

Attachment 2: Impact Comparison Between the TGPA-ZOU Project FEIR and the 2004 General Plan EIR

Impact	Level of Significance¹	Mitigation Measures²	Level of Significance After Mitigation	2004 General Plan EIR Impact	2004 General Plan EIR Level of Significance After Mitigation	Different Impact From 2004?³
3.1 Aesthetics						
AES-1: Result in a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista	S	BIO-1a: Limit the relaxation of hillside development standards	SU	5.3-1: Degradation of the quality of scenic vistas and scenic resources	LTS	Yes
AES-2: Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a scenic highway	S	AG-1a: Amend the ZOU to limit the size of proposed Health Resort and Retreat Centers	SU	5.3-1: Degradation of the quality of scenic vistas and scenic resources	LTS	Yes
AES-3: Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings	S	BIO-1a: Limit the relaxation of hillside development standards	SU	5.3-2: Degradation of existing visual character or quality of the area or region	SU	No ⁴
AES-4: Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area	S	AES-4: Revise proposed Zoning Ordinance Chapter 130.34 and Section 130.40.170	LTS SU (RF Zone only)	5.3-3: Creation of new sources of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views	LTS	No Yes (RF Zone)
3.2 Agricultural and Forestry Resources						
Impact AG-1: Convert Important Farmland, grazing land, land currently in agricultural production, or cause land use conflict that results in cancellation of a Williamson Act contract	S	AG-1a: Amend the ZOU to limit the size of proposed Health Resort and Retreat Centers AG-1b: Amend the ZOU to limit Public Utility Service Facilities to minor facilities in the PA, AG and RL zones	SU	5.2-1: Potential for conversion of important farmland, grazing land, land currently in agricultural production or result in cancellation of a Williamson Act Contract	SU	No ⁵

Attachment 2: Impact Comparison Between the TGPA-ZOU Project FEIR and the 2004 General Plan EIR

Impact	Level of Significance¹	Mitigation Measures²	Level of Significance After Mitigation	2004 General Plan EIR Impact	2004 General Plan EIR Level of Significance After Mitigation	Different Impact From 2004?³
Impact AG-2: Remove substantial areas of agricultural land from production by Ranch Marketing, Winery, and visitor-serving activities (less than significant with mitigation)	S	AG-1a: Amend the ZOU to limit the size of proposed Health Resort and Retreat Centers	LTS with mitigation	5.2-2: Potential for ranch marketing, winery and visitor-serving activities to remove substantial areas of agricultural land from production	LTS	No ⁵
Impact AG-3: Provide an inconsistent level of protection for agricultural operations based on location in identified agricultural areas	LTS			5.2-3: Inconsistent level of protection for agricultural operations based on location in identified agricultural areas	LTS	No
Impact AG-4: Convert timberland, including lands currently in timber production and lands zoned for timber production to non-forestry uses	S	AG-4: Amend proposed Table 130.21.020 to restrict incompatible uses from being located in the TPZ zone	LTS with mitigation	5.2-4: Conversion of timberland, including lands currently in timber production and lands zoned for timber production, to nonforestry uses	LTS	No ⁵
3.3 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases						
Impact AQ-1: Generate Construction-Related emissions in excess of EDCAQMD thresholds	SU	Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Implement Measures to reduce construction-related exhaust Emissions	SU	5.11-1: Construction emissions of ROG, NO _x and PM ₁₀	SU	No
Impact AQ-2: Generate on-road mobile source criteria pollutant emissions in excess of EDCAQMD thresholds	SU	None		5.11-2, 5.11-3, 5.11-4: Long-term operational (regional) emissions of ROG, NO _x , PM ₁₀ ; Toxic air emissions; Local mobile-source emissions of carbon monoxide (CO)	SU	No
Impact AQ-3: Temporary Generation of Naturally Occurring Asbestos During Grading and Construction Activities	LTS			5.8-9: Public exposure to asbestos	LTS	No
Impact AQ-4: Exposure of	LTS			5.11-4: Local mobile-source	SU	No

Attachment 2: Impact Comparison Between the TGPA-ZOU Project FEIR and the 2004 General Plan EIR

Impact	Level of Significance¹	Mitigation Measures²	Level of Significance After Mitigation	2004 General Plan EIR Impact	2004 General Plan EIR Level of Significance After Mitigation	Different Impact From 2004?³
Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Concentrations of Carbon Monoxide				emissions of carbon monoxide (CO)		
Impact AQ-5: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations	SU	None	SU	5.11-3: Toxic air emissions	SU	No
Impact AQ-6: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Odors	SU	None	SU	5.11-5: Odorous emissions	SU	No
Impact AQ-7: Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment	LTS			Not Reviewed	N/A	Yes ⁶
3.4 Biological Resources						
Impact BIO-1: Result in the loss and fragmentation of wildlife habitat	SU	Mitigation Measure BIO-1a: Limit the relaxation of hillside development standards Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Limit the approval of Private Recreation Areas Mitigation Measure BIO-1c: Limit music festivals and concerts Mitigation Measure AG-1a: Amend the ZOU to limit the size of proposed Health Resort and Retreat Centers	SU	5.12-1: Loss and fragmentation of wildlife habitat	SU	No
Impact BIO-2: Have a substantial adverse effect on special-status species	SU	Mitigation Measure BIO-1a: Limit the relaxation of hillside development standards Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Limit the approval of Private	SU	5.12-2: Impacts on Special-Status species	SU	No

Attachment 2: Impact Comparison Between the TGPA-ZOU Project FEIR and the 2004 General Plan EIR

Impact	Level of Significance¹	Mitigation Measures²	Level of Significance After Mitigation	2004 General Plan EIR Impact	2004 General Plan EIR Level of Significance After Mitigation	Different Impact From 2004?³
		Recreation Areas Mitigation Measure BIO-1c: Limit music festivals and concerts Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Return Event Site to Pre-Event Condition				
Impact BIO-3: Have a substantial adverse effect on wildlife movement	SU	Mitigation Measure BIO-1c: Limit music festivals and concerts Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Return Event Site to Pre-Event Condition	SU	5.12-3: Impacts on wildlife movement	SU	No
Impact BIO-4: Result in the removal, degradation, and fragmentation of sensitive habitats	SU	Mitigation Measure BIO-1a: Limit the relaxation of hillside development standards Mitigation Measure BIO-1c: Limit music festivals and concerts Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Return Event Site to Pre-Event Condition	SU	5.12-4: Removal, degradation and fragmentation of sensitive habitat	SU	No

Attachment 2: Impact Comparison Between the TGPA-ZOU Project FEIR and the 2004 General Plan EIR

Impact	Level of Significance¹	Mitigation Measures²	Level of Significance After Mitigation	2004 General Plan EIR Impact	2004 General Plan EIR Level of Significance After Mitigation	Different Impact From 2004?³
3.5 Cultural Resources						
Impact CUL-1: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5	SU	None	SU	5.13-1: Destruction or alteration of known and unknown prehistoric and historic sites, features, artifacts and human remains	LTS	Yes
Impact CUL-2: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5	SU	None	SU	5.13-1: Destruction or alteration of known and unknown prehistoric and historic sites, features, artifacts and human remains	LTS	Yes
Impact CUL-3: Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries	LTS			5.13-1: Destruction or alteration of known and unknown prehistoric and historic sites, features, artifacts and human remains	LTS	No
3.6 Land Use and Planning						
Impact LU-1: Physically divide an established community	NI			Not Reviewed	N/A	N/A
Impact LU-2: Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect	LTS			5.1-1: Inconsistency with applicable plans and policies of other agencies	LTS	No
Impact LU-3: Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan	NI			Not Reviewed	N/A	N/A

Attachment 2: Impact Comparison Between the TGPA-ZOU Project FEIR and the 2004 General Plan EIR

Impact	Level of Significance¹	Mitigation Measures²	Level of Significance After Mitigation	2004 General Plan EIR Impact	2004 General Plan EIR Level of Significance After Mitigation	Different Impact From 2004?³
Impact LU-4: Substantially alter or degrade the existing land use character of the County	SU	Mitigation Measure AG-1a: Amend the ZOU to limit the size of proposed Health Resort and Retreat Centers AG-1b: Amend the ZOU to limit Public Utility Service Facilities to minor facilities in the PA, AG and RL zones AG-4: Amend proposed Table 130.21.020 to restrict incompatible uses from being located in the TPZ zone BIO-1a: Limit the relaxation of hillside development standards LU-4a: Revise Policy 2.1.2.5, Commercial/Mixed Use (in Rural Centers) LU-4b: Require proposed Ranch Marketing uses to be reviewed for compatibility with adjoining agricultural uses	SU	5.1-2: Substantial alteration or degradation of land use character in the county or subarea	SU	No
Impact LU-5: Create substantial incompatibilities between land uses.	SU	Mitigation Measure AG-1a: Amend the ZOU to limit the size of proposed Health Resort and Retreat Centers AG-1b: Amend the ZOU to limit Public Utility Service Facilities in the PA, AG and RL zones AG-4: Amend proposed Table 130.21.020 to restrict incompatible uses from being located in the TPZ zone LU-4b: Revise Section 130.40.260, Ranch Marketing	SU	5.1-3: Creation of substantial land use compatibility	LTS	Yes

Attachment 2: Impact Comparison Between the TGPA-ZOU Project FEIR and the 2004 General Plan EIR

Impact	Level of Significance¹	Mitigation Measures²	Level of Significance After Mitigation	2004 General Plan EIR Impact	2004 General Plan EIR Level of Significance After Mitigation	Different Impact From 2004?³
		prior to adoption				
3.7 Noise						
Impact NOI-1: Exposure of noise-sensitive land uses to short-term (construction) noise	SU	None	SU	5.10-1: Exposure of noise-sensitive land uses to short-term (construction) noise	SU	No
Impact NOI-2: Exposure to ground transportation noise sources as a result of the TGPA	SU	None	SU	5.10-2: Exposure to ground transportation noise sources	SU	No
Impact NOI-3: Exposure to ground transportation noise sources as a result of the ZOU	SU	None	SU	5.10-2: Exposure to ground transportation noise sources	SU	No
Impact NOI-4: Exposure of noise-sensitive land uses to fixed or non-transportation noise sources	SU	None	SU	5.10-3: Exposure of noise-sensitive land uses to fixed or non-transportation noise sources	SU	No
Impact NOI-5: Exposure to aircraft noise	SU	None	SU	5.10-4: Exposure to aircraft noise	SU	No
3.8 Population and Housing						
Impact PH-1: Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)	S		SU	Not Reviewed	N/A	N/A
Impact PH-2: Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere	NI		NI	5.1-4: Need for replacement housing	LTS	No
Impact PH-3: Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing	NI		NI	5.1-4: Need for replacement housing	LTS	No

Attachment 2: Impact Comparison Between the TGPA-ZOU Project FEIR and the 2004 General Plan EIR

Impact	Level of Significance ¹	Mitigation Measures ²	Level of Significance After Mitigation	2004 General Plan EIR Impact	2004 General Plan EIR Level of Significance After Mitigation	Different Impact From 2004? ³
elsewhere						
3.9 Transportation and Traffic						
Impact TRA-1: Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level-of-service standards and travel demand measures or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways	S	<p>Mitigation Measure TRA-1: Extend timeframe of General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element Policy TC-Xa.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measure TRA-2: Reduce the Proposed Number of Employees Allowed by Right at Home Occupations (by amending Table 130.40.160.2 and Section 130.40.160G in the ZOU).</u></p>	SU	5:4-1: Potential inconsistencies with LOS policies	SU	No ⁵
Impact TRA-2: Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit	LTS		LTS	Not Reviewed	N/A	N/A
Impact TRA-3: Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks	NI		NI	Not Reviewed	N/A	N/A

Attachment 2: Impact Comparison Between the TGPA-ZOU Project FEIR and the 2004 General Plan EIR

Impact	Level of Significance¹	Mitigation Measures²	Level of Significance After Mitigation	2004 General Plan EIR Impact	2004 General Plan EIR Level of Significance After Mitigation	Different Impact From 2004?³
Impact TRA-4: Substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)	NI		NI	Not Reviewed	N/A	N/A
Impact TRA-5: Result in inadequate emergency access	NI		NI	Not Reviewed	N/A	N/A
Impact TRA-6: Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities	LTS		LTS	5.4-4: Insufficient transit capacity	SU	No
3.10 Water Supply						
Impact WS-1: Create a need for new or expanded entitlements or resources for sufficient water supply	SU	None	SU	5.5-1: Increased water demand and likelihood of surface water shortages resulting from expected development	SU	No
<u>Impact WS-2: Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, resulting in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>SU</u>	<u>Not Reviewed</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>

Attachment 2: Impact Comparison Between the TGPA-ZOU Project FEIR and the 2004 General Plan EIR

Impact	Level of Significance¹	Mitigation Measures²	Level of Significance After Mitigation	2004 General Plan EIR Impact	2004 General Plan EIR Level of Significance After Mitigation	Different Impact From 2004?³

Attachment 2: Impact Comparison Between the TGPA-ZOU Project FEIR and the 2004 General Plan EIR

5.2 Cumulative Impacts						
Aesthetics	SU		SU		SU	No
Agricultural and Forestry Resources	LTS				SU	No
Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases	S		SU		Not Reviewed	Yes ⁶
Biological Resources	SU		SU		SU	No
Cultural Resources	SU		SU		LTS	Yes
Land Use and Planning	SU		SU		SU	No
Noise	SU		SU		SU	No
Population and Housing	LTS		LTS		See Note 7*	See Note 7*
Transportation and Traffic	S		SU		SU	No
Water Supply	SU	None	SU		SU	No

Note:

1. S = significant; SU = significant and unavoidable; LTS = less than significant; NI = no impact
2. The full texts of the mitigation measures are found in the respective impact sections under Chapters 3 and 4. Mitigation measures identified for impacts of the project would reduce the project's contribution to cumulative impacts, but not to a less than considerable level.
3. The differences relate to changes in the potential intensity of uses as a result of changes in policy or allowable development under either the TGPA, ZOU, or both. The analysis conservatively viewed how the changes might result in changes in existing conditions or general conflicts with existing land uses. The EIR's mitigation measures reduce the Project's impact by altering the proposed changes so that changes in existing conditions or conflicts with existing land uses would be reduced.
- 4 There would likely be increased and/or different impact(s) in this category. However, the 2004 General Plan EIR already listed impact(s) as significant and unavoidable.
5. The level of significance is shown with full implementation of proposed mitigation measures.
6. Greenhouse gas emissions were not examined in the 2004 EIR.
7. For this category, the 2004 cumulative impact analysis was unclear.