2.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

This section describes existing conditions for hazards and hazardous materials, airports, vector hazards, emergency response and evacuation plans, and wildland fire risks within the unincorporated county, and evaluates the potential effects that implementation of the CAP Update may have on these resources. Because the analysis is subsequent to the certified 2011 GPU PEIR, the evaluation of impacts focuses on the potential for implementation of the CAP Update to result in new or substantially more severe impacts than presented in the 2011 GPU PEIR, given the changes to the General Plan proposed by the CAP Update and changes in environmental and regulatory conditions that have occurred since the certification of the 2011 GPU PEIR.

This section incorporates by reference the hazards and hazardous materials setting and impact analysis from the 2011 GPU PEIR as it applies to the CAP Update and supplements with relevant setting conditions that have changed since certification of the 2011 GPU PEIR.

Table 2.9-1 summarizes the impact conclusions reached in the 2011 GPU PEIR for hazards and hazardous materials and identifies if a new or more severe significant impact would occur with implementation of the CAP Update. The evaluation of hazardous materials-related topics has been consolidated into one discussion because the physical changes resulting from implementation of the CAP Update that would occur from construction activities would result in similar impacts for each issue area. Once operational, the infrastructure improvements associated with implementation of the CAP Update would not require the routine use of potentially hazardous materials and would not have the potential to encounter sites with existing contamination. As indicated in Table 2.9-1, implementation of the CAP Update would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts on hazards and hazardous materials.

Table 2.9-1 Summary of Hazards and Hazardous Materials–Related Impacts

Issue Number	Issue Topic	Determination from 2011 GPU PEIR	CAP Update SEIR Determination	
			Potential New or More Severe Significant Impact Prior to Mitigation	New or More Severe Significant Impact After Mitigation
1	Hazardous Materials (including Transport, Storage, Use, Disposal; Reasonably Foreseeable Accidental Release; Emitting Hazardous Materials Near to Schools; Being Within a Listed Hazardous Materials Site Pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5)	General Plan Only: Less than Significant	CAP Update Only: No	CAP Update Only: No
		General Plan Cumulative Contribution: Less than Significant	CAP Update Cumulative Contribution: No	CAP Update Cumulative Contribution: No

Issue Number	Issue Topic	Determination from 2011 GPU PEIR	CAP Update SEIR Determination	
			Potential New or More Severe Significant Impact Prior to Mitigation	New or More Severe Significant Impact After Mitigation
2	Public and Private Airports	General Plan Only: Less than Significant with Mitigation	CAP Update Only: No	CAP Update Only: No
		General Plan Cumulative Contribution: Less than Significant	CAP Update Cumulative Contribution: No	CAP Update Cumulative Contribution: No
3	Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans	General Plan Only: Less than Significant with Mitigation	CAP Update Only: No	CAP Update Only: No
		General Plan Cumulative Contribution: Less than Significant	CAP Update Cumulative Contribution: No	CAP Update Cumulative Contribution: No
4	Wildland Fires	General Plan Only: Significant and Unavoidable	CAP Update Only: No	CAP Update Only: No
		General Plan Cumulative Contribution: Significant	CAP Update Cumulative Contribution: No	CAP Update Cumulative Contribution: No
5	Vectors	General Plan Only: Less than Significant	CAP Update Only: No	CAP Update Only: No
		General Plan Cumulative Contribution: Less than Significant	CAP Update Cumulative Contribution: No	CAP Update Cumulative Contribution: No

Notes: CAP = Climate Action Plan; GPU = General Plan Update; PEIR = Program Environmental Impact Report; SEIR = Supplemental Environmental Impact Report.

Source: Compiled by Ascent Environmental in 2023.

During the Notice of Preparation (NOP) scoping process, the County received comments concerning wildfire risk and chemical hazards. Copies of the NOP and comment letters received in response to the NOP are included in Appendix A of this ~~draft~~ SEIR.

2.9.1 Existing Conditions

The 2011 GPU PEIR includes a discussion of existing conditions within the unincorporated county related to hazards and hazardous materials in Section 2.7, “Hazards and Hazardous Materials.” The 2011 GPU PEIR divides the discussion of existing conditions into five topics: hazardous materials sites, airport hazards, wildland fires, vectors, and emergency response and evacuation plans. While there have been some updates to the designation of Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZs) within the unincorporated county (see Section 2.15, “Wildfire,” for additional detail), no substantial

changes to the existing conditions for hazards and hazardous materials have been identified that would alter the conclusions or require a supplemental discussion of the existing conditions as described in the 2011 GPU PEIR. Therefore, the existing conditions in the 2011 GPU PEIR remain applicable and are hereby incorporated by reference. A summary of the existing conditions, as described on pages 2.7-1 through 2.7-20 of the 2011 GPU PEIR, is provided below.

2.9.1.1 Hazardous Materials Sites

The hazardous materials existing conditions discussion in the 2011 GPU PEIR includes information from the following databases:

- Hazardous Waste and Substances sites from California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) EnviroStor database;
- Leaking Underground Storage Tank Sites by County and Fiscal Year from the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) GeoTracker database;
- Solid waste disposal sites identified by SWRCB with waste constituents above hazardous waste levels outside the waste management unit;
- Active Cease and Desist Orders and Cleanup and Abatement Orders from SWRCB;
- Hazardous waste facilities subject to corrective action pursuant to Section 25187.5 of the Health and Safety Code (H&SC), identified by DTSC;
- Active and closed solid waste sites (Solid Waste Inventory System database) maintained by the California Integrated Waste Management Board;
- Hazardous Materials Establishment Listing maintained by the County; and
- The Site Assessment and Mitigation (SAM) Case Listing of contaminated sites that have previously or are currently undergoing environmental investigations and/or remedial actions is maintained by the County.

As described in the 2011 GPU PEIR, a variety of existing and historical land uses and conditions are present within the county that may have resulted in site contamination, representing potential hazards for humans and the environment when land development, including related earthwork for site preparation, are proposed on those lands. There are several known and potential hazardous materials sites within the unincorporated area of the county, including multiple sites listed on DTSC's EnviroStor database, SWRCB's GeoTracker database, California Integrated Waste Management Board's Solid Waste Inventory System database, and the County's SAM Case listing. Additionally, historic land uses such as burn sites, landfills, formerly used defense sites, agriculture, and petroleum storage may have caused on-site contamination that could be disturbed by future land development activities.

2.9.1.2 Airport Hazards

Airport-related hazards include the protection of airspace, consideration of flight patterns, and general land use compatibility with nearby land uses. As described in the 2011 GPU

PEIR, there are eight County-owned public airports located in San Diego County. Of these, six are located within the unincorporated area. These airports include Agua Caliente Airstrip, Borrego Valley Airport, Fallbrook Community Airpark, Jacumba Airport, Ocotillo Airport, and Ramona Airport. The Gillespie Field and McClellan-Palomar Airports are also owned by the County but are located within incorporated areas. Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans (ALUCPs) are adopted for all of these airports.

2.9.1.3 Vectors

A vector is any insect, arthropod, rodent, or other animal of public health significance that can cause human discomfort or injury or is capable of harboring or transmitting the causative agents of human disease. In the county, the most significant vector populations include mosquitoes, rodents, flies, and fleas and sources include standing water and composting/manure. Diseases that can be transmitted include arboviruses, Zika, dengue, yellow fever, and chikungunya viruses (via mosquitos); plague and hantavirus (via rodents); dysentery, salmonella, e-coli infection, and cholera (via flies); and plague, tapeworm, and typhus (via fleas).

2.9.1.4 Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans

Potential hazards or events that may trigger an emergency response action in the county include earthquakes, tsunamis, floods, wildland fires, landslides, droughts, hurricanes, tropical storms, and freezes. Emergency response actions could also be triggered from a hazardous material incident, water or air pollution, a major transportation accident, water, gas, or energy shortage, an epidemic, a nuclear accident, or terrorism.

The Unified Disaster Council (UDC) is the governing body of the Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization that addresses disasters and emergency situations at the local level. The UDC is chaired by a member of the San Diego County Board of Supervisors and consists of representatives from the 18 incorporated cities. The County of San Diego Office of Emergency Services serves as staff to the UDC.

In San Diego County, there is a comprehensive emergency plan known as the Operational Area Emergency Operations Plan (OA EOP). Since certification of the 2011 GPU PEIR, the OA EOP was updated in August 2022 and now contains the following 16 annexes:

- Annex A – Emergency Management
- Annex B – Fire and Rescue Mutual Aid Operations
- Annex C – Law Enforcement Mutual Aid Operations
- Annex D – Mass-Casualty Incident Operations
- Annex E – Public Health Operations
- Annex F – Department of the Chief Medical Examiner Operations
- Annex G – Care and Shelter Operations

- Annex H – Environmental Health Operations
- Annex I – Communications and Warning Systems
- Annex J – Construction and Engineering Operations
- Annex K – Logistics
- Annex L – Emergency Public Information Plan
- Annex M – Behavioral Health Operations
- Annex N – (Not Assigned)
- Annex O – Animal Services
- Annex P – Terrorism
- Annex Q – Evacuation

In addition to the OA EOP and associated annexes, the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan was developed with the participation of all local governments in San Diego County, including every incorporated city and the County. The plan includes an overview of the risk assessment process, identifies hazards present in the jurisdiction, hazard profiles, and vulnerability assessments, and identifies goals, objectives, and actions for each jurisdiction in the county. The plan has been incorporated into the General Plan Safety Element. Safety Element Policy S-1.4 identifies the County's intent to review and update this plan every five years. Hazards profiled in the plan include wildfire, structure fire, flood, coastal storms, erosion, tsunami, earthquakes, liquefaction, rain-induced landslides, dam failure, hazardous materials incidents, nuclear materials release, and terrorism.

2.9.2 Regulatory Framework

Section 2.7, "Hazards and Hazardous Materials," of the 2011 GPU PEIR (pages 2.7-20 through 2.7-28) describes the regulatory framework related to hazards and hazardous materials and is hereby incorporated by reference. Specific regulations discussed in the 2011 GPU PEIR that may be applicable to the CAP Update include the following:

2.9.2.1 Federal

- International Fire Code
- Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976, as amended by the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984 (RCRA)
- Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) and the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986
- Hazardous Materials Transportation Act
- Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Regulations
- Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act

- Federal Occupational and Safety and Health Act
- US Department of Defense (DOD) Air Installations Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) Program
- The Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (Public Law 93-288), as amended, (42 US Code Sections 5121–5206), and Related Authorities
- Federal Response Plan of 1999

All regulations in the 2011 GPU PEIR were reviewed during the preparation of this SEIR to ensure they remain valid. In addition to the above, the following federal laws, regulations, and policies have been adopted/updated since certification of the 2011 GPU PEIR.

14 Code of Federal Regulations Part 77

Federal law 14 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 77 Notification Criteria requires project sponsors of structures or objects such as antennas, trees, or construction cranes, that exceed the Part 77 height criteria to submit to the FAA a Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration (Form 7460-1). Additionally, the FAA may require notification for structures that may cause signal reception interference with navigational aids. The Part 77 height criteria also apply to any construction or alteration that is more than 200 feet above the ground; and any construction or alteration that exceeds an imaginary surface extending outward and upward at any of the following slopes:

- 100 to 1 for a horizontal distance of 20,000 feet from the nearest point of the nearest runway of each airport with its longest runway more than 3,200 feet in actual length, excluding heliports.
- 50 to 1 for a horizontal distance of 10,000 feet from the nearest point of the nearest runway of each airport with its longest runway no more than 3,200 feet in actual length, excluding heliports.
- 25 to 1 for a horizontal distance of 5,000 feet from the nearest point of the nearest landing and takeoff area of each heliport.

2.9.2.2 State

- Government Code Section 65962.5(a), Cortese List
- H&SC, Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory
- Title 14 Division 1.5 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR)
- Title 22 of the CCR & Hazardous Waste Control Law, Chapter 6.5
- Title 23 of the CCR, Underground Storage Tank Act
- Title 27 of the CCR, Solid Waste
- H&SC Section 25270 et seq., Aboveground Petroleum Storage Act

- California Human Health Screening Levels
- Senate Bill 1889, Accidental Release Prevention Law/California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARP)
- Emergency Response to Hazardous Materials Incidents
- California Fire Code (CFC)
- California Education Code
- California State Aeronautics Act
- California fire regulations
- California Emergency Services Act
- California Natural Disaster Assistance Act

All regulations in the 2011 GPU PEIR were reviewed during the preparation of this SEIR to ensure they remain valid. In addition to the above, the following state laws, regulations, and policies have been adopted/updated since certification of the 2011 GPU PEIR.

Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations; California Occupational Safety and Health Act

Title 8 of CCR Section 1532.1 (8 CCR 1532.1) is a rule developed by the federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration in 1993 and adopted by the State of California. Occupational safety standards exist in federal and state laws to minimize worker safety risks from both physical and chemical hazards in the workplace. The federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration and the California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal/OSHA) are responsible for ensuring worker safety in the workplace. Cal/OSHA assumes primary responsibility for developing and enforcing standards for safe workplaces and work practices.

Title 8 includes regulations pertaining to hazard control (including administrative and engineering controls), hazardous chemical labeling and training requirements, hazardous exposure prevention, hazardous material management, and hazardous waste operations. These regulations also include compliance with Injury Illness Prevention Program requirements (8 CCR 3203), which ensure that workers are properly trained to recognize workplace hazards and to take appropriate steps to reduce potential risks due to hazards. A site Health and Safety Plan must be prepared prior to commencing any work at a contaminated site or involving disturbance of building materials containing hazardous substances to protect workers from exposure to potential hazards.

Title 8 also specifies requirements for the removal and disposal of asbestos-containing materials (ACMs). In addition to providing information regarding how to remove ACMs, specific regulations limit the time of exposure, regulate access to work areas, require demarcation of work areas, prohibit certain activities in the presence of ACM removal activities, require the use of respirators, require monitoring of work conditions, require appropriate ventilation, and require qualified persons for ACM removal.

Title 8 also covers the removal of lead-based paint (LBP). Specific regulations cover the demolition of structures that contain LBP, the process associated with its removal or encapsulation, remediation of lead contamination, the transportation, disposal, storage, and containment of lead or materials containing lead, and maintenance operations associated with construction activities involving lead, such as LBP.

Lastly, these regulations require implementation of engineering and work practice controls such as respiratory protection, protective clothing, housekeeping, hygiene practices, and signage requirements to meet worker exposure limits. Medical monitoring and training requirements are also identified.

2.9.2.3 Local

- San Diego County, SAM Program
- San Diego County Board Policy I-132, Valley Center Mitigation Policy

All regulations in the 2011 GPU PEIR were reviewed during the preparation of this SEIR to ensure they remain applicable to the analysis. In addition to the above, the following local laws, regulations, and policies have been adopted/updated since certification of the 2011 GPU PEIR.

San Diego County Zoning Ordinance, Renewable Energy Regulations

Sections 6950–6959 of the County Zoning Ordinance prescribe reasonable standards and procedures for the installation and operation of solar energy systems and wind turbines.

Photovoltaic (PV) solar energy systems for on-site use are allowed as an accessory use in all zones upon approval of a building permit unless the property is subject to a Special Area Designator or is governed by a Discretionary Permit. Setback and height requirements are established in Section 6954(a).

Ordinance 10261 amended the San Diego County Zoning Ordinance to update and streamline provisions related to small wind energy turbines. This ordinance is consistent with state laws that encourage the construction of small wind energy turbines. The amendments made by this ordinance are intended to set forth reasonable standards and procedures for the installation and operation of small wind turbines to improve and enhance public welfare and safety, and to implement the Energy Element of the San Diego County General Plan. The amendments to Section 6951 allow a maximum of three small wind turbines on a legal lot as an accessory use to the primary use of the lot in accordance with several requirements, including height restrictions (the wind turbine height may exceed the height limit of the zone in accordance with Section 4620.j, but shall not exceed 80 feet), lighting restrictions (a small wind turbine shall not include any exterior lights unless required by law), locations restrictions (a small wind turbine tower shall not be located on a ridgeline, and the turbine blades shall not exceed the height of the ridgeline in an area within 150 feet of the ridgeline), and design guidelines (which prohibit use of trellis towers and guy wires and require that power lines connecting turbine towers

to structures are installed underground). Installation of a small wind turbine requires approval of a Building Permit to ensure the turbine meets current Uniform Building Code and approval of a Zoning Verification Permit to ensure the turbine complies with County Zoning regulations.

San Diego County Emergency Operations Plan

The OA EOP provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. Since certification of the 2011 GPU PEIR, the County updated the OA EOP in August 2022. The plan is used by all key partner agencies within the county to respond to major emergencies and disasters.

Cities in the region are encouraged to adopt the OA EOP as their own with modifications as appropriate. The current plan was updated in 2022 by the Office of Emergency Services and the UDC of the Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization. The updated OA EOP now contains the following 16 annexes:

- Annex A – Emergency Management
- Annex B – Fire and Rescue Mutual Aid Operations
- Annex C – Law Enforcement Mutual Aid Operations
- Annex D – Mass-Casualty Incident Operations
- Annex E – Public Health Operations
- Annex F – Department of the Chief Medical Examiner Operations
- Annex G – Care and Shelter Operations
- Annex H – Environmental Health Operations
- Annex I – Communications and Warning Systems
- Annex J – Construction and Engineering Operations
- Annex K – Logistics
- Annex L – Emergency Public Information Plan
- Annex M – Behavioral Health Operations
- Annex N – (Not Assigned)
- Annex O – Animal Services
- Annex P – Terrorism
- Annex Q – Evacuation

These annexes describe the operational actions, roles, and responsibilities of departments, agencies, and supporting organizations of a particular function. The plan is

complete with 16 functional annexes. (Annex N has been replaced by the stand-alone Recovery Plan.)

2011 San Diego County General Plan

The General Plan policies related to hazards and hazardous materials that are applicable to the CAP Update include the following:

> Policy LU-6.11: Protection from Wildfires and Unmitigable Hazards. Assign land uses and densities in a manner that minimizes development in extreme, very high and high hazard fire areas or other unmitigable hazardous areas.
>
> Policy LU-10.2: Development—Environmental Resource Relationship. Require development in Semi-Rural and Rural areas to respect and conserve the unique natural features and rural character, and avoid sensitive or intact environmental resources and hazard areas.
>
> Policy M-1.2: Interconnected Road Network. Provide an interconnected public road network with multiple connections that improve efficiency by incorporating shorter routes between trip origin and destination, disperse traffic, reduce traffic congestion in specific areas, and provide both primary and secondary access/egress routes that support emergency services during fire and other emergencies.
>
> Policy M-3.3: Multiple Ingress and Egress. Require development to provide multiple ingress/egress routes in conformance with State law and local regulations.
>
> Policy M-4.3: Rural Roads Compatible with Rural Character. Design and construct public roads to meet travel demands in Semi-Rural and Rural Lands that are consistent with rural character while safely accommodating transit stops when deemed necessary, along with bicyclists, pedestrians, and equestrians. Where feasible, utilize rural road design features (e.g., no curb and gutter improvements) to maintain community character.
>
> Policy S-1.1: Minimize Exposure to Hazards. Minimize the populations exposed to hazards by assigning land use designations, density allowances, and roadway classifications that reflect site-specific constraints and hazards. Coordinate with SANDAG on regional planning projects that accomplish this across jurisdictions.
>
> Policy S-1.2: Public Facilities Location. Advise, and where appropriate, require new development to locate future public facilities, including new essential and sensitive facilities, in appropriate locations with respect to the County's hazardous areas and State law that allow for temporary refuge for sheltering in place.
>
> Policy S-1.3: Risk Reduction Programs. Support efforts and programs that reduce the risk of natural and human-caused hazards and response time to these hazards.

Policy S-1.4: Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan. Review and update the County's MJHMP every five years.

Policy S-1.5: Post-disaster Reconstruction. Participate in the development of programs and procedures that emphasize coordination between appropriate public agencies and private entities to remove debris and promote the rapid reconstruction of the County following a disaster event and facilitate the upgrading of the built environment as expeditiously as possible.

Policy S-1.8: County Updates. Update County Ordinances, Standards, and Design Guidelines to integrate the best practices and regulations that reduce hazard vulnerability and improve resilience throughout the county.

Policy S-1.10: Familiarity with National and State Response Planning. Ensure that all relevant and pertinent County of San Diego personnel are familiar with the National Incident Management System (NIMS), the National Response Framework (NRF), the State of California Standardized Emergency Management Systems (SEMS), and any other relevant response plans consistent with their position in the County's Emergency Management Program.

Policy S-2.2: Evacuation Impediments. Advise, and where appropriate, require all new developments to help eliminate impediments to evacuation within existing community plan areas, where limited ingress/egress conditions could impede evacuation events.

Policy S-2.4: Prioritize CIP Roadways. Future CIP projects should prioritize development of roadways that serve as evacuation routes or require roadway improvements to existing roads to better function during an evacuation.

Policy S-2.5: Existing Development within Hazard Zones. Implement warning systems and evacuation plans for developed areas located within known hazard areas (i.e., flood, wildfire, earthquake, other hazards).

Policy S-2.5: Evacuation Access. All development proposals are required to identify evacuation routes at the Community Plan level and identify and facilitate the establishment of new routes needed to ensure effective evacuation. Evacuation routes should be incorporated into existing Community Wildfire Protection Plans where available.

Policy S-3.3: Updated Data and Information. Periodically update County datasets to include newer, more relevant information and mapping to support effective emergency response and hazard mitigation. Provide updated information to emergency responders to help ensure easier and faster response times.

Policy S-3.4: Coordination with Public Utilities. Public Safety Power Shutoff (PSPS) coordination between the County and SDGE should occur in order to limit the impacts on residents and businesses. SDGE and the County should continue to

collaborate while monitoring weather conditions to ensure pertinent information is shared.

Policy S-4.1: Defensible Development. Require development to be located, designed, and constructed to provide adequate defensibility and minimize the risk of structural loss and life safety resulting from wildland fires.

Policy S-4.2: Development in Hillsides and Canyons. Require development located near ridgelines, top of slopes, saddles, or other areas where the terrain or topography affect its susceptibility to wildfires to be located and designed to account for topography and reduce the increased risk from fires.

Policy S-4.3: Minimize Flammable Vegetation. Site and design development to minimize the likelihood of a wildfire spreading to structures by minimizing pockets, peninsulas, or islands of flammable vegetation within a development.

Policy S-4.4: Service Availability. Plan for development where fire and emergency services are available or planned.

Policy S-4.6: Fire Protection Plans. Ensure that development located within fire hazard areas implement measures in a Fire Protection Plan that reduce the risk of structural and human loss due to wildfire.

Policy S-4.7: Fire Resistant Construction. Require all new, remodeled, or rebuilt structures to meet current ignition resistance construction codes and establish and enforce reasonable and prudent standards that support retrofitting of existing structures in high fire hazard areas.

Policy S-5.1: Fuel Management Programs. Support programs consistent with State law that require fuel management/modification within established defensible space boundaries and when strategic fuel modification is necessary outside of defensible space, balance fuel management needs to protect structures with the preservation of native vegetation and sensitive habitats.

Policy S-13.1: Land Use Location. Require that land uses involving the storage, transfer, or processing of hazardous materials be located and designed to minimize risk and comply with all applicable hazardous materials regulations.

Policy S-13.2: Industrial Use Restrictions. Restrict industrial uses that store, process, or transport significant amounts of hazardous material to areas designated as High Impact-Industrial.

Policy S-13.3: Hazards-Sensitive Uses. Require that land uses using hazardous materials be located and designed to ensure sensitive uses, such as schools, hospitals, daycare centers, and residential neighborhoods, are protected. Similarly, avoid locating sensitive uses near established hazardous materials users or High Impact Industrial areas where incompatibilities would result.

Policy S-13.4: Contaminated Lands. Require areas of known or suspected contamination to be assessed prior to reuse. The reuse shall be in a manner that is compatible with the nature of the contamination and subsequent remediation efforts.

Policy S-13.5: Development Adjacent to Agricultural Operations. Require development adjacent to existing agricultural operations in Semi-Rural and Rural Lands to adequately buffer agricultural areas and ensure compliance with relevant safety codes where pesticides or other hazardous materials are used.

Policy S-17.2: Land Use Compatibility. Require land uses surrounding airports to be compatible with the operation of each airport.

Policy S-17-3: Airport Operational Plans. Require operational plans for new public/private airports and heliports, as well as future operational changes to existing airports, to be compatible with existing and planned land uses that surround the airport facility.

Policy S-17.4: Hazardous Obstructions within Airport Approach and Departure. Restrict development of potentially hazardous obstructions or other hazards to flight located within airport approach and departure areas or known flight patterns and discourage uses that may impact airport operations or do not meet Federal or State aviation standards.

Policy S-17.5: Private Airstrip and Heliport Location. Locate private airstrips and heliports outside of safety zones and flight paths for existing airports where they are compatible with surrounding established and planned land use, and in a manner to avoid impacting public roadways and facilities.

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

In addition, the General Plan Safety Element identifies major freeways and state routes (SRs) as potential evacuation routes within the county, including Interstate 5 (I-5), I-15, I-8, I-805, SR 52, SR 54, SR 56, SR 67, SR 75, SR 76, SR 78, SR 84, SR 125, SR 163, and SR 905.

2011 San Diego County GPU PEIR

The following mitigation measures from the 2011 GPU PEIR are applicable to the CAP Update:

Adopted Mitigation Measure Haz-1.1: Implement the Guidelines for Determining Significance, Airport Hazards, when reviewing new development projects to ensure compatibility with surrounding airports and land uses and apply appropriate mitigation when impacts are significant.

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

Adopted Mitigation Measure Haz-1.5: Coordinate with the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (SDCRAA) and County Airports for issues related to airport planning and operations.

Adopted Mitigation Measure Haz-3.1: Facilitate coordination between DPLU (now PDS) and the Office of Emergency services to implement and periodically update the Hazard Mitigation Plan.

Adopted Mitigation Measure Haz-3.2: Implement the CEQA Guidelines for Determining Significance to ensure that discretionary projects do not adversely impact emergency response or evacuation plans. Also implement the County Public Road Standards and County Private Road Standards during these reviews and ensure that road improvements are consistent with Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans. Apply appropriate mitigation when impacts are significant.

Adopted Mitigation Measure Haz-3.3: Prepare Fire Access Road network plans and include in Community Plans or other document as appropriate. Also implement the County Fire Code and require fire apparatus access roads and secondary access for projects.

Adopted Mitigation Measure Haz-4.1: Identify and minimize potential fire hazards for future development by using and maintaining a database that identifies fire prone areas, locating development away from Fire Hazard areas whenever practicable, and adhering to the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Wildland Fires & Fire Protection and applying appropriate mitigation when impacts are significant.

Adopted Mitigation Measure Haz-4.2: Conduct effective and environmentally sensitive brush management measures such as: addressing habitat-specific fire controls within Resource Management Plans; implementation of the Weed Abatement Ordinance and enforcing proper techniques for maintaining defensible space around structures; coordination with the local FAHJ to ensure that district goals for fuel management and fire protection are being met; and recognizing the Memorandum of Understanding between the wildlife agencies and fire authorities that guides the abatement of flammable vegetation without violating environmental regulations for habitat protection.

Adopted Mitigation Measure Haz-4.3: Enforce and comply with Building and Fire Code to ensure there are adequate fire service levels; and require site and/or building designs that incorporate features that reduce fire hazards. Also implement the General Plan Regional Category map and Land Use Maps, which typically show lower densities in wildland areas.

Adopted Mitigation Measure Haz-4.4: Create a Conservation Subdivision Program that facilitates conservation-oriented, fire-safe, project design through changes to the Subdivision Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance, Zoning Ordinance, Groundwater Ordinance, and other regulations as necessary.

Adopted Mitigation Measure Pub-1.5: Implement, and revise as necessary, Board Policy I-84 requiring that discretionary project applications include commitments from available fire protection districts. These commitments shall also demonstrate that the distance between the projects and the fire service facilities do not result in unacceptable travel times.

Adopted Mitigation Measure Pub-1.6: Maintain and use the County GIS and the County Guidelines for Determining Significant impacts in order to identify fire prone areas during the review of development projects. Once identified, ensure that development proposals meet requirements set by the FAHJ and that new/additional fire protection facilities are not required; or, if such facilities are required, that potential environmental impacts resulting from construction are evaluated along with the development project under review.

Adopted Mitigation Measure Pub-1.7: Implement the Building and Fire code to ensure there are adequate fire protections in place associated with the construction of structures and their defensibility, accessibility and egress, adequate water supply, coverage by the local fire district, and other critical issues.

2.9.3 Analysis of Effects and Significance Determinations

2.9.3.1 Significance Criteria

Based on guidance provided in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, the *County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance: Hazardous Materials and Existing Contamination* (County of San Diego 2007a), *County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance: Airport Hazards* (County of San Diego 2007b), *County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance: Emergency Response Plans* (County of San Diego 2007c), and *County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements: Vectors* (County of San Diego 2009), the proposed project would result in a significant impact on hazards and hazardous materials if it would:

- create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials;
- create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment;
- emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school;

- be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment;
- for a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area;
- impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan;
- implement a BMP for stormwater management or construction of a wetland, pond, or other wet basin that could create sources of standing water for more than 72 hours and, as a result, could substantially increase human exposure to vectors, such as mosquitoes, that are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or creating nuisances;
- include a use that involves the production, use, and/or storage of manure or proposes a composting operation or facility and as a result, could substantially increase human exposure to vectors that are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or creating nuisances; or
- result in a substantial increase in the number of residents located within one-quarter mile of a significant offsite vector breeding source; including but not limited to, standing water (e.g., agricultural ponds, reservoirs) and sources of manure generation or management activities (e.g., confined animal facilities, horse keeping operations, composting operations).

2.9.3.2 Approach to Analysis

Impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials were analyzed qualitatively based on a review of CAP Update measures and actions and their potential to result in physical changes to the environment if the CAP Updated is approved and implemented. Each issue area was analyzed in the context of existing laws and regulations, as well as policies adopted in the General Plan, and the extent to which these existing regulations and policies adequately address and minimize the potential hazard and hazardous materials impacts associated with implementation of the CAP Update. Because this SEIR tiers from the 2011 GPU PEIR, all relevant 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures are applicable to the proposed project as needed to avoid or minimize project impacts and are considered part of the proposed CAP Update.

Scope of SEIR Impact Analysis

The impact analysis contained within this ~~draft~~ SEIR focuses on whether implementation of the CAP Update would result in new or more severe impacts than were disclosed in the 2011 GPU PEIR, which is herein incorporated by reference. The CAP Update identifies strategies, measures, and supporting actions (referred to herein as measures and actions) to demonstrate progress toward established GHG reduction targets. Because these measures and actions represent the components of the CAP Update that could result in

physical environmental effects within the unincorporated county, this analysis focuses on the impacts of their implementation. Given the broad scope of the CAP Update (i.e., covering the entire unicorporated county) and its role as a programmatic planning document designed to guide future decision-making related to the reduction of GHGs within the unincorporated county, the study area for the CAP Update is the unincorporated area of the county within the County's jurisdiction (i.e., all unincorporated lands excluding tribal lands, state and federally owned lands, and military installations).

The analysis in this ~~draft~~ SEIR is programmatic. Implementation of all CAP Update measures and actions were considered during preparation of this ~~draft~~ SEIR, to the degree specific information about their implementation is known. Because future projects associated with the CAP Update have yet to be specifically defined, this SEIR considers the types of impacts that could occur with implementation of the proposed GHG reduction measures and actions. Future discretionary projects would be evaluated by the County to determine if they are within the scope of this SEIR or if they result in project-specific impacts additional to what is concluded in this analysis. If additional impacts would result, subsequent CEQA documentation would be required to evaluate impacts, determine mitigation, and conclude whether impacts are reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Proposed CAP Update Strategies

As described in Chapter 1, "Project Description," the overarching strategies, measures, and actions proposed in the CAP Update (see Table 1-2) have been grouped into subcategories for the purpose of analysis, based on the sector they target. CAP Update measures that would have the potential to result in new or more severe impacts, as compared to the conclusions of the 2011 GPU PEIR, related to hazards and hazardous materials are summarized below. CAP Update measures and actions that would involve development of policies and programs that would not result in direct physical effects or those that would result in limited physical improvements to existing development are not discussed further because these actions and measures would not have potential to result in new or more severe impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Solid Waste Measures and Actions. This category includes strategies to increase solid waste diversion and availability of sustainable solid waste facilities in County operations and within the unincorporated county. Key actions with potential to result in new or more severe impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials include those that could result in new or expanded composting and recycling facilities (Actions SW-1.1, SW-2.1, SW-4.1.a, and SW-4.1.b).

Water and Wastewater Measures and Actions. This category includes strategies to decrease potable water consumption and increase stormwater collection, water pumping, and wastewater treatment in County operations and the unincorporated county. Key actions with potential to result in new or more severe impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials include those that could result in the construction of new greywater capture systems and new stormwater capture, treatment, and reuse infrastructure (Actions W-1.1 W-2.2, W-2.3, and W-2.4)

Agriculture and Conservation Measures and Actions. This category includes strategies to preserve natural and agricultural lands, improve land management practices to protect habitat and increase carbon storage, and support climate-friendly farming practices. This category also includes an action that would evaluate opportunities for the construction of farmworker housing (Action A-4.1.b). Therefore, the measures and actions are not expected to result in new or more severe impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Energy Measures and Actions. This category includes strategies to increase building energy efficiency, renewable energy, and electrification in County operations and the unincorporated county. Key actions with potential to result in new or more severe impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials include those that could result in the construction and operation of renewable energy infrastructure (Actions E-3.2 and E-3.3). Action E-3.3 would require the County to develop a program to provide the unincorporated area with 100 percent renewable energy from San Diego Community Power by 2030. This action may indirectly result in the construction of large-scale renewable energy infrastructure.

Built Environment and Transportation Measures and Actions. This category includes strategies to decarbonize the County's vehicle fleet, support active transportation, and reduce single-occupancy vehicle trips. Key actions with potential to result in new or more severe impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials include those that could result in the construction of new electric vehicle charging, hydrogen fueling infrastructure, and pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure (Actions T-3.1, T-3.1.a, and T-5.1).

2.9.3.3 Issue 1: Create a Hazard from Transport, Use, Disposal, or Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials; Proximity to Schools; and Being Located on Sites Containing Hazardous Materials

This analysis describes the potential for implementation of the CAP Update to result in hazards to the public or the environment due to the transport, use, disposal, or accidental release of hazardous materials; emission or handling of acutely hazardous substances in proximity to schools; and location of subsequent development on contaminated sites.

Guidelines for Determination of Significance

The *County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance: Hazardous Materials and Existing Contamination* (County of San Diego 2007a), which is reflective of the guidelines that were utilized in the 2011 GPU PEIR, provides guidance for addressing the following significance criteria listed in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines:

- Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials;
- Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment;

- Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school; and,
- Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

Based on the County's guidelines, a project would result in a significant impact related to hazardous materials if:

- The project is a business, operation, or facility that proposes to handle hazardous substances in excess of the threshold quantities listed in Chapter 6.95 of the H&SC, generate hazardous waste regulated under Chapter 6.5 of the H&SC, and/or store hazardous substances in underground storage tanks regulated under Chapter 6.7 of the H&SC, and the project will not be able to comply with applicable hazardous substance regulations.
- The project is a business, operation, or facility that would handle regulated substances subject to CalARP risk management plan requirements that in the event of a release could adversely affect children's health due to the presence of a school or daycare within one-quarter mile of the facility.

Impact Analysis

2011 GPU PEIR Determination

The 2011 GPU PEIR evaluated impacts related to the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials, accidental release of hazardous materials, use of hazardous materials in proximity to schools, and contaminated sites from the adoption of the goals and policies contained within the General Plan and development associated with the General Plan land use map. The 2011 GPU PEIR determined that anticipated development under the General Plan would result in less-than-significant project impacts related to hazardous materials and existing contamination in the unincorporated county.

The 2011 GPU PEIR determined that implementation of the General Plan would result in an increase in the transportation, use, and disposal of hazardous materials from an increase in land uses that commonly store, use, and dispose of hazardous materials, such as limited impact industrial, medium impact industrial, and high impact industrial development. Additionally, industries and businesses using hazardous materials would expand or increase to accommodate the projected population growth under the General Plan. These land uses could potentially be located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school or daycare. Lastly, the 2011 GPU PEIR determined that General Plan land uses and development could be located on contaminated sites, such as those listed pursuant to Government Code 65962.5, burn dump sites, active, abandoned or closed landfills, Formerly Used Defense Sites, areas with historic or current agriculture, or areas with petroleum contamination.

However, the 2011 GPU PEIR concluded that implementation of the General Plan would result in less-than-significant impacts related to potential increases in hazards to the public and environment from the transportation, use and disposal of hazardous materials, an accidental release of hazardous materials, and existing hazardous materials sites because development would be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local regulations, policies, plans, and guidelines related to hazardous materials and existing contamination. These include applicable General Plan policies as well as the Clean Air Act (CAA) Chemical Accident Prevention Provision, RCRA, CERCLA, Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, the California H&SC, CFC, Title 22, CCR Titles 23 and 27, Aboveground Petroleum Storage Act, CalARP, Emergency Response to Hazardous Materials Incidents, the California Emergency Services Act, and the County Consolidated Fire Code, all of which strictly regulate the transportation, use, and disposal of hazardous materials.

The discussion of impacts related to hazardous materials and sites can be found in Section 2.7, “Hazards and Hazardous Materials,” of the 2011 GPU PEIR (pages 2.7-28 through 2.7-39) and is hereby incorporated by reference.

CAP Update Impact Analysis

The following discussion describes the potential for implementation of the proposed CAP Update measures to result in effects related to hazardous materials and sites.

Solid Waste Measures and Actions

The CAP Update includes strategies to increase solid waste diversion and availability of sustainable solid waste facilities in County operations and within the unincorporated county. Key actions with potential to result in new or more severe impacts related to hazardous materials and sites include those that would result in the development of new or expanded recycling and composting facilities (e.g., Actions SW-1.1, SW-2.1, SW-4.1.a, and SW-4.1.b).

Implementation of these CAP Update measures and actions could result in the construction of new or expanded solid waste facilities. For example, Actions SW-1.1 and SW-2.1 include development of zero waste policies which would result in new or expanded composting and recycling facilities to divert solid waste from landfills. Specific locations for any new and expanded facilities have not been identified. The construction of new or expanded solid waste facilities would involve the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials typically used in construction, including paints, oils, solvents, fuels, lubricants, asphalt products, and other materials. Hazardous waste generated during construction may consist of welding materials, fuel and lubricant containers, paint and solvent containers, and cement products containing strong basic or acidic chemicals. However, similar to what was described in the 2011 GPU PEIR, the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials during construction would be required to comply with federal, state, and local regulatory requirements, including CAA Chemical Accident Prevention Provision, RCRA, CERCLA, Hazardous Materials Transportation

Act, Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, the California H&SC, CFC, Title 22, CCR Titles 23 and 27, Aboveground Petroleum Storage Act, CalARP, Emergency Response to Hazardous Materials Incidents, the California Emergency Services Act, and the County Consolidated Fire Code, all of which strictly regulate the transportation, use, and disposal of hazardous materials.

While specific locations for new and expanded solid waste facilities have not been identified, it is assumed that the development of these facilities would occur in accordance with the General Plan and its policies to reduce the potential for hazardous materials impacts. For example, General Plan Policy LU-16.1 requires that new solid waste management identified in the San Diego County Integrated Waste Management Plan (County of San Diego 2005) are sited in a manner that minimizes environmental impacts and in accordance with applicable local land use policies. In addition, General Plan Policy LU-16.3 encourages the establishment of new recycling and resource recovery facilities in areas with industrial land use designations or other appropriate areas based on the type of recycling. Similarly, Policy S-1.1 aims to minimize exposing populations to hazards by assigning land use designations, density allowances, and roadway classifications that reflect site-specific constraints and hazards. Policy S-13.1 requires land uses involving the storage, transfer, or processing of hazardous materials to be located and designed to minimize risk and comply with all applicable hazardous materials regulations. Policy S-13.2 aims to restrict industrial uses that store, process, or transport significant amounts of hazardous material to areas designated as High Impact-Industrial. Lastly, Policy S-13.3 requires land uses using hazardous materials to be located and designed to ensure sensitive uses, such as schools, hospitals, daycare centers, and residential neighborhoods, are protected. This policy also aims to avoid locating sensitive uses near established hazardous materials users or High Impact Industrial areas where incompatibilities would result.

The proper siting of new or expanded solid waste facilities in accordance with applicable General Plan policies would ensure that these types of facilities are not developed in residential areas or in proximity to schools or other sensitive receptors. Compliance with these regulatory requirements and General Plan policies also would ensure that the construction of new or expanded solid waste facilities would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment or emit hazardous emissions during construction activities or operations.

Additionally, there is a potential that new or expanded solid waste facilities could be constructed on sites that are included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, as well as burn dump sites, active, abandoned or closed landfills, Formerly Used Defense Sites, areas with historic or current agriculture, or areas with petroleum contamination. However, similar to what was described in the 2011 GPU PEIR, the development of solid waste facilities on these sites would be required to comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations related to existing on-site hazardous materials contamination, including many of the same regulations described above.

With implementation of General Plan policies and compliance with regulatory requirements, implementation of solid waste measures and actions would not result in hazards to the public or environment related to the transport, use, disposal, or accidental release of hazardous materials; proximity to schools; or sites containing hazardous materials. The impact would be less than significant.

Water and Wastewater Measures and Actions

The CAP Update includes strategies to decrease potable water consumption and increase stormwater collection, water pumping, and wastewater treatment in County operations and the unincorporated county. Implementation of CAP Update Actions W-1.1, W-2.2, W-2.3, and W-2.4 could result in the construction of new greywater capture systems and new stormwater capture, treatment, and reuse infrastructure within the unincorporated county. Specifically, these actions would require existing and new development to meet water efficiency and conservation requirements through small-scale improvements with limited physical footprints, such as installing greywater capture systems for irrigation, installing recycled water pipelines, replacing existing landscaping with water-efficient landscaping, and installing rain barrels to collect stormwater.

The construction of new recycled water and stormwater capture and reuse infrastructure would occur in conjunction with existing or proposed development and would not result in the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials beyond those described in the 2011 GPU PEIR. The construction of this infrastructure would involve the use of similar types of hazardous materials as are commonly used as part of new development, including paints, oils, solvents, fuels, lubricants, asphalt products, and other materials. Similar to what was described in the 2011 GPU PEIR, the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials during construction would be required to comply with the federal, state, and local regulatory requirements described above. Should the development of these facilities occur on a listed hazardous materials site compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, compliance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations related to existing on-site hazardous materials contamination would similarly be required, including many of the same regulations described above. Compliance with these regulatory requirements and General Plan policies would ensure that the construction of new recycled water and stormwater capture and reuse infrastructure would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment or emit hazardous emissions during construction activities or operations.

With implementation of General Plan policies and compliance with regulatory requirements, implementation of water and wastewater measures and actions would not result in hazards to the public or environment related to the transport, use, disposal, or accidental release of hazardous materials; proximity to schools; or sites containing hazardous materials. The impact would be less than significant.

Agriculture and Conservation Measures and Actions

The CAP Update includes strategies to preserve natural and agricultural lands, improve land management practices, and support climate-friendly farming practices. CAP Update

Actions A-1.1, A-1.2, A-1.2.a, A-3.1, A-4.1, A-4.1.c, and A-4.1.d would result in acquiring and managing conservation lands and improving land management practices on existing agricultural land to improve carbon sequestration. These actions would be consistent with General Plan Policies LU-7.1, COS-6.2, and COS-6.4, which were adopted for the purpose of protecting agricultural operations and preserving agricultural lands. Because these actions are focused on conservation and preservation of natural and agricultural lands, they would not result in any construction or the development of uses that would involve the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials. Therefore, with implementation of General Plan policies and compliance with regulatory requirements, implementation of agriculture and conservation measures and actions would not result in hazards to the public or environment related to the transport, use, disposal, or accidental release of hazardous materials; proximity to schools; or sites containing hazardous materials. The impact would be less than significant.

Energy Measures and Actions

The CAP Update energy measures and actions would involve implementation of policies, programs, and other mechanisms to increase building energy efficiency, increase the use of renewable energy, and increase electrification in the unincorporated county and County operations. These policies and programs could have the potential to result in the development of various renewable energy projects.

Implementation of CAP Update Actions E-2.2 and E-3.3 would include the construction of new infrastructure to promote renewable energy use and electrification. Requirements would include retrofitting and improving existing residential and non-residential structures and County facilities to meet energy efficiency requirements. These retrofits could include rooftop or ground-mounted PV solar arrays or small wind turbines, upgraded mechanical systems, and other similar improvements. With the exception of wind turbines, these types of improvements generally would be made to existing buildings or would be ancillary to new development. Additionally, new large-scale renewable energy infrastructure could be developed through Action E-3.3.

Construction associated with renewable energy projects, including PV solar arrays and small and large wind turbines, would involve the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials typically used during construction, including paints, oils, solvents, fuels, lubricants, asphalt products, and other materials. Similar to what was described in the 2011 GPU PEIR and 2012 Wind Energy EIR, the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials during construction would be required to comply with the federal, state, and local regulatory requirements described above. Specific locations for new small- and large-scale wind turbines have not been identified; however, these facilities would be developed in accordance with the County's Wind Energy Ordinance Sections 6950–6952. Some small wind turbines would be roof-mounted and would not result in ground disturbance, while others would require the erection of turbine towers and construction of concrete foundations. As described on page 2.6-29 of the 2012 Wind Energy EIR, small wind turbines are permitted as accessory structures without a discretionary permit but would still require a building permit, which would not be issued if the turbines were located on a contaminated site under Government Code Section

65962.5. Additionally, turbines would not require the routine use and storage of hazardous materials and would only utilize small amounts of lubricating oils and hydraulic fluids for ongoing operations.

Large-scale renewable energy systems would require construction activities including earthmoving, the use of construction equipment, and the use of worker vehicles, and may require the use of some hazardous materials to operate or maintain equipment but would be required to obtain a Major Use Permit (MUP) and undergo the County's discretionary review process prior to receiving a permit to develop or operate. Any use of hazardous materials during construction or operations would be evaluated and regulated through the discretionary process, including the preparation of Hazardous Materials Business Plans, as needed.

With implementation of General Plan policies and compliance with regulatory requirements, implementation of energy measures and actions would not result in hazards to the public or environment related to the transport, use, disposal, or accidental release of hazardous materials; proximity to schools; or sites containing hazardous materials. The impact would be less than significant.

Built Environment and Transportation Measures and Actions

The CAP Update includes measures and actions to decarbonize the County's vehicle fleet, support active transportation, and reduce single-occupancy vehicle trips. Actions T-4.1, T-4.1.a, T-4.2, T-5.1, and T-6.2.a would result in programs to reduce emissions from County employee commutes; improvements to pedestrian, bicycle, and transit networks; programs to encourage active modes of transportation and reduce single occupancy vehicle trips; and the incorporation of Transportation Demand Management strategies. Because of the nature of such improvements (i.e., limited size and within existing transportation corridors), it is likely that most infrastructure improvements would occur within existing developed residential and commercial centers throughout the county or as part of new development.

Construction associated with these improvements would involve the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials typically used during construction, including paints, oils, solvents, fuels, lubricants, asphalt products, and other materials. Similar to what was described in the 2011 GPU PEIR, the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials during construction would be required to comply with the federal, state, and local regulatory requirements described above. Similarly, should the development of these facilities occur on a listed hazardous materials site compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, compliance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations related to existing on-site hazardous materials contamination would also be required, including many of the same regulations described above. Compliance with regulatory requirements and General Plan policies would ensure that the construction these improvements would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment or emit hazardous emissions during construction activities or operations.

With implementation of General Plan policies and compliance with regulatory requirements, implementation of built environment and transportation measures and actions would not result in hazards to the public or environment related to the transport, use, disposal, or accidental release of hazardous materials; proximity to schools; or sites containing hazardous materials. The impact would be less than significant.

Summary

As detailed in the 2011 GPU PEIR, compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations related to hazardous materials would ensure that projects implemented under the CAP Update would not result significant impacts related to hazardous materials, contaminated sites, or emissions of hazardous materials in proximity to schools. Additionally, General Plan Policies LU-16.1, LU-16.3, S-1.1, S-13.1, S-13.2, and S-13.3 would ensure the proper siting of new or expanded solid waste facilities so that these facilities are not developed in residential areas or in proximity to schools or other sensitive receptors.

With implementation of adopted General Plan policies and compliance with existing regulatory requirements, implementation of the CAP Update would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts related to hazardous materials compared to the 2011 GPU PEIR. Impacts related to hazardous materials associated with implementation of the solid waste, water and wastewater, agriculture and conservation, energy, and built environment and transportation measures and actions in the CAP Update would remain **less than significant**, consistent with the conclusions in the 2011 GPU PEIR**.** Implementation of the CAP Update **would not result in new or more severe impacts** than disclosed in the 2011 GPU PEIR.

2.9.3.4 Issue 2: Result in Safety Hazards or Excessive Noise from Public and Private Airports

This analysis describes the potential for implementation of the CAP Update to result in impacts related to public and private airports. Note that potential impacts related to excessive airport noise are discussed in Section 2.12, “Noise.”

Guidelines for Determination of Significance

The *County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance: Airport Hazards* (County of San Diego 2007b), which is reflective of the guidelines that were utilized in the 2011 GPU PEIR, provides guidance for addressing the following significance criteria listed in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines:

- For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would it result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area.

Based on the County’s guidelines, a project would result in a significant impact related to airport hazards if:

- The project is located within an established aircraft influence area for a public or public use airport and proposes a development intensity, flight obstruction, or other land use that conflicts with the ALUCP or Comprehensive Land Use Plan (if no ALUCP is adopted) and as a result, the project may result in a significant airport hazard.
- The project is located within 2 miles of a public or public use airport or within 1 mile of a private airport, and proposes any of the following:
    - Residential densities inconsistent with the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook's Safety Compatibility Criteria Guidelines for Maximum Residential Density (Table 2.9-2, presented at the end of this section) and as a result, the project may result in a significant airport hazard.
    - Non-residential land uses that exceed the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbooks Safety Compatibility Criteria Guidelines for Maximum Non-Residential Intensity (Table 2.9-3, presented at the end of this section) and as a result, the project may result in a significant airport hazard.
    - An incompatible use identified in the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook's Safety Compatibility Criteria Guidelines for Safety Compatibility Zones – Prohibited Uses (see Table 2.9-4, presented at the end of this section) and as a result, the project may result in a significant airport hazard.

Impact Analysis

2011 GPU PEIR Determination

The 2011 GPU PEIR evaluated impacts related to public and private airport hazards from the adoption of the goals and policies contained within the General Plan and development associated with the General Plan land use map. The 2011 GPU PEIR determined that implementation of the General Plan would result in potentially significant impacts related to airport safety hazards because it would allow the development of higher density land uses near existing public airports and would also allow development within two miles of a private airport, which would have the potential to increase the risk of safety hazards associated with airport operations. The 2011 GPU PEIR determined that these impacts would be reduced through a combination of the following:

- Complying with a combination of federal and state regulations and County processes, including but not limited to:
    - FAA regulations that establish safety standards for civil aviation (e.g., 14 CFR Part 77);
    - DOD AICUZ regulations, which establishes safety compatibility criteria for military air bases;
    - State Aeronautics Act, which establishes air safety standards; and

  - County requirements to comply with applicable ALUCPs for any development projects near public airports.

- Implementing General Plan goals and policies related to airport hazards, including LU-4.7, M-7.1, S-15.1, S-15.2, S-15.3, and S-15.4, all of which address hazards to the public and environment near airports. Note that the General Plan Safety Element was recently updated in August 2021. The Safety Element policies referenced in the 2011 GPU PEIR are now identified as Policies S-17.2 (General Plan Policy S-15.1), S-17.3 (General Plan Policy S-15.2), S-17.4 (General Plan Policy S-15.3), and S-17.5 (General Plan Policy S-15.4).
- Implementing Mitigation Measures Haz-1.1 through Haz-1.5 and Haz-2.1 identified in the 2011 GPU PEIR to ensure compatibility between airports and land uses and avoid potential airport operation-related hazards.

The 2011 GPU PEIR concluded that impacts related to public and private airport hazards would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of the General Plan policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures, as well as compliance with applicable regulations such as FAA regulations, DOD AICUZ regulations, the State Aeronautics Act, as applicable ALUCPs. Enforcement of existing regulations and implementation of General Plan policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures would reduce hazards related to development near public and private airports to less than significant. The discussion of impacts can be found in Section 2.7, “Hazards and Hazardous Materials” (pages 2.7-39 through 2.7-43), of the 2011 GPU PEIR and is hereby incorporated by reference. The full text of the specific policies related to airport hazards is provided above in Section 2.9.2, “Regulatory Framework,” while the full text of applicable 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures is provided below in Section 2.9.5, “Mitigation Measures.”

CAP Update Impact Analysis

The following discussion describes the potential for implementation of the proposed CAP Update measures to result in effects related to airport hazards.

Solid Waste Measures and Actions

The CAP Update includes strategies to increase solid waste diversion and availability of sustainable solid waste facilities in County operations and within the unincorporated county. Key actions with potential to result in new or more severe impacts related to hazardous materials and sites include those that would result in the development of new or expanded recycling and composting facilities (e.g., Actions SW-1.1, SW-2.1, SW-4.1.a, and SW-4.1.b).

Implementation of these CAP Update measures and actions could result in the construction of new or expanded solid waste facilities. For example, Actions SW-1.1 and SW-2.1 include development of zero waste policies which would result in new or expanded composting and recycling facilities to divert solid waste from landfills. Specific locations for any new and expanded facilities have not been identified. However, any new or expanded solid waste facilities would be required to comply with federal, state, and

local regulations related to airport safety and hazards, including FAA regulations such as 14 CFR Part 77, DOD AICUZ regulations, the State Aeronautics Act, and applicable ALUCPs. These regulations require proposed structures that exceed certain height criteria to undergo an Obstruction Evaluation/Airport Airspace Analysis (14 CFR Part 77), consideration of land use compatibility with nearby military airbases (DOD AICUZ regulations) and public airports (ALUCPs). Should the FAA's Obstruction Evaluation/Airport Airspace Analysis determine that a new or expanded solid waste facility has the potential to result in hazards to air navigation, the incorporation of measures such as marking and/or lighting would be required to ensure that no hazards to air navigation occur.

While specific locations for new and expanded solid waste facilities have not been identified, it is assumed that the development of these facilities would occur in accordance with the General Plan and its policies to reduce the potential for airport-related hazards. General Plan Policy S-17.2 requires land used surrounding airports to be compatible with the operation of each airport. Policy S-17.3 requires operational plans for new public/private airports and heliports, as well as future operational changes to existing airports, to be compatible with existing and planned land uses that surround the airport facility. While this policy would not be implemented by future projects associated with the CAP Update, it would require consideration of any such projects should they be built or planned in areas surrounding existing or new airports and/or heliports. Lastly, Policy S-17.4 restricts development of potentially hazardous obstructions or other hazards to flight located within airport approach and departure areas or known flight patterns and discourage uses that may impact airport operations or do not meet federal or state aviation standards.

In addition to the regulations and General Plan policies described above, the following 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures also would be applied to the CAP Update to minimize impacts related to airport hazards: Mitigation Measure Haz-1.1, which requires new development projects to be reviewed in accordance with the *County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance: Airport Hazards* to ensure compatibility with surrounding airports and land uses; Mitigation Measure Haz-1.3, which requires new development projects to be reviewed in accordance with the applicable AICUZ to ensure consistency with the land use compatibility and safety policies; and Mitigation Measure Haz-1.5, which requires coordination with the SDCRAA and County airports for issues that may affect airport planning and operations. Implementation of these 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures, along with the General Plan policies described above, would ensure that new or expanded solid waste facilities would not create safety hazards related to airport operations. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

Water and Wastewater Measures and Actions

The CAP Update includes measures and actions to decrease potable water consumption and increase stormwater collection, water pumping, and wastewater treatment in County operations and the unincorporated county. Implementation of CAP Update Actions W-1.1, W-2.2, W-2.3, and W-2.4 would involve construction of new recycled water and stormwater capture and reuse infrastructure within the unincorporated county.

Specifically, these actions would require existing and new development to meet water efficiency and conservation requirements through small-scale improvements with limited physical footprints, such as installing greywater capture systems for irrigation, installing recycled water pipelines, replacing existing landscaping with water-efficient landscaping, and installing rain barrels to collect stormwater.

The construction of new recycled water and stormwater capture and reuse infrastructure would not result in potential hazards related to airport operations. Any new or expanded physical structures associated with implementing water conservation measures and actions would be ancillary to existing or proposed development and would be relatively minor in size and scale, and therefore are not anticipated to be tall enough to pose hazards to air navigation.

Based on the discussion above, implementation of water and wastewater measures and actions that would be implemented under the CAP Update would not create safety hazards related to airport operations. The impact would be less than significant.

Agriculture and Conservation Measures and Actions

Implementation of Measures A-1 through A-2 and associated implementing actions would involve acquiring and managing conservation lands, preserving natural and agricultural lands, planting and protecting trees, and providing incentive to encourage carbon farming. These measures would result in the preservation of natural and agricultural lands in the unincorporated county. Therefore, implementation of these measures would not increase airport hazards.

Implementation of Action A-4.1.b would have the potential to result in new farmworker housing in the unincorporated county, if opportunities to increase farmworker housing in the unincorporated area are identified. It is anticipated that new farmworker housing would be low density and in proximity to existing agricultural operations, which are generally in more rural areas of the unincorporated county and not in the vicinity of any airports. However, should any new farmworker housing be developed in proximity to an existing airport, it would be required to comply with federal, state, and local regulations related to airport safety and hazards, including FAA regulations such as 14 CFR Part 77, DOD AICUZ regulations, the State Aeronautics Act, and applicable ALUCPs. Additionally, new farmworker housing would be required to implement adopted General Plan goals and policies related to airport hazards, including General Plan Policies S-17.2, S-17.3, and S-17.4, as described above. Lastly, 2011 GPU PEIR Mitigation Measures Haz-1.1, Haz-1.3, and Haz-1.5 require new development projects to be reviewed for compatibility with surrounding airports, military airbases, and land uses, as well as coordination with the SDCRAA and County airports for issues that may affect airport planning and operations. Compliance with existing regulations and implementation of applicable General Plan policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures would ensure that new farmworker housing associated with the CAP Update would not result in airport hazards.

Based on the discussion above, implementation of Agricultural and Conservation measures and actions that would be implemented under the CAP Update would not

create safety hazards related to airport operations. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

Energy Measures and Actions

Implementation of CAP Update energy measures and actions would involve implementation of policies, programs, and other mechanisms to increase building energy efficiency, increase the use of renewable energy, and increase electrification in the unincorporated county and County operations. These policies and programs could have the potential to result in the development of various renewable energy projects.

Implementation of CAP Update Action E-2.2 and Action E-3.3 could result in the construction of new renewable energy infrastructure and energy efficiency retrofits on existing residential and non-residential structures and County facilities. These retrofits could include rooftop or ground-mounted PV solar arrays or small wind turbines, upgraded mechanical systems, and other similar improvements. Potential PV solar arrays, small-scale wind turbines, and other building retrofits and improvements would occur in areas of existing development, and in association with new development, which would include energy-efficient mechanical equipment at the time of construction. Additionally, new large-scale renewable energy infrastructure, such as large-scale PV solar or concentrated solar, and wind turbines, could be developed as a result of Action E-3.3. Because the amount of demand generated by such a program and the mix of renewable energy types that would be constructed to satisfy demand is unknown, this ~~draft~~ SEIR evaluates the potential for impacts at the program level and assumes development of typical, currently available technologies. The potential for construction of large-scale renewable energy infrastructure was not evaluated in the 2011 GPU PEIR, but potential wind energy impacts were evaluated in the 2012 Wind Energy Ordinance EIR and are incorporated by reference as applicable.

Large-scale renewable energy infrastructure would generally be constructed in primarily undeveloped locations that are productive for generating renewable energy. Specific locations that may be chosen for these large-scale utility projects are unknown; however, it is likely that suitable locations would include areas that are not highly developed with residential and commercial uses because of the size, massing, coverage, and scale of this type of infrastructure that relies upon large amounts of land unencumbered by buildings or shadowed by buildings or trees.

The main compatibility concerns for the protection of airport airspace are related to airspace obstructions (e.g., building height, antennas) and hazards to flight (e.g., wildlife attractants, distracting lighting, or glare) that could produce visual or electronic impairment to navigation. This would occur if the structures were located too close to an airport runway, were too tall, or produced glare or lighting that could cause a distraction to pilots. Specific locations for renewable energy projects have not been identified; however, it is possible that small- and large-scale solar arrays or small- and large-scale wind turbines would be constructed within an Airport Influence Area (area around an airport for which an ALUCP exists), within 2 miles of a public airport, or within the safety zone for an airport, and could potentially result in a safety risk.

Federal law requires proposed structures that exceed FAA Regulations Part 77 height criteria to undergo an Obstruction Evaluation/Airport Airspace Analysis. These regulations apply to any construction or alteration that is more than 200 feet above the ground, and any construction or alteration that exceeds an imaginary surface extending outward and upward at any of the slopes identified in Section 2.9.2, "Regulatory Framework." The development of any structures meeting these criteria must submit a Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration (Form 7460-1) to the FAA. Additionally, the FAA published a final policy in May 2021 addressing the construction of solar energy systems on airport property, specifically federally obligated airports with control towers. Federally obligated airports are public airports that have accepted federal assistance either in the form of grants or property conveyances. Under the final policy, airports must file a Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration with the FAA that includes a statement that the project will not cause any visual impact (i.e., glare) that could affect pilot approaches.

The placement of small-scale PV solar renewable energy equipment on new and existing buildings is regulated by the existing County Renewable Energy Zoning Ordinance Section 6954(a), which limits the height and scale of these facilities. Rooftop PV solar energy panels generally do not involve construction that would substantially change roof lines or add substantial massing or height such that the altered buildings would have the potential to result in hazards to air navigation. The County's Renewable Energy Zoning Ordinance Section 6954(a) requires the height of on-site PV solar energy systems be no taller than the height designator of the zone, except for on-site energy use systems that may extend no more than 5 feet above the roofline. In the event any small-scale PV solar would be installed on existing County airport facilities with a control tower, the County would be required to file a Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration with the FAA for review and approval to demonstrate that there would be no visual impact on air traffic. Similarly, large-scale PV solar projects would be subject to the County's Renewable Energy Zoning Ordinance Section 6954(b). Section 6954(b) requires the location, size, design, and operating characteristics of offsite PV solar systems that are less than 10 acres to be compatible with adjacent uses, residents, buildings, or structures, with consideration given to harmony in scale, bulk, coverage, and density. Offsite PV solar systems that are 10 acres or more are considered a Major Impact Service and Utility and are required to obtain a MUP. Section 6954(b) requires any solar system more than 200 feet in height to comply with FAA safety height requirements.

Additionally, wind turbines of all sizes are regulated by the County's Wind Energy Ordinance Sections 6950–6952 and would be required to comply with regulations specific to size and scale of the turbines. Small wind turbines that meet the zoning verification requirements would be limited to a height of no more than 80 feet for small turbines, 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. Similar to small- and large-scale solar systems, small and large wind turbines proposed in proximity to airports that exceed FAA Regulations Part 77 height criteria would be subject to FAA requirements and would be required to undergo an Obstruction Evaluation/Airport Airspace Analysis. Because large wind turbines may

range in height from 300 to 500 feet at the topmost blade tip, they would be required to display aviation lighting per FAA requirements if they are taller than 200 feet.

Future discretionary renewable energy projects would be required to be evaluated for project-specific impacts under CEQA at the time of application and project-specific mitigation would be required to minimize or eliminate airport hazard impacts to the extent feasible in compliance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4. Additionally, as described on pages 2.6-38 through 2.6-39 of the 2012 Wind Energy EIR, all large-scale wind turbine projects would be required to obtain a MUP. Therefore, these facilities would be required to undergo discretionary review which would provide the opportunity to evaluate if any land use conflicts related to airports existed.

In addition to the regulatory requirements described above, the General Plan policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures pertaining to airport hazards (Mitigation Measures Haz-1.1, Haz-1.3, and Haz-1.5) would further limit the project impacts on airport hazards by requiring new development projects to be reviewed for compatibility with surrounding airports, military airbases, and land uses, as well as coordination with the SDCRAA and County airports for issues that may affect airport planning and operations. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

Built Environment and Transportation Measures and Actions

The built environment and transportation measures and actions would implement existing County programs, such as the County's 2019 Electric Vehicle Roadmap and 2023 Green Fleet Action Plan (Action T-1.1) and Active Transportation Program (Action T-5.1). Other measures and actions would affect the design of existing and planned roadways. Action T-6.2 would implement transit-supportive roadway treatments such as signal communication and curb extensions along County-maintained roadways to optimize traffic flow for transit and pedestrians. Action T-3.1 would result in the installation of publicly available electric vehicle charging stations. Action T-3.1.a would support the transition to clean hydrogen fuel for medium- and heavy-duty vehicles by increasing access to hydrogen fueling infrastructure through streamlined permitting processes and other efforts that could facilitate future infrastructure construction. Several measures and actions would further support alternative modes of transportation without resulting in physical changes that could result in airport-related hazards.

Where CAP Update measures and actions result in physical changes to the environment, these improvements would be located throughout the county and would occur in areas that are developed with existing residential and commercial uses. None of these improvements would have the potential to increase airport hazards because any physical changes would be relatively minor and would not introduce any uses that would be incompatible with airport operations. The impact would be less than significant.

Summary

With compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations and implementation of adopted General Plan policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures (Haz-1.1, Haz-

1.3, and Haz-1.5), implementation of the CAP Update would not result in new or substantial increase in magnitude of impacts related to airport hazards compared to the 2011 GPU PEIR. Therefore, impacts related to airport hazards associated with implementation of the solid waste, water and wastewater, agriculture and conservation, energy and built environment and transportation measures and actions in the CAP Update would remain **less than significant with mitigation**, consistent with the conclusions in the 2011 GPU PEIR. Implementation of the CAP Update **would not result in new or more severe impacts** than disclosed in the 2011 GPU PEIR.

2.9.3.5 Issue 3: Impair or Interfere with Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans

This analysis describes the potential for implementation of the CAP Update to result in impacts related to emergency response and evacuation plans.

Guidelines for Determination of Significance

The *County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance: Emergency Response Plans* (County of San Diego 2007c), which is reflective of the guidelines that were utilized in the 2011 GPU PEIR, provides guidance for addressing the following significance criteria listed in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines:

- Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

Based on the County's guidelines, a project would result in a significant impact related to emergency response and evacuation plans if:

- The project proposes one of the following unique institutions in a dam inundation zone as identified on the inundation map prepared by the dam owner:
  - Hospital
  - School
  - Skilled nursing facility
  - Retirement home
  - Mental health care facility
  - Care facility with patients that have disabilities
  - Adult and childcare facility
  - Jails/detention facility
  - Stadium, arena, amphitheater

- Any other use that would involve concentrations of people that could be exposed to death in the event of a dam failure

- The project proposes a structure or tower 100 feet or greater in height on a peak or other location where no structures or towers of similar height already exist and as a result, the project could cause hazards to emergency response aircraft resulting in interference with the implementation of an emergency response.

Impact Analysis

2011 GPU PEIR Determination

As discussed in Section 2.7, "Hazards and Hazardous Materials," the 2011 GPU PEIR evaluated impacts related to emergency response and evacuation plans with the adoption of the goals and policies contained within the General Plan and buildout of the unincorporated county at the planning horizon. The 2011 GPU PEIR concluded that implementation of the General Plan would increase development in areas of the county that would not have accounted for growth in their existing emergency response and evacuation plans. Therefore, implementation of the General Plan would have the potential to impair emergency response and evacuation plans. However, the County would implement applicable General Plan policies listed above in Section 2.9.2, "Regulatory Framework," and applicable 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures listed below in Section 2.9.5, "Mitigation Measures," which would reduce a project's potential for impairing emergency response and evacuation plans by requiring projects to comply with standards for adequate emergency access.

As discussed in the 2011 GPU PEIR (page 2.7-44), the County reviews development proposals for consistency with existing emergency response and evacuation plans. In addition, the San Diego County Fire Protection District is responsible for discretionary project reviews to ensure that development projects include adequate emergency access. Compliance with General Plan policies (Policies S-1.3, M-1.2, M-3.3, and M-4.4), 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures Haz-3.1, Haz-3.2, and Haz-3.3), and other applicable regulations listed in Section 2.9.2, "Regulatory Framework," would reduce impacts related to impairment of emergency response and evacuation plans because the General Plan policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures would require improvement of road network to shorter routes that support emergencies services, require multiple ingress/egress routes, require coordination between agencies to implement and update the Hazard Mitigation Plan, and require preparation of Fire Access Road network plans and include in Community Plans. The 2011 GPU PEIR determined that impacts would be less than significant after mitigation. The discussion of impacts can be found in Section 2.7, "Hazards and Hazardous Materials" (pages 2.7-43 through 2.7-45 and 2.7-53), of the 2011 GPU PEIR and is incorporated by reference.

CAP Update Impact Analysis

The following sections describe the potential impacts to emergency response and evacuation that could result from implementation of CAP Update measures and actions.

Solid Waste Measures and Actions

Implementation of CAP Update solid waste measures and actions (e.g., Actions SW-1.1, SW-2.1, SW-4.1.a, and SW-4.1.b) could result in construction of new or expanded solid waste facilities in the unincorporated county. Implementation of the CAP Update does not propose changes to the OA EOP, the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, the OA EOP, or any other emergency plan. Construction activities would include vegetation clearing and piling, grading, site preparation, soil disturbances, concrete pouring and preparation, and construction and refueling. These construction activities may include the presence of vehicles, heavy equipment, heat-generating equipment and activities, and sparks from various sources as well as use of fuels, and combustible materials during construction. However, construction of the new or expanded solid waste facilities would have the potential to interfere with emergency plans and procedures if authorities are not properly notified or emergency routes are blocked.

Operation of the types of solid waste related projects that would occur consistent with the CAP Update generally would not result in development within areas of high fire risk or introduce new population into the unincorporated county. To minimize any potential impacts related to emergency response and evacuation, future development of solid waste facilities would be required to comply with adopted General Plan Policy S-1.3, which supports risk reduction programs and Policy M-3.3, which requires development of multiple ingress/egress routes. Furthermore, implementation of 2011 GPU PEIR Mitigation Measure Haz-3.1 to ensure authorities would prevent impediments to emergency response and evacuation plans, Mitigation Measure Haz-3.2 to avoid conflicts with adopted emergency response and evacuation plans, and Mitigation Measure Haz-3.3 to implement the County Fire Code and to include fire apparatus access and secondary access road, would ensure that impacts related to emergency response and evacuation are minimized by ensuring that emergency vehicle access is maintained during project construction and operation and that evacuation routes remain available to the extent feasible during wildfire events. Therefore, implementation of 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures and adopted General Plan policies would ensure that future development of solid waste facilities would not impact adopted emergency response and evacuation plans.

Therefore, implementation of CAP Update solid waste measures and actions would not substantially affect emergency response or evacuation plans. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

Water and Wastewater Measures and Actions

Implementation of CAP Update Measures W-1 through W-3 and associated implementing actions would involve development of policies and programs to encourage water conservation and increase water and wastewater efficiency. Measures W-1 and W-2 include implementing actions to develop policies and programs to increase water efficiency. Implementation of these measures would generally result in installation of water efficient appliance, smart irrigation system, and stormwater and grey water capture systems. Implementation of Measure W-3 would have the potential to result in installation

of stormwater and wastewater treatment systems on-site, so that the stormwater and greywater would be treated and reused for landscaping. Implementation of these measures would not interfere with emergency response or excavation plans because installation and operation of the proposed water and wastewater infrastructure improvements would not require the any road closures. The impact would be less than significant.

Agriculture and Conservation Measures and Actions

Implementation of CAP Update Measures A-1 through A-2 and associated implementing actions would involve acquiring and managing conservation lands, planting and protecting trees, and providing incentive to encourage carbon farming. These measures would result in the preservation of natural and agricultural lands in the unincorporated county. Interference with an adopted emergency response plan is unlikely to result from implementing these measures and actions because they would not involve extensive long-term construction that would impair emergency vehicle access or block evacuation routes. Additionally, these uses would not introduce new development within high fire risk areas that would increase population such that evacuation or emergency vehicle access routes would become congested.

Some measures and actions would direct the County to conduct evaluations that could result in subsequent programs with the potential to result in projects with potential to conflict with established emergency response plans. For example, Implementation of Action A-4.1.b would result in evaluation of opportunities to increase farmworker housing that could lead to construction of new farmworker housing. It is assumed that new farmworker housing would move existing residents in the county closer to work and provide housing for seasonal farmworkers, and would not result in an overall increase in population within the unincorporated county. If the existing emergency response and evacuation plans do not account for population changes in areas zoned for agricultural use, development of new farmworker housing would have the potential to increase the risk to loss of life in the event of an emergency. The impact would be potentially significant. However, the location or extent of potential future housing development is unknown at this time, and future discretionary projects, including farmworker housing projects, would be subject to an environmental review process and would be required to implement regulations that support emergency response and evacuation plans and mitigate for fire-related impacts. Future projects would also be required to conform to adopted General Plan policies, including Policies S-1.2, M-1.2, M-3.3, and M-4.3, to support emergency services. In addition, the 2011 GPU PEIR Mitigation Measures Haz-3.1, Haz-3.2, and Haz-3.3 would prevent impediments and conflicts with adopted emergency response and evacuation plans. Implementation of the adopted General Plan policies and the identified 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures would ensure that future development of farmworker housing would not impact adopted emergency response and evacuation plans.

Therefore, implementation of CAP Update agriculture and conservation measures and actions would not substantially affect emergency response or evacuation plans. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

Energy Measures and Actions

Implementation of the CAP Update Measure E-3 and associated implementing actions would involve implementation of policies, programs, and mechanisms to increase building energy efficiency, increase the use of renewable energy, and increase electrification in the unincorporated county and County operations. Implementation of CAP Update Measure E-3, Action E-3.2, and Action E-3.3 could result in development of small- and large-scale renewable energy projects, which would have the potential to result in impacts to adopted emergency response and evacuation plans.

Construction activities associated with the development of renewable energy projects under the CAP Update would have the potential to interfere with emergency response plans if authorities are not properly notified or emergency routes are blocked. However, projects being implemented under the CAP Update would be required to implement applicable 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures, including Mitigation Measure Haz-3.2, which requires the County to implement guidelines and measures to ensure that projects do not adversely impact existing emergency response and evacuation plans.

Once operational, small-scale renewable energy projects would not obstruct implementation of emergency response and evacuation plans because these projects would have limited height structures (e.g., solar panels shall not extend more than five feet above the highest pint of the roof and small wind turbines shall not exceed 80 feet) that would not be expected to affect navigable airspace and thus would not interfere with emergency air support services. In addition, operation of small-scale renewable energy projects would require few maintenance workers and would not involve activities requiring regular trucks or other vehicle trips that would impede access.

The development of large-scale renewable energy systems would result in large projects that occur over many acres, and generally include large and tall components, including tall wind turbines as well as new roads, transmission lines, and fencing. While specific locations for these projects have not been selected, projects would primarily be in areas of the county that are suited to the type of energy that the infrastructure is intended to produce, and therefore would generally be located away from population centers or areas with great evacuation need.

Future discretionary projects would be required to be evaluated for project-specific impacts under CEQA at the time of application and project-specific mitigation would minimize or eliminate impacts related to the facilitation of emergency response and evacuation plans to the extent feasible in compliance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4. Additionally, all large-scale renewable energy projects would be required to undergo the County's discretionary review process to obtain a MUP. In the case of large-scale wind turbines, as described on page 2.6-40 of the 2012 Wind Energy EIR, tall structures (300–500 feet tall) could potentially affect the ability of emergency air support services to carry out missions associated with an emergency response and may also result in obstructions on roads that are used as emergency access or evacuation. However, all large-scale renewable energy systems would require a MUP, and the County would be required to review all proposals for consistency with existing emergency

response and evacuation plans. Additionally, projects would be required to comply with the applicable General Plan policies listed in Section 2.9.2, "Regulatory Framework," and 2011 GPU PEIR Mitigation Measures Haz-3.2 and Haz-3.3 pertaining to emergency response and evacuation, which would further reduce the potential for impacts.

Therefore, implementation of CAP Update energy measures and actions would not substantially affect emergency response or evacuation plans. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

Built Environment and Transportation Measures and Actions

Implementation of the CAP Update Measure T-3 would result in construction of new or expanded pedestrian and bicycle improvements and electric vehicle charge stations, which could result in physical impacts. It is assumed that installation of electric vehicle charge stations would occur within exiting parking lots or parking garages, so that construction activities would be minimal, and no road closures would be required and no impact to emergency response or evacuation plans would occur.

Prior to construction activities, transportation infrastructure improvements with potential to disrupt traffic within County or state right-of-way would be required to obtain traffic control permits and develop traffic control plans in accordance with County requirements. Project plans would be reviewed by the County or other applicable transportation agencies to ensure that projects do not adversely impact emergency evacuation routes as designated in County emergency response and evacuation plans. Furthermore, transportation infrastructure projects would be required to comply with the applicable General Plan policies listed in Section 2.9.2, "Regulatory Framework," and 2011 GPU PEIR Mitigation Measures Haz-3.2 and Haz-3.3 pertaining to emergency response and evacuation. Therefore, overall impacts related to impairment of emergency response and evacuation plans from implementation of transportation infrastructure improvements would be similar to those identified in the 2011 GPU PEIR. Once operational, no roads would be closed or blocked; therefore, implementation of the CAP Update built environment and transportation measures and actions would not impair emergency response or evacuation plans. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

Summary

The measures and actions proposed in the CAP Update would have a limited potential to result in impacts related to impairing emergency response or evacuation plans. Where development would occur as a result of CAP Update implementation, adopted General Plan policies, including Policies S-1.2, M-1.2, M-3.3, and M-4.3, and 2011 GPU PEIR Mitigation Measures Haz-3.1, Haz-3.2, and Haz-3.3 would prevent impediments and conflicts with adopted emergency response and evacuation plans. Accordingly, implementation of the CAP Update measures and actions would not result in new impacts or a substantial increase in the magnitude of existing impacts related to emergency response and evacuation plans compared to the 2011 GPU PEIR. Therefore, impacts related to emergency response and evacuation plans associated with implementation of the solid waste, water and wastewater, agriculture and conservation, energy and built

environment and transportation measures and actions in the CAP Update would remain **less than significant with mitigation,** consistent with the conclusions in the 2011 GPU PEIR. Implementation of the CAP Update **would not result in new or more severe impacts** than disclosed in the 2011 GPU PEIR.

2.9.3.6 Issue 4: Expose People or Structures to Wildland Fire Hazards

This analysis describes the potential for implementation of the CAP Update to result in impacts related to wildland fires.

Guidelines for Determination of Significance

The *County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance: Wildland Fire and Fire Protection* (County of San Diego 2022), which is reflective of the guidelines that were utilized in the 2011 GPU PEIR, provides guidance for addressing the following significance criteria listed in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines:

- The project would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.

Impact Analysis

2011 GPU PEIR Determination

The 2011 GPU PEIR evaluated impacts related to wildland fires with the adoption of the goals and policies contained within the General Plan and the development anticipated throughout the planning horizon. Implementation of the General Plan would result in land uses that allow residential, commercial, and industrial development in areas that are prone to wildland fires. The 2011 GPU PEIR determined that anticipated development under the General Plan would result in potentially significant impacts related to wildland fires. The 2011 GPU PEIR determined that the impacts could be reduced through a combination of the following:

- Complying with a combination of federal, state, and local regulations and permits and existing County regulatory processes related to wildland fire hazards (e.g., County Vegetation and Other Flammable Materials Ordinance, County Removal of Fire Hazards Regulatory Ordinance, County Consolidated Fire Code).
- Implementing General Plan goals and policies related to wildland fire hazards, including LU-6.11, LU-10.2, S-3.1, S-3.2, S-3.3, S-3.4, S-3.6, and S-4.1. Note that the General Plan Safety Element was recently updated in August 2021. The Safety Element policies referenced in the 2011 GPU PEIR are now generally identified as Policies S-4.1 (General Plan Policy S-3.1), S-4.2 (General Plan Policy S-3.2), S-4.3 (General Plan Policy S-3.3), S-4.4 (General Plan Policy S-3.4), S-4.6 (General Plan Policy S-3.6), and S-5.1 (General Plan Policy S-4.1).

- Implementing Mitigation Measures Haz-4.1, Haz-4.2, Haz-4.3, and Haz-4.4 identified in the 2011 GPU PEIR related to wildland fire hazards.

Although the General Plan policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures would reduce the potential for impacts related to wildland fire hazards, the 2011 GPU PEIR determined that these policies and mitigation measures would not reduce the impacts to less than significant because the majority of the unincorporated county is located in a High or Very High FHSZ. The 2011 GPU PEIR determined that impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

The discussion of impacts can be found in Section 2.7, "Hazards and Hazardous Materials," pages 2.7-45 through 2.7-48 of the 2011 GPU PEIR and is incorporated by reference. The full text of the specific policies related to wildland fire hazards is provided above in Section 2.9.2, "Regulatory Framework," while the full text of applicable 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures is provided below in Section 2.9.5, "Mitigation Measures."

CAP Update Impact Analysis

The following discussion describes the potential for implementation of the proposed CAP Update measures and actions to result in effects related to wildland fires.

Solid Waste Measures and Actions

Implementation of CAP Update solid waste measures and actions would increase solid waste diversion and availability of sustainable solid waste facilities in County operations and within the unincorporated county. Implementation of Actions SW-1.1, SW-2.1, SW-4.1.a, and SW-4.1.b could result in potential construction of new or expanded solid waste facilities in the unincorporated county. Specific locations for these facilities have not been identified. The unincorporated county contains many wildland-urban interface (WUI) areas, which are areas where development is located close to lands prone to brush fires, and majority of the unincorporated county is in areas classified as a High or Very High FHSZ or State Responsibility Area, which means these areas are at higher risk of adverse effects from wildfire events. If the new or expanded solid waste solid waste facilities are to be constructed in areas adjacent to or within a High or Very High FHSZ, they would have the potential to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

New or expanded solid waste facilities would be required to conform with the currently adopted General Plan policies related to wildfire protection, including but not limited to: Policy LU-6.11 to direct development away from hazardous wildfire areas; Policy LU-6.10 to protect property and residents from natural and human-induced hazards; Policy S-4.1 to locate, site, design, and construction new development to enhance defensibility and to minimize the risk of structural loss and life safety resulting from wildfire; Policy S-4.2 to require development located on ridgelines, top of slopes, saddles or other topographic areas to be sited and designed to account for topography in wildland areas that pose a greater fire risk; Policy S-4.3 to site and design new developments to minimize the likelihood of a wildfire spreading to structures; Policy S-4.4 to locate new developments to where fire and emergency services are available; Policy S-4.6 to implement measures

to mitigate wildfire risks to structures and humans; and Policy S-4.7 to require new development to meet current ignition resistance construction codes. Complying with these adopted General Plan policies would minimize wildfire risk from new or expanded solid waste facilities.

In addition, new or expanded solid waste facilities would be required to implement 2011 GPU PEIR Mitigation Measures Haz-4.1 through Haz-4.4 to reduce impacts from wildland fires. These mitigation measures require development to be located away from fire hazard areas, conducting vegetation management, enforcing the Building and Fire Codes, and creating a program that facilitates conservation-oriented, fire-safe, project design. Furthermore, 2011 GPU PEIR Mitigation Measure Pub-1.5 requires discretionary project applications to include commitments from available fire protection districts, Mitigation Measure Pub-1.6 identifies fire-prone areas and ensures development proposals meet the requirements set forth by the applicable fire jurisdiction, and Mitigation Measure Pub-1.7 implements the Building and Fire Code to ensure there are adequate fire protection in place. Compliance with the adopted General Plan policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures would ensure that implementation of CAP Update solid waste measures and actions would not expose people or structures to significant risks of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

Water and Wastewater Measures and Actions

Implementation of CAP Update Measures W-1 through W-3 and associated implementing actions would involve development of policies and programs to encourage water conservation and increase water and wastewater efficiency. Implementation of these measures would generally result in the installation of water efficient appliances, smart irrigation systems, and stormwater and grey water capture systems. Implementation of Measure W-3 would have the potential to result in installation of stormwater and wastewater treatment systems on-site, so that the stormwater and greywater would be treated and reused for landscaping. Implementation of these measures would not result in new population growth or construction of new structures; therefore, implementation of CAP Update water and wastewater measures and actions would not expose people or structures to significant risks of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. The impact would be less than significant.

Agriculture and Conservation Measures and Actions

Implementation of CAP Update Measures A-1 through A-2 and associated implementing actions would involve acquiring and managing conservation lands, preserving natural and agricultural lands, planting and protecting trees, and providing incentive to encourage carbon farming. No new population growth would occur as a result of these measures and actions, and it is assumed that construction of new structures would not be required for managing and preserving conservation, natural, and agricultural lands, promoting carbon framing, or protecting and planting trees.

However, implementation of Action A-4.1.b could result in the identification of opportunities to increase farmworker housing in the unincorporated county. As discussed above, the unincorporated county contains WUI areas and Very High FHSZs. Construction of new farmworker housing in WUI areas or a Very High FHSZ would have the potential to expose people and structures to significant risks involving a wildland fire. However, future farmworker housing development that occurs as a result of evaluations conducted through the CAP Update would be required to conform to the currently adopted General Plan policies related to wildfire protection, including Policy LU-6.11 to direct development away from hazardous wildfire areas; Policy S-4.1 to locate, site, design, and construct new development to enhance defensibility and to minimize the risk of structural loss and life safety resulting from wildfire; Policy S-4.2 to require new development located on ridgelines, top of slopes, saddles or other topographic areas to be sited and designed to account for topography areas that pose a greater fire risk; Policy S-4.3 to site and design new developments to minimize the likelihood of a wildfire spreading to structures; Policy S-4.4 to locate new developments to where fire and emergency services are available; Policy S-4.6 to implement measures to mitigate wildfire risks to structures and humans; and Policy S-4.7 to require new development to meet current ignition resistance construction codes. Compliance with these adopted policies would limit wildfire risks associated with the construction of new farmworker housing in areas prone to wildfire.

In addition, future farmworker housing development would implement applicable 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures to ensure that fire services and fire protection are in place for new development, including Mitigation Measure Pub-1.5, which requires discretionary project applications to include commitments from available fire protection districts; Mitigation Measure Pub-1.6, which requires the identification of fire prone areas during the review of development projects and that development proposals meet the requirements set forth by the applicable fire jurisdiction; and Mitigation Measure Pub-1.7, which requires implementation of the Building and Fire Codes and that there are adequate fire protection services in place. In addition, Mitigation Measures Haz-4.1 through Haz-4.4 would further reduce impacts by requiring development to be located away from fire hazard areas, conducting vegetation management, enforcing the Building and Fire Codes, and creating a program that facilitates conservation-oriented, fire-safe, project design. Compliance with the adopted General Plan policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures would ensure that future farmworker housing development would not expose people or structures to significant risks of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

Energy Measures and Actions

Implementation of CAP Update energy measures and actions (e.g., Measure E-3, Action E-3.2, and Action E-3.3) would involve implementation of policies, programs, and mechanisms to increase building energy efficiency, increase the use of renewable energy, and increase electrification in the unincorporated county and County operations. These policies and programs have the potential to result in development of various renewable energy projects in the unincorporated county, such as new small-scale PV solar arrays and wind turbine projects and large-scale PV solar, concentrated solar, and

wind turbines. Specific locations for the potential renewable energy system projects are unknown, but they could be located in WUI areas or Very High FHSZs. Impacts related to the exposure of people or structures to wildland fires would be potentially significant if potential renewable energy development are located in a WUI area or Very High FHSZ.

In accordance with the County's Zoning Ordinance, small-scale PV solar systems (under 500 square feet) and up to three small wind turbines are permitted without a discretionary permit if specific zoning criteria are met in accordance with the ordinance. Even though there is a lack of discretionary oversight for small-scale renewable energy projects, all projects would be required to comply with federal, state, and local regulations to minimize or prevent wildfire. The small-scale renewable energy projects would also be required to implement the currently adopted General Plan policies listed in Section 2.9.2, "Regulatory Framework," including Policy LU-6.11 to direct development away from hazardous wildfire areas; Policy S-4.1 to locate, site, design, and construct new development to enhance defensibility and to minimize the risk of structural loss and life safety resulting from wildfire; Policy S-4.2 to require new development located on ridgelines, top of slopes, saddles or other topographic areas to be sited and designed to account for topography areas that pose a greater fire risk; Policy S-4.3 to site and design new developments to minimize the likelihood of a wildfire spreading to structures; Policy S-4.4 to locate new developments to where fire and emergency services are available; Policy S-4.6 to implement measures to mitigate wildfire risks to structures and humans; and Policy S-4.7 to require new development to meet current ignition resistance construction codes.

Furthermore, implementation of 2011 GPU PEIR Mitigation Measures Haz-4.3 and Pub-1.7, which would require compliance with the Building and Fire Code to ensure there are adequate fire service levels and would require site designs to incorporate features that reduce fire hazards, and Mitigation Measure Pub-1.6, which requires compliance with applicable requirements from the local fire authority, would reduce impacts related to wildland fires. In addition, Mitigation Measures Haz-4.1, Haz-4.2, and Haz-4.4 would further reduce impacts by locating development away from fire hazard areas, conducting vegetation management, and creating a program that facilitates conservation-oriented, fire-safe, project design. Compliance with the adopted General Plan policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures would ensure that future small-scale renewable energy projects would not expose people or structures to significant risks of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

Implementation of CAP Update Action E-3.3 could result in development of large-scale renewable energy projects, such as large-scale PV solar or concentrated solar, and wind turbines. Large-scale renewable energy infrastructure would generally be constructed in primarily undeveloped locations that are productive for generating renewable energy. While specific locations for projects have not been identified, it is likely that suitable locations would include areas that are not highly developed with residential and commercial uses because of the size, massing, coverage, and scale of this type of infrastructure that relies upon large amounts of land unencumbered by buildings or shadowed by buildings or trees. Due to the majority of the unincorporated county is located in WUI areas or Very High FHSZ, it is likely that future large-scale renewable

energy projects would be located in these high fire risk areas, which could expose people or structures to significant risks of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

However, future large-scale renewable energy projects would be subject to discretionary review and would be evaluated for project-specific impacts under CEQA at the time of application. Project-specific mitigation would be required to reduce and minimize impacts related to wildland fires to the extent feasible in compliance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4. In addition, future large-scale renewable energy projects would be required to comply with the currently adopted General Plan policies related to fire protection, including Policy S-4.1 which requires development to be located, designed, and constructed to provide adequate defensibility, Policy S-4.2 which requires development located near areas where the terrain or topography affects its susceptibility to wildfires to include design features to reduce the increased risk from fire, Policy S-4.3 which minimizes flammable vegetation around the development, Policy S-4.4 which requires development to locate in areas with available or planned fire and emergency services, Policy S-4.6 which requires development of a fire protection plan if a project is located in a fire hazard area, Policy S-4.7 which require all new, remodeled, or rebuilt structures to meet current ignition resistance construction codes, Policy S-5.1 which requires fuel management within established defensible space boundaries, and Policy COS-18.3 to requires alternative energy system operations to design and maintain the systems to minimize adverse impacts to the environment.

In addition, implementation of 2011 GPU PEIR Mitigation Measures Haz-4.1 through Haz-4.4 would further reduce impacts by locating development away from fire hazard areas, conducting vegetation management, enforcing the Building and Fire Codes, and creating a program that facilitates conservation-oriented, fire-safe, project design; Mitigation Measure Pub-1.5 would ensure that discretionary projects include commitments from available fire protection district; Mitigation Measure Pub-1.6 would ensure compliance with applicable requirements from local fire authority; and Mitigation Measure Pub-1.7 would ensure that the Building and Fire Codes are implemented to provide adequate fire protection. Compliance with the adopted General Plan policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures would reduce the potential impacts related to exposing people or structures to significant risks of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. However, construction and operation of large-scale renewable energy projects would have the potential to introduce people and structures into areas highly susceptible to wildland fires. Therefore, construction and operation of large-scale renewable energy projects in these areas would have the potential to expose people or structures to significant risks involving wildland fires. The impacts would remain significant, consistent with the 2021 GPU PEIR.

Built Environment and Transportation Measures and Actions

Implementation of the CAP Update Measure T-3 could result in future infrastructure development that would result in impacts related to wildland fires in the unincorporated county. More specifically, implementation of CAP Update would result in new or expanded pedestrian and bicycle improvements, electric vehicle charging stations, and other measures and actions to promote sustainable transportation options. Development of pedestrian and bicycle improvements would occur on existing roadways, and electric

vehicle charging stations would be installed in existing parking lots and garages. Implementation of the proposed transportation infrastructures projects would be connected to existing roadways and located within existing facilities. Future projects consistent with these measures would not involve the construction of new structures intended for human occupancy. As such, the construction of these projects would not result in impacts related to exposing people or structures to significant risks of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. The impact would be less than significant.

Summary

Federal, state, and local regulations exist to minimize or prevent wildfire, and implementation of the adopted General Plan policies listed in Section 2.9.2, "Regulatory Framework," would aid in the efforts to prevent wildfire in the county by managing vegetation, preparing for the threat of wildfire based upon location and weather conditions, and ensuring development occurs in areas with adequate fire services. Implementation of 2011 GPU PEIR Mitigation Measures Haz-4.1 through Haz-4.4, Pub-1.5, Pub-1.6, and Pub-1.7 would require locating development away from fire hazard areas, compliance with the Building and Fire Codes, site design to incorporate features to reduce fire hazards, and that there are adequate fire service levels available to serve potential development. However, development of large-scale renewable energy projects would have the potential to introduce people and structures to areas highly susceptible to wildland fires. The impacts related to exposing people or structures to significant risks of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires would be remain **significant with mitigation** incorporated, consistent with the 2011 GPU PEIR. Therefore, implementation of the CAP Update **would not result in a new or more significant impact** than identified in the 2011 GPU PEIR.

2.9.3.7 Issue 5: Expose Humans to Vectors

This analysis describes the potential for implementation of the CAP Update to result in impacts related to vectors.

Guidelines for Determination of Significance

Based on the *County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements: Vectors* (County of San Diego 2009), which is reflective of the guidelines that were utilized in the 2011 GPU PEIR, a project would have a significant impact related to vectors if:

- The project proposes a BMP for stormwater management or construction of a wetland, pond or other wet basin that could create sources of standing water for more than 72 hours, and as a result, could substantially increase human exposure to vectors, such as mosquitoes, that are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or creating nuisances;
- The project proposes a use that involves the production, use and/or storage of manure or proposes a composting operation or facility and as a result, could substantially

increase human exposure to vectors that are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or creating nuisances; or

- The project would result in a substantial increase in the number of residents located within one-quarter mile of a significant offsite vector breeding source; including but not limited to, standing water (e.g., agricultural ponds, reservoirs) and sources of manure generation or management activities (e.g., confined animal facilities, horse keeping operations, composting operations).

Impact Analysis

2011 GPU PEIR Determination

The 2011 GPU PEIR evaluated impacts related to vectors with the adoption of the goals and policies contained within the General Plan and the development anticipated through the planning horizon. The 2011 GPU PEIR determined that implementation of the General Plan would allow for the creation of sources of standing water that would persist for more than 72 hours, which could substantially increase human exposure to vectors, such as mosquitoes, that are capable of transmitting potentially significant public health diseases or creating nuisances. Additionally, the General Plan would encourage agricultural operations that involve the production, use, and/or storage of manure or a composting operation. The 2011 GPU PEIR determined that anticipated development under the General Plan would result in potentially significant impacts related to vectors.

The 2011 GPU PEIR concluded that impacts related to vectors would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of the General Plan policies and compliance with applicable regulations and processes such as the Center for Disease Control Division of Vector-Borne Infectious Diseases' requirements, which implements programs to prevent hazards from vectors, and H&SC Sections 116110–116112, which establish mosquito abatement and vector control districts, as well as the County Department of Environmental Health and Quality's Vector Surveillance Program. The discussion of impacts can be found in Section 2.7, "Hazards and Hazardous Materials" (pages 2.7-48 and 2.7-49), of the 2011 GPU PEIR and is hereby incorporated by reference.

CAP Update Impact Analysis

Solid Waste Measures and Actions

Implementation of CAP Update Measures SW-1 through SW-4 and associated implementing actions have the potential to result in the construction of new or expanded solid waste facilities, including new composting/anaerobic digestion facilities and on-farm digesters. These facilities could be located in rural areas or in proximity to developed communities and could result in new vector breeding sources. If the new vector breeding source is located near a substantial human population, a potentially adverse environmental effect could occur.

New or expanded solid waste facilities, including composting facilities, would be required to comply with federal, state, and local regulations and programs that aid in the prevention

of new vector breeding sources, as well as provide vector control as needed. This includes compliance with the Center for Disease Control Division of Vector-Borne Infectious Diseases' requirements and H&SC Sections 116110–116112, which are both described above. Additionally, the County Department of Environmental Health and Quality reviews project development plans for adequate vector control when projects have the potential to create new vector breeding sources. Therefore, compliance with existing regulations and processes associated with vector control would reduce the potential for new or expanded solid waste facilities to create new vector breeding sources. The impact would be less than significant.

Water and Wastewater Measures and Actions

Implementation of CAP Update Measures W-1 through W-3 and associated implementing actions would involve development of policies and programs to encourage water conservation and increase water and wastewater efficiency. Implementation of CAP Update Measures W-1 and W-2 would have the potential to result in installation of water efficient appliance, smart irrigation system, and stormwater and greywater capture systems. Implementation of CAP Update Measure W-3 would have the potential to result in installation of stormwater and wastewater treatment systems on-site, so that the stormwater and greywater would be treated and reused for landscaping. Water efficient appliances, irrigation systems, and stormwater and wastewater treatment systems would generally be installed indoors. While these systems would generally be installed indoors, it is anticipated that stormwater and greywater capture systems would be installed outside and would likely hold standing water for more than 72 hours. As such, these facilities could result in new vector breeding sources. However, any new water and wastewater measures and actions that would have the potential to introduce new vector breeding sources would be subject to the same federal, state, and local regulations and processes described above, including Center for Disease Control Division of Vector-Borne Infectious Diseases' requirements, H&SC Sections 116110–116112, and County Department of Environmental Health and Quality requirements. Therefore, compliance with existing regulations and processes associated with vector control would reduce the potential for implementation of water and wastewater measures and actions to create new vector breeding sources. The impact would be less than significant.

Agriculture and Conservation Measures and Actions

Implementation of CAP Update Measures A-1 through A-2 would involve acquiring and managing conservation lands, preserving natural and agricultural lands, planting and protecting trees, and incentivizing carbon farming. The acquisition of conservation lands, preserving natural and agricultural lands, planting and protecting trees, and implementing carbon farming would not create new vector breeding sources. However, Action A-4.1.c would incentivize voluntary alternative manure management (e.g., compost bedded barn, solid separation) projects, which could create conditions that are conducive to vector breeding. The introduction of composting would result in similar vector impacts as those discussed in the 2011 GPU PEIR, which identified agricultural operations that involve the production, use, and/or storage of manure or a composting operation as a potential vector breeding source (2011 GPU PEIR page 2.7-48). Similar to what was described in the

2011 GPU PEIR, composting operations would be subject to the same federal, state, and local regulations and processes described above, including Center for Disease Control Division of Vector-Borne Infectious Diseases' requirements, H&SC Sections 116110–116112, and County Department of Environmental Health and Quality requirements. Therefore, compliance with existing regulations and processes associated with vector control would reduce the potential for implementation of water and wastewater measures and actions to create new vector breeding sources. The impact would be less than significant.

Energy Measures and Actions

Implementation of CAP Update energy measures and actions could result in energy efficiency retrofits on existing residential and non-residential structures and County facilities, and the project could include rooftop or ground-mounted solar arrays or small wind turbines, modern mechanical systems, and other similar improvements. Specifically, Actions E-3.2 and E-3.3 would include the construction of new infrastructure to promote renewable energy use and electrification. Requirements for new development would include retrofitting and improving existing buildings to meet energy efficiency requirements and installing new energy infrastructure, including small- and large-scale solar and battery storage systems and small- and large-scale wind turbines (roof- or ground-mounted systems).

The implementation of these measures and actions would not include any components that would create sources of standing water for more than 72 hours, involve the production, use, and/or storage of manure or proposes a composting operation or facility, or result in a substantial increase in the number of residents located within one-quarter mile of a significant offsite vector breeding source. Therefore, implementation of the energy measures and actions of the CAP Update would not create new vector breeding sources. The impact would be less than significant.

Built Environment and Transportation Measures and Actions

The CAP Update includes measures and actions to decarbonize the County's vehicle fleet, support active transportation, and reduce single-occupancy vehicle trips. Actions T-4.1, T-4.1.a, T-4.2, T-5.1, and T-6.2.a would result in programs to reduce emissions from County employee commutes; improvements to pedestrian, bicycle and transit networks; programs to encourage active modes of transportation and reduce single occupancy vehicle trips; and the incorporation of Transportation Demand Management strategies. Because of the nature of such improvements (i.e., limited size and within existing transportation corridors), it is likely that most infrastructure improvements would occur within existing developed residential and commercial centers throughout the county or as part of new development as it is approved. These improvements are not expected to occur on undeveloped land. As such, implementation of these measures and actions would not result in new impervious surfaces that could create new sources of standing water for more than 72 hours and potentially increase human exposure to vectors. Therefore, implementation of the built environment and transportation measures and actions of the

CAP Update would not create new vector breeding sources. The impact would be less than significant.

Summary

Compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations and processes related to vector control would ensure that implementation of the CAP Update would not result in new or substantial increase in magnitude of impacts related to vectors compared to the 2011 GPU PEIR. Therefore, impacts related to vectors associated with implementation of the solid waste, water and wastewater, agriculture and conservation, energy and built environment and transportation measures and actions in the CAP Update would remain **less than significant**, consistent with the conclusions in the 2011 GPU PEIR. Implementation of the CAP Update **would not result in new or more severe impacts** than disclosed in the 2011 GPU PEIR.

2.9.3.8 Cumulative Impact Analysis

The cumulative impact analysis study area for hazards and hazardous materials in the 2011 GPU PEIR was identified as the unincorporated county and immediately surrounding areas (as described on pages 2.7-49 and 2.7-50 of the 2011 GPU PEIR). This analysis uses the same scope identified in the 2011 GPU PEIR. The scope and approach to the cumulative impact analysis are described in the "Cumulative Impact Assessment Overview" section in the introduction to this chapter.

Issue 1: Transport, Use, Disposal, or Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials; Proximity to Schools; and Sites Containing Hazardous Materials

Cumulative development includes facilities that involve the use, storage, disposal or transport hazardous materials, and potentially increase hazards to the public or the environment. For example, the general plans of surrounding jurisdictions contain industrial land use designations that allow businesses to handle large quantities of hazardous materials. Additionally, the transportation of hazardous materials would increase in the region as a result of an expanded and improved highway system, as proposed in the Southern California Association of Governments Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy and San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) 2021 Regional Plan (combination of Regional Transportation Plan, Sustainable Communities Strategy, and Regional Comprehensive Plan).

The 2011 GPU PEIR concluded that cumulative impacts related to hazardous materials and sites would not be significant with compliance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations, including CAA Chemical Accident Prevention Provision, RCRA, CERCLA, Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, the California H&SC, CFC, Title 22, CCR Titles 23 and 27, Aboveground Petroleum Storage Act, CalARP, Emergency Response to Hazardous Materials Incidents, the California Emergency Services Act, and the County Consolidated Fire Code. Cumulative projects in Mexico would not be subject to these regulations;

however, any transportation of hazardous materials from Mexico into the United States would be required to comply with the above-mentioned regulations.

Implementation of the CAP Update measures and actions would have the potential to result in construction of new or expanded solid waste, renewable energy, and transportation facilities in the unincorporated county. As discussed in Section 2.9.3.3, "Issue 1: Create a Hazard from Transport, Use, Disposal, or Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials; Proximity to Schools; and Being Located on Sites Containing Hazardous Materials," new facilities would be required to comply with the applicable federal, state, and local regulations above, as well as implement General Plan Policies LU-16.1, LU-16.3, S-1.1, S-13.1, S-13.2, and S-13.3.

The 2011 GPU PEIR did not identify a cumulative impact related to hazardous materials. Similar to the conclusions of the 2011 GPU PEIR, the project would not result in a substantial incremental effect that would result in a new significant cumulative impact. The cumulative impact would be **less than significant**.

Issue 2: Public and Private Airports

Impacts would be cumulative in nature if the project in combination with cumulative development would contribute to a regional increase in airport hazards to the public or the environment. The 2011 GPU PEIR concluded that because cumulative projects would result in less than significant cumulative impacts related to airport hazards with compliance with the federal, state, and local regulations related to airport safety, implementation of the General Plan would not contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact.

Implementation of the CAP Update would include components that could create safety hazards to air navigation. Specifically, the construction of new or expanded solid waste facilities, new farmworker housing, and renewable energy projects could result in potential airport-related safety hazards. However, as discussed in Section 2.9.3.4, "Issue 2: Result in Safety Hazards or Excessive Noise from Public and Private Airports," compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations and implementation of adopted General Plan policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures (Haz-1.1, Haz-1.3, and Haz-1.5) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

Similar to the conclusions of the 2011 GPU PEIR, the project would not result in a substantial incremental effect that would result in a new significant cumulative impact. This cumulative impact would be **less than significant**.

Issue 3: Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans

Impacts would be cumulative in nature if the project in combination with cumulative development would contribute to a regional impairment of emergency response or evacuation plans. The 2011 GPU PEIR determined that cumulative projects would be required to comply with applicable emergency response and evacuation policies outlined in regulations such as the Federal Response Plan, the California Emergency Services Act, and local fire codes. Therefore, due to existing regulations, cumulative projects would not result in a significant cumulative impact.

The 2011 GPU PEIR concluded that because cumulative projects would result in less than significant cumulative impacts, and compliance with existing regulations and implementation of General Plan policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures would reduce impacts of the General Plan to less than significant, the General Plan in combination with other cumulative projects would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact.

Implementation of the CAP Update measures would include components that could potentially impair emergency response and evacuations plans. However, as discussed in Section 2.9.3.5, "Issue 3: Impair or Interfere with Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans," adopted General Plan policies, including Policies S-1.2, M-1.2, M-3.3, and M-4.3, and 2011 GPU PEIR Mitigation Measures Haz-3.1, Haz-3.2, and Haz-3.3 would prevent impediments and conflicts with adopted emergency response and evacuation plans and would reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

Similar to the conclusions of the 2011 GPU PEIR, the project would not result in a substantial incremental effect that would result in a new significant cumulative impact. This cumulative impact would be **less than significant**.

Issue 4: Wildland Fires

As noted above, the majority of the unincorporated county is in WUI areas or a High and Very High FHSZ. Given the amount of high fire hazard zones in the unincorporated county, and consistent with the conclusion of the GPU PEIR, a significant cumulative impact related to exposing people or structures to significant risks of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires in the unincorporated county and immediate surrounding areas. The General Plan establishes land uses that allow residential, commercial, and industrial development in areas that are prone to wildland fires. Implementation of the General Plan results in a potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residents are intermixed with wildlands. Therefore, the 2011 GPU PEIR concluded that the General Plan's contribution to this significant cumulative impact would be cumulatively considerable.

Implementation of the CAP Update measures and actions would result in future development that could expose people or structures to significant risks of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. However, as discussed in Section 2.9.3.6, "Issue 4: Expose People or Structures to Wildland Fire Hazards," adopted General Plan policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures, including Policies LU-6.11, LU-10.2, S-4.1 through 4.4, S-4.6, S-4.7, S-5.1, and COS-18.3, and Mitigation Measures Haz-4.1 through Haz-4.4 and Pub-1.5 through Pub-1.7, would reduce the potential impacts but not to a less-than-significant level.

Because there is a significant cumulative impact related to wildland fires may result from cumulative development within the unincorporated county and immediately surrounding areas, and the potential exists for future projects associated with the CAP Update to increase the risk of exposing people or structures to significant risks of loss, injury, or

death involving wildland fires, the project would contribute the existing cumulative impact. Therefore, the project would result in a considerable contribution to a significant impact related to wildland fires. However, this impact would be consistent with the conclusion of the GPU PEIR and the project would not result in a substantial incremental effect that would result in a new significant cumulative impact. The cumulative impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**.

Issue 5: Vectors

Cumulative projects, such as surrounding jurisdiction's general plans, would potentially contribute to vector breeding sources. Cumulative projects that incorporate environmental measures such as conserving wetlands or encouraging agricultural operations would inadvertently increase vector breeding sources. However, these projects would be required to follow would be subject to the same federal, state, and local regulations and processes described above, including Center for Disease Control Division of Vector-Borne Infectious Diseases' requirements, H&SC Sections 116110–116112, and County Department of Environmental Health and Quality requirements discussed above. Cumulative projects in Mexico would not be subject to these regulations; however, cumulative projects in Mexico would be unlikely to contribute to a cumulative impact because of the limited area of exposure. Therefore, the 2011 GPU PEIR concluded that cumulative project compliance with established requirements would reduce potential cumulative impacts to below a level of significance. A significant cumulative impact with respect to vectors would not occur.

Implementation of the CAP Update measures would include components that could create new vector breeding sources, including new or expanded composting/anaerobic digestion facilities and new stormwater and greywater capture systems. However, as discussed in Section 2.9.3.7, "Issue 5: Expose Humans to Vectors," compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations and processes related to vector control would ensure that implementation of the CAP Update would result in less than significant vector impacts. Similar to the conclusions of the 2011 GPU PEIR, the project would not result in a substantial incremental effect that would result in a new significant cumulative impact. This cumulative impact would be **less than significant**.

2.9.4 Summary of New or More Severe Significant Impacts

Implementation of the CAP Update would not result in potentially significant impacts related to hazardous materials and sites, airport hazards, emergency response and evacuation plans, wildland fires, or vectors.

2.9.5 Mitigation Measures

2.9.5.1 Issue 1: Transport, Use, Disposal, or Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials; Proximity to Schools; and Sites Containing Hazardous Materials

Project level and contributions to cumulative impacts were determined to be less than significant; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

2.9.5.2 Issue 2: Public and Private Airports

The mitigation measures applicable to public and private airports that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include the following:

> Adopted Mitigation Measure Haz-1.1: Implement the Guidelines for Determining Significance, Airport Hazards, when reviewing new development projects to ensure compatibility with surrounding airports and land uses and apply appropriate mitigation when impacts are significant.
>
> Adopted Mitigation Measure Haz-1.3: Review the AICUZ when reviewing new development projects within the study area. Ensure that such development projects are consistent with the land use compatibility and safety policies therein.
>
> Adopted Mitigation Measure Haz-1.5: Coordinate with the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (SDCRAA) and County Airports for issues related to airport planning and operations.

2.9.5.3 Issue 3: Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans

The mitigation measures applicable to emergency response and evacuation plans that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include the following:

> Adopted Mitigation Measure Haz-3.1: Facilitate coordination between DPLU (now PDS) and the Office of Emergency services to implement and periodically update the Hazard Mitigation Plan.
>
> Adopted Mitigation Measure Haz-3.2: Implement the CEQA Guidelines for Determining Significance to ensure that discretionary projects do not adversely impact emergency response or evacuation plans. Also implement the County Public Road Standards and County Private Road Standards during these reviews and ensure that road improvements are consistent with Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans. Apply appropriate mitigation when impacts are significant.
>
> Adopted Mitigation Measure Haz-3.3: Prepare Fire Access Road network plans and include in Community Plans or other document as appropriate. Also implement

the County Fire Code and require fire apparatus access roads and secondary access for projects.

2.9.5.4 Issue 4: Wildland Fires

The mitigation measures applicable to wildland fires impacts that were adopted as a part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include the following:

Adopted Mitigation Measure Haz-4.1: Identify and minimize potential fire hazards for future development by using and maintaining a database that identifies fire prone areas, locating development away from Fire Hazard areas whenever practicable, and adhering to the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Wildland Fires & Fire Protection and applying appropriate mitigation when impacts are significant.

Adopted Mitigation Measure Haz-4.2: Conduct effective and environmentally sensitive brush management measures such as: addressing habitat-specific fire controls within Resource Management Plans; implementation of the Weed Abatement Ordinance and enforcing proper techniques for maintaining defensible space around structures; coordination with the local FAHJ to ensure that district goals for fuel management and fire protection are being met; and recognizing the Memorandum of Understanding between the wildlife agencies and fire authorities that guides the abatement of flammable vegetation without violating environmental regulations for habitat protection.

Adopted Mitigation Measure Haz-4.3: Enforce and comply with Building and Fire Code to ensure there are adequate fire service levels; and require site and/or building designs that incorporate features that reduce fire hazards. Also implement the General Plan Regional Category map and Land Use Maps, which typically show lower densities in wildland areas.

Adopted Mitigation Measure Haz-4.4: Create a Conservation Subdivision Program that facilitates conservation-oriented, fire-safe, project design through changes to the Subdivision Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance, Zoning Ordinance, Groundwater Ordinance, and other regulations as necessary.

Adopted Mitigation Measure Pub-1.5: Implement, and revise as necessary, Board Policy I-84 requiring that discretionary project applications include commitments from available fire protection districts. These commitments shall also demonstrate that the distance between the projects and the fire service facilities do not result in unacceptable travel times.

Adopted Mitigation Measure Pub-1.6: Maintain and use the County GIS and the County Guidelines for Determining Significant impacts in order to identify fire prone areas during the review of development projects. Once identified, ensure that development proposals meet requirements set by the FAHJ and that new/additional fire protection facilities are not required; or, if such facilities are

required, that potential environmental impacts resulting from construction are evaluated along with the development project under review.

Adopted Mitigation Measure Pub-1.7: Implement the Building and Fire code to ensure there are adequate fire protections in place associated with the construction of structures and their defensibility, accessibility and egress, adequate water supply, coverage by the local fire district, and other critical issues.

2.9.5.5 Issue 5: Vectors

Project level impacts and contributions to cumulative impacts were determined to be less than significant; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

2.9.6 Significance Conclusions

2.9.6.1 Issue 1: Transport, Use, Disposal, or Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials; Proximity to Schools; and Sites Containing Hazardous Materials

With implementation of adopted General Plan policies and compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations related to hazardous materials, implementation of the CAP Update would result in project and cumulative impacts associated with the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials, accidental release of hazardous materials, use of hazardous materials in proximity to schools, and contaminated sites. Therefore, impacts from implementation of the CAP Update would remain **less than significant** and **would not result in a considerable contribution** such that a new significant cumulative impact would occur. Implementation of the CAP Update **would not result in a new significant impact** not discussed in the 2011 GPU PEIR or a substantial increase in the severity of the previously identified significant effect.

2.9.6.2 Issue 2: Public and Private Airports

The CAP Update would result in the development and redevelopment of infrastructure throughout the unincorporated county. Although there is a potential for some types of projects to result in airport-related safety hazards, compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations related to airports and implementation of adopted General Plan policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures would ensure that project-level and cumulative impacts associated with potential airport hazards would remain **less than significant with mitigation** and **would not result in a considerable contribution** such that a new significant cumulative impact would occur. Implementation of the CAP Update **would not result in a new significant impact** not discussed in the 2011 GPU PEIR or a substantial increase in the severity of the previously identified significant effect.

2.9.6.3 Issue 3: Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans

The CAP Update would result in the development and redevelopment of infrastructure throughout the unincorporated county. Although there is a potential for some types of

projects to impair emergency response and evacuation plans, implementation of adopted General Plan policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures would ensure that project-level and cumulative impacts associated with impairing implementation of emergency response and evacuation plans would remain **less than significant with mitigation** and **would not result in a considerable contribution** such that a new significant cumulative impact would occur. Implementation of the CAP Update **would not result in a new significant impact** not discussed in the 2011 GPU PEIR or a substantial increase in the severity of the previously identified significant effect.

2.9.6.4 Issue 4: Wildland Fires

The CAP Update would result in the development and redevelopment of infrastructure throughout the unincorporated county, including areas susceptible to wildland fires. Compliance with existing regulations related to wildfire protection and implementation of adopted General Plan policies and 2011 GPU PEIR Mitigation Measures Haz-4.1 through Haz-4.4 and Pub-1.5 through Pub-1.7 would reduce the project-level and cumulative impacts but not to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, impacts associated with exposing people or structures to significant risks of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires would be **significant and unavoidable** and **would result in a considerable contribution** to an existing significant cumulative impact. This impact would be consistent with the conclusion of the 2011 GPU PEIR. Therefore, implementation of the CAP Update **would not result in a new significant impact** not discussed in the 2011 GPU PEIR or a substantial increase in the severity of the previously identified significant effect.

2.9.6.5 Issue 5: Vectors

The CAP Update would result in the development and redevelopment of infrastructure throughout the unincorporated county. Although there is a potential for some types of projects to create new vector breeding sources, compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations related to vector control and implementation of adopted General Plan policies would ensure that project and cumulative impacts associated with vectors would remain **less than significant** and **would not result in a considerable contribution** such that a new significant cumulative impact would occur. Implementation of the CAP Update **would not result in a new significant impact** not discussed in the 2011 GPU PEIR or a substantial increase in the severity of the previously identified significant effect.

Table 2.9-2 Maximum Residential Density

Current Setting	Safety Compatibility Zones a					
	(1) Runaway Protection Zone	(2) Inner Approach/ Departure Zone	(3) Inner Turning Zone	(4) Outer Approach/ Departure Zone	(5) Sideline Zone	(6) Traffic Pattern Zone
	Average number of dwelling units (du) per gross acre					
Rural Farmland/ Open Space (Minimal Development)	0	Maintain current zoning if less than density Criteria for rural / suburban setting				No limit
Rural/Suburban (Mostly to Partially Undeveloped)	0	1 du per 10 – 20 ac.	1 du per 2 – 5 ac.	1 du per 2 – 5 ac.	1 du per 1 – 2 ac.	No limit
Urban (Heavily Developed)	0	0	Allow infill at up to average of surrounding residential area [b]			No limit

Notes:

[a] Clustering to preserve open land encouraged in all zones.

[b] See Chapter 3 of the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook (January 2002) for discussion of infill development criteria; infill is appropriate only if nonresidential uses are not feasible.

Source: Caltrans 2011.

Table 2.9-3 Maximum Non-Residential Intensity

Current Setting	Safety Compatibility Zones					
	(1) Runaway Protection Zone	(2) Inner Approach/ Departure Zone	(3) Inner Turning Zone	(4) Outer Approach/ Departure Zone	(5) Sideline Zone	(6) Traffic Pattern Zone
	Average number of people per gross acre [a]					
Rural Farmland/Open Space (Minimal Development)	0[b]	10–25	60–80	60–80	80–100	150
Rural/Suburban (Mostly to Partially Undeveloped)	0[b]	25–40	60–80	60–80	80–100	150
Urban (Heavily Developed)	0[b]	40–60	80–100	80–100	100–150	No limit [c]
Multipliers for above numbers [d]						
Maximum Number of People per Single Acre	x 1.0	x 2.0	x 2.0	x 3.0	x 2.0	x 3.0
Bonus for Special Risk-Reduction Bldg. Design	x 1.0	x 1.5	x 2.0	x 2.0	x 2.0	x 2.0

Notes:

[a] Also see Table 2.9-4 for guidelines regarding uses that should be prohibited regardless of usage intensity.

[b] Exceptions may be permitted for agricultural activities, roads, and automobile parking provided that FAA criteria are satisfied.

[c] Large stadiums and similar uses should be prohibited.

[d] Multipliers are cumulative (e.g., maximum intensity per single acre in inner safety is 2.0 times the average intensity for the site, but with risk-reduction building design is 2.0 x 1.5 = 3.0 times the average intensity).

Source: Caltrans 2011.

Table 2.9-4 Safety Compatibility Zones – Prohibited Uses

Safety Compatibility Zone	Prohibited Uses
Zone 1 Runway Protection Zone	• Prohibit all new structures • Prohibit residential land uses • Avoid nonresidential uses except if very low intensity in character and confined to the sides and outer end of the area
Zone Inner Approach/ Departure Zone	• Prohibit residential uses except on large, agricultural parcels • Limit nonresidential uses to activities which attract few people (uses such as shopping centers, most eating establishments, theaters, meeting halls, multi-story office buildings, and labor-intensive manufacturing plants unacceptable) • Prohibit children's schools, day care centers, hospitals, nursing homes • Prohibit hazardous uses (e.g., aboveground bulk fuel storage)
Zone 3 Inner Turning Zone	• Limit residential uses to very low densities (if not deemed unacceptable because of noise) • Avoid nonresidential uses having moderate or higher usage intensities (e.g., major shopping centers, fast food restaurants, theaters, meeting halls, buildings with more than three aboveground habitable floors are generally unacceptable) • Prohibit children's schools, large day care centers, hospitals, nursing homes • Avoid hazardous uses (e.g., aboveground bulk fuel storage)
Zone 4 Outer Approach/ Departure Zone	• In undeveloped areas, limit residential uses to very low densities (if not deemed unacceptable because of noise); if alternative uses are impractical, allow higher densities as infill in urban areas • Limit nonresidential uses as in Zone 3 • Prohibit children's schools, large day care centers, hospitals, nursing homes
Zone 5 Sideline Zone	• Avoid residential uses unless airport related (noise usually also a factor) • Allow all common aviation-related activities provided that height-limit criteria are met • Limit other nonresidential uses similarly to Zone 3, but with slightly higher usage intensities • Prohibit children's schools, large day care centers, hospitals, nursing homes
Zone 6 Traffic Pattern Zone	• Allow residential uses • Allow most nonresidential uses; prohibit outdoor stadiums and similar uses with very high intensities • Avoid children's schools, large day care centers, hospitals, nursing homes

Notes:

Definitions: As used in this table, the follow meanings are intended:

Allow: **Use is acceptable**

Limit: **Use is acceptable only if density/intensity restrictions are met**

Avoid: **Use generally should not be permitted unless no feasible alternative is available**

Prohibit: **Use should not be permitted under any circumstances**

Children's Schools: **Through grade 12**

Large Day Care Centers: **Commercial facilities as defined in accordance with state law; for the purposes here, family day care homes and noncommercial facilities ancillary to a place of business are generally allowed.**

Aboveground Bulk Storage of Fuel: **Tank size greater than 6,000 gallons (this suggested criterion is based on Uniform Fire Code criteria which are more stringent for larger tank sizes)**

[1] **The prohibitions are pursuant to the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, Chapter 9, pp. 9-44 and 9-45, Basic Safety Compatibility Qualities, Table 9B.**

Source: Caltrans 2011.