

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents.....	i
1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Background and Purpose of the EIR Addendum	1
1.2 Basis for Decision to Prepare an Addendum	2
2.0 Project Description	4
2.1 Modified Project Objectives.....	4
2.2 Modified Project Location	4
2.3 Modified Project Components.....	4
3.0 Environmental Analysis	14
4.0 Changes in Circumstances/New Information	16
References	42

TABLES

Table 1: Summary of Land Use Designation Modifications	7
Table 2: Comparison of Projected Growth – Approved Project v. Modified Project.....	8
Table 3: Comparison of Approved Project Impacts and Modified Project Impacts	17

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Comparison of Farmland Impacts	A-1
Appendix B – Comparison of Trip Generation.....	B-1

This page left intentionally blank

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Addendum was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines. This document has been prepared to serve as an Addendum to the previously certified EIR (State Clearinghouse Number 2005102104) for the 2009 City of Lakeport General Plan Update Project (Original Project). The City of Lakeport is the lead agency for the environmental review of the proposed Project modifications (Modified Project).

This Addendum addresses the proposed modifications in relation to the previous environmental review prepared for the General Plan Update Project. CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 defines an Addendum as:

The lead agency or responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.

.....A brief explanation of the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 should be included in an addendum to an EIR, the lead agency's findings on the project, or elsewhere in the record.

Information and technical analyses from the General Plan Update EIR are utilized throughout this Addendum. Relevant passages from the General Plan Update EIR are cited and the complete General Plan Update EIR, including both the General Plan Draft EIR (City of Lakeport, 2008) and the General Plan Final EIR (City of Lakeport, 2009), is available for review at:

City of Lakeport
Community Development Department
225 Park Street, Lakeport, CA 95453
<http://www.cityoflakeport.com/departments/docs.aspx?deptID=39&catID=128>

1.1 BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF THE EIR ADDENDUM

The City of Lakeport General Plan Update EIR was certified on April 21, 2009 by the Lakeport City Council. The General Plan Update included nine elements: Land Use, Urban Boundary, Transportation, Community Design, Economic Development, Conservation, Open Space and Parks, Noise, and Safety. Designated land uses were identified on the Land Use Map. The General Plan Update addressed future growth and development in the City and in the proposed modified Sphere of Influence (SOI). The General Plan Update is referred to as the "Original Project" in this EIR Addendum. The General Plan Update is described in detail in the General Plan Update Draft EIR.

Since certification of the EIR, the City has undertaken a planning effort to address the growth potential in the Sphere of Influence, which has resulted in the proposed 2014 General Plan Update and Rezoning Project (referred to as the "Modified Project" in this EIR Addendum). The Modified Project, which is described in greater detail under Section 2.0 below, would

reduce the size of the Sphere of Influence, modify General Plan policies and actions to address conservation, infrastructure, utilities, and growth, and would modify the General Plan Land Use Map and the Prezoning map in the southern portion of the Sphere of Influence.

In determining whether an Addendum is the appropriate document to analyze the proposed modifications to the project and its approval, CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 (Addendum to an EIR or Negative Declaration) states:

- a) The lead agency or a responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.*
- b) An addendum to an adopted negative declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred.*
- c) An addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the final EIR or adopted negative declaration.*
- d) The decision-making body shall consider the addendum with the final EIR or adopted negative declaration prior to making a decision on the project.*
- e) A brief explanation of the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 should be included in an addendum to an EIR, the lead agency's required findings on the project, or elsewhere in the record. The explanation must be supported by substantial evidence.*

1.2 BASIS FOR DECISION TO PREPARE AN ADDENDUM

When an environmental impact report has been certified for a project, Public Resources Code Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15164 set forth the criteria for determining whether a subsequent EIR, subsequent negative declaration, addendum, or no further documentation be prepared in support of further agency action on the project. Under these Guidelines, a subsequent EIR or negative declaration shall be prepared if any of the following criteria are met:

- (a) When an EIR has been certified or negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:*

- (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the*

involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;

(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;

(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;

(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or

(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

(b) If changes to a project or its circumstances occur or new information becomes available after adoption of a negative declaration, the lead agency shall prepare a subsequent EIR if required under subdivision (a). Otherwise the lead agency shall determine whether to prepare a subsequent negative declaration, and addendum, or no further documentation.

As demonstrated in the environmental analysis provided in Section 3.0 (Environmental Analysis) and Section 4.0 (Changes in Circumstances/New Information), the proposed changes do not meet the criteria for preparing a subsequent EIR or negative declaration. An addendum is appropriate here because, as explained in Sections 3.0 and 4.0, none of the conditions calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred.

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This section provides a detailed description of the proposed Modified Project. The reader is referred to Section 3.0 (Environmental Analysis) for the analysis of environmental effects of the proposed modifications in relation to the analysis contained in the previously certified General Plan Update EIR.

2.1. MODIFIED PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the Modified Project are to:

- Address the proposed Lakeport Sphere of Influence
- Provide guidance for future annexations,
- Ensure the conservation of natural resources, including riparian areas and agricultural lands under Williamson Act contract, and
- Ensure that future development adequately addresses impacts on transportation and utilities.

2.2 MODIFIED PROJECT LOCATION

The Modified Project includes text amendments to the General Plan that would be implemented City-wide (see Figure 1-1). The modifications to the General Plan Land Use Map and Prezoning would affect the southern area of the Modified Sphere of Influence associated with the Approved Project (Existing General Plan) as shown on Figure 1-2.

2.3. MODIFIED PROJECT COMPONENTS

The Modified Project includes the following components, which focus on changes to the General Plan and prezoning.

2014 FOCUSED GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

The Modified Project would make the following changes to the General Plan:

INTRODUCTION. The introduction will be revised to identify and briefly describe the 2014 focused General Plan update.

LAND USE ELEMENT. The Land Use Element will be amended to:

- Remove the description of the Specific Plan Area land use designation;
- Provide a description of the Urban Reserve land use designation to address land at the periphery of the SOI that has a low priority for annexation at the current time but may be necessary for the expansion of urban development in the long-term;
- Eliminate Policy LU 1.8 Specific Plan Area.

URBAN BOUNDARY ELEMENT. The Urban Boundary Element will be amended to:

- Refine the explanation of the purpose of the Element, including the City's approach to annexation of land, provision of City services and infrastructure, and sharing of tax revenues;
- Define the Lakeport urban growth boundary as the City's Sphere of Influence;
- Update the text and description of the estimated demand for land for the period from 2005 through 2025;
- Revise Policy UB 4.1 to clarify limitations for provision of City utilities and services for purposes of development in rural areas;
- Revise UB 4.2 to require findings that the full range of City utilities and services are available or in place prior to annexation of any land into the City; and
- Eliminate Program UB 4.2-c.

CONSERVATION ELEMENT. The Conservation Element will be amended to:

- Address the riparian area adjacent to Manning Creek and ensure that this resource is preserved by removing much of this area from the Sphere of Influence;
- Address removal of agricultural land under Williamson Act contract from the proposed Lakeport Sphere of Influence;
- Revise Policy C 1.1 to ensure protection of biological resources, including special habitat areas and environmentally sensitive wildlife and plant life;
- Add Program C 1.2-c to encourage the planting of native trees, shrubs, and grasslands for visual and biological resource conservation purposes;
- Add Program C 1.2-d to limit the encroachment of development into areas with a moderate to high potential for sensitive habitat and direct development to less sensitive areas;
- Add Program C 1.2-e to require buffer areas between development projects and significant watercourses, riparian vegetation, and wetlands;
- Add Program C 1.2-f to require a biological study prior to approval of a development project to determine the project site's potential to contain various important and sensitive biological resources;
- Add Program C 1.2-g to require appropriate mitigation consistent with adopted standards and protocols to be applied to future projects that would affect sensitive habitat or special status species;

- Revise Policy C 7.1 to remove all prime agricultural land under Williamson Act contract from the SOI;
- Add Program C 8.1-c to require development to be set back from riparian resources and habitats;
- Add Program C 8.1-d to require creek management plans to include measures to protect and maintain riparian resources and habitats; and
- Add Program C 8.1-e to support the management of wetland and riparian plant communities for passive recreation, groundwater recharge, and wildlife habitat purposes.

LAND USE MAP. As shown on Figure 1-2, the Land Use Map will be amended to:

- Revise the proposed Sphere of Influence boundary to remove some of the riparian area adjacent to Manning Creek and remove agricultural land under Williamson Act contract; and
- Remove the City of Lakeport Municipal Services District (CLSMD) land, which is currently designated Special Planning Area, from the proposed Sphere of Influence.
- Modify the designations of a few parcels to achieve consistency with the Lake County Lakeport Area Plan.

The changes to the General Plan and Land Use Map will modify land use designations on 774.0 acres. Lands currently designated Industrial, Open Space, Rural Residential, Specific Plan Area, and Urban Reserve will be modified to: 1) remove land use designations from 670.1 acres and to exclude these lands from the proposed Modified Sphere of Influence, and 2) designate 54.7 acres as Major Retail that were designated for Industrial, Resort Residential, and Open Space uses by the General Plan. Of the 719.1 acres that would be removed from the Land Use Map and Proposed Modified SOI, approximately 631.9 acres were designated Industrial, Specific Plan Area, and Urban Reserve and 87.3 acres were designated as Open Space by the General Plan. The lands that will be removed from the proposed Modified Sphere of Influence are primarily undeveloped agricultural lands located west of Main Street, and undeveloped and rural residential lands located south of the City. The lands that would be redesignated Major Retail are located west of Main Street, south of the City limits, and include lands with rural residential, commercial, and light industrial uses as well as undeveloped lands.

TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF LAND USE DESIGNATION MODIFICATIONS

	Lands Changed to Major Retail Designation (Acres)	Designations Removed from Land Use Map and Proposed Modified SOI (Acres)	Total Acreage Affected
Industrial	27.0	11.3	38.3
Open Space	8.6	87.3	95.9
Resort Residential	19.2	-	19.2
Specific Plan Area	-	600.0	600.0
Urban Reserve	-	20.6	20.6
Grand Total	54.7	719.1	774.0

Table 2 compares projected growth under the Approved Project (Existing General Plan) to the Modified Project (2014 General Plan Update and Prezoning). This table focuses on acreage identified for a change in land use designation that was included in the Modified SOI in the General Plan EIR (General Plan Draft EIR Table 3.12-9, p. 3-131). It is noted that some of the lands designated for Major Retail are currently developed with a range of residential, light industrial, and commercial uses.

Based on the planning analysis used in the General Plan Update EIR, which took into account the densities and land use intensities allowed under the City’s current General Plan, it is projected that the Modified Project would result in a reduction in residential growth by 1,213 to 2,413 residential units (at an average unit size of 1,800 s.f. this would represent a reduction of 2,183,400 to 4,343,000 square feet). The Modified Project is projected to reduce non-residential growth by 130 hotel rooms, 193 RV spaces, and a golf course (18 holes and restaurant). The Modified Project is projected to result in a potential net increase in non-residential development of 143,574 square feet (189,074 additional s.f. of Major Retail uses, 45,500 less s.f. of Industrial uses).

TABLE 2: COMPARISON OF PROJECTED GROWTH – APPROVED PROJECT V. MODIFIED PROJECT

	Existing General Plan		Modified Project		Difference in New Growth
	Acres	Projected New Growth	Acres	Projected New Growth	
Urban Reserves	155.38 acres	100 units	134.82 acres	87 units	-13 units
Low Density Residential	350.8 acres	1,063 units	350.8 acres	1,630 units	0
Medium Density Residential	7.05 acres	49 units	7.05 acres	49 units	0
High Density Residential	19.84 acres	298 units (multifamily)	19.84 acres	298 units (multifamily)	0
Specific Plan Area	600 acres	1,200 to 2,400 units*	0 acres	0 units	- 1,200 to -2,400 units
Resort Residential	41.61 acres	473 new hotel rooms / 700 RV spaces	30.15 acres	343 new hotel rooms/507 RV spaces	- 130 hotel rooms / - 193 RV spaces
Central Business District	0.14 acres	3,700 sf	0.14 acres	3,700 sf	0
Civic / Public	170.8 acres	25,650 sf of building and 168 acres parks	170.8 acres	25,650 sf of building and 168 acres parks	0
Industrial	4.15 acres	45,500 sf	0 acres	0	-45,500 s.f.
Office	7.44 acres	194,200 sf	7.44 acres	194,200 s.f.	0
Light Retail	0.54 acres	5,900 sf	0.54 acres	5,900	0
Major Retail	73 acres	803,400 sf	90.18 acres	992,474 s.f.	17.18 acres or 189,074 s.f.
Golf Course	150 acres**	18 holes and restaurant	0 acres	0	- 18 holes, - restaurant
TOTAL	1,430.75 acres		814.54 acres		-1,213 to -2,413 residential units, -130 hotel rooms, -193 RV spaces, - 1 golf course (18 holes/restaurant), + 143,574 s.f. non-residential uses

*The General Plan EIR anticipated between 1,200 and 2,400 units for the Specific Plan Area; 1,200 units was the basis for most impacts discussed in the General Plan EIR, including traffic. For maximum growth at buildout and potential population/housing impacts, 2,400 potential units were analyzed for the Specific Plan Area.

**Included in 600 acres of Special Planning Area

PREZONING

The rezoning modifications for the South Main Street and Soda Bay Road area will be consistent with the proposed modifications to the General Plan Land Use Map. The proposed rezoning revisions will result in modifying 38.3 acres currently rezoned Industrial and will result in a net reduction of 11.4 acres land rezoned for future urban industrial uses, as shown on Figure 1-3. The modifications will remove rezoning designations from 11.4 acres and will change the rezoning of 27.0 acres to C2: Major Retail. The intent of the proposed rezoning is to ensure adequate protection of natural resources, revise the rezoning for the riparian area adjacent Manning Creek and for Williamson Act lands, reflect current land uses, where appropriate, and provide consistency with the proposed General Plan land use designations. The proposed rezoning designations are consistent with the growth projected for the Modified Project as shown in Table 2.

This page left intentionally blank

Insert Figure 1- Project Location

Insert Figure 2- Land Use Map Changes

Insert Figure 3- Prezoning Changes

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

This section of the Addendum provides analysis and cites substantial evidence that supports the City’s determination that the proposed modifications to the General Plan and Prezoning proposed by the 2014 Focused General Plan Update and Prezoning Project do not meet the criteria for preparing a subsequent or supplemental EIR under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162.

As addressed in the analysis below, the proposed modifications associated with the Modified Project are not substantial changes to the adopted project. The proposed modifications would not cause a new significant impact or substantially increase the severity of a previously identified significant impact from the Final EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15162[a][1]) that would require major revisions to the EIR. All impacts would be nearly equivalent to or reduced from the impacts previously analyzed in the Final EIR. Accordingly, the proposed modifications associated with the 2014 Focused General Plan Update and Prezoning Project are not inconsistent with the General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, or adopted Mitigation Measures for this project.

The proposed changes do not cause a new significant impact or substantially increase the severity of a previously identified significant impact, and there have been no other changes in the circumstances that meet this criterion (CEQA Guidelines Section 15162[a][2]). There have been no significant changes in the environmental conditions not contemplated and analyzed in the EIR that would result in new or substantially more severe environmental impacts.

There is no new information of substantial importance (which was not known or could not have been known at the time of the application (see Section 4.0), that identifies: a new significant impact (condition “A” under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162[a][3]); a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact (condition “B” CEQA Guidelines Section 15162[a][3]); mitigation measures or alternatives previously found infeasible that would now be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects; or mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the EIR which would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment (conditions “C” and “D” CEQA Guidelines Section 15162[a][3]). The reader is referred to City Resolution No. 2436 regarding findings on the feasibility of mitigation measures and alternatives evaluated in the EIR. None of the “new information” conditions listed in the CEQA Guidelines Section 15162[a][3] are present here to trigger the need for a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 states that “The lead agency or a responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.” An addendum is appropriate here because, as explained above, none of the conditions calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.

The following includes a detailed discussion of applicable impacts identified under the EIR in relation to the Modified Project . All impacts identified under the EIR for the Approved Project have been determined to be less than significant, less than significant with mitigation, or significant and unavoidable. As described in Table 3, the Modified Project would not result in the increase in significance of environmental impacts or in new environmental impacts.

Table 3 identifies the environmental topics addressed in the EIR, provides a summary of impacts associated with the Approved Project, as described in the EIR, and includes an analysis of the potential impacts associated with the Modified Project when compared to the Approved Project.

4.0 CHANGES IN CIRCUMSTANCES/NEW INFORMATION

In addition to the effects of the Project changes discussed in Section 3.0 and Table 3 of this Addendum, Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines states that a subsequent EIR would be required if substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which would require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

To address the potential for other changed circumstances that may result in new or substantially more severe cumulative impacts, a review was completed of plans, policies, and regulations that would apply to the Modified Project. No new plans, policies, or regulations that would result in new significant environmental impacts or an increase in the severity of environmental impacts were identified. There have been no significant changes in circumstances that would involve new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

Since the certification of the General Plan EIR and adoption of the Approved Project, there has been a downward trend in the amount of growth that is anticipated to occur in the region. From 2007-2014, the City was allocated 430 new residential units through the Lake County Regional Housing Needs Plan prepared by the Area Planning Commission. However, due to the decline in the housing market, only 79 new residential units were developed during this 2007-2014 period. The City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation for 2014-2019 is 147 units. The downward growth trend in the City and region suggests that the build-out scenario envisioned for the Approved Project will likely occur at a much slower pace and impacts associated with future growth will occur at a slower and reduced rate.

Overall, the changes in circumstances that have occurred since preparation of the General Plan EIR would not result in new significant impacts or substantial increases in the severity of previously identified significant impacts in association with the Modified Project. No other additional information of substantial importance, which would require major revisions to earlier analyses that would warrant preparation of a subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines, has been identified or received. Therefore, pursuant to Section 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines, an Addendum to the General Plan EIR provides the appropriate level of environmental review for the Modified Project.

TABLE 3: COMPARISON OF APPROVED PROJECT IMPACTS AND MODIFIED PROJECT IMPACTS

Environmental Issues	Adopted General Plan (Approved Project)	2014 Focused General Plan Update and Prezoning Project (Modified Project)
<p><u>Aesthetics</u> <i>a through d) Would the project result in substantial adverse effects regarding a scenic vista, scenic resources, visual character, and light or glare?</i></p>	<p>The General Plan EIR identified that future development associated with the Approved Project, particularly development associated with changes in land use designations and expansion of the SOI, has the potential to substantially degrade visual character. The policies included in the General Plan would protect scenic views and visual character but would not reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation measure 3.1-1 identified Policy C-1.4 (Hillside Protection) to be included in the General Plan to ensure view of the hillsides are maintained in order to reduce potential aesthetic impacts to less than significant (Impact 3.1-1, General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-6 and 3-7).</p> <p>The General Plan EIR identified that the Approved Project includes adequate policies that would ensure there would be a less than significant impact associated with the potential to have an adverse effect on a scenic vista, substantially damage scenic resources, and create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect views in the area (General Plan Draft EIR p. 3-6).</p>	<p>The EIR found that the Approved Project would result in less than significant impacts to visual character with implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.1-1 and would have a less than significant impact associated with scenic vistas, scenic resources, and the introduction of light and glare.</p> <p>The Modified Project would be subject to the policies and actions of the General Plan identified to reduce potential impacts associated with visual character, scenic resources and vistas, and light and glare as discussed under Impact 3.1-1 in the General Plan EIR (General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-6 through 3-7) and would also be subject to Mitigation Measure 3.3-1, which protects hillside views. The Modified Project would revise the General Plan Conservation Element to include additional measures related to the protection of biologic and riparian resources, including measures to encourage planting of native plants and trees for visual conservation and to include buffers between development and watercourses, riparian vegetation, and wetlands. In addition to protection biological resources, the buffers would provide a visual buffer from areas with visual character, such as wetlands and waterways. Further, the Modified Project revises the Land Use Element and Land Use Map to reduce the potential extent of the City and SOI by removing land use designations placed on undeveloped open space, agricultural, and riparian lands and reducing the size of the Proposed Modified SOI. The reduction in the size of the proposed SOI of 719.1 acres would reduce the future urban</p>

TABLE 3: COMPARISON OF APPROVED PROJECT IMPACTS AND MODIFIED PROJECT IMPACTS

Environmental Issues	Adopted General Plan (Approved Project)	2014 Focused General Plan Update and Prezoning Project (Modified Project)
		<p>development area by approximately 631.9 acres, reducing potential impacts on visual resources, scenic vistas and resources, and light and glare that would have been associated with the future development. This reduction in the Modified SOI would also result in a more compact development pattern, focusing on in-fill development and locating new development adjacent existing uses rather than in outlying areas. The Modified Project provides for additional protection of visual resources through changes to the policy language of the Conservation Element, as described in 2.0 (Project Description) and reduces the extent of land that could be urbanized and result in aesthetic impacts. Therefore, the Modified Project would reduce the potential to degrade existing visual character, impact scenic resources and vistas, and cause light and glare impacts. There would be no new significant impacts or increase in the significance of impacts associated with aesthetic resources.</p>
<p><u>Agricultural and Forest Resources</u> <i>a through e) Would the project convert Farmland (Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance) to non-agricultural use, conflict with existing agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contracts, involve other changes that could convert Farmland, or</i></p>	<p>The General Plan EIR identified that future development associated with the Approved Project would convert agricultural resources, including Farmland to non-agricultural and developed uses. While policies in the General Plan would minimize impacts associated with the conversion of agricultural land, the impact would remain potentially significant. Mitigation measure 3.2-1a encourages maintenance and preservation of agricultural lands as well as infill and sequential development in order to preserve agricultural lands. Mitigation measure 3.2-1b requires development that would impact prime</p>	<p>The EIR found that the Approved Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural uses. Implementation of the policies and actions included in the General Plan and the mitigation measures identified in the EIR would not reduce this impact to a less than significant level, given that the loss of agricultural land is a permanent condition. However the potential for conversion of agricultural lands to non-agricultural uses and conflicting with agricultural zoning was determined to be less than significant and no mitigation was required. There was no impact associated with the potential to conflict with Williamson Act contracts.</p>

TABLE 3: COMPARISON OF APPROVED PROJECT IMPACTS AND MODIFIED PROJECT IMPACTS

Environmental Issues	Adopted General Plan (Approved Project)	2014 Focused General Plan Update and Prezoning Project (Modified Project)
<p><i>involve changes that could convert forest and timber resources to non-residential uses?</i></p>	<p>farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance to permanently preserve comparable or better agricultural lands at a minimum ratio of 1:1. The General Plan EIR concluded that even with implementation of MM 3.2-1a and 3.2-1b the impact of conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses is significant and unavoidable (Impact 3.2-1, General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-12 and 3-13).</p> <p>The General Plan EIR identified that the Approved Project would result in development of lands zoned for agricultural use and that the potential impact associated with conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use would be less than significant and no mitigation was required (Impact 3.2-2, General Plan Draft EIR p. 3-13 and 3-14).</p> <p>The General Plan EIR identified that the Approved Project would have no impact related to potential conflicts with an existing Williamson Act contract (General Plan Draft EIR p. 3-12).</p>	<p>The Modified Project would not designate any additional Farmland (Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance) for development. There would be no change in acreage of potential impacts to Farmland conversion for the Modified Project in comparison to the Approved Project (see Appendix A, Table A-1). As shown in Table A-1 in Appendix A and Figure 3-1, the Modified Project would remove 551.5 acres of Farmland of Local Importance and Grazing Land from the Proposed Modified SOI, resulting in fewer impacts to agricultural lands. Impacts associated with conversion of Farmland would remain significant and unavoidable and the Modified Project would not result in any change in the significance.</p> <p>The Approved Project would result in conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use due to the County’s zoning of 65 acres within the Specific Plan Area as Agricultural Preserve District. The Modified Project would remove this land from the Proposed Modified SOI and would remove General Plan land use designations from the land, anticipating that the land would remain under County control and zoning. This change to the Modified Project would remove the potential conflict with agricultural zoning. There would be no impact associated with conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use.</p> <p>The Modified Project would remove lands under Williamson Act contracts from the Modified SOI. There would not be any development of land under Williamson Act contracts under the Modified Project.</p>

TABLE 3: COMPARISON OF APPROVED PROJECT IMPACTS AND MODIFIED PROJECT IMPACTS

Environmental Issues	Adopted General Plan (Approved Project)	2014 Focused General Plan Update and Prezoning Project (Modified Project)
		Future development would be required to comply with General Plan policies and programs related to potential agricultural conflicts which would continue to ensure that there would be no impact associated with conflicts with an existing Williamson Act Contract.
<p><u>Air Quality</u> <i>a through e) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, violate or contribute to violation of an air quality standard, result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a non-attainment criteria pollutant, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, or create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</i></p>	<p>The Approved Project was determined to have a less than significant impact associated with construction emissions of reactive organic gases, nitrous oxides, and particulate matter. General Plan Programs C 3.1a and 3.1-b require development proposals to be reviewed to identify potential impacts. The General Plan EIR concluded that the policies and programs in the General Plan would mitigate construction emissions to a less than significant level and no mitigation was required (Impact 3.3-1, General Plan Draft EIR p. 3-33).</p> <p>The Approved Project was determined to have a less than significant impact associated with operational emissions of reactive organic gases, nitrous oxides, and particulate matter. General Plan Programs C 3.1a and 3.1-b require development proposals to be reviewed to identify potential impacts. The General Plan EIR concluded that the policies and programs in the General Plan would mitigate operational emissions to a less than significant level and no mitigation was required (Impact 3.3-2, General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-33 and 3-34).</p>	<p>The Approved Project was determined to have less than significant air quality impacts associated with construction-related emissions, operational emissions, toxic air emissions, and odorous emissions. No mitigation was required for these impacts.</p> <p>Impacts associated with construction-related and operational emissions discussed under Impact 3.3-1 and 3.3-2 of the General Plan EIR were primarily associated with the Specific Plan Area, which is removed by the Modified Project. The Modified Project would reduce the extent of future development within the City and Proposed Modified SOI by removing lands from the Proposed Modified SOI and removing land use designations that would allow for future urbanization (see Figures 1-2 and 1-3). The Modified Project would designate 54.7 acres of land for use as Major Retail, which includes both developed and undeveloped lands. As shown in Table B-1 (see Appendix B), the Modified Project would result in approximately 58,080 average daily vehicle trips (ADT) at buildout, a reduction of 7,029 ADT compared to the Approved Project, based on the ITE Trip Generation Handbook rates used for the General Plan EIR. Future development under the Modified Project would be subject to the regulations and General Plan policies and programs identified under Impacts 3.3-1, 3.3-2, 3.3-3, 3.3-5, and 3.3-6 (General Plan Draft EIR</p>

TABLE 3: COMPARISON OF APPROVED PROJECT IMPACTS AND MODIFIED PROJECT IMPACTS

Environmental Issues	Adopted General Plan (Approved Project)	2014 Focused General Plan Update and Prezoning Project (Modified Project)
	<p>The Approved Project was determined to have a less than significant impact associated with toxic air emissions. General Plan Program C 3.1-c and Policy C 3.2 and associated programs would address potential air pollutant sources and exposure of sensitive receptors. The General Plan EIR concluded that the policies and programs in the General Plan would mitigate toxic air emissions to a less than significant level and no mitigation was required (Impact 3.3-3, General Plan Draft EIR p. 3-34).</p> <p>The Approved Project was determined to have a less than significant impact associated with odorous emissions with implementation of applicable General Plan policies and programs and no mitigation was required (Impact 3.3-5, General Plan Draft EIR p. 3-37).</p> <p>The Approved Project was determined to have a potentially significant impact associated with disturbance of naturally occurring asbestos during construction activities. General Plan Programs C 3.1-a and C 3.1-b would ensure that development proposals are reviewed for potential air quality impacts prior to approval. However, the General Plan policies and programs were not adequate to reduce the impact to a level of less than significant so Mitigation Measure 3.3-6 required the General Plan to include Policy C 3.3 and Program C 3.3-a to require dust and emission control measures</p>	<p>pp. 3-33 through 3-34 and p. 3-37). The Modified Project would result in a net reduction in potential construction, operational, toxic air contaminants, and odorous emissions by reducing future development potential by 631.9 acres that had been designated for Industrial, Rural Residential, Specific Plan Area, and Urban Reserve uses by the General Plan, and by reducing vehicle trip generation at buildout by 7,029 ADT daily. The Modified Project would not result in any new or increased impacts associated with construction, operational, toxic air contaminants, and odorous emissions.</p> <p>The Approved Project was determined to have potentially significant impacts associated with disturbance of naturally occurring asbestos during construction activities. Mitigation measure 3.3-6 was identified to reduce potential impacts to less than significant. The Modified Project would revise land use designations to accommodate 54.7 acres of Major Retail development. Future development on these Major Retail lands would be required to comply with the asbestos controls created by Mitigation Measure 3.3-6, which would ensure potential hazards associated with asbestos exposure would be reduced to less than significant, as described under Impact 3.3-6 (General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-37 and 3-38). Further, the Modified Project would decrease the extent of future urbanization, including potential disturbance of naturally-occurring asbestos, by approximately 631.9 acres by removing Industrial, Specific Plan Area, and Urban Reserve land use designations from these lands and removing the lands from the Proposed Modified SOI (see Figure 1-2).</p>

TABLE 3: COMPARISON OF APPROVED PROJECT IMPACTS AND MODIFIED PROJECT IMPACTS

Environmental Issues	Adopted General Plan (Approved Project)	2014 Focused General Plan Update and Prezoning Project (Modified Project)
	<p>during construction in order to reduce impacts to a less than significant level (Impact 3.3-6, General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-37 and 3-38).</p> <p>The General Plan EIR identified that the Approved Project would have no impact related to conflicts with or obstruction of implementation of the applicable air quality plan (General Plan Draft EIR p. 3-32).</p>	<p>Therefore, the Modified Project would not result in any new or increased impacts associated with exposure to naturally occurring asbestos.</p>
<p><u>Biological Resources</u> <i>a through f) Would the project cause a substantial adverse effect on special-status species, sensitive habitat, federally protected wetlands, wildlife movement corridors, local policies and ordinances adopted to protect biological resources, and adopted habitat or conservation plan?</i></p>	<p>The General Plan EIR identified that the Approved Project included policies and programs, including Policies C 1.1, C 1.2, and C 8.1 and associated programs, to minimize potential impacts to biological resources and would have a less than significant impact associated with substantial adverse impacts on candidate, special-status, or sensitive species. No mitigation was required (Impact 3.4-1, General Plan Draft EIR p. 3-52).</p> <p>The Approved Project would result in a less than significant impact associated with riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities with implementation of General Plan policies, including Policies C 1.2 and 1.3 that establish standards to protect riparian areas from development. No mitigation was required (Impact 3.4-2, General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-52 and 3-53).</p>	<p>The EIR found that the approved project would result in less than significant impacts on biological resources. No mitigation measures were required.</p> <p>The Modified Project would designate 54.7 acres for Major Retail use that are currently designated for Industrial, Rural Residential, and Open Space uses and would remove 719.1 acres from the Proposed Modified SOI, including 631.9 acres that had been designated for Industrial, Rural Residential, Specific Plan Area, and Urban Reserve uses by the General Plan. Overall, the Modified Project would result in a decreased area of impact to biological resources.</p> <p>Further, the Conservation Element includes modifications to policies and programs that provide for increased protection of biological resources, including special-status species and sensitive habitats. Specifically, Policy C 1.1 would be revised to ensure protection of biological resources including special habitat areas and environmentally sensitive wildlife and plant life. Program C 1.2-d would be added to the General Plan to limit the extent of development in areas</p>

TABLE 3: COMPARISON OF APPROVED PROJECT IMPACTS AND MODIFIED PROJECT IMPACTS

Environmental Issues	Adopted General Plan (Approved Project)	2014 Focused General Plan Update and Prezoning Project (Modified Project)
	<p>The Approved Project would have a less than significant impact related to the movement of native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, wildlife corridors, and native wildlife nursery sites. General Plan Policy OS 2.2 would ensure adequate open space to permit effective wildlife corridors. No mitigation was required (Impact 3.4-3, General Plan Draft EIR p. 3-53).</p> <p>The Approved Project would have a less than significant impact related to conflicts with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Policies and programs provided in the General Plan would ensure consistency with applicable policies. Therefore, no mitigation was required (Impact 3.4-4, General Plan Draft EIR p. 3-53).</p> <p>The General Plan EIR identified that the Approved Project would have a less than significant or no impact related to substantial adverse effects on federally protected wetlands and conflicts with an adopted habitat or natural community conservation plan. No mitigation was required. (General Plan Draft EIR p. 3-52).</p>	<p>with a moderate to high potential for sensitive habitat. Program C 1.2-e would be added to require buffer areas between development projects and significant watercourses, riparian vegetation, and wetlands. Programs C 1.2-f and C 1.2-g would reduce impacts to biological resources by requiring a biological study prior to approval of a development project and implementation of appropriate mitigation, consistent with adopted standards and protocols, to address any identified impacts to sensitive habitats or special-status species. Programs C 8.1-c through C 8.1-e would ensure protection of creeks, wetlands, and other riparian areas by requiring setbacks from riparian areas and requiring creek management plans to include measures for the protection and maintenance of riparian areas.</p> <p>The Modified Project would result in a reduction of open space, agricultural, riparian, and wetland areas that would be disturbed by development allowed under the General Plan. The policies and programs identified in the General Plan EIR under Impacts 3.4-1 through 3.4-4 to address biological impacts (General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-52 and 3-53) would continue to apply to future projects, including development of the land proposed for Major Retail, and would be augmented by the additional policies and programs identified previously. Future development would be required to comply with all applicable adopted policies, programs, and regulations associated with biological resources. The Modified Project would result in a reduction of potential biological impacts, including effects on special-status species, sensitive habitat, wetlands, and wildlife movement</p>

TABLE 3: COMPARISON OF APPROVED PROJECT IMPACTS AND MODIFIED PROJECT IMPACTS

Environmental Issues	Adopted General Plan (Approved Project)	2014 Focused General Plan Update and Prezoning Project (Modified Project)
		corridors, when compared to the Approved Project. There would be no new significant impacts and no increase in the significance of any impacts to biological resources.
<p><u>Cultural Resources</u> <i>a through d) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical, archaeological, paleontological, or geologic resource or disturb human remains?</i></p>	<p>The General Plan EIR identified that future development associated with the Approved Project could disturb or destroy cultural resources. While applicable General Plan policies and programs would reduce the potential impact, the impact would remain potentially significant. Mitigation measure 3.5-1 identified Program PR 1.10-b, which requires alterations of historically significant structures to be compliant with General Plan policies, and Program 1.10-c, which identifies measures to be taken to protect archaeological resources and human remains encountered during development activities, to reduce the potential impact to less than significant (Impact 3.5-1, General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-60 and 3-61).</p>	<p>The EIR found that the Approved Project would result in less-than significant Cultural Resources impacts when mitigation measures are implemented.</p> <p>The proposed Modified Project would substantially reduce the land area that would be disturbed by future development under the General Plan, as previously described, which would reduce the potential to disturb cultural resources. The requirements of Mitigation Measure 3.5-1 as well as the policies and programs identified under Impact 3.5-1 of the General Plan (General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-60 and 3.61) would be applied to future development, including the proposed Major Retail lands, allowed under the Modified Project and would continue to ensure that potential impacts are less than significant. The Modified Project also includes a new measure to require setbacks between development and riparian areas, which would further reduce potential impacts to cultural resources by avoiding development on or adjacent to streambanks, which can be sensitive for archaeological resources. The Modified Project would not result in new impacts to cultural resources, including historical, archaeological, paleontologic, and geologic resources, or human remains and there would be no increase in the significance of impacts to cultural resources identified in the General Plan EIR.</p>

TABLE 3: COMPARISON OF APPROVED PROJECT IMPACTS AND MODIFIED PROJECT IMPACTS

Environmental Issues	Adopted General Plan (Approved Project)	2014 Focused General Plan Update and Prezoning Project (Modified Project)
<p><u>Geology and Soils</u> <i>a through e) Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects associated with seismicity, geologic or soil instability, expansive soil, result in substantial soil erosion or loss, or have soils incapable of supporting septic or alternative wastewater disposal systems?</i></p>	<p>The Approved Project would have a less than significant impact associated with substantial adverse effects from fault rupture and seismic-related ground failure with implementation of General Plan policies and programs that address seismic hazards (Impact 3.6-1, General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-72 and 3-73).</p> <p>The Approved Project would have a less than significant impact associated with substantial soil erosion or soil instability. Applicable General Plan policies and local regulations would address potential impacts. No mitigation was required (Impact 3.6-2, General Plan Draft EIR p. 3-73).</p> <p>The Approved Project would have a less than significant impact associated with potential structural damage due to expansive soils. The General Plan includes policies that address expansive soils. No mitigation was required (Impact 3.6-3, General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-73 and 3-74).</p>	<p>The EIR found that the approved project would result in less than significant impacts associated with geology and soils. No mitigation measures were required.</p> <p>The Modified Project would substantially reduce the land area that would be disturbed by future development, as previously described. As a result, there would be a reduction in development that could be exposed to potential adverse geologic and soils impacts. Future developed allowed under the Modified Project would be required to comply with the General Plan policies and programs discussed under Impacts 3.6-1 through 3.6-3 in the General Plan EIR that were adopted to reduce potential impacts associated with geologic and soils hazards (General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-73 and 3-74). Therefore, the Modified Project would not result in any new significant impacts or increase the significance of impacts associated with seismicity, geologic instability, soil instability, including erosion or loss, expansive soil, or septic or alternative wastewater disposal systems.</p>
<p><u>Greenhouse Gases</u> <i>a and b) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment or conflict with a plan, policy or</i></p>	<p>The General Plan EIR identified that the Approved Project would result in an increase in vehicle miles traveled that would contribute to greenhouse gas emissions. The General Plan EIR identified mitigating factors associated with the project, including smart growth factors, traffic factors, electricity factors, and other steps taken that would reduce potential greenhouse gas emissions. Mitigation measure 3.3-4 was</p>	<p>The EIR found that the Approved Project would result in less than significant impacts related to greenhouse gases with implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.3-4.</p> <p>The Modified Project would result in a reduction in potential development by removing 719.1 acres from the Proposed Modified SOI, including 631.9 acres that were designated for urbanization (Industrial, Specific Plan Area, and Urban Reserve) from the General Plan Land</p>

TABLE 3: COMPARISON OF APPROVED PROJECT IMPACTS AND MODIFIED PROJECT IMPACTS

Environmental Issues	Adopted General Plan (Approved Project)	2014 Focused General Plan Update and Prezoning Project (Modified Project)
<i>regulation reducing greenhouse gas emission?</i>	identified to reduce the potential impact to less than significant through adding specific objectives, policies, and programs to the General Plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through energy audits, tree planting, energy saving measures beyond Title 24 requirements, and vehicle trip reduction measures, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (Impact 3.3-4, General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-34 through 3-37).	Use Map and the Proposed Modified Sphere of Influence. This would result in a significant reduction of 7,029 ADT (see Appendix B, Table B-1) that would result in an associated reduction in overall vehicle miles travelled (VMT) when compared to the Approved Project. This reduction in VMT would reduce emissions of greenhouse gases associated with the Modified Project. Future development accommodated by the Modified Project would be required to comply the policies and programs associated with Mitigation Measure 3.3-4. As the Modified Project would result in a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, the Modified Project would not result in an increase in GHG emissions that would have a significant impact on the environment or conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, there would be no new or increased impacts associated with greenhouse gases.
<u>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</u> <i>a through h) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through potential exposure to hazardous materials, wildland fires, or incidents associated with airplane facilities and uses, or conflict with implementation of plan</i>	The General Plan EIR identified that future development associated with the Approved Project would be guided by the policies and programs contained in the General Plan, including requirements related to hazardous materials, airport safety, and fire risk. No significant or potentially significant impacts were identified and no mitigation was required (General Plan Draft EIR p. 5-2).	The EIR found that the approved project would result in less than significant impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials. No mitigation measures were required. As previously described, the Modified Project would reduce the Proposed Modified SOI by 719.1 acres, including 631.9 acres that were designated for urbanization under the Approved Project. There would be a reduction in potential development that could result in hazardous conditions, as well as a reduction in the potential to expose development to existing or future hazards. Future development, including the 54.7 acres designated for Major Retail use, would be required to

TABLE 3: COMPARISON OF APPROVED PROJECT IMPACTS AND MODIFIED PROJECT IMPACTS

Environmental Issues	Adopted General Plan (Approved Project)	2014 Focused General Plan Update and Prezoning Project (Modified Project)
<i>adopted to address emergencies?</i>		comply with the policies and programs in the General Plan that address potential impacts associated with hazardous materials. Therefore, the Modified Project would not result in changes to development patterns or potential development that would create significant hazards associated with hazardous materials, wildland fires, airplane-related impacts, or conflicts with emergency response plans. The Modified Project would not result in any new potential impacts associated with hazardous materials and would not increase the significance of any impacts associated with hazardous materials.
<u>Hydrology and Water Quality</u> <i>a through j) Would the project result in adverse environmental effects associated with water quality, waste discharge, drainage patterns, groundwater supplies, runoff, flood hazards, or other hydrological hazards?</i>	<p>The Approved Project would have a less than significant impact associated with depletion of groundwater or interference with recharge. Future development would be guided by General Plan policies and programs and no mitigation was required (Impact 3.7-1, General Plan Draft EIR p. 3-83).</p> <p>The Approved Project would have a less than significant impact associated with alteration of drainage patterns that could result in flooding. Future development would be required to comply with General Plan policies which address flooding and stormwater management. No mitigation was required (Impact 3.7-2, General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-83 and 3-84).</p> <p>The Approved Project would have a less than significant impact associated with the demand for storm drainage facilities. Future</p>	<p>The EIR found that the approved project would result in less than significant impacts associated with hydrology and water quality. No mitigation measures were required.</p> <p>As previously described, the Modified Project would designate 54.7 acres Major Retail and would reduce the Modified SOI by 719.1 acres, reducing potential urbanization by 631.9 acres. The Modified Project includes policies and programs that would provide additional protection to hydrological features and water quality. Program C 1.2-e and C 8.1-c would require buffer areas and setbacks between development projects and significant watercourses, riparian vegetation, and wetlands, reducing impacts to water quality, runoff, and drainage patterns. Program C 8.1-e would support the management of wetland and riparian plan communities for a variety of uses, including groundwater recharge,</p>

TABLE 3: COMPARISON OF APPROVED PROJECT IMPACTS AND MODIFIED PROJECT IMPACTS

Environmental Issues	Adopted General Plan (Approved Project)	2014 Focused General Plan Update and Prezoning Project (Modified Project)
	<p>development would be required to comply with General Plan policies that address stormwater management. No mitigation was required (Impact 3.7-3, General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-83 and 3-84).</p> <p>The Approved Project would not have a significant impact associated with the placement of people and/or structures in 100-year flood zones or possible flood hazard areas. The General Plan includes policies to address flooding and development will be subject to the Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance. No mitigation was required (Impact 3.7-4, General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-84 and 3-85).</p> <p>The Approved Project would have a less than significant impact associated with inundation or risk of seiche and no mitigation was required (Impact 3.7-5, General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-85).</p> <p>The General Plan EIR identified that impacts associated with violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements and the potential to result in erosion or siltation due to alteration of existing drainage patterns was less than significant (General Plan Draft EIR p. 3-83).</p>	<p>which would decrease potential impacts to groundwater supplies.</p> <p>While the Modified Project would designate 54.7 acres currently designated Industrial, Resort Residential, and Open Space for development as Major Retail, development of Major Retail lands would be required to comply with the proposed buffer and setback requirements of Programs C 1.2-e and C 8.1-c as well as the hydrology and water quality related policies discussed under Impacts 3.7-1 through 3.7-5 in the General Plan EIR; conformance with these policies and programs would reduce potential impacts associated with future development to less than significant as described in the General Plan EIR (General Plan EIR pp. 3-83 through 3-85).</p> <p>The changes associated with the Modified Project would significantly decrease the amount of land that could be disturbed and developed, resulting in a decrease in future impervious surfaces, a decrease in potential storm water runoff during both construction and operation of development projects, a decrease in potential changes to drainage patterns, and a decrease in pollutants generated by construction and operation of future development that could enter the surface water or groundwater supply. The decrease in potential development would result in a reduction in demand for both surface water and groundwater supplies compared to the Approved Project.</p> <p>The Modified Project would result in a reduced amount of land designated for development located within the</p>

TABLE 3: COMPARISON OF APPROVED PROJECT IMPACTS AND MODIFIED PROJECT IMPACTS

Environmental Issues	Adopted General Plan (Approved Project)	2014 Focused General Plan Update and Prezoning Project (Modified Project)
		<p>100-year floodplain as well as areas identified as having possible flood hazards. Programs and policies identified in the General Plan to address potential flood risks would continue to be applied to future development under the Modified Project to ensure that potential flooding impacts are reduced to less than significant as discussed under Impact 3.7-4 (General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-84 and 3-85). The Modified Project would not result in any new impacts or the increase in severity of impacts associated with flood hazards.</p> <p>The Modified Project would result in no change to lands that could be affected by a seiche associated with Clear Lake. There would be no new impacts nor would there be an increase in the severity of impacts in comparison to the Modified Project.</p>
<p><u>Land Use and Planning</u> <i>a through c) Would the project physically divide an established community or conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation adopted for purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</i></p>	<p>The Approved Project would have a less than significant impact associated with conflicts with policies and regulations intended to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect. Future projects would be subject to the policies of the General Plan as well as other local, state, and federal regulations intended to avoid or minimize environmental effects. No mitigation was required (Impact 3.8-1, General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-96).</p> <p>The General Plan EIR identified that impacts associated with physical division of an established community and conflicts with any habitat or natural community plans were less than significant (General Plan Draft EIR p. 3-95).</p>	<p>The EIR found that the Approved Project would result in less than significant impacts associated with land use and planning and no mitigation measures were required.</p> <p>The Modified Project would reduce the extent of the City’s Proposed Modified SOI, as previously described. Lands currently designated Specific Plan Area, Industrial, Open Space, and Urban Reserve would be removed from the General Plan land use map and the Proposed Modified Sphere of Influence. The Modified Project would revise land use designations within the Proposed Modified SOI to be similar to those depicted on the Lake County General Plan Land Use Map. Lands currently designated Open Space (8.6 acres), Industrial (27.0 acres), and Resort Residential (19.2 acres) would be designated Major Retail, which is similar to the</p>

TABLE 3: COMPARISON OF APPROVED PROJECT IMPACTS AND MODIFIED PROJECT IMPACTS

Environmental Issues	Adopted General Plan (Approved Project)	2014 Focused General Plan Update and Prezoning Project (Modified Project)
		<p>County’s Service Commercial designation in the area along SR 29 south of the City’s borders. The Conservation Element would be revised to ensure that adequate policies and programs are in place to protect natural resources and environmentally sensitive lands. It is noted that the Conservation Element policies regarding creek and stream biology and riparian/wetland areas have been modified to be more similar to the Lake County General Plan policies. Future development accommodated by the Modified Project would be required to comply with the land use-related policies and programs discussed under Impact 3.8-1 (General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-96), which would avoid or minimize environmental effects and ensure compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations. Compliance with the General Plan policies and programs would ensure that potential impacts remain less than significant. The Modified Project would not result in a significant increase in any environmental impacts associated with land use and planning and would not result in any new impacts.</p>
<p><u>Mineral Resources</u> <i>a and b) Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource or recovery site?</i></p>	<p>The General Plan EIR identified that impacts associated with mineral resources would not be significant (General Plan Draft EIR p. 5-3).</p>	<p>The Modified Project would reduce the overall extent of development by removing approximately 719.1 acres from the City’s Modified SOI. The Modified Project would not result in the loss or availability of a known mineral resource or recovery site. There would be no increase in significance to mineral resource impacts and there would be no new impacts.</p>

TABLE 3: COMPARISON OF APPROVED PROJECT IMPACTS AND MODIFIED PROJECT IMPACTS

Environmental Issues	Adopted General Plan (Approved Project)	2014 Focused General Plan Update and Prezoning Project (Modified Project)
<p><u>Noise</u> <i>a through f) Would the project result in noise levels in excess of standards, a substantial temporary, periodic, or permanent increase in ambient noise levels, or exposure to excessive noise associated with an airport or airstrip?</i></p>	<p>The Approved Project would have a less than significant impact associated with exposure of noise-sensitive uses to construction noise, excessive ground-borne vibration, and ground-borne noise. Future development projects would be subject to the Noise and Land Use Compatibility Standards established by the General Plan, as well as applicable policies designed to maintain or reduce noise levels. No mitigation was required (Impact 3.9-1, General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-103 and 3.104).</p> <p>The Approved Project would have a less than significant impact associated with exposure of noise-sensitive land uses to a substantial temporary, periodic, or permanent increase in ambient noise levels. Future development projects would be subject to the Noise and Land Use Compatibility Standards established by the General Plan, as well as applicable policies designed to maintain or reduce noise levels. No mitigation was required (Impact 3.9-2, General Plan Draft EIR p. 3-103).</p> <p>The Approved Project would have no impact regarding noise associated with a private airstrip (Impact 3.9-3, General Plan Draft EIR p. 3-103).</p>	<p>The EIR found that the Approved Project would result in less than significant noise impacts and no mitigation measures were required.</p> <p>As previously described, the Modified Project would result in designating 54.7 acres of land in the Proposed Modified SOI as Major Retail and removing approximately 719.1 acres from the Proposed Modified SOI, including 631.9 acres identified for future development with Industrial, Specific Plan Area, and Urban Reserve uses. The Modified Project would result in a decrease in potential construction activities and associated noise and ground-borne vibration, as there would be less land disturbance. The Modified Project would not result in any new impacts or an increase in the severity of impacts associated with construction noise, ground-borne vibration, and ground-borne noise.</p> <p>The Modified Project would result in a reduction of 7,029 ADT in comparison to the Approved Project, as shown in Table B-1 (see Appendix B). This reduction in vehicle trips would result in a reduction in traffic-generated noise. Future development that would result in increased noise levels, such as potential uses associated with the Major Retail designation, would be required to comply with the noise-related policies and programs in the General Plan and potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant, as discussed under Impact 3.9-2 (see General Plan Draft EIR p. 3-103), and there would be no new impacts or significant increase in impacts associated with a substantial temporary, periodic, or permanent increase in ambient noise levels.</p>

TABLE 3: COMPARISON OF APPROVED PROJECT IMPACTS AND MODIFIED PROJECT IMPACTS

Environmental Issues	Adopted General Plan (Approved Project)	2014 Focused General Plan Update and Prezoning Project (Modified Project)
		The Modified Project would not result in any changes in noise exposure relative to airstrips or airports, so there would be no new impacts or increase in significance of impacts in relation to this topic.
<p><u>Population/Housing</u> <i>a through c) Would the project induce substantial population growth or displace substantial numbers of housing or people?</i></p>	<p>The General Plan EIR determined that impacts associated with population growth would be growth-inducing. Mitigation Measure 3.10-1 was identified to address potential growth impacts to utilities and circulation facilities. However, the General Plan EIR determined that while the mitigation measure would reduce the impact, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable (Impact 3.10-1, General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-110 and 3-111).</p> <p>Impacts associated with displacement of existing housing and people were determined to be less than significant and no mitigation was required (General Plan Draft EIR, p. 3-109).</p>	<p>The Approved Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts associated with population growth and related growth inducement, with implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.10-1.</p> <p>The General Plan EIR identified that the Approved Project would result in potential residential growth of 3,237 to 3,516 dwelling units on 692.06 acres under buildout conditions. Of the potential residential growth, 2,400 units were attributed to the Specific Plan Area. The Modified Project would remove the Specific Plan Area from the General Plan and Proposed Modified SOI, resulting in 837 to 1,116 new dwelling units at buildout. As the Modified Project would result in a decrease in residential growth and the associated population increase, there would be no new impacts associated with population growth and there would not be an increase in the significance of any impacts associated with population growth.</p> <p>Impacts associated with potential displacement of existing housing and people would remain less than significant; the Modified Project would have no effect on the significance of this impact.</p>
<p><u>Public Services</u> <i>a through e) Would the project have an effect upon, or generate a need</i></p>	<p>The General Plan EIR determined that the Approved Project would have a less than significant impact on law enforcement services</p>	<p>The General Plan EIR determined that the Approved Project would have a less than significant impact on law</p>

TABLE 3: COMPARISON OF APPROVED PROJECT IMPACTS AND MODIFIED PROJECT IMPACTS

Environmental Issues	Adopted General Plan (Approved Project)	2014 Focused General Plan Update and Prezoning Project (Modified Project)
<p><i>fire protection, police services, parks, schools, or other public facilities?</i></p>	<p>and no mitigation was necessary (Impact 3.11-1, General Plan Draft EIR p. 3-121).</p> <p>The General Plan EIR determined that the Approved Project would have a less than significant impact on fire protection services and no mitigation was necessary (Impact 3.11-2, General Plan Draft EIR p. 3-121).</p> <p>The General Plan EIR determined that the Approved Project would have a less than significant impact on law enforcement services and no mitigation was necessary (Impact 3.11-3, General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-121 and 3-122).</p> <p>The General Plan EIR determined that the Approved Project would have a less than significant impact on parks and recreation facilities resulting from increased population and use of facilities and no mitigation was necessary (Impact 3.11-4, General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-122).</p>	<p>enforcement, fire protection, schools, and parks services and facilities and that no mitigation was necessary.</p> <p>The Modified Project would result in a reduction in the potential developed area of the City as a result of reducing the Proposed Modified SOI by 719.1 acres, including 631.9 acres planned for urbanization. The Modified Project would 54.7 acres currently planned for Industrial, Resort Residential, and Open Space uses for Major Retail. The Modified Project would result in a reduction in potential population and housing growth of 1,213 units to 2,400 units compared to the Approved Project. The reduction in future service areas as well as the reduction in population and housing growth would ensure that the Modified Project would result in a reduced demand for law enforcement, fire protection, schools, and parks services and facilities in comparison to the Approved Project. Future development accommodated by the Modified Project would be required to comply with General Plan policies and programs related to the provisions of public services and facilities as well as payment of all applicable impact fees for public services and facilities, as described in the General Plan EIR under Impacts 3.11-1 through 3.11-4 (General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-121 through 3-122). The Modified Project would not result in an increase in the significance or any new environmental impacts associated with the provision of public services.</p>
<p><u>Recreation</u> <i>a and b) Would the project result in substantial physical deterioration of</i></p>	<p>The General Plan EIR determined that the Approved Project would have a less than significant impact on parks and recreation facilities resulting from increased population</p>	<p>The Approved Project was determined to have a less than significant impact associated with use of and</p>

TABLE 3: COMPARISON OF APPROVED PROJECT IMPACTS AND MODIFIED PROJECT IMPACTS

Environmental Issues	Adopted General Plan (Approved Project)	2014 Focused General Plan Update and Prezoning Project (Modified Project)
<i>recreational facilities or require construction or expansion of recreational facilities that may have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</i>	and use of facilities and no mitigation was necessary (Impact 3.11-4, General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-122).	provision of parks and recreation facilities and no mitigation measures were required. The Modified Project would result in a net decrease in development as previously described. There would be a reduction in housing growth by approximately 1,213 to 2,400 dwelling units compared to the Approved Project. The reduction in future population and housing growth would result in a reduced demand for existing and new recreational facilities. Provision of new facilities would proceed as anticipated under the Approved Project. Future development would be required to comply with policies and programs related to the provision of parks and recreation facilities. There would be no new impact or increase in the significance of an impact associated with the provision or use of parks and recreational facilities.
<u>Transportation/Traffic</u> <i>a through g) Would the project conflict with a plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, conflict with an applicable congestion management program, result in a change in air traffic patterns, increase roadway hazards, result in inadequate emergency</i>	The Approved Project would increase traffic volume on SR 29 and result in levels of service that exceed the City’s level of service (LOS) D standard. General Plan policies will ensure that necessary improvements are planned and that the City coordinated with appropriate agencies. This impact is less than significant and no mitigation was required (Impact 3.12-1, General Plan Draft EIR p. 3-147). The Approved Project would increase traffic on SR 29 interchanges and result in the need to upgrade facilities. General Plan policies and programs ensure that new development pay its fair share of planned roadway improvements,	The Approved Project would result in less than significant impacts associated with changes in level of service (LOS) associated with traffic on SR 29, need for improvements to SR 29 interchanges, increased traffic on interregional roadways, and demand for bicycle and pedestrian facilities. No mitigation was required for these impacts. The Approved Project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact associated with increased traffic on City roadway segments because while impacts to most facilities would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of General Plan policies, no feasible mitigation was available for impacts to High Street. The Approved Project was determined to have a potentially significant impact on local

TABLE 3: COMPARISON OF APPROVED PROJECT IMPACTS AND MODIFIED PROJECT IMPACTS

Environmental Issues	Adopted General Plan (Approved Project)	2014 Focused General Plan Update and Prezoning Project (Modified Project)
<p><i>access,, or conflict with adopted policies or programs supporting alternative transportation?</i></p>	<p>encourage coordination of the fair share payment, and ensure that necessary improvements become a part of the City’s Five Year Roadway Capital Improvement Program (Roadway CIP). The impact was determined to be less than significant and no mitigation was required (Impact 3.12-2, General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-147 and 3-148).</p> <p>Under buildout conditions, the Approved Project would result in LOS D or worse conditions on various City streets. While General Plan policies and programs ensure that new development pay its fair share of planned roadway improvements, encourage coordination of the fair share payment, and ensure that necessary improvements become a part of the City’s Roadway CIP, improvements to High Street to mitigate the impact are not considered feasible. Therefore, the impact was determined to be significant and unavoidable and no feasible mitigation was available (Impact 3.12-3, General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-148 and 3-149).</p> <p>Under buildout conditions, the Approved Project would add traffic to the inter-regional roadway system including facilities outside the City’s SOI. The General Plan includes policies to require new development to pay its fair share of planned roadway improvements and to encourage cooperation with other jurisdictions to develop and implement regional solutions to traffic</p>	<p>intersections and mitigation was required to reduce the impact to less than significant.</p> <p>The Modified Project would result in a decrease in traffic volumes in comparison to the Approved Project. As shown in Table B-1, located in Appendix B, the Approved Project would result in 65,109 ADT under buildout conditions. The Modified Project would result in 58,080 ADT under buildout conditions, a decrease of 7,029 ADT. The reduction in trips would primarily come from the removal of the Specific Plan Area from the Modified SOI, which would reduce associated residential and golf course trips. The Modified Project would designate lands as Major Retail that have been designated for Industrial, Resort Residential, and Open Space uses. While there would be an increase in retail-oriented trips in south Lakeport, the reduction in the Urban Reserve and Industrial designations in the vicinity, as well as removal of the Specific Plan Area, would result in a net decrease in trips generated in south Lakeport. No significant reduction in future LOS is anticipated. Future development under the Modified Project would be required to comply with General Plan policies and programs that require development projects to identify potential traffic impacts and to pay their fair-share of improvements necessary to address both local and regional impacts. General Plan policies would continue to ensure that necessary improvements are addressed by the Roadway CIP (Policy T 1.1), by new development providing necessary off-site improvements (Policy T 4.1), by requiring strip commercial uses to be designed to reduce impacts and demonstrate that significant</p>

TABLE 3: COMPARISON OF APPROVED PROJECT IMPACTS AND MODIFIED PROJECT IMPACTS

Environmental Issues	Adopted General Plan (Approved Project)	2014 Focused General Plan Update and Prezoning Project (Modified Project)
	<p>problems. The impact was determined to be less than significant and no mitigation was required (Impact 3.12-4, General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-149 and 3-150).</p> <p>Under buildout conditions, the Approved Project could result in peak hour LOS conditions in excess of LOS C at intersections in Lakeport. The General Plan identified intersections recommended for signalization and included policies to ensure the improvements would be addressed through the City’s Roadway CIP. However, improvements were not identified for seven of the affected intersections, therefore the impact was potentially significant. Mitigation Measure 3.12-5 was identified to ensure that signalization of impacted intersections would be addressed through the Roadway CIP and reduced the impact to less than significant (Impact 3.12-5, General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-149 and 3-150).</p> <p>Implementation of the Approved Project could result in inadequate bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Policies in the General Plan require dedication of land for necessary bicycle and pedestrian facilities as well as completion, improvement, and maintenance of existing facilities. The impact is less than significant and no mitigation was required (Impact 3.12-6, General Plan Draft EIR p. 3-150).</p>	<p>traffic impacts will be mitigated (Program T 12.1-c), and by requiring new developments to pay for their fair share of planned roadway improvements (Policy T 18.1). Continued implementation of General Plan policies and programs and Mitigation Measure 3.12-5 would ensure that the Modified Project continues to be consistent with adopted plans, regulations, and policies associated with the performance of the circulation system and does not result in any new impacts or the increase in significance of impacts relative to this topic.</p> <p>The Modified Project would result in a decrease in potential development and does not include any plans that would introduce roadway or other transportation hazards. There would be no impact associated with roadway or transportation hazards.</p> <p>The Modified Project would reduce the potential overall footprint and extent of new development and would continue to focus development within the existing City and Proposed Modified SOI. There would be no change in the potential for changes in air traffic patterns or air traffic hazards.</p> <p>The Modified Project would result in a decrease in demand for bicycle and pedestrian facilities associated with population growth. However, future development associated with the Modified Project would be required to comply with applicable adopted policies and programs supporting alternative transportation. The Modified Project would not result in any new or increased impacts associated with alternative transportation.</p>

TABLE 3: COMPARISON OF APPROVED PROJECT IMPACTS AND MODIFIED PROJECT IMPACTS

Environmental Issues	Adopted General Plan (Approved Project)	2014 Focused General Plan Update and Prezoning Project (Modified Project)
<p><u>Utilities/Service Systems</u> <i>a through g) Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements or capacity, require the construction or expansion of utility facilities that would result in a significant environmental effects, be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity, and comply with applicable statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</i></p>	<p>The Approved Project would result in increased demand for wastewater treatment. Future development would pay sewer expansion fees and monthly service charges and wastewater infrastructure needed by new projects would be funded by project developers/owners. The impact would be less than significant and no mitigation was required (Impact 3.13-1, General Plan Draft EIR, p.3-165).</p> <p>The Approved Project would result in increased demand for storm drainage facilities. New development would be required to install necessary storm drainage facilities that meet City and State requirements. The impact would be less than significant and no mitigation was required (Impact 3.13-2, General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-165 and 3-166).</p> <p>The Approved Project would result in increased demand for solid waste disposal. The impact would be less than significant and no mitigation measures were required (Impact 3.13-3, General Plan Draft EIR p. 3-166).</p> <p>The Approved Project would result in increased demand for water supplies and treatment facilities. The City’s conservation programs combined with General Plan policies would ensure that water supply impacts are less than significant. No mitigation was required (Impact</p>	<p>The Approved Project would result in less than significant impacts associated with wastewater treatment and conveyance facilities, storm drainage facilities, solid waste disposal, and water supply and treatment facilities. No mitigation was necessary to address these impacts.</p> <p>The Modified Project would reduce the potential extent of the wastewater, stormwater, solid waste, and water supply service areas by reducing the boundary of the Modified SOI. This would result in a decrease in potential impacts associated with extending utility and service facilities into the Specific Plan Area and other areas removed from the Modified SOI. See Figures 1-2 and 1-3. The Modified Project would reduce the extent of development that would require wastewater, stormwater, solid waste, and water supply services. While the Modified Project would increase the potential for non-residential uses by a net increase of 143,574 square feet, there would be a significant decrease in other uses. There would be a reduction in future growth of 1,213 to 2,413 residential units, 130 hotel rooms, 193 RV spaces, and 1 golf course, including 18 holes and a restaurant.</p> <p>Future development accommodated by the Modified Project would continue to be subject to General Plan policies, development impact fees, ordinances, and requirements identified in the General Plan EIR to reduce potential impacts associated with an increased demand for wastewater, stormwater, solid waste, and water supply services and facilities to a less than significant level. There would be no increase in the</p>

TABLE 3: COMPARISON OF APPROVED PROJECT IMPACTS AND MODIFIED PROJECT IMPACTS

Environmental Issues	Adopted General Plan (Approved Project)	2014 Focused General Plan Update and Prezoning Project (Modified Project)
	3.13-4, General Plan Draft EIR pp. 3-166 and 3-167).	severity of impacts and there would be no new impacts associated with utilities and service systems.
<u>Cumulative Impact:</u>	<p>The Approved Project would not result in significant cumulative impacts related to aesthetics, agricultural resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, public services and recreation, and utilities and service systems (General Plan Draft EIR pp. 5-10 through 5-13).</p> <p>The Approved Project could result in significant cumulative impact to population and housing related to development within the City, within the Specific Plan Area, and the entire SOI. No mitigation was identified (General Plan Draft EIR, p. 5-12).</p> <p>The Approved Project combined with development outside of the City’s SOI could result in LOS D or worse on roadways until the Roadway CIP is implemented, resulting in a significant cumulative impact (General Plan Draft EIR p. 5-13).</p>	<p>As the Modified Project would result in a reduction in total development as well as a reduction in the total land area that could be developed, the Modified Project would have less of a contribution to cumulative aesthetic, agricultural, biological, cultural, geology/soils, hydrology/water quality, land use/planning, public services, recreation, and utilities/service system impacts than the Approved Project. The Modified Project would result in a reduction in total vehicle trips and an associated reduction in traffic, air quality, and noise impacts, resulting in a reduction in cumulative transportation, air quality, and noise impacts compared to the Approved Project. The Modified Project would result in a reduction in population and housing growth, as previously described, and would have less of cumulative impact associated with population and housing growth than the Approved Project. The Modified Project would not result in any new or increased cumulative impacts.</p>

Figure 3-1

Figure 3-2

REFERENCES

City of Lakeport, 2008. General Plan Update Draft Environmental Impact Report. Prepared by Quad Knopf for the City of Lakeport. November 2008.

City of Lakeport, 2009. General Plan 2025. Prepared by Quad Knopf for the City of Lakeport. August 2009.

City of Lakeport, 2009. General Plan Update Final Environmental Impact Report. Prepared by Quad Knopf for the City of Lakeport. February 2009.

City of Lakeport, 2014. GIS Data. City staff. 2014.

City of Lakeport, 2014. Lakeport Municipal Code, current through Ordinance 892. City of Lakeport. June 27, 104.

FMMP, 2014. Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Lake County data accessed September 2014.

FEMA, 2014. National Flood Hazard Layer GIS Data. City of Lakeport and surrounding area data accessed September 2014.

Lake County, 2008. Lake County General Plan Land Use Element. Prepared by Matrix Design Group and Mintier & Associates for Lake County. September 2008.

Lake County/City Area Planning Council, 2008. 2008 Lake County Regional Housing Needs Plan FINAL. Lake County/City Area Planning Council. August 2008.

Lake County/City Area Planning Council, 2013. 2013 Lake County Regional Housing Needs Plan FINAL. Lake County/City Area Planning Council. September 11, 2013.

TABLE A-1: COMPARISON OF FARMLAND IMPACTS – APPROVED PROJECT V. MODIFIED PROJECT

Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Designation	Approved Project	Modified Project	Difference
	Acres	Acres	
P - Prime Farmland	2.2	2.2	0.0
L - Farmland of Local Importance	256.4	99.0	-157.4
U - Unique Farmland	106.3	106.3	0.0
G - Grazing Land	807.8	413.7	-394.1
TOTAL	1,172.7	621.2	-551.5

Source: Important Farmlands Map, California Department of Conservation, 2010; De Novo Planning Group, 2014

APPENDIX B – COMPARISON OF TRIP GENERATION

TABLE B-1: COMPARISON OF TRIP GENERATION – APPROVED PROJECT V. MODIFIED PROJECT

Type of Use	Trip Generation Rate	Existing Project		Modified Project		Difference
		Units	Trips	Units	Trips	
Single Family (Dwelling Units)	9.6/unit	2,412	23,155	1,199	11,510	(11,645)
Apartments/Townhomes/Condo (Dwelling Units)	5.9/unit	298	1,758	298	1,758	0
Hotel (Number of Rooms)	5.8/room	473	2,743	343	1,989	(754)
RV Spaces	3.7/space	700	2,590	507	1,875	(715)
General Office Building (sf) - Central Business District, Office	11/1,000 sf	197,900	2,177	197,900	2,177	0
Industrial Park (sf)	7/1,000 sf	45,500	319	0	0	(319)
Specialty Retail (sf) - Light Retail	44/1,000 sf	5,900	259	5,900	259	0
Regional Shopping Center (sf) - Major Retail	37.3/1,000 sf	803,400	29,967	1,000,178	37,019	7,052
Regional Park (Acres)	4.6/acre	168	775	168	775	0
Civic Center (sf)	28/1,000 sf	25,650	718	25,650	718	0
Golf Course (Holes)	36/hole	18	648	0	0	(648)
TOTAL			65,109		58,080	(7,029)

Source: Trip Generation Rates, Table 3.12-10, Draft General Plan EIR; Existing Project Units/Trips, Table 3.12-11, Draft General Plan EIR; Modified Project Trip Generation calculated by De Novo Planning Group based on the trip generation rates shown in Table 3.12-10 of the Draft General Plan EIR.