind energy within the County, maximizing the production of energy from renewable wind sources, and allowing development of small wind turbines and temporary MET facilities without a discretionary permit.

The Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative (discussed in Section 4.3 of the FEIR) would reduce the number of small wind turbines allowed on a legal lot, and fewer wind turbines would result in fewer obstructions and distractions from scenic vistas. Therefore, impacts would be lessened as compared to the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, however, impacts would still be considered significant since the alternative would potentially introduce vertical elements within close proximity to the viewshed of a scenic vista and would have the potential to interrupt or detract from a scenic vista that previously did not include infrastructure. Therefore, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative.

Because the measures listed above would be infeasible; because application of all environmental design criteria would not achieve a level of less than significant;

and because there are no feasible project alternatives that would achieve a level of less than significant; impacts to scenic vistas would remain significant and unavoidable.

2 **AES-2 Significant Effect – Scenic Vistas (Large Turbines)**: The proposed project may result in a potentially significant adverse impact to a scenic vista since it could potentially introduce taller vertical elements within close proximity to the viewshed of a scenic vista and large turbines would have the potential to interrupt or detract from a scenic vista that previously did not include infrastructure or development.

Facts in Support of Finding: The County contains visual resources affording opportunities for scenic vistas in every community. Although there are no formally designated scenic vistas, various communities have identified Resource Conservation Areas that have aesthetic value. Visual access to these resources is available via public roads, parks, and trails. If future large wind turbines or related infrastructure are developed that are incompatible with these vistas, they could obstruct, interrupt or detract from the scenic value and would cause a significant impact.

The following mitigation measure identified in the FEIR would reduce the impact, but not to below a level of significance:

- M-AES-1: During the environmental review process for future Major Use Permits for wind turbines, 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.

The following measure from the FEIR that would reduce impacts to scenic vistas to below significant was also considered. However, the County has determined that this measure would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, the following mitigation measure will not be implemented.

(2) Measure: Prohibit large wind turbines within the viewshed of scenic vistas.

Rationale for Rejection: This measure is not feasible as it would conflict with the project objectives of facilitating the use of renewable wind energy within the County and maximizing the production of energy from renewable wind sources.

The Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative (discussed in Section 4.4 of the FEIR) has a reduced project area compared to the proposed project and, therefore, has fewer potential areas allowed for the development of large turbines. Less development would potentially result in fewer obstructions or distractions to scenic vistas. Additionally, the Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative would not change the Boulevard and Borrego Springs community plan language, and therefore, scenic vistas in the Boulevard and Borrego Springs planning areas would be better protected. Nonetheless, impacts would still be considered significant since the alternative would potentially introduce vertical elements within close proximity of the viewshed of a scenic vista and would have the potential to interrupt or detract from a scenic vista that previously did not include infrastructure or development. Therefore, impacts to scenic vistas would remain significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative.

Because some the measures listed above would be infeasible; because application of all feasible mitigation would not achieve a level of less than significant; and because there are no feasible project alternatives that would achieve a level of less than significant; impacts to scenic vistas would remain significant and unavoidable.

3 **AES-3 Significant Effect – Scenic Resources (Small Turbines/MET Facilities)**: The FEIR identifies a significant impact to scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within the viewshed of a state scenic highway.

Facts in Support of Finding: The County contains many scenic resources including mountains, watersheds, scenic geologic features, and Resource Conservation Areas that have been identified for protection because of their scenic value. Scenic resources are often found in parks, habitat preserves, reservoirs, and other undeveloped lands throughout the County, but can also be found in urbanized areas. Future development of small wind turbines and MET facilities would have the potential to result in the removal or alteration of scenic neighborhood or community resources. In addition, small wind turbines placed

along designated state scenic highways located in the County would have the potential to detract from the visual quality of the scenic highway.

The project includes environmental design criteria as part of the zoning verification process for small wind turbines and MET facilities that help protect scenic resources. Small wind turbines and MET facilities that meet the zoning verification requirements would be limited to a height of no more than 80 feet for small turbines and 200 feet for MET facilities, would have relatively small blades on a vertical or horizontal axis, and would be prohibited on ridgelines. In addition, these structures cannot include guy wires for structural support or aboveground power lines. These environmental design criteria would reduce potential impacts to scenic resources, but not to a level below significance.

The following measures were also considered to reduce impacts to scenic resources to below significant. However, the County has determined that these measures would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, the following mitigation measures will not be implemented.

(1) Measure: Require a visual resource study for all small wind turbine projects and temporary MET facilities to ensure that impacts to scenic resources will be avoided or mitigated.

Rationale for Rejection: This measure is not feasible as it would directly conflict with the project objectives to allow development of small wind turbines and temporary MET facilities without a discretionary permit.

(2) Measure: Prohibit small wind turbines and temporary MET facilities near scenic resources.

Rationale for Rejection: This measure is not feasible as it would conflict with the project objectives of facilitating the use of renewable wind energy within the County, maximizing the production of energy from renewable wind sources, and allowing development of small wind turbines and temporary MET facilities without a discretionary permit.

The Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative (discussed in Section 4.3 of the FEIR) would reduce the maximum small wind turbine tower height to 65 feet, and would reduce the number of small wind turbines allowed on a legal lot. Fewer and shorter wind turbines would result in fewer impacts to scenic resources. Although the Limited Small Wind Turbine alternative would lessen impacts as

compared to the proposed project, impacts would still be considered significant since small turbines under this alternative could potentially impair viewsheds that were previously available for viewing. Therefore, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative.

Because the measures listed above would be infeasible; because application of all environmental design criteria would not achieve a level of less than significant; and because there are no feasible project alternatives that would achieve a level of less than significant; impacts to scenic resources would remain significant and unavoidable.

4 **AES-4 Significant Effect – Scenic Resources (Large Turbines)**: The FEIR identifies a significant impact to scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within the viewshed of a state scenic highway.

Facts in Support of Finding: The County contains many scenic resources including mountains, watersheds, scenic geologic features, and Resource Conservation Areas that have been identified for protection because of their scenic value. Scenic resources are often found in parks, habitat preserves, reservoirs, and other undeveloped lands throughout the County, but can also be found in urbanized areas. Future development of large wind turbines would have the potential to result in the removal or alteration of scenic neighborhood or community resources. In addition, wind turbines placed along designated state scenic highways located in the County would have the potential to detract from the visual quality of the scenic highway.

The following mitigation measure identified in the FEIR would reduce the impact, but not to below a level of significance:

- M-AES-1: During the environmental review process for future Major Use Permits for wind turbines, 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.

The following measure from the FEIR that would reduce impacts to scenic resources to below significant was also considered. However, the County has determined that this measure would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, the following mitigation measure will not be implemented.

(1) Measure: Prohibit large wind turbines near scenic resources.

Rationale for Rejection: This measure is not feasible as it would conflict with the project objectives of facilitating the use of renewable wind energy within the County and maximizing the production of energy from renewable wind sources.

The Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative (discussed in Section 4.4 of the FEIR) would have a smaller project area, which would result in fewer potential areas for the development of large wind turbines and potentially fewer impacts to scenic resources. Additionally, the Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative would not change the Boulevard and Borrego Springs community plan language, and therefore, scenic resources in these planning areas would be better protected. However, impacts would still be considered significant since the alternative could still potentially introduce wind turbine towers that could impair viewsheds that were previously available for viewing and/or previously undisturbed. Therefore, impacts to scenic resources would remain significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative.

Because some of the measures listed above would be infeasible; because application of all feasible mitigation would not achieve a level of less than significant; and because there are no feasible project alternatives that would achieve a level of less than significant; impacts to scenic resources would remain significant and unavoidable.

5 **AES-5 Significant Effect – Visual Character or Quality (Small Wind Turbines/MET Facilities):** The FEIR identifies significant impacts from future development of small wind turbines and MET facilities that would potentially increase visual contrasts, view blockage, or skylining (showing the outline of the facilities) from sensitive viewing locations that would detract from or contrast with the existing visual character and/or quality of a neighborhood, community, or localized area.

Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of the project has the potential to result in the degradation of, or substantial change in, the existing visual character or quality of communities throughout the unincorporated County.

The project includes environmental design criteria as part of the zoning verification process for small wind turbines and MET facilities that help protect visual character and quality. Small wind turbines and MET facilities that meet the zoning verification requirements would be limited to a height of no more than 80 feet for small turbines and 200 feet for MET facilities, would have relatively small blades on a vertical or horizontal axis, and would be prohibited on ridgelines. In addition, these structures cannot include guy wires for structural support or aboveground power lines. These environmental design criteria would reduce potential impacts to visual character and quality.

The following measures were considered to reduce impacts to visual character or quality to below significant. However, the County has determined that these measures would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, the following mitigation measures will not be implemented.

(1) Measure: Require a visual resource study for all small wind turbine projects and temporary MET facilities to ensure that impacts to scenic resources will be avoided or mitigated.

Rationale for rejection: This measure is not feasible as it would directly conflict with the two project objectives to allow development of small wind turbines and temporary MET facilities without a discretionary permit.

(2) Measure: Require a community planning group design review process for small wind turbines and MET facilities.

Rationale for rejection: This measure is not feasible as it would directly conflict with the project objectives to allow development of small wind turbines

and temporary MET facilities without a discretionary permit and to streamline and clarify the approval process for the development and operation of small wind turbines.

(3) Measure: Prohibit small wind turbines and temporary MET facilities that would degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

Rationale for rejection: This measure is not feasible as it would conflict with the project objectives of facilitating the use of renewable wind energy within the County, maximizing the production of energy from renewable wind sources, and allowing development of small wind turbines and temporary MET facilities without a discretionary permit.

The Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative (discussed in Section 4.3 of the FEIR) would reduce the maximum wind turbine tower height to 65 feet and would reduce the number of small wind turbines allowed on a legal lot. Fewer and shorter small wind turbines would result in fewer impacts to visual character and quality. Although the Limited Small Wind Turbine alternative would lessen impacts as compared to the proposed project, impacts would still be considered significant since small turbines could potentially degrade existing visual character or quality. Therefore, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative.

Because the measures listed above would be infeasible; because application of all environmental design criteria would not achieve a level of less than significant; and because there are no feasible project alternatives that would achieve a level of less than significant; impacts to visual character and quality would remain significant and unavoidable.

6 AES-6 Significant Effect – Visual Character or Quality (Large Turbines): The FEIR identifies significant impacts from future development of large wind turbines that would potentially increase visual contrasts, view blockage, or skylining (showing the outline of the facilities) from sensitive viewing locations that would detract from or contrast with the existing visual character and/or quality of a neighborhood, community, or localized area.

Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of the project has the potential to result in the degradation of, or substantial change in, the existing visual character or quality of communities throughout the unincorporated County.

The following mitigation measure identified in the FEIR would reduce the impact, but not to below a level of significance:

- M-AES-1: During the environmental review process for future Major Use Permits for wind turbines, 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.

The following measure from the FEIR that would reduce impacts to visual character or quality to below significant was also considered. However, the County has determined that this measure would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, the following mitigation measure will not be implemented.

(1) Measure: Prohibit large turbines that would degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

    Rationale for rejection: This measure is not feasible as it would conflict with the project objectives of facilitating the use of renewable wind energy within the County and maximizing the production of energy from renewable wind sources.

The Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative would have a smaller project area, which would result in fewer potential areas for the development of large wind turbines and potentially fewer impacts to visual character or quality. Additionally, the Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative would not change the Boulevard and Borrego Springs community plan language, and therefore, visual character or quality in these communities would be better protected. However, impacts would still be considered significant since the alternative could still potentially introduce large wind turbine towers that could affect visual character or quality. Therefore, impacts to scenic resources would remain significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative.

Because the measure listed above would be infeasible; because application of the feasible mitigation measure would not achieve a level of less than significant; and because there are no feasible project alternatives that would achieve a level

of less than significant; impacts to visual character and quality would remain significant and unavoidable.

7 AES-7 Significant Effect – Light or Glare (Large Turbines): The FEIR identifies significant impacts from future development of large wind turbines that would create a new source of substantial light or glare associated with FAA lighting requirements and shadow flicker effects.

Facts in Support of Finding: The project would have the potential to result in a substantial new source of light or glare from future development of large wind turbines.

The mitigation measures identified in the FEIR would reduce the impact, but not to below a level of significance:

- M-AES-2: Require that a Lighting Mitigation Plan be prepared as part of the Major Use Permit discretionary review process. The Lighting Mitigation Plan would demonstrate that the design and installation of all permanent lighting for large wind turbine ancillary facilities is such that light bulbs and reflectors are not visible from public viewing areas; lighting does not cause reflected glare; and illumination of the project facilities, vicinity, and nighttime sky is minimized. The Lighting Mitigation Plan would demonstrate consistency with the Light Pollution Code (Section 59.100 et al.) and Sections 6322 and 6324 of the Zoning Ordinance to ensure outdoor light fixtures emitting light into the night sky do not result in a detrimental effect on astronomical research and to ensure reflected glare and light trespass is minimized.

- M-AES-3: Require that a Shadow Flicker Study be prepared as part of the Major Use Permit discretionary review process. The Shadow Flicker Study would utilize a shadow flicker model run to determine the potential shadow flicker that could occur at sensitive receptors within 2,000 meters (6,562 feet) of the proposed turbines. Due to the fact that some receptors may lie within 60° due north of the turbines, outside of the sun's path at any given point in the year, those receptors may be excluded from the study. Beyond 2,000 meters, the human eye would not be able to discern a shadow cast from a wind turbine.

  The modeling should utilize many different inputs, including:

  1. Real Data
     - Actual coordinates of turbines

- Actual coordinates of receptors
- Actual topographic data

2. Conservative Assumptions
    - Specifications of the turbines being considered with the highest hub height and longest rotor diameter
    - 100% turbine operation
    - No vegetative screening
    - Receptors can be impacted from all directions (i.e., “greenhouse mode”)
3. Realistic Features
    - Actual wind data from a local meteorological tower to account for the percentage of time wind blows from each direction
    - National Weather Service sunshine probability data to approximate average cloud cover.

The following measure that would reduce lighting impacts to below significant was also considered. However, the County has determined that this measure would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, the following mitigation measure will not be implemented.

(1) Measure: Incorporate Obstacle Collision Avoidance System (OCAS) onto all future wind turbines. The OCAS lighting system minimizes nighttime lighting impacts attributed to the operation of FAA-required obstruction lighting by utilizing an audio-visual system in which lights are only turned on when planes are within a certain distance of airspace.

Rationale for rejection: This mitigation measure is infeasible because the FAA is currently unable to approve requests for OCAS and other audio-visual warning systems (AVWS) for wind turbines or wind farms. However, the FAA is currently studying the application of these systems on wind turbine farms, but standards regarding the use of AVWS were still not available as of spring of 2013.

The Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative would have a smaller project area, which would result in fewer potential areas for the development of large wind turbines and potentially fewer lighting impacts. Additionally, the Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative would not change the Boulevard and Borrego Springs community plan language, and therefore, potential lighting or shadow flicker impacts in these planning areas would be reduced. However, impacts would still be considered significant since the alternative could still potentially result in future

large turbine projects that require specific lighting per Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulations or occasional instances of shadow flicker. Therefore, lighting and shadow flicker impacts would remain significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative.

Because the measure listed above would be infeasible; because application of all feasible mitigation would not achieve a level of less than significant; and because there are no feasible project alternatives that would achieve a level of less than significant; impacts associated with light and glare would remain significant and unavoidable.

8 **AES-8 Cumulatively Considerable Effect – Scenic Vistas (Small Turbines/MET Facilities):** The proposed project may result in a potentially significant adverse impact to a scenic vista since it could potentially introduce new vertical elements within the viewshed of a scenic vista that would have the potential to interrupt or detract from a scenic vista that previously did not include infrastructure or development. Therefore, in combination with other past, present and foreseeable future projects, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to scenic vistas

Facts in Support of Finding: Cumulative projects located in the San Diego region would have the potential to result in a cumulative impact to scenic vistas if in combination they caused visual impacts within the viewshed of a scenic vista. The Sunrise Powerlink, for example, causes visual impacts to scenic vistas. In addition, there are a number of tribal projects that adversely affect scenic vistas in the project area. Therefore, additional projects in the region would have the potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts to scenic vistas.

As described for Impact AES-1, future small wind turbines and MET facilities would have the potential to result in impacts to scenic vistas. Therefore, in combination with other past, present and foreseeable future projects, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to scenic vistas.

As described for Impact AES-1, none of the environmental design criteria or project alternatives would reduce the project's significant impacts associated with scenic vistas to below significant. Therefore, impacts to scenic vistas from future small wind turbines and temporary MET facilities would remain cumulatively considerable.

9 **AES-9 Cumulatively Considerable Effect – Scenic Vistas (Large Turbines)**: The proposed project may result in a potentially significant adverse cumulative impact to a scenic vista since it could potentially introduce taller vertical elements within close proximity to the viewshed of a scenic vista and large turbines would have the potential to interrupt or detract from a scenic vista that previously did not include infrastructure or development. Therefore, in combination with other past, present and foreseeable future projects, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to scenic vistas

Facts in Support of Finding: Cumulative projects located in the San Diego region would have the potential to result in a cumulative impact to scenic vistas if in combination they caused visual impacts within the viewshed of a scenic vista. The Sunrise Powerlink, for example, causes visual impacts to scenic vistas. In addition, there are a number of tribal projects that adversely affect scenic vistas in the project area. Therefore, projects in the region would have the potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts to scenic vistas.

As described above for Impact AES-2, future large wind turbines would have the potential to result in impacts to scenic vistas. The proposed project may allow future large turbine projects in close proximity to scenic vistas and introduce taller vertical elements which may contribute to cumulative impacts. Therefore, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to scenic vistas.

As described above for Impact AES-2, none of the mitigation measures or project alternatives would reduce significant impacts associated with scenic vistas to below significant. Therefore, impacts to scenic vistas from future large wind turbines would remain cumulatively considerable.

10 **AES-10 Cumulatively Considerable Effect – Scenic Resources (Small Turbines/MET Facilities)**: The FEIR identifies a significant impact to scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within the viewshed of a state scenic highway. Therefore, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to scenic resources.

Facts in Support of Finding: Cumulative projects located in the San Diego region would have the potential to result in a cumulative impact to scenic resources if in combination they would substantially damage scenic resources,

including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within the viewshed of a state scenic highway. Past, present, and foreseeable future projects are not all held to strict standards protecting scenic resources. Therefore, the cumulative projects in the region would have the potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts to scenic resources.

As described above for Impact AES-3, future small wind turbines and MET facilities would have the potential to result in impacts to scenic resources, including scenic highways. Therefore, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to scenic resources.

As described above for Impact AES-3, none of the environmental design criteria or project alternatives would reduce impacts associated with scenic resources to below significant. Therefore, impacts to scenic resources from future small wind turbines and temporary MET facilities would remain cumulatively considerable.

11 **AES-11 Cumulatively Considerable Effect – Scenic Resources (Large Turbines)**: The FEIR identifies a significant impact to scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within the viewshed of a state scenic highway. Therefore, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to scenic resources.

Facts in Support of Finding: Cumulative projects located in the San Diego region would have the potential to result in a cumulative impact to scenic resources if in combination they would substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within the viewshed of a state scenic highway. Past, present, and foreseeable future projects are not all held to strict standards protecting scenic resources. Therefore, the cumulative projects in the region would have the potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts to scenic resources.

As described above for Impact AES-4, future large wind turbine(s) would have the potential to result in impacts to scenic resources, including scenic highways. Therefore, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to scenic resources.

As described above for Impact AES-4, none of the mitigation measures or project alternatives would reduce impacts associated with scenic resources to below significant. Therefore, impacts to scenic resources from future large wind turbines would remain cumulatively considerable.

12 **AES-12 Cumulatively Considerable Effect – Visual Character or Quality (Small Wind Turbines/MET Facilities):** The FEIR identifies significant impacts from future development of wind turbines and MET facilities that would potentially increase visual contrasts, view blockage, or skylining (showing the outline of the facilities) from sensitive viewing locations that would detract from or contrast with the existing visual character and/or quality of a neighborhood, community, or localized area. Therefore, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to visual character and quality within the project site and its surroundings

Facts in Support of Finding: Cumulative projects located in the County would have the potential to result in a cumulative impact to visual character or quality if, in combination, they would substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The County's General Plan Update project identified significant unavoidable impacts to the visual character and quality of its communities throughout the unincorporated County. Therefore, the cumulative projects in the region would have the potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts related to visual character and quality.

As described above for Impact AES-5, implementation of the proposed project would have the potential to degrade the existing visual character or quality of a site and its surroundings. Therefore, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to visual character and quality within the project site and its surroundings.

As described above for Impact AES-6, none of the environmental design criteria or project alternatives would reduce impacts to visual character or quality to below significant. Therefore, impacts to visual character and quality from future small wind turbines and temporary MET facilities would remain cumulatively considerable.

13 **AES-13 Cumulative Considerable Effect – Visual Character or Quality (Large Turbines):** The FEIR identifies significant impacts from future development of wind turbines that would potentially increase visual contrasts, view blockage, or skylining (showing the outline of the facilities) from sensitive viewing locations that would detract from or contrast with the existing visual character and/or quality of a neighborhood, community, or localized area. Therefore, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively

considerable impact to visual character and quality within the project site and its surroundings.

Facts in Support of Finding: Cumulative projects located in the County would have the potential to result in a cumulative impact to visual character or quality if, in combination, they would substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The County's General Plan Update project identified significant unavoidable impacts to the visual character and quality of the communities throughout the unincorporated County. Therefore, the cumulative projects in the region would have the potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts related to visual character and quality.

As described above for Impact AES-6, implementation of the proposed project would have the potential to degrade the existing visual character or quality of a community. Therefore, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to visual character and quality within the project site and its surroundings.

As described above for Impact AES-6, none of the mitigation measures or project alternatives would reduce impacts to visual character or quality to below significant. Therefore, impacts to visual character and quality from future large wind turbines would remain cumulatively considerable.

14 **AES-14 Cumulatively Considerable Effect – Light or Glare (Large Turbines):** The FEIR identifies significant impacts from future development of large wind turbines that would create a new source of substantial light or glare associated with FAA lighting requirements and shadow flicker effects. Therefore, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact due to light or glare.

Facts in Support of Finding: The construction and operation of cumulative projects located in the San Diego region would have the potential to create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Impacts from glare are generally localized and not cumulative in nature. There are no known instances in the County unincorporated area where multiple projects have reflective materials in close proximity, thereby resulting in combined effects of glare. Therefore, a cumulatively considerable impact related to glare would not occur. However, new sources of nighttime light pollution in the San Diego region would result in a potential lighting impact to the Palomar Mountain and Mount Laguna Observatories. Despite lighting ordinances

and other regulations pertaining to night lighting and mitigation measures that would reduce light pollution on a project by project basis, the combined effect of all cumulative projects in the San Diego region would be a cumulative increase in light pollution. Therefore, the cumulative projects in the region would have the potential to result in a cumulatively considerable impact associated with nighttime lighting.

As described above for Impact AES-7, implementation of the proposed project would have the potential to result in significant impacts associated with FAA lighting requirements and shadow flicker effects. Shadow flicker effects would be limited to just the immediate vicinity of the large turbine project location and, therefore, would not contribute to a cumulative impact related to light or glare. However, the lighting required for FAA compliance could contribute to the cumulatively considerable impacts associated with nighttime lighting described above.

As described above for Impact AES-7, none of the mitigation measures or project alternatives would reduce impacts associated with lighting to a level below significant. Therefore, impacts associated with light from future large wind turbines would remain cumulatively considerable.

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

15 AGR-1 Significant Effect – Direct Conversion of Farmland (Large Turbines): The FEIR identifies significant impacts related to the direct conversion of San Diego County Agricultural Resources (including, but not limited to, Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance, pursuant to the FMMP of the California Resources Agency), or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use from the development of large wind turbines under the proposed project.

Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of the project could result in the direct conversion of agricultural resources to non-agricultural land uses due to the development of large wind turbines.

The mitigation measure identified in the FEIR would reduce the impact, but not to below a level of significance:

- M-AGR-1 During the environmental review process for future Major Use Permits for wind turbines, 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.

The following measures were considered to reduce impacts associated with the conversion of agricultural resources within the unincorporated County to below a level of significance. However, the County has determined that these measures would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, these measures will not be implemented.

(1) Measure: Prohibit construction of large wind turbine projects in areas supporting Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance.

Rationale for Rejection: This measure would be infeasible because some of this farmland occurs within high-quality wind resource areas. This prohibition within the wind resource areas would conflict with the project objectives to facilitate the use of renewable wind energy within the County, to maximize the production of energy from renewable wind sources, and to reduce the potential for energy shortages and outages by facilitating local energy supply.

The Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative (discussed in Section 4.4 of the FEIR) has a reduced project area compared to the proposed project and, therefore, has fewer potential areas allowed for the development of large turbines. Less development would potentially result in fewer impacts relative to the conversion of farmland. Additionally, the Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative would not change the Boulevard and Borrego Springs community plan language, and therefore, farmland in the Boulevard and Borrego Springs planning areas would be better protected. Nonetheless, impacts would still be considered significant since the alternative would potentially result in the conversion of farmland due to the development of large wind turbines. Therefore, impacts to agricultural resources would remain significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative.

Because some measures listed above would be infeasible; because application of all feasible mitigation would not achieve a level of less than significant; and because there are no feasible project alternatives that would achieve a level of

less than significant; impacts associated with the conversion of farmland due to the development of large wind turbines and would remain significant and unavoidable.

16 **AGR-2 Significant Effect – Agricultural Zoning and Williamson Act Contracts (Large Turbines):** The FEIR identifies significant impacts related the development of large wind turbines under the proposed project that would have potentially significant adverse effects to agricultural zoning and Williamson Act contracts.

Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of the project could result in conflicts with existing agricultural zones and Williamson Act contracts due to the development of large wind turbines through ground-disturbing activities, such as excavation and grading, which have the potential to conflict with agricultural zones and lands with Williamson Act contracts. It is not likely that large wind turbine projects would be permissible on lands under Williamson Act contracts because of the restrictions in these contracts. However, one or more large wind turbines could be developed in agriculturally zoned lands or adjacent to Williamson Act lands, thereby potentially causing an adverse impact to important agriculture. For example, large towers near agricultural fields have been known to interfere with crop dusting activities.

The mitigation measure identified in the FEIR would reduce the impact, but not to below a level of significance:

- M-AGR-1 During the environmental review process for future Major Use Permits for wind turbines, 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.

The following measures were considered to reduce impacts associated with conflicts with agricultural zones and the Williamson Act contract within the unincorporated County to below a level of significance. However, the County has determined that these measures would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, these measures will not be implemented.

(1) Measure: Prohibit construction of large wind turbine projects in areas zoned for agriculture and areas near Williamson Act contract lands.

Rationale for Rejection: This measure would be infeasible because areas with high-quality wind resource areas may have agricultural zoning or include lands under Williamson Act contracts. This prohibition within the wind resource areas would conflict with the project objectives to facilitate the use of renewable wind energy within the County, to maximize the production of energy from renewable wind sources, and to reduce the potential for energy shortages and outages by facilitating local energy supply.

The Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative (discussed in Section 4.4 of the FEIR) has a reduced project area compared to the proposed project and, therefore, has fewer potential areas allowed for the development of large turbines. Less development would potentially result in fewer impacts relative to conflicts with existing agricultural zones and the Williamson Act contract. Additionally, the Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative would not change the Boulevard and Borrego Springs community plan language, and therefore, agricultural zones in the Boulevard and Borrego Springs planning areas would be better protected. Nonetheless, impacts would still be considered significant since the alternative would potentially result in conflicts with existing agricultural zones and with Williamson Act contracts due to the development of large wind turbines. Therefore, impacts to agricultural zones and the Williamson Act contracts would remain significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative.

Because some measures listed above would be infeasible; because application of all feasible mitigation would not achieve a level of less than significant; and because there are no feasible project alternatives that would achieve a level of less than significant; impacts associated with agricultural zones and the Williamson Act contract due to the development of large wind turbines would remain significant and unavoidable.

17 **AGR-3 Significant Effect – Loss or Conversion of Forest Land (Large Turbines):** The FEIR identifies significant impacts related to the development of large wind turbines under the proposed project that would have potentially significant adverse effects related to the loss or conversion of forest land.

Facts in Support of Finding: “Forest land” is land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions,

and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits (California Public Resources Code, Section 12220(g)). Implementation of the project could result in the loss or conversion of forest land through ground-disturbing activities, such as excavation and grading, associated with the development of large wind turbines and associated infrastructure.

The mitigation measure identified in the FEIR would reduce the impact, but not to below a level of significance:

- M-AGR-2 During the environmental review process for future Major Use Permits for wind turbines, 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.

The following measures were considered to reduce impacts associated with the loss or conversion of forest land within the unincorporated County to below a level of significance. However, the County has determined that these measures would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, these measures will not be implemented.

(1) Measure: Prohibit construction of large wind turbine projects in areas supporting forest land.

Rationale for Rejection: This measure would be infeasible because forest land may be located within high-quality wind resource areas. This prohibition within the wind resource areas would conflict with the project objectives to facilitate the use of renewable wind energy within the County, to maximize the production of energy from renewable wind sources, and to reduce the potential for energy shortages and outages by facilitating local energy supply.

The Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative (discussed in Section 4.4 of the FEIR) has a reduced project area compared to the proposed project and, therefore, has fewer potential areas allowed for the development of large turbines. Less development would potentially result in fewer impacts to forest land. Additionally, the Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative would not change the Boulevard and Borrego Springs community plan language, and therefore,

forest land in the Boulevard and Borrego Springs planning areas would be better protected. Nonetheless, impacts would still be considered significant since the alternative would potentially result in impacts to forest land due to the development of large wind turbines. Therefore, impacts to forest land would remain significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative.

Because some measures listed above would be infeasible; because application of all feasible mitigation would not achieve a level of less than significant; and because there are no feasible project alternatives that would achieve a level of less than significant; impacts associated with forest land due to the development of large wind turbines would remain significant and unavoidable.

18 **AGR-4 Significant Effect – Indirect Conversion of Farmland or Forest Land (Large Turbines):** The FEIR identifies significant impacts related the development of large wind turbines under the proposed project that would have potentially significant adverse effects related the indirect conversion of farmland or forest land.

Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of the project could result in the indirect conversion of farmland or forest land through ground-disturbing activities, such as excavation and grading, associated with the development of large wind turbines and associated infrastructure near farmland or forest land.

The mitigation measures identified in the FEIR would reduce the impact, but not to below a level of significance:

- M-AGR-1 During the environmental review process for future Major Use Permits for wind turbines, 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.

- M-AGR-2 During the environmental review process for future Major Use Permits for wind turbines, the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Agricultural 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.

The following measures were considered to reduce impacts associated with the loss or conversion of farmland or forest land within the unincorporated County to below a level of significance. However, the County has determined that these measures would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, these measures will not be implemented.

(1) Measure: Prohibit construction of large wind turbine projects on or near areas supporting Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance, or forest land.

Rationale for Rejection: This measure would be infeasible because farmland or forest land may be located within or adjacent to high-quality wind resource areas. This prohibition within the wind resource areas would conflict with the project objectives to facilitate the use of renewable wind energy within the County, to maximize the production of energy from renewable wind sources, and to reduce the potential for energy shortages and outages by facilitating local energy supply.

The Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative (discussed in Section 4.4 of the FEIR) has a reduced project area compared to the proposed project and, therefore, has fewer potential areas allowed for the development of large turbines. Less development would potentially result in fewer impacts relative to indirect conversion of farmland or forest land. Additionally, the Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative would not change the Boulevard and Borrego Springs community plan language, and therefore, farmland and/or forest land in the Boulevard and Borrego Springs planning areas would be better protected. Nonetheless, impacts would still be considered significant since the alternative would potentially result in impacts to farmland and forest land due to the development of large wind turbines. For example, large towers can interfere with crop dusting activities. Therefore, impacts from the indirect conversion of farmland or forest land would remain significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative.

Because some measures listed above would be infeasible; because application of all feasible mitigation would not achieve a level of less than significant; and because there are no feasible project alternatives that would achieve a level of

less than significant; impacts associated with indirect conversion of farmland and forest land due to the development of large wind turbines would remain significant and unavoidable.

19 **AGR-5 Cumulatively Considerable Effect – Direct Conversion of Farmland (Large Turbines):** The development of large wind turbines under the proposed project would have the potential to convert San Diego County agricultural resources to non-agricultural use. In combination with other cumulative projects, the project would have a cumulatively considerable contribution to a regionally significant impact to the direct conversion of agricultural land.

Facts in Support of Finding: Cumulative projects located in the San Diego region would have the potential to result in a cumulative impact to agricultural resources if in combination they would convert existing agriculture to non-agricultural uses. Cumulative projects that would have the potential to result in adverse impacts to farmland include, but are not limited to, development allowed by the General Plan update and the development of land uses as designated under surrounding jurisdictions' general plans. These projects are regulated by federal, state, and local regulations. Important farmland may occur on tribal lands and be affected by tribal projects such as wind energy projects. Tribal projects may not adhere to state or local regulations and could result in cumulatively considerable impacts to agricultural resources. Therefore, the cumulative projects in the region would have the potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts to farmland.

As described above for Impact AGR-1, future large wind turbines would have the potential to result in impacts to due to the direct conversion of farmland. The proposed project could result in the direct conversion of agricultural resources to non-agricultural land uses due to the development of large wind turbines. Therefore, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to farmland.

As described above for Impact AGR-1, none of the mitigation measures or project alternatives would reduce impacts to agricultural resources to below significant. Therefore, project impacts associated with the conversion of farmland due to the development of large wind turbines would remain cumulatively considerable.

20 **AGR-6 Cumulative Impact – Agricultural Zoning and Williamson Act Contracts (Large Turbines):** As described above, the development of large

wind turbines under the proposed project would have the potential to conflict with agricultural zoning and Williamson Act contracts. In combination with other cumulative projects, the project would have a cumulatively considerable contribution to this significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Cumulative projects located in the San Diego region would have the potential to result in a cumulative impact to agricultural resources if, in combination, they would conflict with agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contracts. Some projects within the County and within adjacent jurisdictions are not compatible with agricultural zones or Williamson Act contracts. Thus, they create cumulatively considerable impacts related to conflicts with agricultural zoning and Williamson Act contracts. Therefore, the cumulative projects in the region would have the potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts to agricultural zoning and Williamson Act contracts.

As described above for Impact AGR-2, future large wind turbines would have the potential to result in impacts due to the development of large wind turbines through ground-disturbing activities, such as excavation and grading, which have the potential to impact agricultural zones and lands with Williamson Act contracts. Therefore, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact related to conflicts with agricultural zoning and Williamson Act contracts.

As described above for Impact AGR-2, none of the mitigation measures or project alternatives would reduce impacts to agricultural resources to below significant. Therefore, project impacts related to conflicts with agricultural zoning and Williamson Act contracts due to the development of large wind turbines would remain cumulatively considerable.

21 **AGR-7 Cumulative Impact – Direct Loss or Conversion of Forest Land (Large Turbines):** As described above, the development of large wind turbines under the proposed project would have the potential to result in the loss or conversion of forest land. In combination with other cumulative projects, the project would have a cumulatively considerable contribution to this significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Cumulative projects that would have the potential to result in adverse impacts to forest land include, but are not limited to, development of the County's General Plan Update and the development of land

uses as designated under surrounding jurisdictions' general plans. Forest lands may also occur on tribal lands and be affected by tribal projects such as casino expansions or wind energy projects. Therefore, the cumulative projects in the region would have the potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts to forest land.

As described above for Impact AGR-3, future large wind turbines would have the potential to result in impacts to forest land due to the development of large wind turbines through ground-disturbing activities, such as excavation and grading. Therefore, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact related to forest land.

As described above for Impact AGR-3, none of the mitigation measures or project alternatives would reduce impacts to forest land to below significant. Therefore, project impacts associated with forest land due to the development of large wind turbines would remain cumulatively considerable.

22 **AGR-8 Cumulative Impact – Indirect Loss or Conversion of Farmland or Forest Land (Large Turbines):** As described above, the development of large wind turbines under the proposed project would have the potential to result in the indirect conversion of farmland or forest land. In combination with other cumulative projects, the project would have a cumulatively considerable contribution to this significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Within the San Diego region, the indirect conversion of farmland and forest land is increasing due to population growth and the subsequent development required to support the population growth. Cumulative projects that would have the potential to result in adverse indirect impacts to farmland or forest land include, but are not limited to, development allowed by the General Plan Update and the development of land uses as designated under surrounding jurisdictions' general plans. Therefore, the cumulative projects in the region would have the potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts to farmland and forest land.

As described above for Impact AGR-4, future large wind turbines would have the potential to result in impacts related to indirect conversion of farmland and forest land due to the development of large wind turbines through ground-disturbing activities, such as excavation and grading. Therefore, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact related to farmland and forest land.

As described above for Impact AGR-4, none of the mitigation measures or project alternatives would reduce impacts resulting from indirect conversion of farmland and forest land to below significant. Therefore, project impacts associated with indirect conversion of farmland and forest land due to the development of large wind turbines would remain cumulatively considerable.

AIR QUALITY

23 AQ-1 Significant Effect – Air Quality Violations (Large Turbines): The FEIR identifies significant impacts associated with exceedance of quantitative screening-level thresholds (SLTs) for attainment pollutants (NO_2, SO_2, and CO) and exceedance of SLTs for nonattainment pollutants (O_3 precursors and particulate matter) due to construction activities associated with the development of large wind turbines under the proposed project.

Facts in Support of Finding: The project would have the potential to result in a significant impact associated with violation of an air quality standard because emissions of criteria pollutants from development of future large wind turbines under the proposed project would exceed the screening-level thresholds for certain air pollutants. While wind turbines developed under the proposed project would help to reduce air pollutants emitted from large power plants supplying power to the County, the construction activities for large wind turbines have the potential to increase emissions.

The mitigation measure identified in the FEIR would reduce the impact, but not to below a level of significance:

- M-AQ-1: During the environmental review process for future discretionary permits for wind turbines, 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.

The following measures were also considered to reduce impacts associated with air quality violations to below significant. However, the County has determined that these measures would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, the following mitigation measures will not be implemented.

(1) Measure: Require all construction activities to use equipment that is CARB certified Tier 3 or better.

Rationale for Rejection: This measure could not be accomplished because it would require all construction contractors working within the unincorporated County to upgrade existing equipment even if it is still usable, and it would require a more stringent emissions standard than is currently implemented by CARB. The measure would limit which construction contractors would be allowed to work within the County and could result in significantly increased costs to project applicants. Therefore, it is infeasible due to legal and economic limitations.

(2) Measure: Prohibit large wind turbines that would result in emissions from new vehicle trips that would exceed screening level thresholds.

Rationale for Rejection: This measure is not feasible as it would conflict with the project objectives of facilitating the use of renewable wind energy within the County, to maximize the production of energy from renewable wind sources, and to reduce the potential for energy shortages and outages by facilitating local energy supply.

The Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative (discussed in Section 4.4 of the FEIR) has a reduced project area compared to the proposed project and, therefore, has fewer potential areas allowed for the development of large turbines. Less development would potentially result in less construction and therefore fewer impacts relative to emissions of criteria pollutants. Additionally, the Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative would not change the Boulevard and Borrego Springs community plan language, thereby further limiting the number of wind turbines that could be constructed and emissions from these construction activities. Nonetheless, impacts would still be considered significant since the alternative would potentially result in impacts to air quality due to the construction activities associated with the development of large wind turbines. Therefore, impacts relative to air quality violations would remain significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative.

Because some of the measures listed above would be infeasible; because application of all feasible mitigation would not achieve a level of less than significant; and because there are no feasible project alternatives that would

achieve a level of less than significant; impacts associated with air quality violations would remain significant and unavoidable.

24 **AQ-2 Significant Effect – Non-Attainment Criteria Pollutants (Large Turbines):** The FEIR identifies significant impacts related to a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB) is in non-attainment under applicable federal or State ambient air quality standards (AAQS) due to construction activities associated with the development of large wind turbines under the proposed project. The SDAB is currently classified as a non-attainment area for the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) for O_3, which is caused by contributions from O_3 precursors NOx and VOCs. The SDAB is also classified as a non-attainment area for the CAAQS for PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$.

Facts in Support of Finding: Emissions of criteria pollutants associated with future development of large wind turbines under the proposed project would result in a cumulatively significant impact due to emissions (specifically VOC, NOx, CO, PM10 and PM2.5) from construction activities. Future development under the project would be required to comply with the San Diego County Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS), the State Implementation Plan (SIP), California Air Resources Board (CARB) motor vehicle standards, Air Pollution Control District (APCD) regulations for stationary sources and architectural coatings, Title 24 energy efficiency standards, and the General Plan Update goals and policies. While wind turbines developed under the proposed project would help to reduce air pollutants emitted from large power plants supplying power to the County, the construction activities for large wind turbines has the potential to increase County-wide emissions of VOC, NOx, CO, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$. Therefore, the project would result in a significant impact relative to non-attainment criteria pollutants.

The mitigation measure identified in the FEIR would reduce the impact, but not to below a level of significance:

- M-AQ-1: During the environmental review process for future discretionary permits for wind turbines, 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.

The following measures were also considered to reduce impacts associated with non-attainment criteria pollutants to below significant. However, the County has determined that these measures would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, the following mitigation measures will not be implemented.

(1) Measure: Require all construction activities to use equipment that is CARB certified Tier 3 or better.

Rationale for Rejection: This measure could not be accomplished because it would require all construction contractors working within the unincorporated County to upgrade existing equipment even if it is still usable, and it would require a more stringent emissions standard than is currently implemented by CARB. The measure would limit which construction contractors would be allowed to work within the County and could result in significantly increased costs to project applicants. Therefore, it is infeasible due to economic limitations.

(2) Measure: Prohibit large wind turbines that would result in emissions from new vehicle trips that would exceed screening level thresholds.

Rationale for Rejection: This measure is not feasible as it would conflict with the project objectives of facilitating the use of renewable wind energy within the County, to maximize the production of energy from renewable wind sources, and to reduce the potential for energy shortages and outages by facilitating local energy supply.

The Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative (discussed in Section 4.4 of the FEIR) has a reduced project area compared to the proposed project and, therefore, has fewer potential areas allowed for the development of large turbines. Less development would potentially result in less construction and therefore fewer impacts relative to emissions of criteria pollutants. Additionally, the Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative would not change the Boulevard and Borrego Springs community plan language, thereby further limiting the number of wind turbines that could be constructed and emissions from these construction activities. Nonetheless, impacts would still be considered significant since the alternative would potentially result in impacts to air quality due to the construction activities associated with the development of large wind turbines. Therefore,

impacts relative to non-attainment criteria pollutants would remain significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative.

Because some of the measures listed above would be infeasible; because application of all feasible mitigation would not achieve a level of less than significant; and because there are no feasible project alternatives that would achieve a level of less than significant; impacts associated with non-attainment criteria pollutants would remain significant and unavoidable.

25 **AQ-3 Cumulatively Considerable Impact – Air Quality Violations (Large Turbines):** As described above, the development of large wind turbines under the proposed project would have the potential to result in a significant violation of an air quality standard. In combination with other cumulative projects, the project would have the potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts.

Facts in Support of Finding: Cumulative projects located in the San Diego region would have the potential to result in a significant cumulative air quality violation if, in combination, they would violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. New stationary sources of criteria pollutants or projects that would increase vehicle trips may result in increases in pollutant emissions. There are projects proposed in the unincorporated county that could result in the emission of criteria pollutants due to increased vehicle trips. As such, cumulative projects in the region would have the potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts relative to air quality violations.

As described above for Impact AQ-1, while wind turbines developed under the proposed project would help to reduce air pollutants emitted from large power plants supplying power to the County, the construction activities for large wind turbines has the potential to increase emissions. Therefore, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact related to air quality violations.

As described above for Impact AQ-1, none of the mitigation measures or project alternatives would reduce impacts relative to air quality violations to below significant. Therefore, project impacts associated with air quality violations due to the development of large wind turbines would remain cumulatively considerable.

26 **AQ-4 Cumulatively Considerable Impact – Non-Attainment Criteria Pollutants (Large Turbines):** As described above, the development of large wind turbines under the proposed project would have the potential to result in significant impacts associated with non-attainment criteria pollutants. In combination with other cumulative projects, the project would have the potential to result in a significant cumulative impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Cumulative projects located in the San Diego region would have the potential to result in a significant cumulative impact associated with non-attainment criteria pollutants if, in combination, they would result in a net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the SDAB is non-attainment. The project would result in a potentially significant direct impact associated with non-attainment criteria pollutants. Therefore, the cumulative projects in the region would have the potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts relative to non-attainment criteria pollutants.

As described above for Impact AQ-1, while wind turbines developed under the proposed project would help to reduce air pollutants emitted from large power plants supplying power to the County, the construction activities for large wind turbines has the potential to increase emissions. Therefore, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact related to non-attainment criteria pollutants.

As described above for Impact AQ-1, none of the mitigation measures or project alternatives would reduce impacts relative to non-attainment criteria pollutants to below significant. Therefore, project impacts associated with non-attainment criteria pollutants due to the development of large wind turbines would remain cumulatively considerable.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

27 **BIO-1 Significant Effect – Candidate, Sensitive, or Special Status Species (Small Turbines/MET Facilities)**: The FEIR identifies significant impacts, either directly or through habitat modifications, on species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS.

Facts in Support of Finding: The project would have the potential to result in direct and/or indirect impacts to candidate, sensitive, or special status plant and wildlife species and their habitat from the development of small wind turbines and

MET facilities under this project. It is estimated that small wind turbines developed under the proposed project could result in up to approximately 7,724 acres of ground disturbance, which may impact habitats with the potential to support special status plant and wildlife species. Although, some small wind turbines would be roof-mounted and would not result in any ground disturbance.

The project includes environmental design criteria as part of the zoning verification process for small wind turbines and MET facilities that reduce potential impacts to candidate, sensitive, or special status species. Small wind turbines and MET facilities that meet the zoning verification requirements would be prohibited within 4,000 feet of a known golden eagle nest. Additionally, setbacks of 300 feet or five times the turbine height, whichever is greater, are required from known significant bat roosts, blue-line watercourses or water bodies mapped on the US Geological Survey topographic maps, wetland vegetation, open space or preserve areas, and known locations of transmission towers or power lines. Small wind turbines cannot include guy wires for structural support or aboveground power lines. Guy wires and power lines can be additional collision hazards for birds; and power lines can result in electrocutions of birds. Small wind turbines are also prohibited on ridgelines and within the airspace above ridgelines. In addition, towers that are not roof-mounted must include at least 10 feet of vegetation clearance around the base combined with placement of gravel to reduce potential habitat for prey species that would attract birds and bats. Finally, small turbines are allowed in designated Pre-approved Mitigation Areas only with a discretionary Administrative Permit and would require site-specific environmental review. The environmental design criteria noted above would reduce potential impacts to candidate, sensitive, or special status species, but not to a level below significant.

In addition, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the US Fish and Wildlife Service requested the following mitigation measures identified in the FEIR to be included in the project. These measures would not reduce the impact to below a level of significance:

- M-BIO-3 All ministerial permits for small wind turbines will include a notice to the permittee explicitly stating that additional state and federal regulations may apply to the construction and operation of the wind turbine including, but not limited to, U.S. Endangered Species Act, the California Endangered Species Act, and the California Fish and Game Code related to Lake and Streambed Alteration.

- M-BIO-4 A joint evaluation between the County of San Diego, the California Department of Fish and Game, and the US Fish and Wildlife Service of the permitted small turbines will be conducted five years after the ordinance goes into effect and after the first 100 small wind turbines are permitted. These evaluations will summarize where the majority of turbines are located, how many are roof-mounted, how many are vertical axis, what the average height is, etc.

The following measure that would reduce impacts to special status species to below significant was also considered. However, the County has determined that this measure would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, the following mitigation measure will not be implemented.

(1) Measure: Adopt 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.

Rationale for Rejection: The County is currently in the process of preparing such plans, but has not yet adopted them. Furthermore, 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. Therefore, this measure is not feasible mitigation for the proposed project.

The Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative (discussed in Section 4.3 of the FEIR) would reduce the number of small wind turbines allowed on a legal lot, and fewer wind turbines would result in less ground disturbance and tall obstructions. Therefore, impacts would be lessened as compared to the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, however, impacts would still be considered significant since the alternative could potentially result in excavation and grading activities or construction of tall obstructions that are not subject to discretionary review and that could affect avian or bat species. Therefore, impacts to candidate, sensitive or special status species would remain significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative.

Because the mitigation measure noted above would be infeasible; because application of all feasible environmental design criteria and feasible mitigation would not achieve a level of less than significant; and because there are no feasible project alternatives that would achieve a level of less than significant;

impacts to candidate, sensitive, and special status species would remain significant and unavoidable.

28 **BIO-2 Significant Effect – Candidate, Sensitive, or Special Status Species (Large Turbines)**: The FEIR identifies significant impacts, either directly or through habitat modifications, on species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS.

Facts in Support of Finding: The project would have the potential to result in direct and/or indirect impacts to candidate, sensitive, or special status plant and wildlife species and their habitat from the development of large wind turbines under this project through excavation and grading activities or construction of tall obstructions that could affect avian or bat species.

The mitigation measures identified in the FEIR would reduce the impact, but not to below a level of significance:

- M-BIO-1: During the environmental review process for future Major Use Permits for wind turbines, 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.

- M-BIO-2: Update the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biological Resources to include, or incorporate by reference, recommendations from the California Department of Fish and Game, the Avian Power Line Interaction Committee, the USFWS Draft Guidance, and the California Energy Commission (e.g., California Guidelines for Reducing Impacts to Birds and Bats from Wind Energy Development). Examples of recommended mitigation measures include: site screening; pre-permitting monitoring; acoustic monitoring; buffer zone inclusion; reduction of foraging resources near turbines; specific lighting to reduce bird collisions; post-construction monitoring; and avian protection plans.

The following measure that would reduce impacts to special status species to below significant was also considered. However, the County has determined that

this measure would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, the following mitigation measure will not be implemented.

(1) Measure: Adopt 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.

Rationale for Rejection: The County is currently in the process of preparing such plans, but has not yet adopted them. Furthermore, 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. Therefore, this measure cannot be considered feasible mitigation for the proposed project.

The Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative (discussed in Section 4.4 of the FEIR) has a reduced project area compared to the proposed project and, therefore, has fewer potential areas allowed for the development of large turbines. Less development would potentially result less ground disturbance and vertical obstructions. Additionally, the Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative would not change the Boulevard and Borrego Springs community plan language, and therefore, biological resources in the Boulevard and Borrego Springs planning areas would be better protected. Nonetheless, impacts would still be considered significant since the alternative would potentially introduce ground disturbance and vertical elements that would have the potential to impact special status species. Therefore, impacts to candidate, sensitive or special status species would remain significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative.

Because some of the measures listed above would be infeasible; because application of all feasible mitigation would not achieve a level of less than significant; and because there are no feasible project alternatives that would achieve a level of less than significant; impacts to candidate, sensitive, and special status species would remain significant and unavoidable.

29 **BIO-3 Significant Effect – Riparian Habitat and Other Sensitive Natural Communities (Small Turbines/MET Facilities)**: The FEIR identifies significant impacts on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by CDFG or USFWS.

Facts in Support of Finding: The project would have the potential to result in direct and/or indirect loss of riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities by the removal or destruction of such habitat related to the development of small wind turbines and MET facilities. Future small wind turbines or MET facilities would not be subject to discretionary review, and they may be located in areas that would impact a riparian habitat or sensitive natural community. These future facilities may require ground disturbance that would not be subject to environmental review and, therefore, could adversely affect sensitive vegetation communities.

The project also includes environmental design criteria as part of the zoning verification process for small wind turbines and MET facilities that reduce potential impacts to riparian and other sensitive natural communities. For example, small wind turbines and MET facilities that meet the zoning verification requirements require setbacks of 300 feet or five times the turbine height, whichever is greater, from blue-line watercourses or water bodies mapped on the US Geological Survey topographic maps, from mapped wetland vegetation, and from open space and preserve areas. These requirements would reduce potential impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive communities, but not to a level below significant.

In addition, the mitigation measures identified in the FEIR would reduce the impact, but not to below a level of significance:

- M-BIO-3 All ministerial permits for small wind turbines will include a notice to the permittee explicitly stating that additional state and federal regulations may apply to the construction and operation of the wind turbine including, but not limited to, U.S. Endangered Species Act, the California Endangered Species Act, and the California Fish and Game Code related to Lake and Streambed Alteration.

- M-BIO-4 A joint evaluation between the County of San Diego, the California Department of Fish and Game, and the US Fish and Wildlife Service of the permitted small turbines will be conducted five years after the ordinance goes into effect and after the first 100 small wind turbines are permitted. These evaluations will summarize where the majority of turbines are located, how many are roof-mounted, how many are vertical axis, what the average height is, etc.

The following measure that would reduce impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities to below significant was also considered. However, the County has determined that this measure would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, the following mitigation measure will not be implemented.

(1) Measure: Adopt 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.

Rationale for Rejection: The County is currently in the process of preparing such plans, but has not yet adopted them. Furthermore, 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. Therefore, this measure cannot be considered feasible mitigation for the proposed project.

The Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative (discussed in Section 4.3 of the FEIR) would reduce the number of small wind turbines allowed on a legal lot and fewer wind turbines would result in less ground disturbance and tall obstructions. Therefore, impacts would be lessened as compared to the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, however, impacts would still be considered significant since the alternative could potentially result in excavation and grading activities or construction of tall obstructions that are not subject to discretionary review that could affect avian or bat species. Therefore, impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities would remain significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative.

Because the mitigation measure noted above would to be infeasible; because application of all feasible environmental design criteria and feasible mitigation would not achieve a level of less than significant; and because there are no feasible project alternatives that would achieve a level of less than significant; impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities would remain significant and unavoidable.

30 **BIO-4 Significant Effect – Riparian Habitat and Other Sensitive Natural Communities (Large Turbines)**: The FEIR identifies significant impacts on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by CDFG or USFWS.

Facts in Support of Finding: The project would have the potential to result in direct and/or indirect loss of riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities related to the development of large wind turbines. The proposed amendments related to large wind turbines consist of updated definitions and requirements related to setbacks, noise, height, and locations where large turbines are permissible. All future large turbine projects will be subject to discretionary review and required to obtain a Major Use Permit. As part of the County's discretionary review process, all future projects would be evaluated under CEQA and would be required to implement measures to minimize impacts to riparian habitat or another sensitive natural community. Site-specific conditions will be assessed to analyze the potential effects of projects, and projects will be required to apply feasible mitigation, as necessary to avoid or reduce potentially significant effects. Additionally, the Major Use Permit would be subject to RPO, MSCP, BMO, NCCP, and other local or regional plans, policies, or regulations. The County's RPO, in particular, has provisions to protect sensitive habitat lands, including riparian resources. However, as there is ultimately no guarantee at this stage that on a project-specific level that mitigation measures will reduce impacts to a level below significant, the proposed project may result in significant impacts related to riparian habitat or another sensitive natural community.

The mitigation measures identified in the FEIR would reduce the impact, but not to below a level of significance:

- M-BIO-1: During the environmental review process for future Major Use Permits for wind turbines, 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.

- M-BIO-2: Update the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biological Resources to include, or incorporate by reference, recommendations from the California Department of Fish and Game, the Avian Power Line Interaction Committee, the USFWS Draft Guidance, and the California Energy Commission (e.g., California Guidelines for Reducing Impacts to Birds and Bats from Wind Energy Development). Examples of recommended mitigation measures include: site screening; pre-permitting

monitoring; acoustic monitoring; buffer zone inclusion; reduction of foraging resources near turbines; specific lighting to reduce bird collisions; post-construction monitoring; and avian protection plans.

The following measure that would reduce impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities to below significant was also considered. However, the County has determined that this measure would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, the following mitigation measure will not be implemented.

(1) Measure: Adopt 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.

Rationale for Rejection: The County is currently in the process of preparing such plans, but has not yet adopted them. Furthermore, 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. Therefore, this measure cannot be considered feasible mitigation for the proposed project.

The Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative (discussed in Section 4.4 of the FEIR) has a reduced project area compared to the proposed project and, therefore, has fewer potential areas allowed for the development of large turbines. Less development would potentially result less ground disturbance and vertical obstructions. Additionally, the Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative would not change the Boulevard and Borrego Springs community plan language, and therefore, biological resources in the Boulevard and Borrego Springs planning areas would be better protected. Nonetheless, impacts would still be considered significant since the alternative would potentially introduce ground disturbance and vertical elements that would have the potential to impact riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities. Therefore, impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities would remain significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative.

Because some of the measures listed above would be infeasible; because application of all feasible mitigation would not achieve a level of less than significant; because there are no feasible project alternatives that would achieve

a level of less than significant; impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities would remain significant and unavoidable.

31 **BIO-5 Significant Effect – Wildlife Movement Corridors and Nursery Sites (Small Turbines/MET Facilities)**: The FEIR identifies significant impacts associated with the introduction of new structures or vertical elements, or due to ground disturbance, from the development of small wind turbines, and MET facilities that could interfere with wildlife movement or impede the use of nursery sites.

Facts in Support of Finding: The project would have the potential to result in impacts to wildlife movement corridors and the use of native wildlife nursery sites. Development associated with small wind turbines and MET facilities would have potentially significant direct and indirect impacts to sensitive habitats, including habitats that currently function as a wildlife movement corridor or a nursery site.

The project includes environmental design criteria as part of the zoning verification process for small wind turbines and MET facilities that reduce potential impacts to wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites. Small wind turbines and MET facilities would be prohibited within 4,000 feet of a known golden eagle nest. Additionally, setbacks of 300 feet or five times the turbine height, whichever is greater, are required from known significant roosts of bat species, transmission towers or power lines, blue line water courses and water bodies, wetland vegetation, and open space easements and preserve areas. Small turbines are allowed on properties designated as Pre-Approved Mitigation Area (PAMA) within the boundaries of the Multiple Species Conservation Program Subarea Plan only with an Administrative Permit. Within the MSCP, most known corridors and linkages are mapped as PAMA; therefore, this provision will help to minimize potential corridor impacts within the South County MSCP by requiring site-specific environmental review and MSCP conformance findings for small wind turbines in the PAMA. In addition, small wind turbines are prohibited on ridgelines, which are typical movement paths for both terrestrial and avian species. These environmental design criteria would reduce potential impacts to wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites.

In addition, the mitigation measures identified in the FEIR would reduce the impact, but not to below a level of significance:

- M-BIO-3 All ministerial permits for small wind turbines will include a notice to the permittee explicitly stating that additional state and federal regulations may apply to the construction and operation of the wind turbine including, but not limited to, U.S. Endangered Species Act, the California Endangered Species Act, and the California Fish and Game Code related to Lake and Streambed Alteration.

- M-BIO-4 A joint evaluation between the County of San Diego, the California Department of Fish and Game, and the US Fish and Wildlife Service of the permitted small turbines will be conducted five years after the ordinance goes into effect and after the first 100 small wind turbines are permitted. These evaluations will summarize where the majority of turbines are located, how many are roof-mounted, how many are vertical axis, what the average height is, etc.

The following measure that would reduce impacts to wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites to below significant was also considered. However, the County has determined that this measure would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, the following mitigation measure will not be implemented.

(1) Measure: Adopt 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.

Rationale for Rejection: The County is currently in the process of preparing such plans, but has not yet adopted them. Furthermore, 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. Therefore, this measure cannot be considered feasible mitigation for the proposed project.

The Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative (discussed in Section 4.3 of the FEIR) would reduce the number of small wind turbines allowed on a legal lot and fewer wind turbines would result in less ground disturbance and tall obstructions. Therefore, impacts would be lessened as compared to the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, however, impacts would still be considered significant since small turbines under this alternative could potentially impede wildlife movement or affect a nursery site. Therefore, impacts to wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites would remain significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative.

Because the measure noted above would be infeasible; because application of all feasible mitigation and environmental design criteria would not achieve a level of less than significant; and because there are no feasible project alternatives that would achieve a level of less than significant; impacts to wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites would remain significant and unavoidable.

32 **BIO-6 Significant Effect – Wildlife Movement Corridors and Nursery Sites (Large Turbines)**: The FEIR identifies significant impacts associated with the introduction of new structures or vertical elements, or due to ground disturbance, from the development of large turbines that could interfere with wildlife movement or impede the use of nursery sites.

Facts in Support of Finding: The project would have the potential to result in impacts to wildlife movement corridors and the use of native wildlife nursery sites. Development associated with large wind turbines would have potentially significant direct and indirect impacts to sensitive habitats, including habitats that currently function as a wildlife movement corridor or a nursery site.

The mitigation measures identified in the FEIR would reduce the impact, but not to below a level of significance:

- M-BIO-1: During the environmental review process for future Major Use Permits for wind turbines, 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.

- M-BIO-2: Update the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biological Resources to include, or incorporate by reference, recommendations from the California Department of Fish and Game, the Avian Power Line Interaction Committee, the USFWS Draft Guidance, and the California Energy Commission (e.g., California Guidelines for Reducing Impacts to Birds and Bats from Wind Energy Development). Examples of recommended mitigation measures include: site screening; pre-permitting monitoring; acoustic monitoring; buffer zone inclusion; reduction of foraging

resources near turbines; specific lighting to reduce bird collisions; post-construction monitoring; and avian protection plans.

The following measure that would reduce impacts to wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites to below significant was also considered. However, the County has determined that this measure would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, the following mitigation measure will not be implemented.

(1) Measure: Adopt 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.

Rationale for Rejection: The County is currently in the process of preparing such plans, but has not yet adopted them. Furthermore, 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. Therefore, this measure cannot be considered feasible mitigation for the proposed project.

The Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative (discussed in Section 4.4 of the FEIR) has a reduced project area compared to the proposed project and, therefore, has fewer potential areas allowed for the development of large turbines. Less development would potentially result less ground disturbance and vertical obstructions. Additionally, the Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative would not change the Boulevard and Borrego Springs community plan language, and therefore, wildlife corridors in the Boulevard and Borrego Springs planning areas would be better protected. Nonetheless, impacts would still be considered significant since the alternative would potentially introduce ground disturbance and vertical elements that would have the potential to impact wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites. Therefore, impacts to wildlife corridors and nursery sites remain significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative.

Because some of the measures listed above would be infeasible; because application of all feasible mitigation would not achieve a level of less than significant; because there are no feasible project alternatives that would achieve a level of less than significant; impacts to wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites would remain significant and unavoidable.

33 **BIO-7 Cumulatively Considerable Impact – Candidate, Sensitive, and Special Status Species (Small Turbines/MET Facilities):** As described above, development of small wind turbines and MET facilities under the proposed project would have the potential to impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, species identified as candidate, sensitive or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS. In combination with other cumulative projects, the project would have the potential to result in a significant cumulative impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Cumulative projects located in the San Diego region would have the potential to result in impacts to candidate, sensitive and special status plant and wildlife species, including loss of habitat. Without a comprehensive NCCP in place for the long-term protection of special status plant and wildlife species for the entire southern California region, a cumulative loss of habitat supporting special status plant and wildlife species would occur, even after mitigation has been implemented for individual projects. Therefore, projects in the region would have the potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts to candidate, sensitive and special status plant and wildlife species.

As described above for Impact BIO-1, future small wind turbines and MET facilities would have the potential to result in impacts to candidate, sensitive and special status plant and wildlife species. The proposed project may allow ground disturbance and vertical obstructions which may contribute to cumulative impacts. Therefore, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to candidate, sensitive and special status plant and wildlife species.

As described above for Impact BIO-1, none of the environmental design criteria or project alternatives would reduce significant impacts associated with candidate, sensitive and special status plant and wildlife species to below significant. Therefore, impacts to candidate, sensitive and special status plant and wildlife species from future small wind turbines and MET facilities would remain cumulatively considerable.

34 **BIO-8 Cumulatively Considerable Impact – Candidate, Sensitive, and Special Status Species (Large Turbines):** As described above, development of large wind turbines under the proposed project would have the potential to impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, species identified as candidate, sensitive or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS. In combination with other cumulative

projects, the project would have the potential to result in a significant cumulative impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Cumulative projects located in the San Diego region would have the potential to result in impacts to candidate, sensitive and special status plant and wildlife species, including loss of habitat. Without a comprehensive NCCP in place for the long-term protection of special status plant and wildlife species for the entire southern California region, a cumulative loss of habitat supporting special status plant and wildlife species would occur, even after mitigation has been implemented for individual projects. Therefore, projects in the region would have the potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts to candidate, sensitive and special status plant and wildlife species.

As described above for Impact BIO-2, future large wind turbines would have the potential to result in impacts to candidate, sensitive and special status plant and wildlife species. The proposed project may allow ground disturbance and vertical obstructions which may contribute to cumulative impacts. Therefore, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to candidate, sensitive and special status plant and wildlife species.

As described above for Impact BIO-2, none of the mitigation measures or project alternatives would reduce significant impacts associated with candidate, sensitive and special status plant and wildlife species to below significant. Therefore, impacts to candidate, sensitive and special status plant and wildlife species from future large wind turbines would remain cumulatively considerable.

35 **BIO-9 Cumulatively Considerable Impact – Riparian Habitat and Other Sensitive Natural Communities (Small Turbines/MET Facilities):** As described above, development of small wind turbines under the proposed project would have the potential to result in significant impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by CDFG or USFWS. In combination with other cumulative projects, the project would have the potential to result in a significant cumulative impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Cumulative projects located in the San Diego region have the potential to result in impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities if in combination they would cause direct and/or indirect loss or degradation. State regulations such as the California Lake and Streambed Alteration Program or the California NCCP Act provide protections for

riparian and other sensitive habitats. In addition, many projects that affect riparian or other protected habitat types require approval from the USFWS and the CDFG. If potentially significant impacts would occur from particular cumulative projects, then mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce impacts to the extent feasible. However, without a comprehensive NCCP in place for the long-term protection of sensitive natural communities for the entire southern California region, a cumulative loss of riparian and other sensitive habitat could occur, even after mitigation has been implemented for individual projects. Therefore, projects in the region would have the potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities.

As described above for Impact BIO-3, future small wind turbines and MET facilities would have the potential to result in impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities. The proposed project may allow ground disturbance and vertical obstructions which may contribute to cumulative impacts. Therefore, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities.

As described above for Impact BIO-3, environmental design criteria or project alternatives would reduce significant impacts associated with candidate, sensitive and special status plant and wildlife species, but not to a level below significant. Therefore, impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities from future small wind turbines and MET facilities would remain cumulatively considerable.

36 **BIO-10 Cumulatively Considerable Impact – Riparian Habitat and Other Sensitive Natural Communities (Large Turbines):** As described above, development of large wind turbines under the proposed project would have the potential to result in significant impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by CDFG or USFWS. In combination with other cumulative projects, the project would have the potential to result in a significant cumulative impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Cumulative projects located in the San Diego region have the potential to result in impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities if in combination they would cause direct and/or indirect loss or degradation. State regulations such as the California Lake and Streambed Alteration Program or the California NCCP Act provide protections for

riparian and other sensitive habitats. In addition, many projects that affect riparian or other protected habitat types require approval from the USFWS and the CDFG. If potentially significant impacts would occur from particular cumulative projects, then mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce impacts to the extent feasible. However, without a comprehensive NCCP in place for the long-term protection of sensitive natural communities for the entire southern California region, a cumulative loss of riparian and other sensitive habitat would occur, even after mitigation has been implemented for individual projects. Therefore, projects in the region would have the potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities.

As described above for Impact BIO-4, future large wind turbines would have the potential to result in impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities. The proposed project may allow ground disturbance and vertical obstructions which may contribute to cumulative impacts. Therefore, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities.

As described above for Impact BIO-4, none of the mitigation measures or project alternatives would reduce significant impacts associated with riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities to below significant. Therefore, impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities from future large wind turbines would remain cumulatively considerable.

37 **BIO-11 Cumulatively Considerable Impact – Wildlife Movement Corridors and Nursery Sites (Small Turbines/MET Facilities):** As described above, development of small wind turbine and MET facilities under the proposed project would have the potential to result in significant impacts that would potentially interfere with the movement of any native resident wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. In combination with other cumulative projects, the project would have the potential to result in a significant cumulative impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Cumulative projects located in the San Diego region would have the potential to result in a cumulative impact associated with wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites. Applicable federal and/or State regulations provide protections for wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites. However, without a comprehensive NCCP in place for the long-term protection of wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites for the region, a cumulative loss of

wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites would occur, even after mitigation has been implemented for individual projects. Therefore, projects in the region would have the potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts to wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites.

As described above for Impact BIO-5, future small wind turbines and MET facilities would have the potential to result in impacts to wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites. The proposed project may allow ground disturbance and vertical obstructions which may contribute to cumulative impacts. Therefore, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites.

As described above for Impact BIO-5, environmental design criteria or project alternatives would reduce significant impacts associated with wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites to below significant. Therefore, impacts to wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites from future small wind turbines and MET facilities would remain cumulatively considerable.

38 **BIO-12 Cumulatively Considerable Impact – Wildlife Movement Corridors and Nursery Sites (Large Turbines):** As described above, the development of large wind turbines under the proposed project would have the potential to result in significant impacts that would potentially interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. In combination with other cumulative projects, the project would have the potential to result in a significant cumulative impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Cumulative projects located in the San Diego region would have the potential to result in a cumulative impact associated with wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites. Applicable federal and/or State regulations provide protections for wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites. However, without a comprehensive NCCP in place for the long-term protection of wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites for the entire southern California region, a cumulative loss of wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites would occur, even after mitigation has been implemented for individual projects. Therefore, projects in the region would have the potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts to wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites.

As described above for Impact BIO-6, future large wind turbines would have the potential to result in impacts to wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites.

The proposed project may allow ground disturbance and vertical obstructions which may contribute to cumulative impacts. Therefore, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites.

As described above for Impact BIO-6, none of the mitigation measures or project alternatives would reduce significant impacts associated with wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites to below significant. Therefore, impacts to wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites from future large wind turbines would remain cumulatively considerable.

CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

39 CUL-1 Significant Effect – Historical Resources (Small Turbines/MET Facilities): The FEIR identifies significant impacts to historical resources as defined in Section 15064.5 of the state CEQA Guidelines or the County's Resource Protection Ordinance associated with the development of small wind turbines and MET facilities under the proposed project.

Facts in Support of Finding: Impacts to historical resources would occur if development resulted in physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired. Both direct and indirect impacts to historical resources may result from the development of small wind turbines and MET facilities under the project. The proposed project may result in a potentially significant adverse impact 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 through introducing new vertical elements.

The mitigation measures identified in the FEIR would reduce the impact, but not to below a level of significance:

- M-CUL-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.

The project also includes environmental design criteria as part of the zoning verification process for small wind turbines and MET facilities that further reduce potential impacts to historical resources. Small wind turbines and MET facilities would be prohibited on all sites listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). Furthermore, if a property's zoning contains an "H" or "J" Special Area Designator, then the zoning would limit potential impacts to archaeological and historic landmarks and districts because these designators prohibit modifications to historic resources. These environmental design criteria would further reduce impacts to historic resources.

The following measure that would reduce impacts to historic resources to below significant was also considered. However, the County has determined that this measure would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, the following mitigation measure will not be implemented.

(1) Measure: Identify all potentially historic structures and resources within the County and enter the information in the Planning and Development Services property database. Then monitor development applications for all documented properties. This information would be used to help avoid potential impacts and update the County's guidelines.

    Rationale for Rejection: This mitigation measure would be infeasible because the County does not have access to all of the potential historical sites or the legal right to survey all potential historic sites in the unincorporated areas.

The Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative (discussed in Section 4.3 of the FEIR) would reduce the number of small wind turbines allowed on a legal lot, and fewer wind turbines would result in less ground disturbance and vertical elements that could potentially impact historical resources. Therefore, impacts would be lessened as compared to the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, however, impacts would still be considered significant since the alternative would result in ground disturbance or would introduce vertical elements that would have the potential to impact a historic resource. Therefore, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative.

Because some of the measures listed above would be infeasible; because application of all feasible mitigation and environmental design criteria would not achieve a level of less than significant; and because there are no feasible project

alternatives that would achieve a level of less than significant; impacts to historical resources would remain significant and unavoidable.

40 CUL-2 Significant Effect – Archeological Resources (Small Turbines/MET Facilities): The FEIR identifies significant impacts to archaeological resources from potential ground-disturbing activities associated with the development of small wind turbines and MET facilities under the proposed project.

Facts in Support of Finding: Impacts to archaeological resources would occur if development resulted in a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined by Public Resources Code Section 21083.2 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a). Indirect impacts may also occur from land use development activities that increase erosion, fugitive dust, or the accessibility of a surface or subsurface resource. Both direct and indirect impacts to archeological resources may result from the development of small wind turbines and MET facilities under the project. The proposed project may result in a potentially significant adverse impact 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.

The project includes environmental design criteria as part of the zoning verification process for small wind turbines and MET facilities that reduce potential impacts to archeological resources. Small wind turbines and MET facilities would be prohibited on all sites listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). Furthermore, if a property's zoning contains an "H" or "J" Special Area Designator, then the zoning would limit the potential impacts to archaeological and historic landmarks and districts as explained above. These environmental design criteria would further reduce impacts to archeological resources.

The following measures were also considered to reduce impacts to archeological resources to below significant. However, the County has determined that these measures would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, the following mitigation measures will not be implemented.

(1) Measure: Identify archaeological resources within the County and enter the information in the Planning and Development Services property database. Then monitor development applications for all documented properties. This

information would be used to help avoid potential impacts and update the County's guidelines.

Rationale for Rejection: This mitigation measure would be infeasible because the County does not have access to all of the potential archaeological sites or the legal right to survey all potential archaeological sites in the unincorporated areas.

(2) Measure: Require an archaeological resource survey for all small wind turbine projects and temporary MET facilities to ensure that impacts to archaeological resources will be avoided or mitigated.

Rationale for Rejection: This measure is not feasible as it would directly conflict with the project objectives to allow development of small wind turbines and temporary MET facilities without a discretionary permit.

The Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative (discussed in Section 4.3 of the FEIR) would reduce the number of small wind turbines allowed on a legal lot and fewer wind turbines would result in less ground disturbance that could potentially impact archeological resources. Therefore, impacts would be lessened as compared to the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, however, impacts would still be considered significant since the alternative would result in ground disturbance that would have the potential to impact an archeological resource. Therefore, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative.

Because the measures listed above would be infeasible; because no appropriate feasible and enforceable mitigation measures could be identified that would reduce impacts to less than significant; because application of all feasible environmental design criteria would not achieve a level of less than significant; and because there are no feasible project alternatives that would achieve a level of less than significant; impacts to archeological resources would remain significant and unavoidable.

41 CUL-3 Significant Effect – Human Remains (Small Turbines/MET Facilities): The FEIR identifies significant impacts to human remains from potential ground-disturbing activities associated with the development of small wind turbines and MET facilities under the proposed project.

Facts in Support of Finding: Archaeological investigations within the unincorporated County have identified human remains from prior human occupations, which are important cultural resources. The disturbance of human remains, Native American or otherwise, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, is considered a significant impact. Impacts to human remains may result from the development of small wind turbines and MET facilities under the project. The proposed project may result in a potentially significant adverse impact to human remains since it could potentially result in excavation and grading activities, which have the potential to damage or destroy human remains.

The following measure was considered to reduce impacts to human remains to below significant. However, the County has determined that this measure would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, the following mitigation measure will not be implemented.

(1) Measure: Require a survey to identify potential human remains on site for all small wind turbine projects and temporary MET facilities to ensure that impacts to human remains will be avoided or mitigated.

Rationale for Rejection: This measure is not feasible as it would directly conflict with the project objectives to allow development of small wind turbines and temporary MET facilities without a discretionary permit.

The Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative (discussed in Section 4.3 of the FEIR) would reduce the number of small wind turbines allowed on a legal lot and fewer wind turbines would result in less ground disturbance that could potentially impact human remains. Therefore, impacts would be lessened as compared to the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, however, impacts would still be considered significant since the alternative would result in ground disturbance that would have the potential to impact human remains. Therefore, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative.

Because the measure listed above would be infeasible; because no appropriate feasible and enforceable mitigation measures could be identified that would reduce impacts to less than significant; and because there are no feasible project alternatives that would achieve a level of less than significant; impacts to human remains would remain significant and unavoidable.

42 CUL-4 Significant Effect – Paleontological Resources (Small Turbines/MET Facilities): The FEIR identifies significant impacts to paleontological resources from potential ground-disturbing activities associated with the development of small wind turbines and MET facilities under the proposed project.

Facts in Support of Finding: Paleontological resources are found in sedimentary strata of the County, which primarily underlies the coastal plain, the desert and some mountain valleys. Impacts to paleontological resources would occur if development activities directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site. Such impacts usually result from the physical destruction of fossil remains by excavation operations that cut into geologic formations. The proposed project may result in a potentially significant adverse impact 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.

The following measure was considered to reduce impacts to paleontological resources to below significant. However, the County has determined that this measure would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, the following mitigation measure will not be implemented.

(1) Measure: Require survey or grading monitor to identify potential paleontological resources on site for all small wind turbine projects and temporary MET facilities to ensure that impacts to paleontological resources will be avoided or mitigated.

Rationale for Rejection: This measure is not feasible as it would directly conflict with the project objectives to allow development of small wind turbines and temporary MET facilities without a discretionary permit.

The Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative (discussed in Section 4.3 of the FEIR) would reduce the number of small wind turbines allowed on a legal lot and fewer wind turbines would result in less ground disturbance that could potentially impact paleontological resources. Therefore, impacts would be lessened as compared to the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, however, impacts would still be considered significant since the alternative would result in ground disturbance that would have the potential to impact paleontological resources. Therefore, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative.

Because the measure listed above would be infeasible; because no appropriate feasible and enforceable mitigation measures could be identified that would reduce impacts to less than significant; and because there are no feasible project alternatives that would achieve a level of less than significant; impacts to paleontological resources remain significant and unavoidable.

43 CUL-5 Cumulatively Considerable Impact – Historical Resources (Small Turbines/MET Facilities): As described above, the development of small wind turbines and MET facilities under the proposed project would have the potential to result in significant impacts to historic resources. Therefore, in combination with other past, present and foreseeable future projects, the project would have the potential to result in a significant cumulative impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Cumulatively, projects located in the San Diego region would have the potential to result in a cumulative impact associated with the loss of historical resources through the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of a resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired. Cumulative projects that would have the potential to result in adverse impacts to historical resources from development activities include development allowed by the General Plan Update and the development of land uses as designated under surrounding jurisdictions' general plans. These projects are regulated by and would be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local regulations, including Public Resources Code, Section 5097; Penal Code, Section 622 1/2; the Mills Act; Health and Safety Code, Section 18950–18961; and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. However, even with regulations in place, individual historical resources would still have the potential to be impacted or degraded from demolition, destruction, alteration, or structural relocation as a result of new private or public development or redevelopment allowable under cumulative projects. Therefore, projects in the region would have the potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts to historic resources.

As described above for Impact CUL-1, future small wind turbines and MET facilities would have the potential to result in impacts to historic resources. The proposed project may allow ground disturbance and vertical obstructions which may contribute to cumulative impacts. Therefore, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to historic resources.

As described above for Impact CUL-1, none of the mitigation measures or project alternatives would reduce significant impacts associated with historic resources to below significant. Therefore, impacts to historic resources from future small wind turbines and MET facilities would remain cumulatively considerable.

44 **CUL-5 Cumulatively Considerable Impact – Archeological Resources (Small Turbines/MET Facilities):** As described above, the development of small wind turbines and MET facilities under the proposed project would have the potential to result in significant impacts to archeological resources. Therefore, in combination with other past, present and foreseeable future projects, the project would have the potential to result in a significant cumulative impact.

Facts in Support of Finding Cumulatively, projects located in the San Diego region would have the potential to result in a cumulative impact associated with the loss of archeological resources through the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of a resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired. Cumulative projects that would have the potential to result in adverse impacts to archaeological resources from development activities include development allowed by the General Plan Update and the development of land uses as designated under surrounding jurisdictions' general plans. These projects are regulated by and would be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local regulations, including Public Resources Code, Section 5097; Penal Code, Section 622 1/2; the Mills Act; Health and Safety Code, Sections 18950–18961; and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. However, the loss of archaeological resources on a regional level may not be adequately mitigable through the data recovery and collection methods specified in these regulations, as their value may also lie in cultural mores and religious beliefs of applicable groups. Therefore, projects in the region would have the potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts to archeological resources.

As described above for Impact CUL-2, future small wind turbines and MET facilities would have the potential to result in impacts to archeological resources. The proposed project may allow ground disturbance which may contribute to cumulative impacts. Therefore, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to archeological resources.

As described above for Impact CUL-2, none of the mitigation measures or project alternatives would reduce significant impacts associated with archeological

resources to below significant. Therefore, impacts to archeological resources from future small wind turbines and MET facilities would remain cumulatively considerable.

45 **CUL-6 Cumulatively Considerable Impact – Human Remains (Small Turbines/MET Facilities):** As described above, the development of small wind turbines and MET facilities under the proposed project would have the potential to result in significant impacts to human remains. Therefore, in combination with other past, present and foreseeable future projects, the project would have the potential to result in a significant cumulative impact.

Facts in Support of Finding Cumulative projects located in the San Diego region would have the potential to result in a cumulative impact associated with human remains due to grading, excavation or other ground-disturbing activities. Cumulative projects that would have the potential to result in adverse impacts to human remains from development activities include development allowed by the General Plan Update and the development of land uses as designated under surrounding jurisdictions' general plans. Cumulative projects would be required to comply with the Native American Graves Protection Act, Sections 5097.9–5097.991 of the Public Resources Code (Cal NAGPRA), and Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, if human remains were encountered during project development. However, on a regional level, the disturbance of human remains that are also considered archaeological resources may not be adequately mitigable through methods specified in these regulations because the value of the human remains may also lie in cultural mores and religion beliefs of applicable groups. Therefore, projects in the region would have the potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts to human remains.

As described above for Impact CUL-3, future small wind turbines and MET facilities would have the potential to result in impacts to human remains. The proposed project may allow ground disturbance which may contribute to cumulative impacts. Therefore, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to human remains.

As described above for Impact CUL-3, none of the mitigation measures or project alternatives would reduce significant impacts associated with human remains to below significant. Therefore, impacts to human remains from future small wind turbines and MET facilities would remain cumulatively considerable.

46 CUL-7 Cumulatively Considerable Impact – Paleontological Resources (Small Turbines/MET Facilities): As described above, the development of small wind turbines and MET facilities under the proposed project would have the potential to result in significant impacts that would potentially impact paleontological resources. Therefore, in combination with other past, present and foreseeable future projects, the project would have the potential to result in a significant cumulative impact.

Facts in Support of Finding Cumulative projects located in the San Diego region would have the potential to result in a cumulative impact associated with paleontological resources due to grading, excavation or other ground-disturbing activities. Cumulative projects that would have the potential to result in adverse impacts to paleontological resources from development activities include development allowed by the General Plan Update and the development of land uses as designated under surrounding jurisdictions' general plans. Cumulative projects on state or public lands would be required to comply with Public Resources Code, Sections 5097–5097.6, pertaining to impacts to paleontological resources. However, the loss of paleontological resources on a regional level may not be adequately mitigable through methods specified in these regulations. Therefore, projects in the region would have the potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts to paleontological resources.

As described above for Impact CUL-3, future small wind turbines and MET facilities would have the potential to result in impacts to paleontological resources. The proposed project may allow ground disturbance which may contribute to cumulative impacts. Therefore, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to paleontological resources.

As described above for Impact CUL-3, none of the mitigation measures or project alternatives would reduce significant impacts associated with paleontological resources to below significant. Therefore, impacts to paleontological resources from future small wind turbines and MET facilities would remain cumulatively considerable.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

47 HAZ-1 Significant Effect – Wildland Fires (Small Turbines/MET Facilities): The FEIR identifies potential significant impacts associated with exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland

fires associated with the development of small wind turbines and MET facilities under the proposed project.

Facts in Support of Finding: In addition to the potential loss of life and property, wildfires may result in the loss or permanent change of natural resources. Although natural conditions make wildfires common in San Diego County, locating small wind turbines and MET facilities adjacent to or within a wildland-urban interface can result in increased fire related risk to people and structures. Operation of small wind turbines, for example, may result in vegetation ignitions and wildfire from equipment failure (e.g., turbine blade, braking, oil heating, lightning, nacelle, transformers, circuit breakers), transmission line arcing, and pole failure, among others. The vast majority of unincorporated San Diego County is ranked as having High or Very High fire hazard severity.

The following measure was considered to reduce impacts associated with wildland fires to below significant. However, the County has determined that this measure would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, the following mitigation measure will not be implemented.

(1) Measure: Prohibit construction of wind turbines in High and Very High fire hazard severity zones.

Rationale for Rejection: This measure would be infeasible because the vast majority of unincorporated San Diego County is ranked by the Fire and Resource Assessment Program (FRAP) as High or Very High fire hazard. Consequently, applying this prohibition throughout most of the County's jurisdiction would conflict with the project objectives to facilitate the use of renewable wind energy within the County, to maximize the production of energy from renewable wind sources, and to reduce the potential for energy shortages and outages by facilitating local energy supply.

The Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative (discussed in Section 4.3 of the FEIR) would reduce the number of small wind turbines allowed on a legal lot. Fewer small wind turbines would result in fewer impacts related to potential wildland fires. Although the Limited Small Wind Turbine alternative would lessen impacts as compared to the proposed project, impacts would still be considered significant since small turbines could potentially result in wildland fires due to equipment failure. Therefore, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative.

Because the measure listed above would be infeasible; because no appropriate feasible and enforceable mitigation measures could be identified that would reduce impacts to less than significant; and because there are no feasible project alternatives that would achieve a level of less than significant; impacts associated with wildland fires due to the development of small wind turbines and MET facilities would remain significant and unavoidable.

48 HAZ-2 Significant Effect – Wildland Fires (Large Turbines): The FEIR identifies potential significant impacts associated with exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires associated with the development of large wind turbines under the proposed project.

Facts in Support of Finding: In addition to the potential loss of life and property, wildfires may result in the loss or permanent change of natural resources. Although natural conditions make wildfires common in San Diego County, locating wind turbines adjacent to or within a wildland-urban interface can result in increased fire related risk to people and structures. Large wind turbines can be the source of wildfire ignitions due to short-circuits, collection line failure, turbine malfunction or mechanical failure, and lightning. The vast majority of unincorporated San Diego County is ranked as High or Very High fire hazard.

The mitigation measure identified in the FEIR would reduce the impact, but not to below a level of significance:

- M-HAZ-1: During the environmental review process for future discretionary permits for wind turbines, 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.

Additionally, federal, state, and county regulations exist that reduce hazards to the public and environment from wildland fires. These include, but are not limited to, the following: (1) California Natural Disaster Assistance Act (NDAA), which provides assistance in the event of an emergency; (2) County Vegetation and Other Flammable Materials Ordinance, which addresses the accumulation of weeds, rubbish, and other materials that can create fire hazards, and ensures

adequate defensible space to protect structures from wildland fires; (3) Fire Protection Plans (FPPs), which analyze fire hazards associated with projects under discretionary review; and (4) County Consolidated Fire Code, which has provisions more stringent than state requirements with regard to access roadways, use of ignition-resistant construction materials, vegetation clearance, water supply, and locations of structures on property.

The following measure that would reduce impacts associated with wildland fires to below significant was also considered. However, the County has determined that this measure would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, the following mitigation measure will not be implemented.

(1) Measure: Prohibit construction of wind turbines in High and Very High fire hazard zones.

Rationale for Rejection: This measure would be infeasible because the vast majority of unincorporated San Diego County is ranked by FRAP as High or Very High fire hazard. Consequently, applying this prohibition throughout most of the County's jurisdiction would conflict with the project objectives to facilitate the use of renewable wind energy within the County, to maximize the production of energy from renewable wind sources, and to reduce the potential for energy shortages and outages by facilitating local energy supply.

The Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative (discussed in Section 4.4 of the FEIR) would have a smaller project area, which would result in fewer potential areas for the development of large wind turbines and potentially fewer impacts related to wildland fires. Additionally, the Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative would not change the Boulevard and Borrego Springs community plan language, and therefore, these communities would be better protected against wildland fires from the development of large wind turbines. However, impacts would still be considered significant since the alternative could still potentially introduce large wind turbines that can be the source of wildfire ignitions due to short-circuits, collection line failure, turbine malfunction or mechanical failure, and lightning. Therefore, impacts related to wildland fires would remain significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative.

Because some of the measures listed above would be infeasible; because application of all existing federal, state, and county regulations and feasible mitigation measures would not achieve a level of less than significant; and

because there are no feasible project alternatives that would achieve a level of less than significant; impacts associated with wildland fires would remain significant and unavoidable.

49 **HAZ-3 Cumulatively Considerable Impact – Wildland Fires (Small Turbines/MET Facilities):** As described above, the development of small wind turbines and MET facilities under the proposed project would have the potential to result in significant impacts associated with wildland fires. Therefore, in combination with other past, present and foreseeable future projects, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact related to wildland fires.

Facts in Support of Finding: Southern California has a history of experiencing frequent and intensive wildland fires, which have exposed people and structures to a potentially significant loss of life and property. Growth occurring in the San Diego region, implemented under various cumulative projects, would likely place people and/or property within danger of wildland fires, due to the widespread risk across the region. Although regulations exist to reduce hazards associated with wildland fires, they would not reduce the risk to below a level of significance. Therefore, projects in the region would have the potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts to wildland fires.

As described for Impact HAZ-1, future small wind turbines and MET facilities would have the potential to result in impacts to wildland fires. Therefore, in combination with other past, present and foreseeable future projects, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to wildland fires.

As described for Impact HAZ-1, there are no feasible mitigation measures, and none of the project alternatives would reduce the project's significant impacts associated with wildland fires to below significant. Therefore, potential impacts related to wildland fires due to the development of future small wind turbines and temporary MET facilities would remain cumulatively considerable.

50 **HAZ-4 Cumulatively Considerable Impact – Wildland Fires (Large Turbines):** As described above, implementation of the proposed project would have the potential to result in significant impacts associated with wildland fires. Therefore, in combination with other past, present and foreseeable future projects, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact related to wildland fires.

Facts in Support of Finding: Southern California has a history of experiencing frequent and intensive wildland fires, which have exposed people and structures to a potentially significant loss of life and property. Growth occurring in the San Diego region, implemented under various cumulative projects, would likely place people and/or property within danger of wildland fires, due to the widespread risk across the region. Although regulations exist to reduce hazards associated with wildland fires, they would not reduce the risk to below a level of significance. Therefore, projects in the region would have the potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts to wildland fires.

As described for Impact HAZ-2, future large wind turbines would have the potential to result in impacts to wildland fires. Therefore, in combination with other past, present and foreseeable future projects, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to wildland fires.

As described for Impact HAZ-2, none of the feasible mitigation measures and project alternatives would reduce the project's significant impacts associated with wildland fires to below significant. Therefore, potential impacts related to wildland fires due to the development of future large wind turbines would remain cumulatively considerable.

LAND USE

51 LU-1 Significant Effect – Physically Divide a Community (Large Turbines): The FEIR identifies potential significant impacts associated with the physical division of an established community due to the development of large wind turbines.

Facts in Support of Finding: The development of large wind turbines and associated infrastructure, such as access roads, under the proposed project would have the potential to divide an established community.

The following measure was considered to reduce impacts to land use to below significant. However, the County has determined that this measure would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, the following mitigation measures will not be implemented.

(1) Measure: Require future large wind turbine projects to avoid using project designs or project features (such as access roads) that would potentially divide an established community.

Rationale for Rejection: This measure is not feasible since future large turbine projects may have site constraints that restrict where turbines, transmission lines, and access roads can be located. Furthermore, this measure would be contrary to the project objective to maximize the production of energy from renewable wind sources (objective 2).

The Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative (discussed in Section 4.4 of the FEIR) would have a smaller project area, which would result in fewer potential areas for the development of large wind turbines and potentially fewer land use impacts related to the physical division of an established community. Additionally, the Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative would not change the Boulevard and Borrego Springs community plan language, and therefore, these communities would be better protected against the physical division of an established community due to the development of large wind turbines. However, impacts would still be considered significant since the alternative could still potentially introduce large wind turbines that could potentially divide an established community through the development of associated roads and infrastructure. Therefore, land use impacts related to the physical division of an established community would remain significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative.

Because the measure listed above would be infeasible; because no appropriate feasible and enforceable mitigation measures could be identified that would reduce impacts to less than significant; and because there are no feasible project alternatives that would achieve a level of less than significant; impacts associated with the physical division of an established community would remain significant and unavoidable.

52 LU-2 Cumulatively Considerable Impact – Physically Divide a Community (Large Turbines): As described above, development of large wind turbines and associated access roads under the proposed project would have the potential to result in the physical division of an established community. Therefore, in combination with other past, present and foreseeable future projects, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact on the physical division of an established community.

Facts in Support of Finding: Cumulative projects would include the construction of new or widened roadways, airports, railroad tracks, open space areas, or other features that would individually have the potential to physically divide an established community. In addition to these larger projects, smaller cumulative projects could have the effect of providing a barrier to access that would physically divide a community. Such impacts would generally be limited to an individual community. Multiple projects in the same community could combine to result in a cumulative effect to the division of that community. Therefore, projects in the region would have the potential to result in cumulatively considerable land use impacts related to the division of an established community.

As described for Impact LU-1, future large wind turbines would have the potential to result in the physical division of an established community due to the development of roads and associated infrastructure. Therefore, in combination with other past, present and foreseeable future projects, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable land use impact.

As described for Impact LU-1, there are no feasible mitigation measures and none of the project alternatives would reduce the project's significant impacts associated with the physical division of an established community to below significant. Therefore, potential land use impacts related to the physical division of an established community due to the development of future large wind turbines and associated infrastructure would remain cumulatively considerable.

NOISE

53 NOI-1 Significant Effect – Excessive Noise Levels (Large Turbines): The FEIR identifies significant impacts related to noise exposure associated with low frequency (C-weighted) noise from large wind turbines developed under the proposed project.

Facts in Support of Finding: The development of large wind turbines under the proposed project would have the potential to result in significant impacts related to excessive noise levels associated with low-frequency noise. Although future large wind turbine projects are required to meet the C-weighted sound limit established in the Wind Energy Ordinance, it is possible for a noise waiver to be granted subject to specific conditions. On July 20, 2012, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the area in which projects could obtain this noise waiver. Therefore, if the Board of Supervisors agrees with the Planning

Commission recommendation, then only those future large wind turbines within the designated Noise Waiver Area on the Wind Resources Map can request a noise waiver. These projects must comply with all A-weighted requirements, but a higher C-weighted sound limit may be approved subject to the approval of a noise waiver.

The following measure was considered to reduce impacts to noise to below significant. However, the County has determined that this measure would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, the following mitigation measure will not be implemented.

(1) Measure: Require all future large wind turbine projects to meet Section 6952(f).1 in the amended Zoning Ordinance without exception (i.e., remove Section 6952(f).2 that allows for a waiver in the designated Noise Waiver Area on the Wind Resources Map in some circumstances).

Rationale for Rejection: This measure would be infeasible because some future large wind turbine projects may not be able to meet the new Zoning Ordinance provisions and still be a viable wind energy project. As such, this measure would conflict with the project objectives to facilitate the use of renewable wind energy within the County, to maximize the production of energy from renewable wind sources, and to reduce the potential for energy shortages and outages by facilitating local energy supply.

The Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative (discussed in Section 4.4 of the FEIR) would have a smaller project area, which would result in fewer potential areas for the development of large wind turbines and potentially fewer noise impacts related to C-weighted noise. However, impacts would still be considered significant since noise waivers can still be granted under this alternative. Therefore, noise impacts would remain significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative.

Because the measure listed above would be infeasible; because no appropriate feasible and enforceable mitigation measures could be identified that would reduce impacts to less than significant; and because there are no feasible project alternatives that would achieve a level of less than significant; impacts associated with excessive C-weighted noise levels would remain significant and unavoidable.

54 NOI-2 Significant Effect – Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise (Large Turbines): The FEIR identifies significant impacts related to the substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels associated with the development of large wind turbines under the proposed project.

Facts in Support of Finding: The development of large wind turbines under the proposed project would have the potential to result in significant impacts related to a permanent increase in ambient noise associated with low-frequency C-weighted noise. Although future large wind turbine projects are required to meet the C-weighted sound limit established in the Wind Energy Ordinance, it is possible for a noise waiver to be granted subject to specific conditions. On July 20, 2012, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the area in which projects could obtain this noise waiver. Therefore, if the Board of Supervisors agrees with the Planning Commission recommendation, then only those future large wind turbines within the designated Noise Waiver Area on the Wind Resources Map can request a noise waiver. These projects must comply with all A-weighted requirements, but a higher C-weighted sound limit may be approved subject to the approval of a noise waiver. The local environment and topographic conditions could cause a difference in the noise perceived from wind turbines and, therefore, a higher C-weighted sound level may not result in an impact. However, in some cases, a higher C-weighted sound level may potentially create a permanent increase in ambient noise levels.

The following measure was considered to reduce impacts to noise to below significant. However, the County has determined that this measure would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, the following mitigation measure will not be implemented.

(1) Measure: Require all future large wind turbine projects to meet Section 6952(f).1 in the amended Zoning Ordinance without exception (i.e., remove Section 6952(f).2 that allows for a waiver within the designated Noise Waiver Area on the Wind Resources Map in some circumstances).

Rationale for Rejection: This measure would be infeasible because some future large wind turbine projects may not be able to meet the new Zoning Ordinance provisions and still be a viable wind energy project. As such, this measure would conflict with the project objectives to facilitate the use of renewable wind energy within the County, to maximize the production of energy from renewable wind sources, and to reduce the potential for energy shortages and outages by facilitating local energy supply.

The Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative (discussed in Section 4.4 of the FEIR) would have a smaller project area, which would result in fewer potential areas for the development of large wind turbines and potentially fewer noise impacts related to C-weighted noise. Additionally, the Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative would not change the Boulevard and Borrego Springs community plan language, and therefore, these communities would be better protected against potential impacts from C-weighted noise due to the development of large wind turbines. However, impacts would still be considered significant since the alternative could still potentially introduce large wind turbines that could potentially result in C-weighted noise that would result in a permanent increase in ambient noise levels. Therefore, ambient noise impacts would remain significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative.

Because the measure listed above would be infeasible; because no appropriate feasible and enforceable mitigation measures could be identified that would reduce impacts to less than significant; and because there are no feasible project alternatives that would achieve a level of less than significant; impacts associated with a permanent increase in ambient noise levels would remain significant and unavoidable.

55 NOI-3 Significant Effect – Temporary Increase in Ambient Noise (Large Turbines): The FEIR identifies significant impacts related to the substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels associated with the development of large wind turbines under the proposed project.

Facts in Support of Finding: The development of large wind turbines under the proposed project would have the potential to result in significant impacts related to a temporary increase in ambient noise associated with low-frequency noise. Although future large wind turbine projects are required to meet the C-weighted sound limit established in the Wind Energy Ordinance, it is possible for a noise waiver to be granted subject to specific conditions. On July 20, 2012, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the area in which projects could obtain this noise waiver. Therefore, if the Board of Supervisors agrees with the Planning Commission recommendation, then only those future large wind turbines within the designated Noise Waiver Area on the Wind Resources Map can request a noise waiver. These projects must comply with all A-weighted requirements, but a higher C-weighted sound limit may be approved subject to the approval of a noise waiver. The local environment and topographic conditions

could cause a difference in the noise perceived from wind turbines and, therefore, a higher C-weighted sound level may not result in an impact. However, in some cases a higher C-weighted sound level may potentially create a temporary increase in ambient noise levels.

The following measure was considered to reduce impacts to noise to below significant. However, the County has determined that this measure would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, the following mitigation measure will not be implemented.

(1) Measure: Require that all future large wind turbine projects meet the requirements of Section 6952(f).1 in the amended Zoning Ordinance without exception (i.e., remove Section 6952(f).2 that allows for a waiver within the designated Noise Waiver Area on the Wind Resources Map in some circumstances).

Rationale for Rejection: This measure would be infeasible because some future large wind turbine projects may not be able to meet the new Zoning Ordinance provisions and still be a viable wind energy project. As such, this measure would conflict with the project objectives to facilitate the use of renewable wind energy within the County, to maximize the production of energy from renewable wind sources, and to reduce the potential for energy shortages and outages by facilitating local energy supply.

The Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative (discussed in Section 4.4 of the FEIR) would have a smaller project area, which would result in fewer potential areas for the development of large wind turbines and potentially fewer noise impacts related to C-weighted noise. Additionally, the Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative would not change the Boulevard and Borrego Springs community plan language, and therefore, these communities would be better protected against potential impacts from C-weighted noise due to the development of large wind turbines. However, impacts would still be considered significant since the alternative could still potentially introduce large wind turbines that could potentially result in C-weighted noise that would result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels. Therefore, ambient noise impacts would remain significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative.

Because the measure listed above would be infeasible; because no appropriate feasible and enforceable mitigation measures could be identified that would

reduce impacts to less than significant; and because there are no feasible project alternatives that would achieve a level of less than significant; impacts associated with a temporary increase in ambient noise levels would remain significant and unavoidable.

56 **NOI-4 Cumulatively Considerable Impact – Excessive Noise Levels (Large Turbines):** As described above, development of large wind turbines under the proposed project would have the potential to result in excessive noise levels related to C-weighted noise. Therefore, in combination with other past, present and foreseeable future projects, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable noise impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: A cumulative noise impact would occur if construction and operation associated with cumulative regional land use projects, such as those identified in adjacent city and county general plans and regional transportation plans, combined would exceed the noise compatibility guidelines and standards of the Noise Element. For example, the 2030 San Diego Regional Transportation Plan Projects, such as the expansion of a portion of I-8, would increase traffic noise above the Noise Element standards. However, development and operation of most cumulative projects would be subject to regulations that require compliance with noise standards, such as those contained in the California Code of Regulations. The exception would be projects proposed in Mexico along the U.S.–Mexico international border and on tribal lands. Therefore, even though required regulations would minimize the cumulative impact of projects in the United States, development in Mexico along the U.S.–Mexico international border or on tribal lands within the vicinity of existing noise-sensitive land uses would not be required to comply with the same noise standards and a cumulatively considerable impact could potentially occur.

As described for Impact NOI-1, future large wind turbines would have the potential to result in a C-weighted noise impact. Therefore, in combination with other past, present and foreseeable future projects, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact related to excessive C-weighted noise levels.

As described for Impact NOI-1, there are no feasible mitigation measures, and none of the project alternatives would reduce the project's significant impacts associated with the excessive C-weighted noise to below significant. Therefore, potential noise impacts related to excessive noise levels due to the development of future large wind turbines would remain cumulatively considerable.

57 NOI-5 Cumulatively Considerable Impact – Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise (Large Turbines): As described above, development of large wind turbines under the proposed project would have the potential to result in a permanent increase in ambient noise. Therefore, in combination with other past, present and foreseeable future projects, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable noise impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: A cumulative noise impact would occur if construction and operation associated with cumulative regional land use projects, such as those identified in adjacent city and county general plans and regional transportation plans, combined would permanently increase ambient noise levels in the Noise Element. For example, the extension of State Route (SR) 905 from I-805 to the U.S.–Mexico international border and widening of SR-94 from SR-125 to Jamacha Road would result in a permanent increase in ambient noise due to an increase in roadway noise. However, development and operation of most cumulative projects would be subject to local regulations that require compliance with noise standards. The exception would be projects proposed in Mexico along the U.S.–Mexico international border and on tribal lands. Therefore, even though required regulations would minimize the cumulative impact of projects in the United States, development of land uses in Mexico along the U.S.–Mexico international border or on tribal lands that permanently increase noise would not be required to comply with the same noise standards, and a cumulatively considerable impact could potentially occur.

As described for Impact NOI-2, future large wind turbines would have the potential to result in a C-weighted noise impact. Therefore, in combination with other past, present and foreseeable future projects, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact related to a permanent increase in ambient noise due to C-weighted noise from the development of large wind turbines.

As described for Impact NOI-2, there are no feasible mitigation measures and none of the project alternatives would reduce the project's significant impacts associated with the C-weighted noise to below significant. Therefore, potential noise impacts related to a permanent increase in ambient noise due to the development of future large wind turbines would remain cumulatively considerable.

58 NOI-6 Cumulatively Considerable Impact – Temporary Increase in Ambient Noise (Large Turbines): As described above, development of large wind turbines under the proposed project would have the potential to result in a temporary increase in ambient noise. Therefore, in combination with other past, present and foreseeable future projects, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable noise impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: A cumulative noise impact could occur if construction associated with one or more projects in close proximity to one another could result in combined noise levels that would temporarily increase ambient noise levels beyond the standards in the County Noise Ordinance. As described for Impact NOI-3, future large wind turbines would have the potential to result in a C-weighted noise impact. Although other past, present and foreseeable future projects would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact, future large turbine projects allowed under this ordinance could combine with existing low frequency noise increases in the environment. Thus, a cumulatively considerable impact could potentially occur.

As described for Impact NOI-3, there are no feasible mitigation measures, and none of the project alternatives would reduce the project's significant impacts associated with the C-weighted noise to below significant. Therefore, potential noise impacts related to a temporary increase in ambient noise due to the development of future large wind turbines would remain cumulatively considerable.

TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

59 TRAF-1 Significant Effect – Conflict with Plan, Policy or Ordinance (Large Turbines): The FEIR identifies significant impacts related to an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system associated with the development of large wind turbines under the proposed project. Future large wind turbines could potentially generate traffic that would exceed average daily trip (ADT) thresholds and in turn could conflict with a plan, policy or ordinance that establishes measures of the effectiveness of the circulation system performance.

Facts in Support of Finding: The development of large wind turbines under the proposed project could potentially generate traffic that would exceed ADT thresholds and in turn could conflict with a plan, policy or ordinance that

establishes measures of the effectiveness of the circulation system performance for roads within the County.

The mitigation measure identified in the FEIR would reduce the impact, but not to below a level of significance:

- M-TRAF-1: During the environmental review process for future Major Use Permits for wind turbines, the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Transportation and Traffic shall be applied. When traffic 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: traffic signal improvements; road improvements; street re-striping and parking prohibitions; fair share contributions toward identified, funded and scheduled projects; and transportation demand management programs.

The following measure that would reduce impacts associated with traffic to below significant was also considered. However, the County has determined that this measure would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, the following mitigation measure will not be implemented.

(1) Measure: Require future large wind turbine projects to reduce traffic impacts from construction to a level below significant.

Rationale for Rejection: This measure is not feasible since future large turbine projects would require a substantial number of truck trips for construction purposes, and construction of the project may not be possible without impacting roads and traffic patterns.

The Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative (discussed in Section 4.4 of the FEIR) would have a smaller project area, which would result in fewer potential areas for the development of large wind turbines and potentially fewer ADT. Additionally, the Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative would not change the Boulevard and Borrego Springs community plan language, and therefore, these communities would be better protected against potential traffic impacts from increases in ADT. However, impacts would still be considered significant since the alternative could still potentially introduce large wind turbines that could potentially result ADT levels that exceed thresholds. Therefore, traffic impacts related to a conflict with a policy, plan or ordinance would remain significant and

unavoidable for both the proposed project and Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative.

Because some of the measures listed above would be infeasible; because application of all feasible mitigation would not achieve a level of less than significant; and because there are no feasible project alternatives that would achieve a level of less than significant; impacts associated with traffic would remain significant and unavoidable.

60 TRAF-2 Significant Effect – Conflict with Congestion Management Program (Large Turbines): The FEIR identifies significant impacts related to a potential conflict with the Congestion Management Program (CMP). Future large wind turbines could potentially exceed ADT thresholds and in turn could conflict with the CMP.

Facts in Support of Finding: The development of large wind turbines under the proposed project could potentially generate traffic that would exceed ADT thresholds and in turn could conflict with SANDAG's CMP.

The mitigation measure identified in the FEIR would reduce the impact, but not to below a level of significance:

- M-TRAF-1: During the environmental review process for future Major Use Permits for wind turbines, the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Transportation and Traffic shall be applied. When traffic 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: traffic signal improvements; road improvements; street re-striping and parking prohibitions; fair share contributions toward identified, funded and scheduled projects; and transportation demand management programs.

The following measure that would reduce impacts associated with traffic to below significant was also considered. However, the County has determined that this measure would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, the following mitigation measure will not be implemented.

(1) Measure: Require future large wind turbine projects to reduce traffic impacts from construction to a level below significant.

Rationale for Rejection: This measure is not feasible since future large turbine projects would require a substantial number of truck trips for construction purposes, and construction may not be possible without impacting roads and traffic patterns.

The Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative (discussed in Section 4.4 of the FEIR) would have a smaller project area, which would result in fewer potential areas for the development of large wind turbines and potentially fewer ADT. Additionally, the Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative would not change the Boulevard and Borrego Springs community plan language, and therefore, these communities would be better protected against potential traffic impacts from increases in ADT. However, impacts would still be considered significant since the alternative could still potentially introduce large wind turbines that could potentially result ADT levels that exceed thresholds. Therefore, traffic impacts related to a conflict with the CMP would remain significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative.

Because some of the measures listed above would be infeasible; because application of all feasible mitigation would not achieve a level of less than significant; and because there are no feasible project alternatives that would achieve a level of less than significant; impacts associated with a conflict with the CMP would remain significant and unavoidable.

61 TRAF-3 Cumulatively Considerable Impact – Conflict with Plan, Policy, or Ordinance: As described above, the development of large wind turbines under the proposed project would have the potential to generate traffic that could exceed ADT thresholds and, in turn, could conflict with a plan, policy or ordinance that establishes measures of the effectiveness of the circulation system performance. In combination with other cumulative projects, the project would have the potential to result in a significant cumulative impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the cumulative traffic scenario in the County's General Plan Update, 34 state highways and 124 Mobility Element roads (for a total of 158 roadway segments) would operate at a deficient LOS, as stated in the FEIR Section 2.9.2.1. This would be considered a cumulatively considerable impact. Additionally, 33 roadway segments would be significantly impacted upon build-out of respective adjacent cities' general plans combined with build-out of the County's General Plan Update. Therefore, cumulative projects in the region would have the potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts due to potential conflicts with an applicable plan,

ordinance, or policy establishing measures of the effectiveness of the circulation system performance.

As described for Impact TRAF-1, future large wind turbines would have the potential to exceed ADT thresholds. Therefore, in combination with other past, present and foreseeable future projects, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact related to a conflict with a plan, policy or ordinance that establishes measures of the effectiveness of the circulation system performance.

As described for Impact TRAF-1, there are no feasible mitigation measures, and none of the project alternatives would reduce the project's significant impacts associated with traffic to below significant. Therefore, potential traffic impacts related to a conflict with a plan, policy or ordinance that establishes measures of the effectiveness of the circulation system performance due to the development of future large wind turbines would remain cumulatively considerable.

62 **TRAF-4 Cumulatively Considerable Impact – Conflict with Plan, Policy, or Ordinance (Large Turbines):** As described above, the development of large wind turbines under the proposed project would have the potential to generate traffic that could exceed ADT thresholds and, in turn, could conflict with the CMP. In combination with other cumulative projects, the project would have the potential to result in a significant cumulative impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Because the cumulative traffic scenario in the County's General Plan Update would result in deficient roadway segments, as stated above in Impact TRAF-3, cumulative projects in the region would have the potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts due to conflicts with SANDAG's CMP.

As described for Impact TRAF-2, future large wind turbines would have the potential to generate traffic that would exceed ADT thresholds. Therefore, in combination with other past, present and foreseeable future projects, the proposed project would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact related to a conflict with the CMP.

As described for Impact TRAF-2, there are no feasible mitigation measures, and none of the project alternatives would reduce the project's significant impacts associated with traffic to below significant. Therefore, potential traffic impacts

related to a conflict with the CMP due to the development of future large wind turbines would remain cumulatively considerable.

Section B – Findings Regarding Alternatives

Section 15126.6(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires the discussion of "a reasonable range of alternatives to a project, or the location of a project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives." Three alternatives to the proposed project were analyzed: the No Project Alternative, the Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative, and the Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative. These alternatives are compared to the impacts of the proposed project and are assessed relative to their ability to meet the basic objectives of the proposed project. In addition, a number of alternatives were considered and rejected, as described in Section 4.2 of the FEIR, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c).

The following provides a summary of the alternatives analyzed in Chapter 4.0 of the FEIR, as well as a rationale as to why the Proposed Project is preferred over each alternative and why each alternative has been rejected.

No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative (refer to Subchapter 4.5 of the FEIR) assumes that the existing Zoning Ordinance would remain in effect. Under this No Project Alternative, small, medium, and large wind turbines, as currently defined, would be allowed with varying permit types from ministerial building permits to major use permits. In addition, under the No Project Alternative, the existing General Plan (Boulevard Community Plan and Borrego Springs Community Plan) would remain unchanged, thereby making it difficult for large wind turbines to be developed in the communities of Boulevard and Borrego Springs. The No Project Alternative would not achieve any of the project objectives identified for the proposed project.

Overall, the No Project Alternative would have fewer impacts than the Proposed Project (refer to Section 4.5.2 of the FEIR.) However, certain environmental impacts would still be significant and unavoidable. Impacts to scenic vistas, scenic resources, and visual character from the development of large, medium and small turbines would be significant. Large wind turbines could result in significant direct conversion of farmland, direct conversion of forest lands, indirect conversion of farmland/forest land, and

conflicts with agricultural zoning or Williamson Act lands. Conflicts with federal and state air quality standards and non-attainment criteria pollutants due to development of large wind turbines would be potentially significant. Large, medium and small turbines could result in significant impacts to special-status species, riparian and other sensitive natural communities, and wildlife movement under this alternative. Development of small wind turbines may result in significant impacts to historical resources, archaeological resources, human remains, and paleontological resources. Wildland fires may result from the development of large, medium or small wind turbines. Large turbine projects may result in the physical division of an established community. Impacts from noise exposure, permanent increase in ambient noise, and temporary increase to ambient noise from large wind turbines would be potentially significant. And large turbines would also potentially generate traffic that could result in conflicts with transportation plans, and conflicts with the CMP.

Potential lighting impacts of this alternative would be less than significant since large wind turbines under the existing ordinance would not reach heights that necessitate FAA lighting, whereas lighting impacts of the proposed project would be potentially significant.

Currently, the Zoning Ordinance does not regulate C-weighted noise. Under the proposed project, C-weighted noise regulations would be included in the County Zoning Ordinance to address low frequency noise output from large wind turbines. Therefore, low frequency noise impacts could potentially be greater under the No Project Alternative.

The No Project Alternative is rejected because it fails to meet the eight project objectives and would not have substantially fewer environmental impacts compared to the proposed project.

Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative

The Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative involves three components, including a reduced project area, a reduced turbine height, and fewer turbines. Under this alternative, many environmental effects would be similar in nature to those for the Proposed Project. Although some potentially significant impacts would be reduced under this alternative, they would not be reduced to below a significant level. More specifically, the following impacts would remain significant and unavoidable due to development of small wind turbines under the Limited Small Wind Turbines Alternative: scenic vistas, scenic resources, visual character, special-status species, wildlife movement, historical resources, archaeological resources, human remains, paleontological resources, and wildland fires (see FEIR Section 4.3).

The Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative would achieve the eight project objectives with varying degrees of success. The Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative would not achieve objective 1 (facilitate the use of renewable wind energy within the County pursuant to existing and future statewide goals), objective 2 (maximize the production of energy from renewable wind sources to assist the County in furthering federal goals) or objective 3 (reduce the potential for energy shortages and outages by facilitating local energy supply) as well as the Proposed Project would because this alternative would allow fewer small turbines with fewer height and location options.

The Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative would achieve four objectives as well as the proposed project. This alternative would still streamline and clarify the approval process for the development and operation of small wind turbines (objective 4). Similarly, the Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative would allow the development of small wind turbines without a discretionary permit (objective 6). However, because of this alternative's components, this alternative would provide fewer opportunities for small wind turbines compared to what the proposed project would provide. The Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative would achieve objectives 7 and 8 equally as well as the Proposed Project since these objectives address the permitting of MET facilities and large wind turbines, which the Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative would not change.

Since the Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative would allow fewer small wind turbines, it would better achieve objective 5, which is to minimize the potential for land use conflicts that may arise through the development of wind turbines.

While the Limited Small Wind Turbine Alternative would reduce the severity and frequency of some potential impacts from small wind turbine development, it would not reduce impacts to below significant. As described above, significant and unavoidable impacts would remain to certain resource categories without the benefit of the greater potential to use renewable wind sources that the proposed project would provide. This alternative would be consistent with some of the objectives of the Proposed Project; however, it would not meet objectives 1, 2, and 3 to the same degree as the proposed project. As such, this alternative is rejected because it is infeasible for social, economic and other reasons. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, therefore, the County must adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative

The Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative would involve three substantial changes as compared to the proposed project. First, this alternative would reduce the project area

and shift development of large wind turbines away from village areas by limiting turbine development to rural and semirural areas, as designated by the General Plan, and requiring a 2,000-foot setback from Interstate highways. Second, large wind turbines would be allowed in wind resource areas classified as “fair” through “superb” and would not be allowed in “marginal” wind resource areas, as they are with the proposed project. Finally, the Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative would retain the existing policies and language of the General Plan, including the policies of the Boulevard chapter of the Mountain Empire Subregional plan (Boulevard Community Plan), and the Borrego Springs Community Plan, which restrict or prohibit wind turbine projects.

Under the Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative, many environmental effects would be similar in nature to those described in the Proposed Project. Although the impacts would be reduced due to the limitation to rural and semi-rural areas, the limitation to areas with fair through superb wind and the retention of the language in the two community plans, significant impacts would not be reduced to below a significant level. More specifically, the following impacts would remain significant and unavoidable due to development of large wind turbines under the Limited Large Wind Turbines Alternative: scenic vistas, scenic resources, visual character, light and glare, conversion of farmland, conversion of forest lands, indirect conversion of farmland/forest lands, conflicts with agricultural zoning and/or Williamson Act lands, conflicts with federal and state air quality standards and non-attainment criteria pollutants, special-status species, riparian and other sensitive natural communities, wildlife movement, wildland fires, physically dividing an established community, noise exposure, permanent increase in ambient noise, temporary increase to ambient noise, conflicts with transportation plans, and conflicts with the CMP (see FEIR Section 4.4).

The Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative would achieve the eight project objectives with varying degrees of success. The Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative would not achieve objective 1 (facilitate the use of renewable wind energy within the County pursuant to existing and future statewide goals), objective 2 (maximize the production of energy from renewable wind sources to assist the County in furthering federal goals) or objective 3 (reduce the potential for energy shortages and outages by facilitating local energy supply), to the same degree as the Proposed Project because this alternative would provide fewer opportunities for development of large wind turbines.

The Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative would achieve four project objectives as well as the proposed project. This alternative would achieve objectives 4, 6, and 7 equally as well as the Proposed Project since these objectives address the permitting of MET facilities and small wind turbines, which the Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative would not change. In addition, the Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative

would achieve objective 8 (update regulations for large wind turbines to be consistent with current wind turbine technology and designs) equally as well as the Proposed Project since the ordinance revisions that are consistent with current wind turbine designs and technology would still be included in this alternative.

Since the Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative would allow fewer opportunities for large wind turbines, it would better achieve objective 5, which is to minimize the potential for land use conflicts that may arise through the development of wind turbines.

While the Limited Large Wind Turbine Alternative would reduce the severity and frequency of some potential impacts from large wind turbine development, it would not reduce impacts to below significant. As described above, significant and unavoidable impacts would remain to certain resource categories without the benefit of the greater potential to use renewable wind sources that the proposed project would provide. This alternative would be consistent with some of the objectives of the Proposed Project; however, it would not achieve objectives 1, 2, and 3 to the same degree as the proposed project. As such, this alternative is rejected because it is infeasible for social, economic and other reasons. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, therefore, the County must adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
for the

Wind Energy Ordinance Amendment
(POD 10-007; LOG No. 09-00-003)
SCH No. 2010091030

May 8, 2013

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation measures have been identified in the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the Wind Energy Ordinance Amendment POD 10-007 to reduce or eliminate potential environmental impacts. The County of San Diego (County) is required to implement all adopted mitigation measures. In order to ensure compliance, the following mitigation monitoring and reporting program has been formulated. This program consists of a list of the project impacts and detailed descriptions of the mitigation measures.

A mitigation chart has been prepared for the project. The chart identifies each project impact and the related mitigation measures, monitoring schedule, and the person responsible for verifying compliance. The following is an explanation of the eight columns of the mitigation chart.

Column 1 **Impact:** Each impact is numbered and briefly described.

Column 2 **Mitigation Measures:** Each measure is numbered and briefly described.

Column 3 **Monitoring Activity:** This column identifies the County department or other public agency that is responsible for determining compliance with the mitigation measure.

Column 4 **Timing:** The monitoring schedule depends upon the progression of the overall project. Therefore, specific dates are not used in the "Timing" column. Instead, scheduling describes a logical succession of events (e.g., after 100 permits issued, annual).

Column 5 **Responsibility:** This column identifies the party responsible for ensuring the mitigation measure is completed within the correct timing period.

Column 6 **Initial:** The monitor verifies completion of the particular mitigation measure by initialing and dating in this column. Where the "Timing" column indicates annual or other ongoing mitigation measures, verification of compliance may not occur until completion or expiration of the project. Provision of all required signatures within this column signifies conclusion of the monitoring program.

Column 7 **Date:** The monitor dates the completion of the mitigation measure, which is the same date that Column 6 is initialed.

Column 8 **Remarks:** The status of ongoing and cumulative mitigation measures is to be documented throughout the process. This space should be used for specific comments pertaining to the status of the mitigation measure. If there are additional comments, they should be attached to the chart.

The County adopts this program to comply with Public Resource Code Section 21081.6 and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15097.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Activity	Timing	Responsibility	Initial	Date	Remarks
Aesthetics							
AES-2, AES-4, AES-6, AES-9, AES-11, AES-13 Potential direct and cumulative impacts to scenic vistas, scenic resources, and visual character and quality from large wind turbines	**M-AES-1** During the environmental review process for future Major Use Permits for wind turbines, 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.	The County shall ensure that plot plans comply with County *Guidelines for Determining Significance for Visual Resources and Dark Skies and Glare* and/or implement all feasible project-specific mitigation measures related to aesthetics.	Major Use Permit environmental review process	County Planning & Development Services			
AES-7, AES-14 Potential direct and cumulative aesthetic impacts from lighting and shadow flicker associated with large wind turbines	**M-AES-2** Require a Lighting Mitigation Plan to be prepared as part of the Major Use Permit discretionary review process. The Lighting Mitigation Plan would demonstrate that the design and installation of all permanent lighting for large wind turbine ancillary facilities is such that light bulbs and reflectors are not visible from public viewing areas; lighting does not cause reflected glare; and illumination of the project facilities, vicinity, and nighttime sky is minimized. The Lighting Mitigation Plan would demonstrate consistency with the Light Pollution Code (Section 51.201 et seq.) and Sections 6322 and 6324 of the Zoning Ordinance to ensure outdoor light fixtures emitting light into the night sky do not result in a detrimental effect on astronomical research and to ensure reflected glare and light trespass is minimized.	The County shall ensure that a Lighting Mitigation Plan is prepared that minimizes and mitigates lighting effects and complies with the Light Pollution Code (Section 51.101 et seq.) and Sections 6322 and 6324 of the Zoning Ordinance.	Major Use Permit environmental review process	County Planning & Development Services			
	M-AES-3 Require a Shadow Flicker Study to be prepared as part of the Major Use Permit discretionary review process. The Shadow Flicker Study would utilize a shadow flicker model run to determine the potential shadow flicker that could occur at sensitive receptors within 2,000 meters (6,562 feet) of the proposed turbines. Due to the fact that some receptors may lie within 60° due north of the turbines, outside of the sun's path at any given point in the year, those receptors may be excluded from the study. Beyond 2,000 meters, the human eye would not be able to discern a shadow cast from a wind turbine. The modeling should utilize many different inputs, including: 1. Real Data • Actual coordinates of turbines • Actual coordinates of receptors • Actual topographic data. 2. Conservative Assumptions • Specifications of the turbines being considered with the highest hub height and longest rotor diameter	The County shall ensure that a Shadow Flicker Study is prepared that includes all of the data stated in M-AES-3 and that minimizes and mitigates the effects of shadow flicker on potential receptors to the extent feasible.	Major Use Permit environmental review process	County Planning & Development Services			

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Activity	Timing	Responsibility	Initial	Date	Remarks
	• 100% turbine operation • No vegetative screening • Receptors can be impacted from all directions (i.e., "greenhouse mode"). 3. Realistic Features • Actual wind data from a local meteorological tower to account for the percentage of time wind blows from each direction • National Weather Service sunshine probability data to approximate average cloud cover.						
Agriculture and Forest Resources							
AGR-1, AGR-2, AGR-4, AGR-5, AGR-6, AGR-8 Potential direct and cumulative impacts to farmland, agricultural zoning, Williamson Act contracts, and indirection conversion of farmland or forest land associated with large wind turbines	**M-AGR-1** During the environmental review process for future Major Use Permits for wind turbines, 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.	The County shall ensure that the plans comply with the County *Guidelines for Determining Significance for Agricultural Resources* and/or implement all feasible project-specific mitigation measures related to farmland.	Major Use Permits environmental review process	County Planning & Development Services			
AGR-3, AGR-4, AGR-7, AGR-8 Potential indirect conversion of farmland or forest land, as well as potential cumulative impacts from large wind turbines	**M-AGR-2** During the environmental review process for future Major Use Permits for wind turbines, 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.	The County shall ensure that the plans comply with the County *Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biological Resources* and/or implement all feasible project-specific mitigation measures related to forest land.	Major Use Permits environmental review process	County Planning & Development Services			
Air Quality							
AQ-1, AQ-2, AQ-4, AQ-5 Direct and cumulative impacts associated with conformance to federal and state air quality standards and Non-Attainment Criteria Pollutants from large wind turbines	**M-AQ-1** During the discretionary review process for future Major Use Permits for wind turbines, 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.	The County shall ensure that the plans comply with the County *Guidelines for Determining Significance for Air Quality* and/or implement all feasible project-specific mitigation measures related to federal and state air quality standards.	Major Use Permit discretionary review process	County Planning & Development Services			

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Activity	Timing	Responsibility	Initial	Date	Remarks
Biological Resources							
BIO-2, BIO-4, BIO-6, BIO-8, BIO-10, BIO-12 Direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to candidate, sensitive, or special-status species; riparian habitat and sensitive natural communities; and wildlife movement corridors or nursery sites from large wind turbines.	**M-BIO-1** During the environmental review process for future Major Use Permits for wind turbines, 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.	The County shall ensure that the plans comply with the County *Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biological Resources* and/or implement all feasible project-specific mitigation measures related to biological resources.	Major Use Permit environmental review process	County Planning & Development Services			
	M-BIO-2 Update the County *Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biological Resources* to include, or incorporate by reference, recommendations from the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), the Avian Power Line Interaction Committee, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Draft Guidance, and the California Energy Commission (e.g., *California Guidelines for Reducing Impacts to Birds and Bats from Wind Energy Development*). Examples of recommended mitigation measures include: site screening, pre-permit monitoring, acoustic monitoring, buffer zone inclusion, reduction of foraging resources near turbines, specific lighting to reduce bird collisions, post-construction monitoring, and avian protection plans.	The County shall update the County *Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biological Resources* to include by reference, recommendations from the CDFG, the Avian Power Line Interaction Committee, the USFWS Draft Guidance, and the California Energy Commission.	Upon approval of the Wind Energy Ordinance	County Planning & Development Services			
BIO-1, BIO-3, BIO-5, BIO-7, BIO-9, BIO-11 Direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to candidate, sensitive, or special-status species; riparian habitat and sensitive natural communities; and wildlife movement corridors or nursery sites from small wind turbines.	**M-BIO-3** All ministerial permits for small wind turbines will include a notice to the permittee explicitly stating that additional state and federal regulations may apply to the construction and operation of the wind turbine including, but not limited to, U.S. Endangered Species Act, the California Endangered Species Act, and the California Fish and Game Code related to Lake and Streambed Alteration.	The County shall ensure that all ministerial permits for small wind turbines include the notice regarding state and federal regulations.	Permit language will be established upon approval of the Wind Energy Ordinance and will be included in all future small wind turbine permits	County Planning & Development Services			
	M-BIO-4 A joint evaluation between the County of San Diego, the California Department of Fish and Game, and the US Fish and Wildlife Service of the permitted small turbines will be conducted five years after the ordinance goes into effect and after the first 100 small wind turbines are permitted. These evaluations will summarize where the majority of turbines are located, how many are roof-mounted, how many are vertical axis, what the average height is, etc..	The County shall track the number and locations of small wind turbine permits issued and prepare a report after 5 years and after the issuance of 100 small turbine permits.	Upon issuance of 100 small turbine permits and 5 years subsequent to approval of the Wind Energy Ordinance	County Planning & Development Services			
Cultural and Paleontological Resources							
CUL-1, CUL-5 Potential direct and	**M-CUL-1** The County shall provide incentives through the Mills Act to	The County shall provide incentives through the Mills Act to encourage property owners to protect	Upon approval of the Wind Energy Ordinance (on-going).	County Planning & Development Services			

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Activity	Timing	Responsibility	Initial	Date	Remarks
cumulative impacts to historical resources from small wind turbines	encourage the restoration, renovation, or adaptive reuse of historic resources. This will be done by reaching out to property owners with identified historic resources.	historic resources identified on site.					
Hazards and Hazardous Materials							
HAZ-2, HAZ-4 Potential direct and cumulative impacts associated with wildland fires from large wind turbines	**M-HAZ-1** During the environmental review process for future Major Use Permits for wind turbines, 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.	The County shall ensure that the plans comply with the County *Guidelines for Determining Significance for Wildland Fire & Fire Protection* and/or implement feasible project-specific mitigation measures related to wildland fires.	Major Use Permit environmental review process	County Planning & Development Services and County Fire Authority			
Transportation and Traffic							
TRAF-1, TRAF-2, TRAF-3, TRAF-4 Potential direct and cumulative impacts associated with transportation plan conflicts; or conflicts with a congestion management program from large wind turbines	**M-TRAF-1** During the environmental review process for future Major Use Permits for wind turbines, the County *Guidelines for Determining Significance for Transportation and Traffic* shall be applied. When traffic 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: traffic signal improvements; physical road improvements; street re-striping and parking prohibitions; fair share contributions toward identified, funded, and scheduled projects; and transportation demand management programs.	The County shall ensure that the plans comply with the County *Guidelines for Determining Significance for Transportation and Traffic* and/or implement feasible project-specific mitigation measures related to transportation and traffic.	Major Use Permit environmental review process	County Planning & Development Services and County Department of Public Works Transportation Division			

Environmental Findings

Statement of Overriding Considerations for the County of San Diego Wind Energy Ordinance Amendment POD 10-007

STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS
WIND ENERGY ORDINANCE AMENDMENT
(POD 10-007; LOG No. 09-00-003)
SCH No. 2010091030

May 8, 2013

The Findings required under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Public Resources Code sections 21000 *et seq*.) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code Regulations, title 14, section 15000 *et seq*.) supporting the approval of the County of San Diego's (County) Wind Energy Ordinance Amendment POD 10-007 conclude that the County's approval of the Project would result in significant impacts that cannot be substantially lessened or avoided. Because significant and unavoidable impacts remain after changes or alterations have been applied to the Project, this Statement of Overriding Considerations has been prepared. This statement provides the County's views on whether the project's benefits outweigh its unavoidable adverse environmental effects. CEQA Guidelines Section 15093 provides guidance on what a Statement of Overriding Considerations requires:

a) CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered 'acceptable.'

b) When the lead agency approves a project which would result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the final environmental impact report but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the final environmental impact report and/or other information in the record. The statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

c) If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the notice of determination. This statement does not substitute for, and shall be in addition to, findings required pursuant to Section 15091.

The County has adopted Findings Regarding Significant Effects for the Project, which identify certain significant effects of implementing the Project that are unavoidable even after incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures. The County has adopted all

feasible mitigation measures with respect to the significant unavoidable environmental impacts listed below. In addition, the County has analyzed a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project. Based on the analysis, the County has determined that the proposed Project best meets the project objectives and is preferable to the alternatives analyzed. Based on the entire record, oral and written testimony and other evidence received at the public hearings on the Project, the County finds that there is substantial evidence that the Project will bring substantial benefits to the County, including economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits that outweigh the significant effects on the environment that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level. Therefore, the County is adopting the Wind Energy Ordinance Amendment (the "Project") despite the significant and unavoidable environmental impacts identified in the Environmental Impact Report dated January 2013, and sets forth this Statement of Overriding Considerations as follows:

Significant Unavoidable Environmental Impacts

FEIR Section	Subject/Issue
2.1.6.1	Scenic Vistas
2.1.6.2	Scenic Resources
2.1.6.3	Visual Character and Quality
2.1.6.4	Light and Glare
2.2.6.1	Conversion of Farmland
2.2.6.2	Agricultural Zoning and Williamson Act Contracts
2.2.6.4	Loss of Conversion of Forest Land
2.2.6.5	Indirect Conversion of Farmland or Forest Land
2.3.6.2	Conformance to Federal and State Air Quality Standards
2.3.6.3	Non-Attainment Criteria Pollutants
2.4.6.1	Candidate, Sensitive, or Special-Status Species
2.4.6.2	Riparian Habitat or Sensitive Natural Community
2.4.6.4	Wildlife Movement
2.5.6.1	Historical Resources
2.5.6.2	Archaeological Resources
2.5.6.3	Human Remains
2.5.6.4	Paleontological Resources
2.6.6.7	Wildland Fires
2.7.6.1	Physically Divide a Community
2.8.6.1	Noise Exposure
2.8.6.3	Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels
2.8.6.4	Temporary or Periodic Increase to Ambient Noise
2.9.6.1	Conflict with Transportation Plan, Policy, or Ordinance
2.9.6.2	Conflict with Congestion Management Program (CMP)

Each of the reasons for approval cited below is a separate and independent basis that justifies approval of the Wind Energy Ordinance Amendment. Thus, even if a court were to set aside any particular reason or reasons, the Board of Supervisors finds that it would stand by its determination that each reason, or any combinations of reasons, is a sufficient basis for approving the Wind Energy Ordinance Amendment notwithstanding the significant and unavoidable impacts that may occur. The substantial evidence supporting the various benefits can be found in the CEQA Findings Regarding Significant Effects, the Final EIR and in the Record of Proceedings.

Statement of Overriding Considerations

The benefits of the Project include offsetting the need for electricity generated from fossil fuel by supplying renewable energy and helping the State further reduce greenhouse gases, as well as technological, economic and regulatory benefits. These benefits are specifically detailed below.

A. Energy and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Benefits

1. The Project will help reduce the potential for energy shortages and outages by facilitating the development of small and large wind turbines that will help to provide a local energy supply. The small and large wind turbines that the Project will facilitate will help to offset the need for electricity generated from fossil fuels and, thereby, assist the State in meeting its air quality goals and reducing greenhouse gases.

2. The Project will further the goals of the California Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) and other similar renewable projects in the state. The legislation enacting RPS requires sellers of electricity to purchase 33 percent of their electricity from renewable sources, such as wind, by 2020. The Project will allow for large and small scale wind energy development and assist the State in meeting its legislative mandate. The Project will also help the State meet its greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal enacted under AB 32.

B. Technological Benefits

1. Current wind turbine technology utilizes taller turbine towers with larger turbine blades than are allowed under the existing zoning regulations to maximize turbine efficiency. The Project will bring the zoning regulations in line with current wind turbine technologies and provide expanded opportunities for wind turbine development.

C. Economic Benefits

1. While the Project is not expected to generate a significant number of new permanent jobs, some new job opportunities would result, such as temporary construction jobs.

2. Small turbines developed under the Project can provide residents with relief from high energy costs, as well as the ability to contribute to a larger public benefit by reducing demand on utility systems that are currently primarily supplied by fossil fuels.

3. Large wind turbine projects developed under the Project can benefit economies of rural communities by providing a steady income through lease or royalty payments to farmers and other landowners.

D. Regulatory Benefits

1. The Project streamlines and clarifies the approval process for the development and operation of small wind turbines.

2. The Project provides siting criteria, such as restrictions and setback requirements to avoid habitats and wetlands, for small wind turbines. The addition of these criteria to the zoning regulations will help to reduce potential environmental impacts from small turbines.

3. The Project will expand opportunities for large wind turbines by updating the currently outdated zoning regulations to accommodate current wind turbine technology.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, the County has balanced the economic, social and planning benefits of the Project as set forth above against the Project's unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the Project. The County finds that these considerable benefits of the Project outweigh the unavoidable adverse effects, and that the "adverse environmental effects" of the Project that cannot be mitigated to a level of environmental insignificance are deemed "acceptable".

Environmental Findings

Decision and Explanation Regarding Recirculation of the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the County of San Diego Wind Energy Ordinance Amendment POD 10-007

DECISION AND EXPLANATION REGARDING RECIRCULATION OF THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

WIND ENERGY ORDINANCE AMENDMENT (POD 10-007; LOG No. 09-00-003) SCH No. 2010091030

May 8, 2013

Pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15088.5(a), the County of San Diego (County) is required to recirculate a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) when significant new information is added to the Draft EIR after public review of the Draft EIR, but before certification. Significant new information can include changes in the project or environmental setting, as well as additional data or other information. New information added to a Draft EIR is not significant unless the Draft EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including feasible alternatives) that the project's proponents have declined to implement.

BACKGROUND: The County prepared a Draft EIR for the Wind Energy Ordinance Amendment POD 10-007 and circulated the Draft EIR for public review from November 8, 2011 to December 23, 2011. Responses to all comments received during the public review period were prepared and are included in Appendix E of the Final EIR. Additionally, in response to some public comments and public testimony during Planning Commission hearings, the County made revisions to the Draft EIR. All revisions were evaluated to determine whether new or more severe impacts were identified, or whether feasible mitigation or avoidance measures were identified but rejected.

DECISION: No "significant new information" has been added to the Draft EIR since public notice was given of the availability of the Draft EIR for public review, and therefore, recirculation of the Draft EIR is not required. The following provides an explanation of the modifications made to the Draft EIR.

EXPLANATION: CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 states that new information added to a Draft EIR is not significant unless the Draft EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project's proponents have declined to implement. "Significant new information" requiring recirculation includes, for example, a disclosure showing that:

(1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.

(2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.

(3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from the others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but the project's proponents decline to adopt it.

(4) The Revised Draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

CHANGES TO THE DRAFT EIR: A Summary of Changes made to the Draft EIR subsequent to the public review period has been prepared and is included within Appendix F of the Final EIR. The summary provides changes in underline for new text and strike out for deleted text. Minor text changes, such as typographical errors, that were made to the Final EIR as necessary were not included. The changes do not alter the conclusions of the environmental analysis such that new significant environmental impacts have been identified, nor do they constitute significant new information. The following provides an explanation of notable changes to the project description, environmental analysis and mitigation measures.

Project Description

In response to comments, the project description was revised to clarify terminology and regulations, as well as to add environmental design considerations. The complete list of changes is available in Appendix F of the Final EIR. The most notable changes related to large wind turbines consist of clarifications to noise provisions. Originally, the Draft EIR referred to a "low frequency C-weighted sound level limit." The EIR has been revised to refer to a "low frequency C-Weighted sound level setback." The project description was also revised to clarify terminology for "C-Weighted sound level Residual Background Sound Criterion," which was formerly referred to as "C-Weighted Sound level (dBC), Residual Background Sound Level." These changes better reflect the methodology and regulations for analyzing low frequency noise of large wind turbines. These changes do not result in identification of new or more severe environmental impacts, nor do the changes result in feasible mitigation or avoidance measures identified but rejected.

For small wind turbines, a number of design considerations were added to Table 1-1, Environmental Design Considerations – Small Wind Turbines. These changes are as follows:

- No part of the wind turbine shall be closer than 300 feet or five times the turbine height, whichever is greater, from power transmission towers and lines.
- No part of the wind turbine shall be closer than 300 feet or five times the turbine height, whichever is greater, from blue line watercourse(s) as identified on the United States Geological Survey Topographic Map.
- No part of the wind turbine shall be closer than 300 feet or five times the turbine height, whichever is greater, from significant roost sites for bat species as mapped on the California Natural Diversity Database and San Diego Natural History Museum maps.
- No part of the wind turbine shall be closer than 300 feet or five times the turbine height, whichever is greater, from riparian vegetation as identified on the County Wetland Vegetation Map.
- No part of the wind turbine shall be closer than 300 feet or five times the turbine height, whichever is greater, from recorded open space easements and designated preserve areas
- No part of a wind turbine shall be closer than 4,000 feet from a known golden eagle nest site.
- The area of disturbance for a small wind turbine shall be limited to a 25-foot radius around the base of the tower and an access path to the tower that is a maximum of four feet wide.
- Tower structure lighting shall be prohibited unless required by law.

- No small turbine is allowed ministerially on properties designated as Pre-Approved Mitigation Area within the boundaries of the Multiple Species Conservation Program Subarea Plan.

The additional environmental design considerations were added in response to comments and would help to reduce potential impacts to biological resources, but not to a level less than significant. These changes do not result in identification of new or more severe environmental impacts, nor do the changes result in feasible mitigation or avoidance measures identified but rejected.

Environmental Analysis

The Final EIR includes changes to the environmental analysis provided in Chapter 2.0, Environmental Effects of the Proposed Project, and Chapter 4.0, Project Alternatives. These changes consist of clarifications and additional design considerations in response to comments received during public review of the Draft EIR and subsequent Planning Commission Hearings. The complete list of changes is available in Appendix F of the Final EIR. The following explains the most notable changes to the environmental analysis.

In Section 2.4, Biological Resources, additional environmental design considerations (as described above) were incorporated to reduce potential impacts to biological resources resulting from the development of small wind turbines. However, these additional measures would not reduce impacts to a level less than significant, and therefore, the conclusion of the analysis does not change. Also, throughout Section 2.4, Biological Resources, language was added to better explain potential impacts to certain types of avian species, such as eagles and other raptors. These changes do not result in identification of new or more severe environmental impacts, nor do these changes result in feasible mitigation or avoidance measures identified but rejected.

In Section 2.5, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, language was added to the regulatory setting to define a traditional cultural property (TCP). This definition helps to clarify what types of sites are listed in the National Register. This change does not result in identification of new or more severe environmental impacts, nor does this change result in feasible mitigation or avoidance measures identified but rejected.

In Section 2.8, Noise, changes consisted of clarifications to terminology and regulations related to the analysis of low frequency noise, as described above. In addition to these clarifications, changes to Section 2.8, Noise, include (1) the requirement for large wind turbines to undergo ongoing compliance review, and (2) the limiting of potential noise waivers for a reduced C-weighted sound setback to the designated Noise Waiver Area on the Wind Resources Map. These changes do not result in identification of new or more severe environmental impacts, nor do these changes result in feasible mitigation or avoidance measures identified but rejected.

In Chapter 4.0, Project Alternatives, a solar alternative was added in response to comments received during the Planning Commission hearing held on May 11, 2012. This alternative would allow solar projects rather than wind turbine projects. The alternative was considered but rejected because it would not accomplish most of the project objectives. The change does not result in identification of new or more severe environmental impacts, nor does the change result in feasible mitigation or avoidance measures identified but rejected.

Mitigation Measures

The Final EIR includes the addition of two mitigation measures listed below. These additional mitigation measures do not result in identification of new or more severe environmental impacts, nor do the changes result in feasible mitigation or avoidance measures identified but rejected.

M-BIO-3 All ministerial permits for small wind turbines will include a notice to the permittee explicitly stating that additional state and federal regulations may apply to the construction and operation of the wind turbine including, but not limited to, U.S. Endangered Species Act, the California Endangered Species Act, and the California Fish and Game Code related to Lake and Streambed Alteration.

M-BIO-4 A joint evaluation between the County of San Diego, the California Department of Fish and Game, and the US Fish and Wildlife Service of the permitted small turbines will be conducted five years after the ordinance goes into effect and after the first 100 small wind turbines are permitted. These evaluations will summarize where the majority of turbines are located, how many are roof-mounted, how many are vertical axis, what the average height is, etc.

CONCLUSION: Modifications to the Draft EIR for inclusion in the Final EIR do not constitute "significant new information" as defined in Section 15088.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines. The modifications as discussed above and provided in the Summary of Changes in Appendix F of the Final EIR do not show: (1) new significant environmental impacts from the Project or from new mitigation measures; (2) a substantial increase in the severity of environmental impacts; (3) feasible project alternatives or mitigation measures considerably different from others previously analyzed that would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but which the Project proponents decline to adopt; or (4) that the Draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded. As such, the County's decision not to recirculate the EIR would not deprive the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment on substantial adverse effects or feasible mitigation measures or alternatives. The revisions in the Final EIR, therefore, do not require recirculation of the document.

STATEMENT OF LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF DOCUMENTS OR OTHER MATERIALS THAT CONSTITUTE A RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

May 8, 2013

Project Name: County of San Diego Wind Energy Ordinance and General Plan Amendment

Reference Case Numbers: POD 10-007, Log No. 09-00-003

The CEQA [Section 21081.6(a)(2)] requires that the lead agency (in this case the County of San Diego) specify the location and custodian of the documents or other material that constitute the record of proceedings upon which it decision is based. It is the purpose of this statement to satisfy this requirement.

Location of Documents and Other Materials That Constitute the Record of Proceedings:

County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services
Project Processing Division
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 110
San Diego, California 92123

County of San Diego, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
1600 Pacific Highway, Room 402
San Diego, California 92101

Custodian:

County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services
Project Processing Division
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 110
San Diego, California 92123

County of San Diego, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
1600 Pacific Highway, Room 402
San Diego, California 92101