

SUMMARY

This summary is provided in accordance with California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines (State CEQA Guidelines) Section 15123. As stated in Section 15123(a), “an EIR [environmental impact report] shall contain a brief summary of the proposed action and its consequences. The language of the summary should be as clear and simple as reasonably practical.” As required by the guidelines, this chapter includes (1) a summary description of the Socially Equitable Cannabis Program (Cannabis Program), (2) identification of the alternatives evaluated and of the environmentally superior alternative, (3) a discussion of the areas of controversy associated with the project, and (4) a synopsis of environmental impacts and recommended mitigation measures (Table S.1, presented at the end of this chapter).

Overview

As required by CEQA, this program environmental impact report (PEIR) (1) assesses the potentially significant direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental effects of the Cannabis Program; (2) identifies potential feasible means of avoiding or substantially lessening significant adverse impacts; and (3) evaluates a range of reasonable alternatives to the Cannabis Program, including the required No Project Alternative. The County of San Diego (County) is the “lead agency” for the Cannabis Program evaluated in this PEIR and has the principal responsibility for certifying the PEIR and approving the Cannabis Program. Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines, this PEIR evaluates the effects of the entire Cannabis Program. This PEIR will be used by the County to evaluate the environmental implications of adopting the Cannabis Program.

Project Description

On January 27, 2021, the Board of Supervisors (Board) directed County staff to develop the Cannabis Program, which would establish a licensing and permitting system for new commercial cannabis activities, including retail, cultivation, manufacturing, distribution, testing, microbusinesses, temporary events, and consumption lounges. The proposed Cannabis Program consists of 3 main components, which are discussed further below, (1) Social Equity Program, (2) Cannabis Ordinance amendments, and (3) a cannabis licensing and permitting system. The proposed Cannabis Program would follow the state regulations for buffers from sensitive uses.

The Cannabis Program would contain a Social Equity Program. The goal of the Social Equity Program is to ensure that individuals negatively or adversely impacted by cannabis criminalization are provided the opportunity to successfully participate in the regulated cannabis market. The Social Equity Program would help qualified social equity applicants participate in the legal cannabis industry by providing different types of assistance, including, but not limited to, expungement services, business and technical assistance, one-on-one coaching and mentoring, and grant opportunities.

The Cannabis Program also includes amendments to the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances (Regulatory Code) and Zoning Ordinance. Under these amendments, medicinal use and adult-use would be under the same regulations and referred to as “commercial cannabis,” with no distinction between medicinal and adult-use. Amendments to the Regulatory Code and Zoning Ordinance would establish the requirements for operating a

commercial cannabis business, and the Zoning Ordinance update would establish the zoning regulations to allow for commercial cannabis facilities. The Regulatory Code amendments developed for the Cannabis Program outline the requirements for running a commercial cannabis business in the unincorporated county, including retail, cultivation, manufacturing, distribution, testing, microbusinesses, temporary events, and consumption lounges. The Zoning Ordinance amendments under the Cannabis Program would designate where cannabis operations can take place and would detail any performance standards required based on the cannabis activity type.

Development of the cannabis licensing and permitting system is being led by the County of San Diego Planning & Development Services (PDS). The licensing and permitting system would establish the structure (application framework, review processes) and procedures for obtaining the required County license(s) and permit(s) to operate commercial cannabis facilities. A corresponding fee structure would be established as part of the system's development. This licensing and permitting system would be established after initial adoption of the Cannabis Program.

Project Objectives

The overall purpose of the Cannabis Program is to acknowledge the will of the voters in passing Proposition 64, Marijuana Legalization, in 2016 and allow for medicinal and commercial adult-use cannabis operations in unincorporated San Diego County, including retail, cultivation, manufacturing, distribution, testing, microbusinesses, temporary events, and consumption lounges. The primary objectives of the Cannabis Program are to:

- develop a regulated and legal cannabis industry that allows for greater economic opportunity and safe access to cannabis;
- provide consistency with state law and County regulations associated with commercial cannabis operations;
- prioritize social equity, economic access, and business opportunities for those who have been impacted by cannabis-related criminalization and the War on Drugs;
- develop an efficient and user-friendly cannabis licensing and permitting system;
- develop a regulatory program that will assist in protecting public health, safety, and welfare;
- minimize the effects of commercial cannabis activities on sensitive populations and land uses;
- minimize the potential adverse effects of cannabis activities on the environment, natural resources, and wildlife, including wetlands and sensitive habitats, narrow endemic species, and vernal pools, as well as effects on water supply, water quality, and instream flows; and
- develop and implement a program designed to support and encourage farming in San Diego County, preserve agricultural land, and create new opportunities for farmers.

Impact Summary

This PEIR examines the potential environmental effects from implementation of the Cannabis Program, including information related to existing site conditions, analyses of the types and magnitude of individual and cumulative environmental impacts, and feasible mitigation measures that could reduce or avoid environmental impacts. In accordance with Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, the potential environmental effects of the Cannabis Program are analyzed for the following issue areas:

- aesthetics;
- agricultural and forest resources;
- air quality;
- biological resources;
- cultural and paleontological resources;
- energy;
- geology, soil, and mineral resources;
- greenhouse gas emissions and climate change;
- hazards and hazardous materials;
- hydrology and water quality;
- land use and planning;
- noise;
- population and housing;
- public services;
- transportation;
- tribal cultural resources;
- utilities and service systems; and
- wildfire.

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

Alternatives to the Cannabis Program

The County is considering 5 alternative variations to the Cannabis Program, including the No Project Alternative. Alternative 2 (Proposed Project), Alternative 3 (Expanded Regulations), Alternative 4 (Outdoor Cannabis Cultivation Prohibition), and Alternative 5 (Maximum 1 Acre Outdoor Cannabis Cultivation), which would involve the same 3 components of the Cannabis Program (Social Equity Program, Cannabis Ordinance amendments, and a cannabis licensing and permitting system). The project alternatives differ in regard to the definition and buffer distance from sensitive uses, allowed license types, and allowed maximum outdoor cultivation canopy. Alternatives 2, 3, 4, and 5 would include the storefront license ceiling of 25 facilities established by the Social Equity Program. All alternatives will comply with State Water Resources Control Board Cannabis Cultivation General Order (Order No. WQ 2023-0102-DWQ) and other state operation requirements for cannabis facilities siting and design. These alternatives are described below.

- **Alternative 1: No Project—Retention of Current Cannabis Regulations.** This alternative would consist of not adopting the proposed Cannabis Program and ordinance amendments. The existing 5 commercial cannabis facilities in the unincorporated areas of El Cajon, Escondido, and Ramona would be allowed to continue to operate under the existing ordinances, which allow expansion of their

existing facilities and operations to a total of 10,000 square feet of building area. However, no new commercial cannabis operations would be allowed.

- **Alternative 2: Proposed Project—Cannabis Program Consistent with State Requirements.** This alternative would implement the Cannabis Program and would use state regulations for buffer standards (Business and Professional Code Section 26054(b)). Cannabis facilities would be required to observe a 600-foot buffer from certain state-defined sensitive uses, including schools, daycares, and youth centers.
- **Alternative 3: Cannabis Program with Expanded County Regulations.** This alternative would implement the Cannabis Program with incorporation of Measures 1, 2, and 3 from the June 15, 2022, Board direction. With inclusion of Measures 1 and 2, the definition of “sensitive uses” would be expanded beyond schools, daycares, and youth centers to also include regional parks, local parks, public trails, recreation facilities, preserves with visitor-serving amenities, religious assembly, childcare centers, public libraries operated by the County or other cities, residential care facilities, and other cannabis facilities. The required sensitive use buffer would be expanded to 1,000 feet. Measure 3 would expand existing County billboard regulations to prohibit advertising of cannabis on a billboard within 1,000 feet of a sensitive use.
- **Alternative 4: Cannabis Program with Outdoor Cannabis Cultivation Prohibition.** Under Alternative 4, all commercial outdoor cannabis cultivation within the unincorporated county would be prohibited and mixed-light and indoor cultivation would be allowed only within a building or greenhouse. This alternative would include a 1,000-foot buffer from sensitive uses, defined as schools, daycares, and youth centers to also include regional parks, local parks, public trails, recreation facilities, preserves with visitor-serving amenities, religious assembly, childcare centers, public libraries operated by the County or other cities, residential care facilities, and other cannabis facilities. Advertising of cannabis on a billboard would be prohibited within 1,000 feet of a sensitive use.
- **Alternative 5: Cannabis Program with Maximum 1 Acre of Outdoor Cannabis Cultivation Canopy.** Under Alternative 5, outdoor commercial cannabis cultivation would be limited to 1 acre of total canopy area, or 25 percent of the lot size, whichever is less. This alternative would include a 1,000-foot buffer from sensitive uses, defined as schools, daycares, and youth centers to also include regional parks, local parks, public trails, recreation facilities, preserves with visitor-serving amenities, religious assembly, childcare centers, public libraries operated by the County or other cities, residential care facilities, and other cannabis facilities. Advertising of cannabis on a billboard would be prohibited within 1,000 feet of a sensitive use.

Table S.2, included at the end of this chapter, presents the significant environmental impacts of these alternatives compared to those of the Alternative 2 (proposed project).

Under Alternative 1, the No Project Alternative, there would be no changes to the Cannabis Program and ordinance amendments. Therefore, overall, Alternative 1 would be the environmentally superior alternative because this alternative would reduce and avoid significant environmental impacts under Alternative 2. However, if the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, CEQA requires that the EIR “shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives” (Section 15126.6(e)(2)). Of the remaining alternatives, Alternative 4 would eliminate significant impacts to odors associated

with Alternative 2 and would reduce the severity of significant and unavoidable impacts related to hydrology and water quality and water supply, discussed in Chapter 4, "Alternatives." Therefore, Alternative 4 is the environmentally superior alternative.

Areas of Controversy and Issues to Be Resolved by the Decision-Making Body

Areas of Controversy Known to the Lead Agency

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

- adverse effects on and potential changes in aesthetic character,
- light pollution,
- loss of agricultural land,
- impacts on sensitive habitats and species,
- land preserves under the San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program,
- introduction of nonnative species,
- energy usage and demands and the use of renewable energy sources,
- greenhouse gas emissions and climate change impacts,
- pesticide and hazardous chemical use,
- groundwater management,
- water quality degradation,
- increased traffic noise,
- operational nighttime noise,
- roadway safety and transportation hazards,
- reduced access to public transportation,
- increased vehicle miles traveled,
- increased traffic,
- adequate water supply,
- utility infrastructure impacts,
- wildfire risk during operation of cannabis facilities,
- increased odors, and
- increased noise.

Issues to be Resolved by the Decision-Making Body

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15123 requires the summary section of a Draft EIR to identify issues to be resolved related to the proposed project. Issues to be resolved by the County are identified below, including issues that will not necessarily be resolved through the PEIR:

- Should the proposed Cannabis Program be adopted?
- Which project alternative (or combination) should be adopted?
- What buffers are most appropriate and from what uses?
- Should the proposed mitigation measures identified in this PEIR be applied to future licensing actions?

Table S.1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact After Mitigation
2.2 Aesthetics				
1. Change or Obstruct Scenic Vistas and Scenic Resources	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant
2. Substantially Degrade Visual Character or Quality	Alternative 1: Less than Significant Alternatives 2–5: Significant	Alternative 1: Less than Significant Alternatives 2–5: Significant	M-AE.2-1	Alternative 1: Less than Significant Alternatives 2–5: Significant and Unavoidable
3. Adversely Affect Views due to New Light and Glare	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant
2.3 Agricultural and Forest Resources				
1. Directly or Indirectly Convert Agricultural Resources or Conflict with Agricultural Zoning or Land Conservation Programs	Alternatives 1–5: No Impact	Alternatives 1–5: No Impact	No Mitigation Required	Alternatives 1–5: No Impact
2.4 Air Quality				
1. Conflict with Air Quality Plans	Alternatives 1-5: Less than Significant	Alternatives 1-5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternatives 1-5: Less than Significant
2. Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase of Any Nonattainment Criteria Pollutant	Alternatives 1-5: Less than Significant	Alternatives 1-5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternatives 1-5: Less than Significant
3. Result in Emissions of Odors Adversely Affecting a Substantial Number of People	Alternative 1 and 4: Less than Significant Alternatives 2, 3, and 5: Significant	Alternatives 1-5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Available	Alternative 1 and 4: Less than Significant Alternatives 2, 3, and 5: Significant and Unavoidable

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact After Mitigation
2.5 Biological Resources				
1. Special-Status Plant and Wildlife Species	Alternative 1: Less than Significant Alternatives 2–5: Significant	Alternative 1: Less than Significant Alternatives 2–5: Significant	M-BI.1-1, M-BI.1-2, M-BI.1-3, M-BI.1-4, M-BI.1-5, M-BI.1-6, M-BI.1-7, M-BI.1-8, M-BI.1-9, M-BI.1-10, M-BI.1-11, M-BI.1-12, M-BI.1-13, M-BI.1-14, M-BI.1-15, M-BI.1-16, M-BI.1-17, M-BI.1-18, and M-BI.1-19	Alternative 1: Less than Significant Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant
2. Riparian Habitat and Other Sensitive Natural Communities	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Significant	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Significant	M-BI.2-1	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant
3. State and Federally Protected Wetlands	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Significant	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Significant	M-BI.3-1	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant
4. Wildlife Movement Corridors and Nursery Sites	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Significant	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Significant	M-BI.4-1 and M-BI.4-2	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant
5. Conflict with Local Policies or Ordinances	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Significant	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Significant	M-BI.5-1	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant
6. Conflict with Adopted Habitat Conservation Plans and Natural Community Conservation Plans	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact After Mitigation
<i>2.6 Cultural and Paleontological Resources</i>				
1. Cause a Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of a Historical Resource	Alternatives 1–5: Significant	Alternatives 1–5: Significant	M-CR.1-1	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant
2. Cause a Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of an Archaeological Resource	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant
3. Directly or Indirectly Destroy a Unique Paleontological Resource	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant
4. Disturb Any Human Remains	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant
<i>2.7 Energy</i>				
1. Result in a Potentially Significant Environmental Impact Due to Wasteful, Inefficient, or Unnecessary Consumption of Energy Resources	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant
2. Conflict with or Obstruct a State or Local Plan for Renewable Energy or Energy Efficiency	Alternatives 1–5: Significant	Alternatives 1–5: Significant	M-EN.2-1	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant
<i>2.8 Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources</i>				
1. Exposure to Seismic-Related Hazards	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant
2. Soil Erosion or Topsoil Loss	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant
3. Soil Stability	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant
4. Expansive Soils	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact After Mitigation
5. Unique Geologic Features	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant
<i>2.9 Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change</i>				
1. Conflict with the San Diego County Climate Action Plan	Alternative 1: Less than Significant Alternatives 2–5: Significant	Alternative 1: Less than Significant Alternatives 2–5: Significant	M-GC.1-1	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant
<i>2.10 Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>				
1. Transport, Use, Disposal, or Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials; Hazards to Schools; and Existing Hazardous Materials Sites	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant
2. Airports	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant
3. Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant
4. Vectors	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact After Mitigation
<i>2.11 Hydrology and Water Quality</i>				
1. Water Quality Standards and Requirements and Consistency with Water Quality Control Plans	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant
2. Substantial Decrease of Groundwater Supplies or Interfere Substantially with Groundwater Recharge	Alternative 1: Less than Significant Alternatives 2–5: Significant	Alternative 1: Less than Significant Alternatives 2–5: Significant	M-HYD.2-1	Alternative 1: Less than Significant Alternatives 2–5: Significant and Unavoidable
3. Consistency with Sustainable Groundwater Management Plans	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant
<i>2.12 Land Use and Planning</i>				
1. Conflict with Land Use Plans, Policies, or Regulations	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant
<i>2.13 Noise</i>				
1. Excessive Temporary (Construction-Related) Noise Levels	Alternative 1: Less than Significant Alternatives 2–5: Significant	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant	M-N.1-1	Alternative 1: Less than Significant Alternatives 2–5: Significant and Unavoidable
2. Excessive Long-Term Stationary Noise Levels	Alternative 1: Less than Significant Alternatives 2–5: Significant	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant	M-N.2-1	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant
3. Excessive Long-Term Traffic Noise Levels	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant
4. Excessive Groundborne Vibration	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact After Mitigation
<i>2.14 Population and Housing</i>				
1. Unplanned Population Growth	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternatives 1–5: Less than Significant
<i>2.15 Public Services</i>				
1. Fire Protection Services	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2-5: Less than Significant	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2-5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2-5: Less than Significant
2. Police Protection Services	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2-5: Less than Significant	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2-5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2-5: Less than Significant
<i>2.16 Transportation</i>				
1. Conflict with a Program, Plan, Ordinance, or Policy Addressing the Circulation System	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant
2. Exceed the Threshold for VMT	Alternative 1: Less than Significant Alternatives 2–5: Significant	Alternative 1: Less than Significant Alternatives 2–5: Significant	M-TR.2-1	Alternative 1: Less than Significant Alternatives 2–5: Significant and Unavoidable
3. Substantially Increase Hazards due to a Design Feature	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant Impact	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation Required	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant Impact
4. Result in Inadequate Emergency Access	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternative 1: No Impact Alternatives 2–5: Less than Significant

Issue Topic	Potential Direct Impact	Potential Cumulative Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Impact After Mitigation
<i>2.17 Tribal Cultural Resources</i>				
1. Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of Tribal Cultural Resources	Alternatives 1-5: Less than Significant	Alternatives 1-5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternatives 1-5: Less than Significant
<i>2.18 Utilities and Service Systems</i>				
1. Adequate Water Supplies	Alternative 1: Less than Significant Alternatives 2-5: Significant	Alternative 1: Less than Significant Alternatives 2-5: Significant	M-UT.1-1 M-UT.1-2	Alternative 1: Less than Significant Alternatives 2-5: Significant and Unavoidable
2. Adequate Wastewater Treatment Facilities	Alternatives 1-5: Less than Significant	Alternatives 1-5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternatives 1-5: Less than Significant
3. Sufficient Landfill Capacity and Solid Waste Regulations	Alternatives 1-5: Less than Significant	Alternatives 1-5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternatives 1-5: Less than Significant
<i>2.19 Wildfire</i>				
1. Increase the Risk of Wildland Fire Ignition	Alternatives 1-5: Less than Significant	Alternatives 1-5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternatives 1-5: Less than Significant
2. Exacerbate Wildfire Risks Due to Slope, Prevailing Winds, and Other Factors	Alternatives 1-5: Less than Significant	Alternatives 1-5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternatives 1-5: Less than Significant
3. Install Infrastructure That Exacerbates Fire Risk	Alternatives 1-5: Less than Significant	Alternatives 1-5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternatives 1-5: Less than Significant
4. Expose People or Structures to Post-Fire Risks	Alternatives 1-5: Less than Significant	Alternatives 1-5: Less than Significant	No Mitigation Required	Alternatives 1-5: Less than Significant

**Table S.2 Summary of the Environmental Effects of the Alternatives
Relative to Those of the Proposed Project**

Environmental Topic	Alternative 2: Proposed Project—Cannabis Program Consistent with State Requirements	Alternative 1: No Project—Retention of Current Cannabis Regulations	Alternative 3: Cannabis Program with Expanded County Regulations	Alternative 4: Cannabis Program with Outdoor Cannabis Cultivation Prohibition	Alternative 5: Cannabis Program with Maximum 1 Acre of Outdoor Cannabis Cultivation Canopy
Aesthetics	Significant and unavoidable	Less (LTS, eliminates SU impact)	Similar	Less	Similar
Agriculture and Forest Resources	No impact	Similar (NI)	Similar (NI)	Similar (NI)	Similar (NI)
Air Quality	Significant and unavoidable (odor impacts only)	Less (LTS, eliminates SU impact)	Less	Less (LTS, eliminates SU impact)	Less
Biological Resources	Less than significant (with mitigation)	Less	Similar	Less	Similar
Cultural and Paleontological Resources	Less than significant	Less	Similar	Less	Similar
Energy	Less than significant (with mitigation)	Less	Similar	Less	Similar
Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources	Less than significant	Less	Similar	Less	Similar
Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change	Less than significant (with mitigation)	Less	Similar	Less	Similar
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Less than significant	Less	Similar	Less	Similar
Hydrology and Water Quality	Significant and unavoidable (groundwater supply impacts only)	Less (LTS, eliminates SU impact)	Similar	Less	Similar
Land Use and Planning	Less than significant	Less (NI)	Similar	Similar	Similar
Noise	Significant and unavoidable (construction noise impacts only)	Less (LTS, eliminates SU impact)	Similar	Similar	Similar
Population, and Housing	Less than significant	Less	Similar	Similar	Similar
Public Services	Less than significant	Less (NI)	Similar	Similar	Similar

Environmental Topic	Alternative 2: Proposed Project—Cannabis Program Consistent with State Requirements	Alternative 1: No Project—Retention of Current Cannabis Regulations	Alternative 3: Cannabis Program with Expanded County Regulations	Alternative 4: Cannabis Program with Outdoor Cannabis Cultivation Prohibition	Alternative 5: Cannabis Program with Maximum 1 Acre of Outdoor Cannabis Cultivation Canopy
Transportation	Significant and unavoidable (vehicle miles traveled impacts only)	Less (LTS, eliminates SU impact)	Similar	Similar	Similar
Tribal Cultural Resources	Less than significant	Less	Similar	Less	Similar
Utilities and Service Systems	Significant and unavoidable (water supply impacts only)	Less (LTS, eliminates SU impact)	Similar	Less	Similar
Wildfire	Less than significant	Less	Similar	Less	Similar

Notes: NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; SU = significant and unavoidable.

Source: Compiled by Ascent in 2024.