6 ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

6.1 RATIONALE FOR ALTERNATIVES SELECTION

CEQA requires the consideration of alternatives to the proposed Plan and the analysis of impacts associated with those alternatives. By comparing the proposed Plan to the alternatives, the advantages of each can be weighed and analyzed. Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR "describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives."

Additionally, the CEQA Guidelines state the following:

- The specific alternative of "no project" shall also be evaluated along with its impact. If the environmentally superior alternative is the "no project" alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. [Section 15126.6(e)(1)(2)]
- An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather, it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives that are infeasible. The range of potential alternatives to the proposed project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects. The EIR should briefly discuss the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed. The EIR should also identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination. Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts. [Section 15126.6(a)(c)]
- "Feasible" means capable of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors. [Section 15364]

CEQA requires identification of alternatives that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant impacts of the proposed Plan. Based on the analysis in Chapter 4, *Environmental Impact Analysis*, construction and operational activities associated with forecasted regional growth and land use change and planned transportation network improvements and programs under the proposed Plan would result in significant impacts for many resource topics. Of these topics, air quality and greenhouse gas (GHG) impacts were of particular concern to the public during the EIR scoping and planning processes.

Among other things, the comments provided on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) and during development of the proposed Plan focused on a common theme of avoiding or substantially lessening GHG emission and air quality impacts through major reductions in vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Various transportation investments and policy options were recommended in the comment letters to achieve the major reductions in VMT. SANDAG developed the 5 Big Moves to address many of these concerns. The proposed Plan achieves GHG and VMT reductions by compacting development and increasing transit utilization, which also have the effect of reducing other impacts, such as loss of wildlife habitat or agricultural land.

The range of alternatives analyzed in detail in the EIR is in large part based on these public and stakeholder GHG and VMT comments. The remaining parts of this section provide the following:

- A description of alternatives considered in detail.
- A summary of the environmental impacts of each alternative and a comparison of each alternative's impacts to those of the proposed Plan. The focus of this analysis is to determine if alternatives are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening the significant environmental effects of the proposed Plan to a less-than-significant level.
- A discussion of the environmentally superior alternative.
- A discussion of alternatives considered but rejected from detailed analysis.

6.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN DETAIL

Aside from Alternative 1: No Project, the alternatives analyzed in detail are considered potentially feasible for the purposes of a CEQA analysis of alternatives to the proposed Plan, although some of elements of the alternatives may require major changes in legislation or policy or in the availability of funding. The alternatives are described below. The primary focus of the alternatives descriptions is on the characteristics that differentiate them from the proposed Plan.

Appendix O provides the following information to support the analysis of the alternatives:

- Table O-1 provides a list of the "No Build" projects that are assumed to be implemented for the No Project Alternative.
- Table O-2 provides performance measures data for the proposed Plan and Alternatives Considered in Detail in this EIR, including population, housing, and employment information.
- Table O-3 provides Senate Bill (SB) 375 GHG reduction for Alternatives Considered in Detail in this EIR.
- Table O-4 provides the EMFAC 2017 onroad output summary for Alternatives Considered in Detail in this EIR.

6.2.1 ALTERNATIVE 1: NO PROJECT

CEQA requires a No Project Alternative to be analyzed in the EIR. The No Project Alternative assumes that the proposed Plan would not be adopted or implemented.

The No Project Alternative assumes the Series 14 Regional Growth Forecast with the 2019 Federal Regional Transportation Plan (2019 Federal RTP) land use pattern, plus the Regional Housing Needs Assessment 6th Housing Element Cycle 2021-2029 (6th Cycle RHNA) housing allocations for adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors (SANDAG Board) in July 2020. The Series 14 Regional Growth Forecast was generated to support the 2019 Federal RTP, which was adopted by the SANDAG Board on October 25, 2019. The 2019 Federal RTP land use pattern and 6th Cycle RHNA would likely be implemented even if the proposed Plan were not adopted because they are based on the adopted general plans of the 18 cities and County government except where additional planning assumptions were necessary to accommodate the 6th Cycle RHNA, which must be implemented under State law. Following the January 2020 release of the California Department of Finance (DOF) population projections, SANDAG developed an updated version of the Series 14 Regional Growth Forecast to reflect the new population projections as the latest planning assumptions. Table O-2 (Appendix O of this EIR) provides a comparison of the population, housing, and employment for the proposed Plan and the alternatives.

Although the total population, number of housing units, and number of jobs by 2050 would likely be the same as the proposed Plan under this alternative, the pattern of development within the region would be less compact because all transit improvements included in the proposed Plan would not be available to support the focused transit-oriented development pattern envisioned in the proposed Plan. SANDAG transportation and growth modeling has shown that the likelihood of housing stock and households developing and moving to an area is directly correlated to the accessibility of transportation and employment. In the absence of the future transportation network improvements and programs identified in the proposed Plan, it is likely that the future land use pattern would see less concentration of population, housing, and jobs in major transportation corridors and more growth occurring in less developed areas of the region than would occur under the proposed Plan.

The No Project Alternative includes "No Build" transportation projects likely to be implemented if the proposed Plan were not adopted. These consist of transportation projects with environmental clearance, that have full funding, are under construction, or are otherwise reasonably foreseeable based on current plans, as listed in Table O-1 (Appendix O of this EIR). Future project development and implementation under the No Project Alternative would be limited as SANDAG would fall out of compliance with the State and federal funding requirement of an adopted RTP and SCS on January 1, 2022 (State) and October 25, 2023 (federal).

6.2.2 ALTERNATIVE 2: 2019 TRANSPORTATION NETWORK WITH NEW VALUE PRICING AND USER FEE POLICIES

Alternative 2 consists of the 2019 Federal RTP transportation network and land use pattern, combined with the new value pricing and user fees policies in the proposed Plan that are compatible with the 2019 Federal RTP network. This alternative could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects by minimizing changes to the existing land use plans in the region.

Alternative 2 consists of the land uses in the 2019 Federal RTP, and reflects the adopted general plans of the 18 cities and County except where additional planning assumptions were necessary to accommodate the 6th Cycle RHNA adopted in July 2020, plus the DOF January 2020 release of the State's population projections. Table O-2 (Appendix O of this EIR) provides a comparison of the population, housing, and employment for the proposed Plan and the alternatives. Land uses for Alternative 2 would be the same as for the No Project Alternative because this land use pattern is based on the adopted 2019 Federal RTP, the adopted general plans of the 18 cities and County, and the State-mandated 6th Cycle RHNA, which would be implemented even if the proposed Plan were not adopted.

Alternative 2 includes the 2019 Federal RTP transportation network (included in Appendix O of this EIR) with the addition of policies and programs of the Proposed Plan, including toll pricing, microtransponder ownership, telework assumptions, and micromobility. Table 6-1 provides a comparison of the components of each of the alternatives considered in detail.

This alternative does not include the development of the Mobility Hubs or Complete Corridors as envisioned in the proposed Plan. This alternative also does not include additional high frequency transit beyond what is shown in the 2019 Federal RTP because the supporting land uses are not included in the 2019 Federal RTP land use pattern. Funding for Alternative 2 would be consistent with the funding proposed in the 2019 Federal RTP.

Table 6-1
Summary of Alternatives Considered in Detail

Components		Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
Land Use Pattern		2019 Federal RTP Land Use Pattern	2019 Federal RTP land use pattern	Similar to Proposed Plan except land use pattern with new growth focused in proposed mobility hubs
Transportation Network		"No Build" Projects	2019 Federal RTP transportation network	Proposed Plan transportation network
New Value Pricing and User Fes Policies	*Toll Pricing*	Existing Policy	Same as proposed Plan (By 2035, update toll pricing to $0.30 per mile on I-15 and other Managed Lane facilities)	Same as proposed Plan (By 2035, update toll pricing to $0.30 per mile on I-15 and other Managed Lane facilities)
	Road User Charge	None	None	By 2026, increase road user charge rate to 3 cents/mile, compared to 2 cent/mile in the proposed Plan.
	Parking Costs	Existing Policy	2019 Federal RTP	Increases in parking costs by 50% compared to the proposed Plan.
	Transit Costs	Existing Policy	2019 Federal RTP (No planned transit fare discounts.)	Free transit by 2035.
	Microtransit Costs	N/A	N/A	Free Microtransit by 2035, compared to $1.25 one way/$3 day in the proposed Plan
	Micro-Transponder ownership	N/A	Same as proposed Plan (Microtransponder[2] ownership of 100 percent by 2035)	Same as proposed Plan (Microtransponder ownership of 100 percent by 2035)
	Telework Assumptions	N/A	Same as proposed Plan	Same as proposed Plan
	Micromobility	N/A	Same as proposed Plan (Increases in micro-mobility through assumed personal owned e-bike growth)	Same as proposed Plan (Increases in micro-mobility through assumed personal owned e-bike growth)

Components	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
Funding	Committed funding	2019 Federal RTP ($130 billion)	Same as Proposed Plan ($163 billion)

[1] These consist of transportation projects with environmental clearance, that have full funding, are under construction, or are otherwise reasonably foreseeable based on current plans.

[2] A microtransponder is an electronic toll collection device that allows users to pay tolls automatically from inside their vehicle.

6.2.3 ALTERNATIVE 3: ALL GROWTH FOCUSED IN MOBILITY HUBS AND MORE PROGRESSIVE VALUE PRICING AND USER FEE POLICIES

Alternative 3 consists of the proposed Plan transportation network, a land use pattern that restricts all regional growth to the mobility hubs, and more progressive value pricing and user fees policies than what is included in the proposed Plan. This alternative could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project and could substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects: specifically, VMT and GHG emissions reductions due to more compact development and increased mode shift. Land use in Alternative 3 is similar to the proposed Plan, but would focus all growth in proposed mobility hubs throughout the County to further reduce VMT and GHG emissions. The regional mobility hub areas are the same as the proposed Plan, and are depicted on Figure 2-35 of Chapter 2, *Project Description,* of this EIR.

Alternative 3 would include the following more progressive value pricing and user fee policies than those offered in the proposed Plan, as shown in Table 6-1.

Alternative 3 includes the same transportation network as the proposed Plan, and funding for Alternative 3 would be the same as described for the proposed Plan. Table 6-1 provides a comparison of the components of each of the alternatives considered in detail.

6.2.4 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Alternatives were generated as alternate means of achieving most of the basic objectives of the proposed Plan. As stated in Chapter 2, these basic objectives are to:

1. Focus population and employment growth in mobility hubs and existing urban areas to protect sensitive habitat and natural resource areas.
2. Provide transportation investments that support compact land development patterns and reduce sprawl.
3. Meet greenhouse gas emissions targets established for the San Diego region by the California Air Resources Board and the SANDAG Board of Directors.
4. Provide transportation investments and land use patterns that promote social equity.
5. Provide transportation investments and land use patterns that reduce vehicle miles traveled and improve air quality.
6. Provide multi-modal access to employment centers and key destinations for all communities.
7. Enhance the efficiency of the transportation network for moving people and goods through the deployment of new technologies.

Table 6-2 shows that all of the action alternatives considered in detail in this EIR partially or fully meet most of the basic Plan objectives with the exception of Alternative 1: No Project. In this table, a “yes” indicates an alternative has the ability to at least partially, if not fully, meet project objectives.

Table 6-2
Ability of Alternatives Considered in Detail in this EIR to Meet Basic Project Objectives

Project Objectives	Proposed Plan	Alternatives Considered in Detail in this EIR		
		Alternative 1: No Project	**Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies**	**Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies**
1. Focus population and employment growth in mobility hubs and existing urban areas to protect sensitive habitat and natural resource areas.	Yes	No, alternative does not include mobility hubs.	No, alternative does not include mobility hubs.	Yes. alternative includes all new growth around mobility hubs
2. Provide transportation investments that support compact land development patterns and reduce sprawl.	Yes	No, alternative does not include transportation investments that would reduce sprawl	Yes, alternative includes incentivizing investments in smart growth areas	Yes, alternative includes investments to reduce sprawl similar to the proposed Plan
3. Meet greenhouse gas emissions targets established for the San Diego region by the California Air Resources Board and the SANDAG Board of Directors.	Yes	No, see Appendix O, Table O-3 for SB 375 target achievement	No, see Appendix O, Table O-3 for SB 375 target achievement	Yes, see Appendix O, Table O-3 for SB 375 target achievement
4. Provide transportation investments and land use patterns that promote social equity.	Yes	No, alternative does not include transportation investments and land use patterns that would promote social equity	Yes, alternative includes transportation investments and land use patterns that would promote social equity	Yes, the transportation network for this alternative is the same as the proposed Plan; the land use pattern for this alternative focuses growth in mobility hubs to maximize transit access to employment, educational, and recreational

Project Objectives	Proposed Plan	Alternatives Considered in Detail in this EIR		
		Alternative 1: No Project	**Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies**	**Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies**
				opportunities throughout the region
5. Provide transportation investments and land use patterns that reduce vehicle miles traveled and improve air quality.	Yes	No, alternative does not include transportation investments and land use patterns that would reduce vehicle miles traveled and improve air quality	Yes, based on the modeling results identified in Tables O-2 and O-3 (Appendix O of this EIR), this alternative would reduce vehicle miles traveled and improve air quality	Yes, based on the modeling results identified in Tables O-2 and O-3 (Appendix O of this EIR); this alternative would reduce vehicle miles traveled and improve air quality
6. Provide multi-modal access to employment centers and key destinations for all communities.	Yes	No, alternative does not include transportation investments and land use patterns that would further provide multi-modal access to employment centers	Yes, the transportation improvements and land use pattern as part of this alternative would encourage growth within smart growth areas	Yes, the transportation network for this alternative is the same as the proposed Plan, and this alternative would increase growth around mobility hubs
7. Enhance the efficiency of the transportation network for moving people and goods through the deployment of new technologies.	Yes	No, alternative does not include transportation investments and land use patterns that would move people and goods with new technologies	Yes, this alternative does include transportation systems and demand management projects and emerging technologies that would move people and goods	Yes, the transportation network for this alternative is the same as the proposed Plan

6.3 ALTERNATIVES COMPARISON

Table 6-3 (at the end of this chapter) provides a list of impacts and their significance for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, with a comparison of the impacts of each alternative to those of the proposed Plan. Calculations for the alternatives analysis are provided in Appendix O of this EIR.

6.4 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

Based on the analysis of alternatives provided in Table 6-3, Alternative 3 is the environmentally superior alternative. Although Alternative 3 would not reduce any of the proposed Plan's significant impacts to less-than-significant levels, it would reduce many of the proposed Plan's significant impacts. Compared to the proposed Plan's significant impacts, Alternative 3 would have decreased impacts for one or more significance criteria for the following environmental resources: aesthetics and visual resources. agricultural and forestry resources. air quality. biological resources. cultural resources. energy. paleontological resources. greenhouse gas emissions. mineral resources. noise and vibration. public services. transportation. tribal cultural resources. water supply. and wildfire. Compared to the proposed Plan's significant impacts, Alternative 3 would have increased impacts for only a few significance criteria: for land use, and population and housing.

Alternative 3 would result in a 23 percent per capita GHG reduction, which would result in a greater reduction than the proposed Plan (20.7 percent below 2005). In addition, Alternative 3 would result in VMT per capita of 16.3 (for all vehicle classes) compared to the proposed Plan VMT per capita of 16.8 in 2050 (see Appendix O, Table O-2). Alternative 3 would result in a total VMT increase of 3,479,273 miles per day in year 2050, which is approximately 38 percent lower than the proposed Plan (total VMT increase of 5,611,752 miles per day in year 2050). Alternative 3 would also result in a decrease in reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrous oxides (NO_X), carbon monoxide (CO), fine and respirable particulate matter (PM2.5 and PM10), and sulfur oxide (SO_X) emissions compared to the proposed Plan from onroad sources.

Among the alternatives, Alternative 3 would achieve the greatest reductions of VMT, GHG emissions, and air quality emissions as compared to the proposed Plan.

6.5 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED

This section discusses several alternatives that were considered by SANDAG decision makers or raised by the public during the planning process for the proposed Plan, or that were raised in public comments on the NOP for the EIR, but were rejected from detailed consideration in this EIR. Reasons for rejecting these alternatives include the following:

- Major elements of the alternative are already included in the proposed Plan or one of the alternatives evaluated in detail in this EIR.
- The alternative is infeasible due to economic, legal, or other considerations.
- The alternative fails to reduce any of the proposed Plan's significant environmental impacts.
- The alternative fails to meet most of the basic project objectives.
- The alternative is for individual project components rather than the proposed Plan as a whole.

6.5.1 ACCELERATED PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

As discussed in Section 4.16, *Transportation,* implementation of the proposed Plan would result in significant VMT and GHG impacts. The proposed Plan includes land use growth and transportation improvements that, when implemented, would reduce VMT. However, to further reduce VMT and GHG impacts for years 2025 and 2035, greater transit ridership would need to be achieved earlier than projected. To accomplish this the implementation of the proposed Plan would need to be accelerated.

Reasons for Rejection:

Implementation of the proposed Plan is constructed as a system of integrated land use growth and transportation improvements. Several of the transportation improvements are directly related to increases in land use growth. VMT and GHG reductions under the proposed Plan result from the increasing land uses and resident populations incompact transit-oriented development within mobility hubs. Both the land use changes, and the transportation improvements are essential for the system to work. Under SB 375, an SCS cannot supersede the land use authority of the cities and counties within the region. Therefore, SANDAG does not have the authority to accelerate land use concentration in the region and so several of the transportation improvements, e.g., Mobility Hubs, cannot be accelerated until the corresponding land use growth occurs.

In addition, funding is not available to accelerate the construction of the proposed Plan. The funding strategy for the proposed Plan considers all reasonably anticipated revenues to be received out to 2050. These funds will come with constraints. A majority of the anticipated funds will be tied to certain types of projects (for example, transit infrastructure or highway operations and maintenance), and SANDAG does not have the authority to interchange them. These constraints include requirements from Congress or the State Legislature, and the investment strategy for the proposed Plan is aligned with those rules. SANDAG is also constrained by when funds will become available over the 30-year life of the proposed Plan. More than half of anticipated revenues are not expected to become available until the 2036–2050 timeframe.

For these reasons, this alternative has been rejected from further consideration.

6.5.2 2019 FEDERAL RTP PLUS UPDATED DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE POPULATION AND TELEWORK

This alternative consists of the land uses in the 2019 Federal RTP, and reflects the adopted general plans of the 18 cities and County, except where additional planning assumptions were necessary to accommodate the 6th Cycle RHNA adopted in July 2020, and the DOF January 2020 release of the State's population projections. Table O-2 (Appendix O of this EIR) provides a comparison of the population, housing, and employment for the proposed Plan and the alternatives. Land uses for Alternative 2 would be the same as for the No Project Alternative, because this land use pattern is based on the adopted 2019 Federal RTP and the adopted general plans of the 18 cities and County and the State-mandated 6th Cycle RHNA, which would be implemented even if the proposed Plan were not adopted.

In addition, this alternative would only include the following telework policies, but not all of the other policies and programs included for Alternative 2, as discussed above:

- Increases in primary and occasional telework jobs by 2025, 2035, and 2050 based on latest planning assumptions. In 2025, projected 9.7 percent of employment would be primarily telework, and another 9.8 percent would be occasional telework. In 2035, it is projected that 10.9 percent of jobs would be primary telework, and another 11.8 percent would include occasional telework. In 2050, it is projected that 12.7

percent of employment would be primary telework jobs, and another 14.8 percent would include occasional telework.

This alternative is essentially proposed Alternative 2 without new value pricing and user fees. Adding new value pricing and user fees results in lower VMT and reduced GHG, and as such this alternative would result in more VMT and more GHG than Alternative 2. As discussed in Table 6-3, Alternative 2 would result in a 13.2 percent per capita GHG reduction by 2035, which would not meet the SB 375 2035 GHG reduction target established by CARB for the proposed Plan. There is no evidence that this alternative would avoid or substantially reduce any of the proposed Plan's significant impacts. For these reasons, this alternative has been rejected from further consideration.

6.5.3 TRANSNET-CONSTRAINED TRANSIT ALTERNATIVE

In a January 13, 2015, NOP comment letter, Circulate San Diego, requested that the Regional Plan contain at least one transit-friendly reasonable alternatives that will mitigate environmental impacts. The requested that the alternative should be referred to as a "TransNet-Constrained Transit Alternative" and include the following elements:

- Advance as much public transit and active transportation as possible.
- Including investments from the unconstrained transit network (e.g., investments for which available funding was not identified in the proposed Plan).
- Delaying and eliminating general purpose highway and Managed Lane investments.
- Converting existing general purpose lanes to managed lanes.
- Providing more compact land use patterns.
- Substantially lowering transit fares.
- Substantially increasing the price of parking.
- Substantially increasing the cost of driving.

Reasons for Rejection:

This comment was received prior to SANDAG developing the 5 Big Moves Vision that served to guide the development of the proposed Plan. The proposed Plan substantially addresses many of the suggestions included in this proposed alternative (e.g., converting existing general purpose lanes to managed lanes, providing more compact land use patterns, substantially lowering transit fares, increasing the price of parking). In addition, Alternative 3 further expands on many of these components, including even more accelerated transit investments, more compact land use patterns, and high transit subsidies, parking pricing, and driving costs. The proposed Plan does not include investments drawn from the unconstrained transit network because the proposed Plan re-envisioned the entire transportation network, and because reasonably foreseeable funding sources for unconstrained projects have not been identified. The proposed Plan does not add funding to add general purpose freeway lanes, but instead focuses on adding Managed Lanes where feasible and appropriate by converting existing general purpose lanes or roadway shoulders. The proposed Plan cannot exclude all roadway and freeway funding and expansion as that would preclude the addition of Managed Lanes, which increase the efficiency of roadway travel for vehicles and transit. Further, there is no evidence that excluding funding for Managed Lanes would avoid or further and substantially reduce any of the proposed Plan's significant impacts identified in the EIR.

Because most of the major elements of the alternative are already included in the proposed Plan and/or Alternative 3, and are analyzed in this EIR, and because there is no evidence that this alternative would avoid or further and substantially reduce any of the proposed Plan's significant impacts, this alterative is rejected from further consideration.

6.5.4 COASTAL PROTECTION ALTERNATIVE

In a December 19, 2016, NOP comment letter received from the California Coastal Commission, an alternative was identified to consider the effects of sea level rise and minimize the need for shoreline armoring with the relocation of the rail corridor along the Del Mar bluffs. The letter also requests that the expected life of the rail corridor along the Del Mar bluffs and other existing infrastructure be analyzed given sea level rise and other environmental impacts.

Reasons for Rejection:

The request to analyze alternatives for the Del Mar Bluffs rail corridor is an individual project included in the proposed Plan rather than an alternative for the proposed Plan as a whole that can be considered. but need not discuss alternatives to each particular component of a project (See *California Oak Foundation v. Regents of University of California* (2010) 188 Cal. App. 4th 227, 276–277). Because it is limited, this alternative would not avoid or substantially reduce any of the proposed Plan's significant impacts. The Project (or proposed Plan) includes a proposal to move the rail corridor off the bluffs into a proposed tunnel by 2035 (TL06 Commuter Rail 398 in Appendix B of this EIR). Sea-level rise is a potential effect of Climate Change, which is discussed in impact analysis sections of this EIR and Appendix C of the EIR. For these reasons, this alternative has been rejected from further consideration.

6.5.5 CLIMATE, HOUSING, TRANSIT ALTERNATIVE

On May 26, 2021 SANDAG received a comment letter on the proposed Plan from Save Our Forest and Ranchlands (SOFAR) and the Cleveland National Forest Foundation (CNFF) requesting that the SANDAG Board of Directors "*include a Climate, Housing, Transit Alternative in the 2021 RTP update - an alternative focused on meeting both the housing needs and greenhouse gas ("GHG") reduction goals for a qualified land use area that have been set collectively by the State of California, the City of San Diego, and SANDAG"* that meets the following goals:

- 40 percent reduction in GHG below 1990 levels by 2030
- 80 percent reduction in GHG below 1990 levels by 2050
- 25 percent reduction in per capita GHG from passenger cars and trucks relative to 2005 by 2035
- 14.3 percent reduction in total daily VMT per capita, and 16.8 percent reduction in total light-duty VMT per capita, relative to 2015-2018 average by 2050
- 50 percent transit, walk and bike mode share for commuters within ½ mile of a major transit stop in City of San Diego by 2035
- 150 percent increase in transit mode share
- Adequately plan to meet the housing needs of everyone in the community
- SB 743 VMT reduction goals.

The SOFAR and CNFF comment letter requested than SANDAG consider the following specific components for the proposed Plan:

- Comprehensive transit investments in each of these four levels
    - Highest speed commuter/intercity rail in the LOSSAN corridor, including a double-track rail tunnel through Miramar Hill and rail line straightening
    - Higher-speed high-frequency transit, including separate rights of way, fewer stops grade separations, and new high-speed lines
    - An intermodal terminal (Grand Central) connecting Airport, central core, LOSSAN corridor, SPRINTER corridor, and trolley system
    - Local transit (bus or streetcar) and shared mobility
- Walkable compact land use
- Excluding roadway/freeway funding and expansion

Reasons for Rejection:

The proposed Plan includes comprehensive transit investments in each of the four levels identified in the Climate, Housing, Transit Alternative: high-speed commuter rail; tunneling and double-tracking where feasible; rail line straightening, higher-speed and higher-frequency transit with separate rights-of-way, fewer stops, grade separation, and new high-speed lines; a Central Mobility Hub that connects to the airport as well as to transit elements offering further interconnectivity throughout the San Diego region; and expanded local transit and shared mobility.

The proposed Plan also includes an intensified, compact land use, as well as expanded active transportation infrastructure improvements. The proposed Plan does not add funding to add general purpose freeway lanes, but instead focuses on adding Managed Lanes where feasible and appropriate by converting existing general-purpose lanes or roadway shoulders. The proposed Plan cannot exclude all roadway and freeway funding and expansion as that would preclude the addition of Managed Lanes, which increase the efficiency of roadway travel for vehicles and transit. Further, there is no evidence that excluding funding for Managed Lanes would avoid or further and substantially reduce any of the proposed Plan's significant impacts identified in the EIR. The proposed Plan meets some, but not all, of the Climate, Housing, Transit Alternative goals. The proposed Plan would exceed the GHG emission reduction targets for 2020 and 2035 established by CARB, as shown in Table 2-8. While CARB does not set targets beyond 2035, SANDAG has provided data in Section 4.8, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, of this EIR utilizing the same methodology to show continued GHG reductions beyond 2035. See Appendix O, Table 0-3. Similarly, as discussed in Section 4.16 of this EIR, the proposed Plan achieves a 14.1 percent reduction (approximately 16.3 percent with off model strategies included) in total daily VMT per capita by 2050 as compared to the proposed Plan baseline of 2016. Alternative 3 achieves still greater reductions. See Appendix O, Table 0-3.

Both the proposed Plan and Alternative 3 achieve a greater than 150 percent increase in walk to transit and drive to transit mode share by 2050, along with similar increases in walk and bike mode share. Mode share within ½ mile of a major transit stop is not specifically measured for the proposed Plan or Alternative 3.

As for meeting housing needs, the proposed Plan's SCS land use pattern identifies areas within the region sufficient to house the 6th Cycle RHNA Plan allocations. The adopted 6th cycle RHNA Plan for the San Diego

region covers the 8-year period from 2021 through 2029. The RHNA allocates housing need in four income categories for each of the cities and San Diego County to use in their housing elements.

The remaining goals of the Climate, Housing, Transit Alternative are considered infeasible to achieve. As described above and in the analyses of this EIR, the proposed Plan includes several major changes in transportation investments and other policy changes specifically for the purpose of reducing total GHG and VMT. Even if SANDAG could achieve zero GHG emissions from the transportation sector (the area that SANDAG has the most control over), it still would not be possible to meet the targets of carbon neutrality by 2045 and 80 percent reduction of 1990 levels by 2050 due to emissions from non-transportation sectors. Table 4.8-8 in Section 4.8 shows total GHG emissions in the San Diego region from 2016 to 2050. Even assuming zero GHG emissions from the on-road transportation sector, the region would still have GHG emissions of 10.34 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent ($MMTCO_2e$) by 2050, a 5.14 $MMTCO_2e$ shortfall as compared to the State target of 5.2 $MMTCO_2e$.

Similarly, Alternative 3, which has the most compact land use pattern and includes the most progressive measures to reduce VMT and GHG, is unable to meet the VMT goals of the Climate, Housing, Transit Alternative. Under Alternative 3, GHG and VMT would be reduced by 23 percent per capita and 16.8 percent per capita, respectively, by 2050.

Because the specific feasible components and feasible goals advanced in the Climate, Housing, Transit Alternative proposed by SOFAR and CNFF are already included in the proposed Plan and/or Alternative 3 and analyzed in this EIR, and because the remaining components and goals are infeasible, as discussed above, this alternative has been rejected from further consideration.

6.5.6 10 BIG MOVES TO TRANSPORTATION JUSTICE

On May 27, 2021 comment letter on the proposed Plan from the San Diego Transportation Equity Working Group (SDTEWG), a community-based coalition of the Center on Policy Initiatives, City Heights Community Development Corporation, Environmental Health Coalition, Mid-City CAN, and SanDiego350, requested that SANDAG include an alternative incorporating "*the 10 Big Moves to Transportation Justice.*"

Two of the goals identified in the10 Big Moves to Transportation Justice Alternative, (1) an environmental-justice centered RTP and (6) youth opportunity passes, do not involve physical changes with physical environmental impacts.[1] Under CEQA, an EIR must analyze the impact of a project's physical changes on the physical environment. CEQA does not require EIRs to include an environmental justice analysis or address socioeconomic impacts unrelated to physical environmental impacts. While these two stated goals are not addressed below, they will be addressed by SANDAG staff and considered by the Board of Directors as the proposed Plan is finalized.

The remaining eight goals, which include physical changes with potential physical environmental impacts, are:

- (2) **Improve the Bus System Now:** Develop a bus system that is fast, frequent, reliable, and accessible by increasing frequency on popular lines, especially overcrowded ones. This should be done immediately as a way to introduce the public to a new transit era with short-term and long-term solutions. It should be

done by providing MTS with the necessary financial support for implementation. EJ communities cannot afford to wait 10-20 years for solutions.

- (3) **Blue Line Express:** Fund the planning, environmental, engineering, and capital for the additional Blue Line track that allows express, 24-hour service, and additional frequency enhancements. Rail-grade separations should only move forward with the addition of a third track that eliminates conflict between the Blue Line and freight.
- (4) **24-Hour Service by 2025:** Provide 24-hour service on popular transit routes to connect late night and early morning workers to their jobs by 2025.
- (5) **Purple Line Serves Central City Heights:** Fund the planning, environmental, engineering, and capital for the Purple Line as a rail line that connects EJ communities in central City Heights and South Bay to Sorrento Valley.
- (7) **Electrify Bus Fleet by 2030:** Fund the implementation of California's Innovative Clean Transit rule to accelerate the electrification of the bus fleet ten years before mandated by the California Air Resources Board.
- (8) **Identify Anti-Displacement strategies:** Fund anti-displacement efforts to protect vulnerable communities living near transit corridors by developing an anti-displacement strategy that includes affordable/low-income housing and preservation of naturally occurring existing affordable housing, community ownership, and tenant protections.
- (9) **Bathroom network:** Develop a bathroom access plan and provide MTS with funding for a clean and accessible bathroom network open at all major transit stations.
- (10) **Emergency Ready Transit System:** Fund the planning and implementation of a transit emergency response strategy to provide safety particularly to EJ communities during community-wide emergencies.

Reasons for Rejection:

The proposed Plan and Alternative 3 (*All Growth Focused In Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies*) of the EIR are consistent with goals (2), Improve the Bus System Now, and (7), Electrify Bus Fleet by 2030. The proposed Plan includes significant investments in Rapid buses as well as more efficient associated roadway infrastructure for operating those buses by 2050. The proposed Plan also supports the electrification of the region's transit buses and the State's Innovative Clean Transit regulation. Appendices A and B to the proposed Plan include SANDAG's proposed commitment through 2050 of $657 million for zero-emission buses and infrastructure, which is to support the implementation of MTS' and NCTD's Zero Emission Bus (ZEB) Rollout Plans. $325 million of SANDAG's investment is proposed between 2021-2035. Immediate implementation of all bus system improvements identified in the proposed Plan and accelerated bus fleet electrification by 2035 are economically infeasible due to funding constraints.

Goal (3), Blue Line Express, is not included in the proposed Plan, however, SANDAG will pursue a pilot study of the feasibility of adding a third express track on the Blue Line. There is no evidence that this goal would avoid or further and substantially reduce any of the proposed Plan's significant impacts identified in the EIR.

SANDAG will consider goal (4), 24 Hour Service by 2025, while finalizing the proposed Plan; however, there is no evidence that this goal would avoid or further and substantially reduce any of the proposed Plan's significant impacts identified in the EIR.

The proposed Plan aligns with goal (5), Purple Line Serves Central City Heights. By 2035, the proposed Plan Purple Line connects Sorrento Mesa and National City via UTC, Kearny Mesa, and University Heights. By 2050,

the proposed Plan Purple Line is extended from National City to CBX via San Ysidro. Additionally, the South Bay to Sorrento Comprehensive Multimodal Corridor Plan is currently studying a station in City Heights along Commuter Rail 582. There is no evidence that this goal would avoid or further and substantially reduce any of the proposed Plan's significant impacts identified in the EIR.

Goal (8), Identify Anti-Displacement Strategies, is not addressed in the proposed Plan or Alternatives of the EIR; however, SANDAG is currently developing a Regional Housing Incentive Program through which SANDAG will look for opportunities to coordinate with interested stakeholders on issues like gentrification and displacement. There is no evidence that this goal would avoid or further and substantially reduce any of the proposed Plan's significant impacts identified in the EIR.

SANDAG will consider goal (9), Bathroom Network, while finalizing the proposed Plan; however, there is no evidence that this goal would avoid or further and substantially reduce any of the proposed Plan's significant impacts. Goal (10), Emergency Ready Transit System, is addressed in Appendix Q of the proposed Plan, which describes emergency evacuation strategies, including signaling, traffic control guides, roadblocks and barricades, electronic signage, land expansion, contra-flow lanes, traveler information services, use of mass transit, and airport uses. There is no evidence that this goal would avoid or further and substantially reduce any of the proposed Plan's significant impacts identified in the EIR.

For the reasons above, this alternative has been rejected from further consideration.

Table 6-3
Comparison of Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 to the Proposed Plan

This table provides a list of impacts and their significance for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, with a comparison of the impacts of each alternative to those of the proposed Plan. Calculations for the alternatives analysis are provided in Appendix O of this EIR. The designation "significant impact" in Table 6-3 refers to the level of significance of the impact identified for the proposed Plan as analyzed in this EIR. Within the parentheses is the comparison of the alternative impact to the significance of the impact identified for the proposed Plan (i.e., same, increased, decreased). The level of significance may be the same for the proposed Plan and an alternative for a given threshold, but the impacts from an alternative may be increased or decreased to a degree without changing the significant determination.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
Aesthetics and Visual Resources			
2025	**Significant Impact (same[2])** – Alternative 1 would result in the following significant impacts in 2025 for **AES-1** substantially adverse effects on scenic vistas; **AES-2** substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rocks, outcroppings, and historic structures within a state scenic highway; **AES-3** substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings, including adding a visual element of urban character to an existing rural or open space area, conflicting with regulations governing scenic quality; and **AES-4** substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in the following significant impacts in 2025: **AES-1**, **AES-2**, **AES-3**, and **AES-4**. Impacts would be greater than the proposed Plan in 2025 because growth and land use patterns would result in more growth in less developed areas of the region, and more highway-related transportation network improvements would occur compared to the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in the following significant impacts in 2025: **AES-1**, **AES-2**, **AES-3,** and **AES-4**. Impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed Plan in 2025. This alternative would result in more compact development patterns compared to the proposed Plan, which would result in reduced impacts on scenic vistas, scenic highways, and visual character in rural and less developed areas of the region. Also, transportation network improvements would involve less highway-related projects than the proposed Plan.

[2] For purposes of Table 6-3, "same" means same or closely similar impact.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	the site and its surroundings by creating a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Plan in 2025 because forecasted growth and land use change and transportation network improvements and programs in place by 2025 would be similar to the proposed Plan.		
2035	**Significant Impact (same)** – Impacts **AES-1**, **AES-2**, **AES-3**, and **AES-4** would be significant in 2035, and the same as the proposed Plan. The rationale described under 2025 also applies to 2035.	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Impacts **AES-1**, **AES-2**, **AES-3**, and **AES-4** would be significant in 2035, and greater than the proposed Plan. The rationale described under 2025 also applies to 2035.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Impacts **AES-1**, **AES-2**, **AES-3**, and **AES-4** would be significant in 2035 and would be decreased compared to proposed Plan impacts. The rationale described under 2025 also applies to 2035.
2050	**Significant Impact (same)** – Impacts **AES-1**, **AES-2**, **AES-3**, and **AES-4** would be significant in 2035, and the same as the proposed Plan. The rationale described under 2025 also applies to 2050.	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Impacts **AES-1**, **AES-3**, and **AES-4** would be significant in 2035, and greater than the proposed Plan. Impact **AES-2** would be significant and less than the proposed Plan. The rationale described for 2025 applies to 2050.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Impacts **AES-1**, **AES-2**, **AES-3**, and **AES-4** would be significant in 2035 and considered the same as the proposed Plan impacts. The rationale described under 2025 also applies to 2050.
Agriculture and Forestry Resources			
2025	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in significant impacts on agricultural and forest resources. **AG-1** would occur due to conversion of agricultural lands to nonagricultural use, **AG-2** would occur as a result of conflict with land zoned for agricultural use or with Williamson Act contracts, and **AG-3** would result from	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in significant impacts on agricultural and forest resources (**AG-1**, **AG-2**, and **AG-3**). The impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan in 2025 because Alternative 2 land use would not be as concentrated in urban areas as the proposed Plan and would result in more land	**Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact on agricultural and forest resources (**AG-1**, **AG-2**, and **AG-3**). The impact would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan in 2025 because Alternative 3 land use would be denser in urban areas than the

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	direct loss of forest land. The impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan in 2025 because Alternative 1 land use would not be as concentrated in urban areas as the proposed Plan and would result in more land use conflict with agricultural and forest resources.	use conflict with agricultural and forest resources.	proposed Plan and would result in less land use conflict with agricultural resources.
2035	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in significant impacts on agricultural and forest resources (**AG-1**, **AG-2**, and **AG-3**). The impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan in 2035 because Alternative 1 land use would not be as concentrated in urban areas as the proposed Plan and would result in more land use conflict with agricultural and forest resources.	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in significant impacts on agricultural and forest resources (**AG-1**, **AG-2**, and **AG-3**). The impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan in 2025 because Alternative 2 land use would not be as concentrated in urban areas as the proposed Plan and would result in more land use conflict with agricultural and forest resources.	**Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact on agricultural and forest resources (**AG-1**, **AG-2**, and **AG-3**). The impact would be less compared to the proposed Plan in 2035 because Alternative 3 land use would be denser in urban areas than the proposed Plan and would result in less land use conflict with agricultural resources.
2050	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in significant impacts on agricultural and forest resources (**AG-1**, **AG-2**, and **AG-3**). The impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan in 2050 because Alternative 1 land use would not be as concentrated in urban areas as the proposed Plan and would result in more land use conflict with agricultural and forest resources.	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in significant impacts on agricultural and forest resources (**AG-1**, **AG-2**, and **AG-3**). The impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan in 2025 because Alternative 2 land use would not be as concentrated in urban areas as the proposed Plan and would result in more land use conflict with agricultural and forest resources.	**Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact on agricultural and forest resources (**AG-1**, **AG-2**, and **AG-3**The impact would be less compared to the proposed Plan in 2050 because Alternative 3 land use would be denser in urban areas than the proposed Plan and would result in less land use conflict with agricultural resources.
Air Quality			
2025	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	significant impact in 2025 for **AQ-1**, conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable Air Quality Attainment Plans. As with the proposed Plan, this alternative would also be consistent with the 2016 SIP, 2016 RAQS, and the 2020 SIP.	significant impact in 2025 for **AQ-1**. As with the proposed Plan, this alternative would also be consistent with the 2016 Sip, 2016 RAQS, and the 2020 SIP.	significant impact in 2025 for **AQ-1**. As with the proposed Plan, this alternative would also be consistent with the 2016 SIP, 2016 RAQS, and the 2020 SIP.
	Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) – – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for **AQ-2**, result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in nonattainment or attainment criteria pollutants, including VOC, NO_X, CO, PM10, and PM2.5, and SO_X. While Alternative 1 would cause an increase in ROG, NO_X, CO, PM2.5 and PM10 emissions compared to the proposed Plan, Alternative 1 would result in less emissions than the baseline (2016) conditions; refer to Appendix O, Table 0-4. Additionally, Alternative 1 may result in lower SO_X emissions compared to the proposed Plan due to lower diesel fuel consumption. Therefore, Alternative 1 would result in increased criteria emissions, except SO_X, when compared to the proposed Plan. Impacts would still be less than significant compared to baseline conditions.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for **AQ-2**. Alternative 2 would cause an increase in emissions compared to the proposed Plan but would result in less emissions than the baseline (2016) conditions; refer to Appendix O, Table 0-4. Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in increased emissions compared to the proposed Plan and impacts would be less than significant.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for **AQ-2**. Alternative 3 would have lower emissions compared to the proposed Plan and not result in cumulatively considerable net increase in any nonattainment or attainment criteria pollutant, similar to the proposed Plan; refer to Appendix O, Table O-4. Thus, Alternative 3 would lower emissions and cause a less-than- significant impact.
	Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2025 for **AQ-3**, result in construction-related emissions above mass emission thresholds.	**Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2025 for **AQ-3**. Alternative 2 would result in similar construction-related emissions	**Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2025 for **AQ-3**. Alternative 3 would result in similar construction-related emissions

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	Alternative 1 would result in similar construction-related emissions compared to the proposed Plan, and would result in similar impacts.	compared to the proposed Plan, and would result in similar impacts.	compared to the proposed Plan, and would result in similar impacts.
	Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2025 for **AQ-4**, expose sensitive receptors to substantial PM10 and PM2.5 concentrations. As shown in Appendix O, Table O-4, Alternative 1 would result in higher PM10 and PM2.5 emissions compared to the proposed Plan. Thus, Alternative 1 would have higher PM10 concentration impacts compared to the proposed Plan and would also result in a similar significant impact.	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2025 for **AQ-4**. As shown in Appendix O, Table O-4, Alternative 2 would result in higher PM10 and PM2.5 emissions compared to the proposed Plan. Thus, Alternative 2 would have higher PM10 concentration impacts compared to the proposed Plan and would also result in a similar significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2025 for **AQ-4**. Alternative 3 would result in a small decrease of PM10 and PM2.5 emissions compared to the proposed Plan; refer to Appendix O, Table O-4. However, PM10 concentration impacts would be similar to the proposed Plan and would result in a similar significant impact.
	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2025 for **AQ-5,** expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations. Alternative 1 would result in similar population growth as the proposed Plan, but would not result in focused growth in Mobility Hubs and would not include the diesel commuter rail lines. However, Alternative 1 would result in higher per capita and overall VMT, which could increase TACs from roadways. Overall, while diesel exposure due to commuter rail lines would decrease, this could be offset by an increase	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2025 for **AQ-5,** expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations. Alternative 2 would result in similar population growth as the proposed Plan, but would not result in focused growth in Mobility Hubs and would not include the diesel commuter rail lines. However, Alternative 2 would result in higher per capita and overall VMT, which could increase TACs from roadways. Overall, while diesel exposure due to commuter rail lines would decrease, this could be offset by an increase	**Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2025 for **AQ-5,** expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations. Alternative 3 would result in similar population growth as the proposed Plan, but would focus all growth in the Mobility Hubs and would include the diesel commuter rail lines. While emissions and associated health risk from the commuter rail lines would be similar, the increase in population in the Mobility Hubs may increase the amount of people exposed to this increased cancer risk compared to the proposed Plan. Moreover,

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	in roadways TACs due to increased onroad VMT. Thus, Alternative 1 would have lower TACs compared to the proposed Plan, but result in a similar significant impact.	in roadways TACs due to increased onroad VMT. Thus, Alternative 2 would have lower TACs compared to the proposed Plan, but result in a similar significant impact.	Alternative 3 would result in lower per capita and overall VMT, which could decrease TACs from roadways. Overall, while diesel exposure due to commuter rail lines would be the same, more people could be exposed in Mobility Hubs, and the decrease in VMT could offset some of this increase in commuter rail TACs. Overall, Alternative 3 would have similar TACs compared to the proposed Plan, but result in a similar significant impact.
	Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 1 would result in following less-than-significant impact in 2025 for **AQ-6** expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of CO. According to Appendix O, Table O-4, Alternative 1 would result in higher winter CO emissions compared to the proposed Plan. However, these CO emissions would be substantially less than the baseline (2016) conditions. Thus, exposure of sensitive receptors to CO concentrations would increase under Alternative 1 as under the proposed Plan but still result in a less-than-significant impact.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 2 would result in the following less-than-significant impact in 2025 for **AQ-6**. According to Appendix O, Table O-4, Alternative 2 would result in higher winter CO emissions compared to the proposed Plan. However, these CO emissions would be substantially less than the baseline (2016) conditions. Thus, exposure of sensitive receptors to CO concentrations would increase under Alternative 2 compared to the proposed Plan but still result in a less-than-significant impact.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for **AQ-6**. As shown in Appendix O, Table O-4, Alternative 3 would result in lower winter CO emissions compared to the Proposed Plan. Thus, exposure of sensitive receptors to CO concentrations would decrease under Alternative 3 as under the proposed Plan and be substantially below the baseline (2016) conditions. This would be a less-than-significant impact.
	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 1 would result in the following less-than-significant impact in 2025: **AQ-7** expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors. As shown in Appendix O,	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for **AQ-7**. Alternative 2 would employ similar construction methods as the proposed Plan	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for **AQ-7**. Exposure of people to objectionable odors would be the same under Alternative 3 as

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	Table O-1, Alternative 1 would not promote the construction of typical land uses that cause odor impacts. Alternative 1 would also have similar construction impacts as the proposed Plan and thus similar construction odor impacts. Furthermore, proposed land uses under Alternative 1 would be required to comply with all SDAPCD, city, county, and other odor rules, regulations and programs.	and thus similar construction odor impacts. Furthermore, proposed land uses within Alternative 2 would be required to comply with all SDAPCD, city, county, and other odor rules, regulations and programs. Thus, Alternative 2 would result in similar odor impacts.	under the proposed Plan because Alternative 3 would employ similar construction methods and have similar proposed land uses as the proposed Plan. Furthermore, Alternative 3 would be required to comply with all SDAPCD, city, county, and other odor rules, regulations and programs. Thus, Alternative 3 would result in similar Less-than-Significant odor impacts.
2035	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-1**. As with the proposed Plan, this alternative would be consistent with the 2016 SIP, 2016 RAQS, and the 2020 SIP.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-1**. As with the proposed Plan, this alternative would be consistent with the 2016 SIP, 2016 RAQS, and the 2020 SIP	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for **AQ-1**. As with the proposed Plan, this alternative would be consistent with the 2016 SIP, 2016 RAQS, and the 2020 SIP.
	Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-2**,. While Alternative 1 would cause an increase in onroad emissions compared to the proposed Plan, Alternative 1 would result in less emissions than the baseline (2016) conditions; refer to Appendix O, Table 0-4. Therefore, Alternative 1 would result in increased emissions compared to the proposed Plan, but because emissions would be lower than baseline (2016) conditions impacts would be less than significant.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-2**. Alternative 2 would cause an increase in onroad emissions compared to the proposed Plan but would result in less emissions than the baseline (2016) conditions; refer to Appendix O, Table 0-4. Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in increased emissions compared to the proposed Plan, but because emissions would be lower than baseline (2016) conditions, impacts would still be less than significant.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-2**. Alternative 3 would have lower VMT and emissions from onroad sources, but similar emissions from commuter rail compared to the proposed Plan. While Alternative 3 would result in a decrease in ROG, NO_X, CO, PM2.5, PM10, and SO_X emissions compared to the proposed Plan from onroad sources, and overall emissions would be similar to the proposed Plan. Alternative 3 would not result in cumulatively considerable net increase in any nonattainment or

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
			attainment criteria pollutant, similar to the proposed Plan; refer to Appendix O, Table O-4. Thus, Alternative 3 would lower emissions and have a less-than-significant impact.
	Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-3**. Alternative 1 would result in similar construction-related emissions compared to the proposed Plan, and would result in similar impacts.	**Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-3**. Alternative 2 would result in similar construction-related emissions compared to the proposed Plan, and would result in similar impacts.	**Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-3**. Alternative 3 would result in similar construction-related emissions compared to the proposed Plan, and would result in similar impacts.
	Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-4**, expos e sensitive receptors to substantial PM10 and PM2.5 concentrations. As shown in Appendix O, Table O-4, Alternative 1 would result in higher PM10 and PM2.5 emissions compared to the proposed Plan. Thus, Alternative 1 would have higher PM10 concentration impacts compared to the proposed Plan and would also result in a similar significant impact.	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-4**, expose sensitive receptors to substantial PM10 and PM2.5 concentrations. As shown in Appendix O Table O-4, Alternative 2 would result in higher PM10 and PM2.5 emissions compared to the proposed Plan. Thus, Alternative 2 would have higher PM10 concentration impacts compared to the proposed Plan and would also result in a similar significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-4**. Alternative 3 would result in a small decrease of PM10 and PM2.5 emissions compared to the proposed Plan; refer to Appendix O, Table O-4. However, PM10 concentration impacts would similar to the proposed Plan and would result in a similar significant impact.
	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-5,** expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations. Alternative 1 would result in similar population growth as the proposed Plan, but would not result in focused growth in	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-5,** expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations. Alternative 2 would result in similar population growth as the proposed Plan, but would not result in focused growth in	**Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-5,** expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations. Alternative 3 would result in similar population growth as the proposed Plan, but would focus all growth in the Mobility Hubs and would

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	Mobility Hubs and would not include the diesel commuter rail lines. However, Alternative 1 would result in higher per capita and overall VMT, which could increase TACs from roadways. Overall, while diesel exposure due to commuter rail lines would decrease, this could be offset by an increase in roadways TACs due to increased on-road VMT. Thus, Alternative 1 would have lower TACs compared to the proposed Plan, result in a similar significant impact.	Mobility Hubs and would not include the diesel commuter rail lines. However, Alternative 2 would result in higher per capita and overall VMT, which could increase TACs from roadways. Overall, while diesel exposure due to commuter rail lines would decrease, this could be offset by an increase in roadways TACs due to increased on-road VMT. Thus, Alternative 2 would have lower TACs compared to the proposed Plan, result in a similar significant impact.	include the diesel commuter rail lines. While emissions and associated health risk from the commuter rail lines would be similar, the increase in population in the Mobility Hubs may increase the amount of people exposed to this increased cancer risk compared to the proposed Plan. Moreover, Alternative 3 would result in lower per capita and overall VMT, which could decrease TACs from roadways. Overall, while diesel exposure due to commuter rail lines would be the same, more people could be exposed in Mobility Hubs, and the decrease in VMT could offset some of this increase in commuter rail TACs. Overall, Alternative 3 would have similar TACs compared to the proposed Plan, result in a similar significant impact.
	Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-6**. According to Appendix O, Table O-4, Alternative 1 would result in higher winter CO emissions compared to the proposed Plan. However, these CO emissions would be substantially less than the baseline (2016) conditions. Thus, exposure of sensitive receptors to CO concentrations would increase under Alternative 1 as under the	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-6**. According to Appendix O, Table O-4, Alternative 2 would result in higher winter CO emissions compared to the proposed Plan. However, these CO emissions would be substantially less than the baseline (2016) conditions. Thus, exposure of sensitive receptors to CO concentrations would increase under Alternative 2 as under the	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-6**. As shown in Appendix O, Table O-4, Alternative 3 would result in lower winter CO emissions compared to the Proposed Plan. Thus, exposure of sensitive receptors to CO concentrations would decrease under Alternative 3 as under the proposed Plan and be substantially below the baseline (2016) conditions. This would be a less-than-significant impact.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	proposed Plan but still result in a less-than-significant impact.	proposed Plan but still result in a less-than-significant impact.	
	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-7**. Exposure of people to objectionable odors would be the same under Alternative 1 as Alternative 1 would not promote the construction of typical land uses that cause odor impacts. Alternative 1 would have similar construction impacts as the proposed Plan and thus similar construction odor impacts. Furthermore, Alternative 1 would be required to comply with all SDAPCD, city, county, and other odor rules, regulations and programs.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-7**. Exposure of people to objectionable odors would be the same under Alternative 2 as under the proposed Plan because Alternative 2 would use similar construction methods and have similar land uses as the proposed Plan. Furthermore, Alternative 2 would also be required to comply with all SDAPCD, city, county, and other odor rules, regulations and programs. Thus, Alternative 2 would result in similar less-than-significant odor impacts	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-7**. Exposure of people to objectionable odors would be the same under Alternative 3 as under the proposed Plan because Alternative 3 would use similar construction methods and have similar land uses as the proposed Plan. Furthermore, Alternative 3 would also be required to comply with all SDAPCD, city, county, and other odor rules, regulations and programs. Thus, Alternative 3 would result in similar less-than-significant odor impacts.
2050	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-1**. As with the proposed Plan, this alternative would be consistent with the 2016 SIP, 2016 RAQS, and the 2020 SIP.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-1**. As with the proposed Plan, this alternative would be consistent with the 2016 SIP, 2016 RAQS, and the 2020 SIP.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-1**. As with the proposed Plan, this alternative would be consistent with the 2016 SIP, 2016 RAQS, and the 2020 SIP.
	Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-2**. While Alternative 1 would cause an increase in onroad emissions compared to the proposed Plan, Alternative 1 would result in less emissions than the baseline (2016) conditions; refer to Appendix O, Table 0-4. Therefore, Alternative 1 would	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-2** for PM10 and SO_X. While Alternative 2 would result in an increase in ROG, NO_X, CO, PM2.5 and PM10 emissions compared to the proposed Plan, Alternative 2 would result in less emissions than the baseline (2016) conditions; refer to	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-2**. Alternative 3 would have lower VMT and emissions from onroad sources, but similar emissions from commuter rail compared to the proposed Plan. While Alternative 3 would result in a decrease in ROG, NO_X, CO, PM2.5, PM10, and

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	result in increased emissions compared to the proposed Plan, but because emissions would be lower than baseline (2016) conditions impacts would still be significant compared to baseline conditions.	Appendix O, Table 0-4. Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in increased emissions when compared to the proposed Plan. Impacts would still be significant compared to baseline conditions.	SO_X emissions compared to the proposed Plan from onroad sources, and overall emissions would be similar to the proposed Plan, Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable net increase in any nonattainment or attainment criteria pollutant, similar to the proposed Plan; refer to Appendix O, Table O-4. Thus, while Alternative 3 would lower emissions, it would still result in a significant impact.
	No Impact (Decreased) – Alternative 1 would result in no impact in 2050 for **AQ-3**. Alternative 1 would not have any construction-related emissions in 2050 and thus would have substantially lower construction-related emissions compared to the proposed Plan. Impacts would be decreased.	**Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-3**. Alternative 2 would result in similar construction-related emissions compared to the proposed Plan, and would result in similar impacts.	**Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-3**. Alternative 3 would result in similar construction-related emissions compared to the proposed Plan, and would result in similar impacts.
	Significant Impact (Increased) – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-4**, expose sensitive receptors to substantial PM10 and PM2.5 concentrations. As shown in Appendix O, Table O-4, Alternative 1 would result in higher PM10 and PM2.5 emissions compared to the proposed Plan. Thus, Alternative 1 would have higher PM10 concentrations compared to the proposed Plan and would also result in a similar significant impact.	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-4**, expose sensitive receptors to substantial PM10 and PM2.5 concentrations. As shown in Appendix O, Table O-4, Alternative 2 would result in higher PM10 and PM2.5 emissions compared to the proposed Plan. Thus, Alternative 1 would have higher PM10 concentrations compared to the proposed Plan and would also result in a similar significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-4**, expose sensitive receptors to substantial PM10 and PM2.5 concentrations. Alternative 3 would result in a small decrease of PM10 and PM2.5 emissions compared to the proposed Plan; refer to Appendix O, Table O-4. However, PM10 concentration impacts would be similar to the proposed Plan and would result in a similar significant impact.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-5,** expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations. Alternative 1 would result in similar population growth as the proposed Plan, but would not result in focused growth in Mobility Hubs and would not include the diesel commuter rail lines. However, Alternative 1 would result in higher per capita and overall VMT, which could increase TACs from roadways. Overall, while diesel exposure due to commuter rail lines would decrease, this could be offset by an increase in roadways TACs due to increased on-road VMT. Thus, Alternative 1 would have lower TACs compared to the proposed Plan, result in a similar significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-5,** expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations. Alternative 2 would result in similar population growth as the proposed Plan, but would not result in focused growth in Mobility Hubs and would not include the diesel commuter rail lines. However, Alternative 2 would result in higher per capita and overall VMT, which could increase TACs from roadways. Overall, while diesel exposure due to commuter rail lines would decrease, this could be offset by an increase in roadways TACs due to increased on-road VMT. Thus, Alternative 2 would have lower TACs compared to the proposed Plan, result in a similar significant impact.	**Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-5,** expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations. Alternative 3 would result in similar population growth as the proposed Plan, but would focus all growth in the Mobility Hubs and would include the diesel commuter rail lines. While emissions and associated health risk from the commuter rail lines would be similar, the increase in population in the Mobility Hubs may increase the amount of people exposed to this increased cancer risk compared to the proposed Plan. Moreover, Alternative 3 would result in lower per capita and overall VMT, which could decrease TACs from roadways. Overall, while diesel exposure due to commuter rail lines would be the same, more people could be exposed in Mobility Hubs, and the decrease in VMT could offset some of this increase in commuter rail TACs. Overall, Alternative 3 would have similar TACs compared to the proposed Plan, result in a similar significant impact.
	Less-than-Significant Impact (Increased) – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-6**. According to Appendix O, Table O-4, Alternative 1 would result in higher winter	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-6** expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of CO. According to Appendix	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-6** expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of CO. As shown in Appendix

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	CO emissions compared to the proposed Plan. However, these CO emissions would be substantially less than the baseline (2016) conditions. Thus, exposure of sensitive receptors to CO concentrations would increase under Alternative 1 as under the proposed Plan but still result in a less-than-significant impact.	O, Table O-4, Alternative 2 would result in higher winter CO emissions compared to the proposed Plan. However, these CO emissions would be substantially less than the baseline (2016) conditions. Thus, exposure of sensitive receptors to CO concentrations would increase under Alternative 1 as under the proposed Plan but still result in a less-than-significant impact.	O, Table O-4, Alternative 3 would result in lower winter CO emissions compared to the Proposed Plan. Thus, exposure of sensitive receptors to CO concentrations would decrease under Alternative 3 as under the proposed Plan and be substantially below the baseline (2016) conditions. This would be a less-than-significant impact.
	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-7**. Exposure of people to objectionable odors would be the decreased under Alternative 1 as Alternative 1 would not have any construction emissions or construction-related odor impacts. Furthermore, build-out land uses under Alternative 1 would be required to comply with all SDAPCD, city, county, and other odor rules, regulations and programs.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-7** expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors. Exposure of people to objectionable odors would be the same under Alternative 2 as under the proposed Plan because Alternative 2 would use similar construction methods and have similar land uses as the proposed Plan. Furthermore, Alternative 2 would also be required to comply with all SDAPCD, city, county, and other odor rules, regulations and programs. Thus, Alternative 2 would result in similar less-than-significant odor impacts.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-7** expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors. Exposure of people to objectionable odors would be the same under Alternative 3 as under the proposed Plan because Alternative 3 would use similar construction methods and have similar land uses as the proposed Plan. Furthermore, Alternative 3 would also be required to comply with all SDAPCD, city, county, and other odor rules, regulations and programs. Thus, Alternative 3 would result in similar less-than-significant odor impacts.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
Biological Resources			
2025	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact on biological resources due to adverse effects on sensitive natural communities and regulated aquatic resources (**BIO-1**); adverse effects on candidate, sensitive, endangered, rare, threatened, or special status species (**BIO-**2); and substantial interference with wildlife movement (**BIO-3**). The impacts of Alternative 1 in 2025 would be greater than proposed Plan impacts because there would be less compact development in the region and more impact on natural communities, plant and animal species, and wildlife movement.	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact on biological resources for **BIO-1**, **BIO-2**, and **BIO-3**. The impacts of Alternative 2 in 2025 would be greater than proposed Plan impacts because there would be less compact development in the region and more impact on natural communities, plant and animal species, and wildlife movement.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact on biological resources for **BIO-1**, **BIO-2**, and **BIO-3**. The impacts of Alternative 3 in 2025 would be less than proposed Plan impacts because there would be more compact development around mobility hubs in the region and less impact on natural communities, plant and animal species, and wildlife movement.
	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 1 would result in the following less-than-significant impact in 2025 for **BIO-4** conflict with the provisions of an adopted HCP, NCCP, or other conservation plan, or with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Encroachment into hardline preserve areas would require biologically equivalent or superior compensation of habitat or project redesign, the same as the proposed Plan.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 (**BIO-4**). Encroachment into hardline preserve areas would require biologically equivalent or superior compensation of habitat or project redesign, the same as the proposed Plan.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 (**BIO-4).** Encroachment into hardline preserve areas would require biologically equivalent or superior compensation of habitat or project redesign, the same as the proposed Plan.
2035	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact on biological resources for **BIO-1**,	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact on biological resources for **BIO-1**,	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact on biological resources for **BIO-1**,

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	BIO-2, and **BIO-3**. The impacts of Alternative 1 in 2035 would be greater than proposed Plan impacts because there would be less compact development in the region and more impacts on natural communities, plant and animal species, and wildlife movement.	**BIO-2**, and **BIO-3**. The impacts of Alternative 2 in 2035 would be greater than proposed Plan impacts because there would be less compact development in the region and more impacts on natural communities, plant and animal species, and wildlife movement.	**BIO-2**, and **BIO-3**. The impacts of Alternative 3 in 2025 would be less than proposed Plan impacts because there would be more compact development in the region around mobility hubs, and less impacts on natural communities, plant and animal species, and wildlife movement.
	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 (**BIO-4**). Encroachment into hardline preserve areas would require biologically equivalent or superior compensation of habitat or project redesign, the same as the proposed Plan.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 (**BIO-4**). Encroachment into hardline preserve areas would require biologically equivalent or superior compensation of habitat or project redesign, the same as the proposed Plan.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 (**BIO-4**). Encroachment into hardline preserve areas would require biologically equivalent or superior compensation of habitat or project redesign, the same as the proposed Plan.
2050	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact on biological resources for **BIO-1**, **BIO-2**, and **BIO-3**. The impacts of Alternative 1 in 2050 would be greater than proposed Plan impacts because there would be less compact development in the region and more impacts on natural communities, plant and animal species, and wildlife movement.	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact on biological resources for **BIO-1**, **BIO-2**, and **BIO-3**. The impacts of Alternative 2 in 2050 would be greater than proposed Plan impacts because there would be less compact development in the region and more impacts on natural communities, plant and animal species, and wildlife movement.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact on biological resources for **BIO-1**, **BIO-2**, and **BIO-3**. The impacts of Alternative 3 in 2025 would be less than proposed Plan impacts because there would be more compact development in the region around mobility hubs and less impacts on natural communities, plant and animal species, and wildlife movement.
	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 (**BIO-4**). Encroachment into hardline preserve areas would require biologically equivalent or	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 (**BIO-4**). Encroachment into hardline preserve areas would require biologically equivalent or	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 (**BIO-4).** Encroachment into hardline preserve areas would require biologically equivalent or

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	superior compensation of habitat or project redesign, the same as the proposed Plan.	superior compensation of habitat or project redesign, the same as the proposed Plan.	superior compensation of habitat or project redesign, the same as the proposed Plan.
Cultural Resources			
2025	**Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact on cultural resources due to substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource or unique archaeological resource (**CULT-1**). The impacts of Alternative 1 in 2025 would be similar to the proposed Plan due to ground-disturbing activities that could encounter and adversely affect historical or archaeological resources. Growth associated with Alternative 1 would be more spread-out in the region potentially resulting in more impacts to previously undisturbed land. However, there would be less disturbance due to transportation improvements; thus, the impact would be similar to the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact on cultural resources (**CULT-1**). The impacts of Alternative 2 in 2025 would be increased compared to the proposed Plan due to ground-disturbing activities related to less compact growth and transportation improvements focused on highways rather than mobility hubs that could encounter and adversely affect historical or archaeological resources.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact on cultural resources (**CULT-1**). The impacts of Alternative 3 in 2025 would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan because more compact development and less roadway and highway-related transportation improvements would occur, which would result in less ground-disturbing activities that could encounter and adversely affect historical or archaeological resources.
	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 1 would result in the following less-than-significant impact in 2025 for **CULT-2** disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries, in violation of existing laws and regulations. Existing laws and regulations would continue to apply to Alternative 1, so	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for **CULT-2**. Existing laws and regulations would continue to apply to Alternative 2, so the impact would be the same as the proposed Plan impact.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for **CULT-2**. Existing laws and regulations would continue to apply to Alternative 3, so the impact would be the same as the proposed Plan impact.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	the impact would be the same as the proposed Plan impact.		
2035	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact on cultural resources (**CULT-1**). The impacts of Alternative 1 in 2035 would be less than the proposed Plan because growth associated with Alternative 1 would be more spread-out in the region potentially resulting in more impacts to previously undisturbed land. However, there would be significantly less disturbance due to transportation improvements because there would be no new improvements beyond 2025 ; thus, the impact would be less than the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact on cultural resources (**CULT-1**). The impacts of Alternative 2 in 2035 would be increased compared to the proposed Plan due to the ground-disturbing activities related to less compact growth and transportation improvements focused on highways rather than mobility hubs that could encounter and adversely affect historical or archaeological resources.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact on cultural resources (**CULT-1**). The impacts of Alternative 3 in 2035 would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan because more compact development and less roadway and highway-related transportation improvements would occur, which would result in less ground-disturbing activities that could encounter and adversely affect historical or archaeological resources.
	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for **CULT-2**. Existing laws and regulations would continue to apply to Alternative 1, so the impact would be the same as the proposed Plan impact.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for **CULT-2**. Existing laws and regulations would continue to apply to Alternative 2, so the impact would be the same as the proposed Plan impact.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for **CULT-2**. Existing laws and regulations would continue to apply to Alternative 3, so the impact would be the same as the proposed Plan impact.
2050	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact on cultural resources (**CULT-1**). The impacts of Alternative 1 in 2050 would be less than the proposed Plan because growth associated with Alternative 1 would be more spread-out in the region potentially resulting in more impacts to previously undisturbed	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact on cultural resources (**CULT-1**). The impacts of Alternative 2 in 2050 would be increased compared to the proposed Plan due to the ground-disturbing activities related to less compact growth and transportation improvements focused on	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact on cultural resources (**CULT-1**). The impacts of Alternative 3 in 2050 would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan because more compact development and less roadway and highway-related transportation improvements would occur,

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	land. However, there would be significantly less disturbance due to transportation improvements because there would be no new improvements beyond 2025 ; thus, the impact would be less than the proposed Plan	highways rather than mobility hubs that could encounter and adversely affect historical or archaeological resources.	which would result in less ground-disturbing activities that could encounter and adversely affect historical or archaeological resources.
	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **CULT-2**. Existing laws and regulations would continue to apply to Alternative 1, so the impact would be the same as the proposed Plan impact.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **CULT-2**. Existing laws and regulations would continue to apply to Alternative 2, so the impact would be the same as the proposed Plan impact.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **CULT-2**. Existing laws and regulations would continue to apply to Alternative 3, so the impact would be the same as the proposed Plan impact.
Energy			
2025	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 1 would result in the following less-than-significant impact in 2025 for **EN-1** result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy during project construction or operations. Existing State and regional regulations and programs to reduce energy use would continue to apply to Alternative 1; however, land use would not include as much multi-family development as under the proposed Plan. Thus, Alternative 1 would result in increased impacts.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 (**EN-1**). Existing State and regional regulations and programs to reduce energy use would continue to apply to Alternative 2; however, land use would not include as much multi-family development as under the proposed Plan. Thus, Alternative 2 would result in increased impacts.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 (**EN-1**). Existing State and regional regulations and programs to reduce energy use would continue to apply to Alternative 3; however, land use would include more dense development including multi-family development than under the proposed Plan. Thus Alternative 3 would result in decreased impacts.
	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 1 would result in the following less-than-significant impact in 2025 for **EN-2**	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 (**EN-2**). Alternative	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 (**EN-2**).

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Alternative 1 would be consistent with adopted plans to address energy; thus, it would result in the same significant impact as the proposed Plan.	2 would be consistent with adopted plans to address energy; thus, it would result in the same significant impact as the proposed Plan.	Alternative 3 would be consistent with adopted plans to address energy; thus, it would result in the same significant impact as the proposed Plan.
2035	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 (**EN-1**). Existing State and regional regulations and programs to reduce energy use would continue to apply to Alternative 1; however, land use would not include as much multi-family development as under the proposed Plan. Thus, Alternative 1 would result in increased impacts.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 (**EN-1**). Existing State and regional regulations and programs to reduce energy use would continue to apply to Alternative 2; however, land use would not include as much multi-family development as under the proposed Plan. Thus, Alternative 2 would result in increased impacts.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 (**EN-1**). Existing State and regional regulations and programs to reduce energy use would continue to apply to Alternative 3; however, land use would include more dense development including multi-family development than under the proposed Plan. Thus, Alternative 3 would result in decreased impacts.
	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 (**EN-2**). Alternative 1 would be consistent with adopted plans to address energy; thus, it would result in the same significant impact as the proposed Plan.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 (**EN-2**). Alternative 2 would be consistent with adopted plans to address energy; thus, it would result in the same significant impact as the proposed Plan.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 (**EN-2**). Alternative 3 would be consistent with adopted plans to address energy; thus, it would result in the same significant impact as the proposed Plan.
2050	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 (**EN-1**). Existing State and regional regulations and programs to reduce energy use would continue to apply to Alternative 1; however, land use would not	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 (**EN-1**). Existing State and regional regulations and programs to reduce energy use would continue to apply to Alternative 2; however, land use would not	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 (**EN-1**). Existing State and regional regulations and programs to reduce energy use would continue to apply to Alternative 3; however,

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	include as much multi-family development as under the proposed Plan. Thus, Alternative 1 would result in increased impacts.	include as much multi-family development as under the proposed Plan. Thus, Alternative 2 would result in an increase of impacts.	land use would include more dense development including multi-family development than under the proposed Plan. Thus, Alternative 3 would result in decreased impacts.
	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 (**EN-2**). Alternative 1 would be consistent with adopted plans to address energy; thus, it would result in the same significant impact as the proposed Plan.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 (**EN-2**). Alternative 2 would be consistent with adopted plans to address energy; thus, it would result in the same significant impact as the proposed Plan.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 (**EN-2**). Alternative 3 would be consistent with adopted plans to address energy; thus, it would result in the same significant impact as the proposed Plan.
Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources			
2025	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** The proposed Plan would result in the following less-than-significant impacts in 2025: **GEO-1** expose people or structures to potential substantial significant impacts, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: a) rupture of a known earthquake fault, b) strong seismic ground shaking; c) seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; and d) seismically-induced landslides; and **GEO-2** locate projects on a geologic unit or soil that is expansive or unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse; **GEO-3** result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil;	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** The proposed Plan would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2025 (**GEO-1**, **GEO-2**, **GEO-3** and **GEO-4**). Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts due to adherence to applicable laws and regulations.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** The proposed Plan would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2025 (**GEO-1**, **GEO-2**, **GEO-3** and **GEO-4**). Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts due to adherence to applicable laws and regulations.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	and **GEO-4** have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems, potentially causing adverse groundwater impacts. Alternative 1 would result in less-than-significant impacts due to adherence to applicable laws and regulations.		
	Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 1 would result in the following significant impact in 2025 for **PALEO-1** directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature. Impacts would be same as the proposed Plan in 2025 because impacts from regional growth would be less compact than the proposed Plan, but there would be less transportation improvement projects proposed as part of Alternative 1; thus, the resulting impacts would be similar to the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in significant impact **PALEO-1** in 2025. Impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan in 2025 because impacts from regional growth and land use change would be less compact, and transportation network improvements and programs would include more roadway and highway improvements than the proposed Plan, which would result in increased potential to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or unique geological feature.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in significant impact **PALEO-1** in 2025. Impacts would be less than the proposed Plan in 2025 because impacts from regional growth and land use change would be decreased due to more dense development around mobility hubs, and transportation network improvements and programs would include less highway and roadway improvements compared to the proposed Plan, which would result in les impacts to unique paleontological and geologic resources.
2035	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** The proposed Plan would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 (**GEO-1**, **GEO-2**, **GEO-3** and **GEO-4**). Alternative 1 would result in less-than-significant impacts due to adherence to applicable laws and regulations.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** The proposed Plan would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 (**GEO-1**, **GEO-2**, **GEO-3** and **GEO-4**). Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts due to adherence to applicable laws and regulations.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)–** The proposed Plan would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 (**GEO-1**, **GEO-2**, **GEO-3** and **GEO-4**). Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts due to adherence to applicable laws and regulations.
	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 1 would result in significant impact **PALEO-1** in 2035. Impacts would be	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in significant impact **PALEO-1** in 2035. Impacts would be	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in significant impact **PALEO-1** in 2035. Impacts would be

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	less than the proposed Plan in 2035 because impacts from regional growth and land use change would be increased due to less compact development, but there would be no transportation improvements after 2025 as part of Alternative 1. Thus, the net impacts would be less than the proposed Plan.	increased compared to the proposed Plan in 2035 because impacts from regional growth and land use change would be increased due to less compact development, and transportation network improvements and programs would involve more roadway and highway improvements compared to the proposed Plan, which would result in increased potential to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature.	decreased compared to the proposed Plan in 2035 because impacts from regional growth and land use change would be decreased due to more dense development around mobility hubs, and transportation network improvements and programs would include less highway and roadway improvements compared to the proposed Plan, which would result in les impacts to unique paleontological and geologic resources.
2050	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** The proposed Plan would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2050 (**GEO-1**, **GEO-2**, **GEO-3** and **GEO-4**). Alternative 1 would result in less-than-significant impacts due to adherence to applicable laws and regulations.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** The proposed Plan would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2050 (**GEO-1**, **GEO-2**, **GEO-3** and **GEO-4**). Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts due to adherence to applicable laws and regulations.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** The proposed Plan would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2050 (**GEO-1**, **GEO-2**, **GEO-3** and **GEO-4**). Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts due to adherence to applicable laws and regulations.
	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 1 would result in significant impact **PALEO-1** in 2050. Impacts would be less than the proposed Plan in 2050 because impacts from regional growth and land use change would be increased due to less compact development, but there would be no transportation improvements after 2025 as part of Alternative 1. Thus, the net impacts would be less than the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in significant impact **PALEO-1** in 2050. Impacts would be greater than the proposed Plan in 2050 because impacts from regional growth and land use change would be greater due to less compact development, and transportation network improvements and programs would include more roadway and highway improvements compared to proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in significant impact **PALEO-1** in 2050. Impacts would be less than the proposed Plan in 2050 because impacts from regional growth and land use change would decrease due to more compact development around mobility hubs, and transportation network improvements and programs would focus on more public transit projects rather than highway projects compared to the proposed Plan.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
2025	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 1 would result in the following less-than-significant impacts in 2025 for **GHG-1** directly or indirectly result in an increase in GHG emissions compared to existing conditions (2016)[3] and **GHG-4** conflict with or impede the implementation of local plans adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. As shown in Appendix O, Tables O-3 and O-4, under Alternative 1 in 2025, regional growth, land uses, and the transportation projects shown in Table O-1would result in higher GHG emissions than the proposed Plan in 2025 and would result in increased impacts.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2025 (**GHG-1** and **GHG-4**). Regional growth, land uses, and transportation network improvements for Alternative 2 would result in higher GHG emissions than the proposed Plan and would result in increased impacts; refer to Appendix O, Tables O-3 and O-4.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2025 (**GHG-1**and **GHG-4**). Regional growth, land uses, and transportation network improvements for Alternative 3 would result in lower GHG emissions than the proposed Plan due to more compact development, and would result in decreased impacts; refer to Appendix O, Tables O-3 and O-4.
	Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2030 for **GHG-5**, be inconsistent with the State's ability to achieve the 2030 reduction target of SB 32 and long-term reduction goals of Executive Orders S-3-05 and B-55-18. Alternative 1 would result in higher GHG emissions that would not meet the reduction target reference point for 2030	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2030 (**GHG-5**). Alternative 2 would result in higher GHG emissions that would not meet the reduction target reference point for 2030 and would result in increased impacts compared to the proposed Plan; refer to Appendix O, Tables O-3 and O-4.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2030 (**GHG-5**). Alternative 3 would result in lower GHG emissions compared to the proposed Plan but would not meet the reduction target reference point for 2030, and would result in similar impacts compared to the proposed Plan; refer to Appendix O, Tables O-3 and O-4.

[3] As shown in Table 4.8-6, the majority of the GHG emissions in the San Diego region are from mobile sources.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	and would result in increased impacts compared to the proposed Plan; refer to Appendix O, Tables O-3 and O-4.		
2035	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 1 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 (**GHG-1**, **GHG-3**, and **GHG-4**). Regional growth, land uses, and transportation network improvements for Alternative 1 would result in higher GHG emissions than the proposed Plan due to a less compact land use pattern and fewer transit-oriented transportation network improvement projects. However, while Alternative 1 emissions are higher than the proposed Plan, Alternative 1 emissions in 2035 would still be below existing levels (**GHG-1**), would achieve at least a 30% reduction per capita relative to existing levels (**GHG-2**), and would not conflict with or impede the implementation of local plans (**GHG-4**). Refer to Appendix O, Tables O-3 and O-4.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 (**GHG-1**, **GHG-3**, and **GHG-4**). Regional growth, land uses, and transportation network improvements for Alternative 2 would result in higher GHG emissions than the proposed Plan due to a less compact land use pattern and fewer transit-oriented transportation network improvements. However, while Alternative 2 emissions are higher than the proposed Plan, Alternative 2 emissions in 2035 would still be below existing levels (**GHG-1**), would achieve at least a 30% reduction per capita relative to existing levels (**GHG-2**), and would not conflict with or impede the implementation of local plans (**GHG-4**). Refer to Appendix O, Tables O-3 and O-4.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 (**GHG-1**, **GHG-3,** and **GHG-4**). Regional growth, land uses, and transportation network improvements for Alternative 3 would result in lower GHG emissions than the proposed Plan due to more compact development around mobility hubs and more transit-oriented transportation network improvements and programs, and would result in decreased impacts: refer to Appendix O, Tables O-3 and O-4.
	Significant Impact (increased)- Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **GHG-2** and would result in an increased impact compared to the proposed Plan. Alternative 1 would result in a -9.06% per capita GHG reduction, which would not meet the 2035 reduction goal 19% below 2005, and would result in less reductions than the	**Significant Impact (increased)-** Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **GHG-2** and would result in an increased impact compared to the proposed Plan. Alternative 2 would result in a -13.2% per capita GHG reduction, which would not meet the 2035 reduction goal of 19% below 2005, and would result in less reductions than the	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased)-** Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for **GHG-2** and would result in a decreased impact compared to the proposed Plan. Alternative 3 would result in a -22% per capita GHG reduction, which would exceed the 2035 reduction goal of 19% below

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	proposed Plan (20.38% below 2005); refer to Appendix O, Tables O-3.	proposed Plan (20.38% below 2005); refer to Appendix O, Tables O-3.	2005, and would result in a greater reduction than the proposed Plan (20.38% below 2005); refer to Appendix O, Tables O-3.
	Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2035 (**GHG-5**). Alternative 1 would result in higher GHG emissions that would not meet the reduction target reference points for 2030 and 2045, and would result in increased impacts compared to the proposed Plan; refer to Appendix O, Tables O-3 and O-4.	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2035 (**GHG-5**). Alternative 2 would result in higher GHG emissions that would not meet the reduction target reference points for 2030 and 2045, and would result in increased impacts compared to the proposed Plan; refer to Appendix O, Tables O-3 and O-4.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2035 (**GHG-5**). Alternative 3 would result in lower GHG emissions compared to the proposed Plan but would not meet the reduction target reference points for 2030 and 2045, and would result in similar impacts compared to the proposed Plan; refer to Appendix O, Table O-3 and O-4.
2050	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 1 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2050 (**GHG-1** and **GHG-4**). Regional growth, land uses, and transportation network improvements for Alternative 1 would result in higher GHG emissions than the proposed Plan and would result in increased impacts; refer to Appendix O, Tables O-3 and O-4. **Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2050 (**GHG-5**). Alternative 1 would result in higher GHG emissions that would not meet the reduction target reference points for 2045 and 2050, and would result in increased impacts compared to the	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2050 (**GHG-1** and **GHG-4**). Regional growth, land uses, and transportation network improvements for Alternative 2 would result in higher GHG emissions than the proposed Plan and would result in increased impacts; refer to Appendix O, Tables O-3 and O-4. **Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2050 (**GHG-5**). Alternative 2 would result in higher GHG emissions that would not meet the reduction target reference points for 2045 and 2050, and would result in increased impacts compared to the	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2050 (**GHG-1** and **GHG-4**). Regional growth, land uses, and transportation network improvements for Alternative 3 would result in lower GHG emissions than the proposed Plan due to more compact development, and would result in decreased impacts; refer to Appendix O, Tables O-3 and O-4. **Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2050 (**GHG-5**). Alternative 3 would result in lower GHG emissions compared to the proposed Plan. but still would not meet the reduction target

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	proposed Plan; refer to Appendix O, Tables O-3 and O-4.	proposed Plan. Refer to Appendix O, Table O-3 and O-4.	reference points for 2045 and 2050. Refer to Appendix O, Table O-3 and O-4.
Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
2025	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 1 would result in the following less-than-significant impacts in 2025 for **HAZ-1** create a significant hazard by generating hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials or result in the release of hazardous materials in the environment during pre-construction, demolition, and/or construction activities, including being located on a Government Code Section 65952.5 hazardous materials site; **HAZ-2** create a significant hazard to the public, schools or the environment through the routine use, handling, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials; **HAZ-3** for a project located within an airport land use plan or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; and **HAZ-4** impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan or result in inadequate emergency access. These impacts would be the same as proposed Plan impacts because existing regulations, plans, and programs	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2025 (**HAZ-1**, **HAZ-2**, **HAZ-3**, and **HAZ-4**). These impacts would be the same as proposed Plan impacts because existing regulations, plans, and programs maintaining these impacts at less-than-significant levels would continue with this alternative.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2025 (**HAZ-1**, **HAZ-2**, **HAZ-3**, and **HAZ-4**). These impacts would be the same as proposed Plan impacts because existing regulations, plans, and programs maintaining these impacts at less-than-significant levels would continue with this alternative.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	maintaining these impacts at less-than-significant levels would continue with this alternative.		
2035	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 1 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 (**HAZ-1**, **HAZ-2**, **HAZ-3**, and **HAZ-4**). These impacts would be the same as proposed Plan impacts because existing regulations, plans, and programs maintaining these impacts at less-than-significant levels would continue with this alternative.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 (**HAZ-1**, **HAZ-2**, **HAZ-3**, and **HAZ-4**). These impacts would be the same as proposed Plan impacts because existing regulations, plans, and programs maintaining these impacts at less-than-significant levels would continue with this alternative.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 (**HAZ-1**, **HAZ-2**, **HAZ-3**, and **HAZ-4**). These impacts would be the same as proposed Plan impacts because existing regulations, plans, and programs maintaining these impacts at less-than-significant levels would continue with this alternative.
2050	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 1 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2050 (**HAZ-1**, **HAZ-2**, **HAZ-3**, and **HAZ-4**). These impacts would be the same as proposed Plan impacts because existing regulations, plans, and programs maintaining these impacts at less-than-significant levels would continue with this alternative.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2050 (**HAZ-1**, **HAZ-2**, **HAZ-3**, and **HAZ-4**). These impacts would be the same as proposed Plan impacts because existing regulations, plans, and programs maintaining these impacts at less-than-significant levels would continue with this alternative.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2050 (**HAZ-1**, **HAZ-2**, **HAZ-3**, and **HAZ-4**). These impacts would be the same as proposed Plan impacts because existing regulations, plans, and programs maintaining these impacts at less-than-significant levels would continue with this alternative.
Hydrology and Water Quality			
2025	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 1 would result in the following less-than-significant impacts in 2025 for **HWQ-1** substantially degrade surface water or groundwater quality, including in violation of any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or in conflict with a water quality control plan or its	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2025 (**HWQ-1**, **HWQ-2**, **HWQ-3**, and **HWQ-4**). Existing regulations, plans, and programs would be in effect, and implementation of design measures would occur, the same as under the proposed Plan; however, regional growth would be more	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2025 (**HWQ-1**, **HWQ-2**, **HWQ-3**, and **HWQ-4**). Existing regulations, plans, and programs would be in effect, and implementation of design measures would occur, the same as under the proposed Plan; however, regional

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	implementation; **HWQ-2** substantially alter the existing drainage patter of any area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; **HWQ-3** substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of an area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would (i) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site or (ii) impede or redirect flood flows; **HWQ-4** substantially increase risk of pollutant release due to inundation of a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zone. Existing regulations, plans, and programs would be in effect, and implementation of design measures would occur, the same as under the proposed Plan; however, regional growth would be more dispersed in Alternative 1 compared to the proposed project, which would result in more impervious surfaces and more stormwater run-off region wide. Thus, less-than-significant impacts would be increased.	dispersed in Alternative 2 compared to the proposed project, which would result in more impervious surfaces and more stormwater run-off region wide. Thus less-than-significant impacts would be increased.	growth would be more compact in Alternative 3 compared to the proposed project, which would result in less impervious surfaces and less stormwater run-off region wide. Thus less-than-significant impacts would be decreased.
2035	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 1 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 (**HWQ-1**, **HWQ-2**, **HWQ-3**, and **HWQ-4**). Existing regulations,	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 (**HWQ-1**, **HWQ-2**, **HWQ-3**, and **HWQ-4**). Existing regulations,	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 (**HWQ-1**, **HWQ-2**, **HWQ-3**, and **HWQ-4**). Existing

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	plans, and programs would be in effect, and implementation of design measures would occur, the same as under the proposed Plan; however, regional growth would be more dispersed in Alternative 1 compared to the proposed project, which would result in more impervious surfaces and more stormwater run-off region wide. Thus less-than-significant impacts would be increased.	plans, and programs would be in effect, and implementation of design measures would occur, the same as under the proposed Plan; however, regional growth would be more dispersed in Alternative 2 compared to the proposed project, which would result in more impervious surfaces and more stormwater run-off region wide. Thus less-than-significant impacts would be increased.	regulations, plans, and programs would be in effect, and implementation of design measures would occur, the same as under the proposed Plan; however, regional growth would be more compact in Alternative 3 compared to the proposed project, which would result in less impervious surfaces and less stormwater run-off region wide. Thus less-than-significant impacts would be decreased.
2050	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 1 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2050 (**HWQ-1**, **HWQ-2**, **HWQ-3**, and **HWQ-4**). Existing regulations, plans, and programs would be in effect, and implementation of design measures would occur, the same as under the proposed Plan; however, regional growth would be more dispersed in Alternative 1 compared to the proposed project, which would result in more impervious surfaces and more stormwater run-off region wide. Thus less-than-significant impacts would be increased.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2050 (**HWQ-1**, **HWQ-2**, **HWQ-3**, and **HWQ-4**). Existing regulations, plans, and programs would be in effect, and implementation of design measures would occur, the same as under the proposed Plan; however, regional growth would be more dispersed in Alternative 2 compared to the proposed project, which would result in more impervious surfaces and more stormwater run-off region wide. Thus less-than-significant impacts would be increased.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2050 (**HWQ-1**, **HWQ-2**, **HWQ-3**, and **HWQ-4**). Existing regulations, plans, and programs would be in effect, and implementation of design measures would occur, the same as under the proposed Plan; however, regional growth would be more compact in Alternative 3 compared to the proposed project, which would result in less impervious surfaces and less stormwater run-off region wide. Thus less-than-significant impacts would be decreased.
Land Use			
2025	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 1 would result in the following significant impact in 2025 for **LU-1** which discusses physically dividing an established community. Impacts would be the less than	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in the following significant impact in 2025: **LU-1**. Impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan in 2025 because more	**Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 3 would result in the following significant impact in 2025 for **LU-1**. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Plan in 2025

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	the proposed Plan in 2025 because fewer transportation network improvements would occur that would result in potential to physically divide an established community under Alternative 1.	transportation network improvements related to highways would occur, which would have an increased potential to physically divide an established community.	because similar transportation network improvements would occur.
	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for **LU-2**, cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation (including, but not limited to, the General Plan, Local Coastal Program, or Zoning Ordinance) and result in a physical change to the environment not already addressed in the other resource chapters of this EIR. Impacts would be decreased in 2025 compared to the proposed Plan because Alternative 1 land uses would be more consistent with general plans and specific plans.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for **LU-2**. Impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan in 2025 because the land use patterns in Alternative 2 would have less conflicts with general plans and specific plans than those in the proposed Plan.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for **LU-2**. This impact would be greater as a result of Alternative 3 because more dense development in urban areas would conflict with the land use elements of adopted general plans and specific plans.
2035	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **LU-1**. Impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan in 2035 because no transportation network improvements would occur after 2025 under Alternative 1.	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **LU-1**. Impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan in 2035 because more transportation network improvements related to highways would occur, which would increase the potential to physically divide an established community.	**Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **LU-1**. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Plan in 2035 because similar transportation network improvements would occur.
	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in the following	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 3 would result in a significant

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	significant impact in 2035 for **LU-2**. Impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan in 2035 because the land use patterns would not conflict with adopted general plans and specific plans.	significant impact in 2035 for **LU-2**. Impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan in 2035 because land use patterns would be consistent with adopted general plans and specific plans.	impact in 2035 for **LU-2**. This impact would be greater as a result of Alternative 3 because more dense development in urban areas would conflict with the land use portions of adopted general plans and specific plans.
2050	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **LU-1**. Impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan in 2050 because no transportation network improvements would occur after 2025 under Alternative 1.	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in the following significant impact in 2050 for **LU-1**. Impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan in 2050 because more transportation network improvements related to highways would occur, which would increase the potential to physically divide an established community.	**Significant Impact same)** – Alternative 3 would result in the following significant impact in 2050 for **LU-1**. I Impacts would be the same as the proposed Plan in 2050 because similar transportation network improvements would occur.
	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **LU-2**. Impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan in 2050 because the land use pattern under Alternative 1 would be consistent with adopted general plans and specific plans.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **LU-2**. Impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan in 2050 the land use patterns under Alternative 2 would not conflict with adopted general plans and specific plans.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 (**LU-2**). This impact would be greater as a result of Alternative 3 because more dense development in urban areas would conflict with the land use portions of adopted general plans and specific plans.
Mineral Resources			
2025	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in the following significant impact on mineral resources in 2025: **MR-1** result in the loss of availability of known aggregate and mineral resources supply sites that would be of value to the	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact on mineral resources in 2025 (**MR-1**). The impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan in 2025 because Alternative 2 land use would not be as	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact on mineral resources in 2025 (**MR-1**). The impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan in 2025 because Alternative 3 land use would be

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	region and the residents of the State, or result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated in a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan. The impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan in 2025 because Alternative 1 land use would not be as concentrated in urban areas as it would under the proposed Plan and would result in more land use conflict with mineral resources.	concentrated in urban areas as it would under the proposed Plan and would result in more land use conflict with mineral resources.	more concentrated in urban areas than it would under the proposed Plan and would result in less land use conflict with mineral resources.
2035	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact on mineral resources in 2035 (**MR-1**). The impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan in 2035 because Alternative 1 land use would not be as concentrated in urban areas as it would under the proposed Plan and would result in more land use conflict with mineral resources.	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact on mineral resources in 2035 (**MR-1**). The impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan in 2035 because Alternative 2 land use would not be as concentrated in urban areas as it would under the proposed Plan and would result in more land use conflict with mineral resources.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact on mineral resources in 2035 (**MR-1**). The impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan in 2035 because Alternative 3 land use would be more concentrated in urban areas than it would under the proposed Plan and would result in less land use conflict with mineral resources.
2050	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact on mineral resources in 2050 (**MR-1**). The impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan in 2050 because Alternative 1 land use would not be as concentrated in urban areas as it would under the proposed Plan and would result in	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact on mineral resources in 2050 (**MR-1**). The impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan in 2050 because Alternative 2 land use would not be as concentrated in urban areas as it would under the proposed Plan and would result in	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact on mineral resources in 2050 (**MR-1**). The impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan in 2050 because Alternative 3 land use would be more concentrated in urban areas than it would under the proposed Plan and would

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	more land use conflict with mineral resources.	more land use conflict with mineral resources.	result in less land use conflict with mineral resources.
Noise			
2025	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in the following significant impacts in 2025 for **NOI-1** generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies; or generate a substantial absolute increase in ambient noise; and **NOI-2** generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. Land use patterns would result in more dispersed development than the proposed Plan, which could expose more sensitive receptors to higher noise levels. Additionally, regional growth and transportation network improvements would occur under this alternative by 2025, resulting in noise and vibration impacts similar to proposed Plan impacts.	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in significant impacts in 2025 (**NOI-1** and **NOI-2**). Land use patterns would result in less compact development compared to the proposed Plan, which could expose more sensitive receptors to high noise levels. Additionally, regional growth and transportation network improvements would occur under this alternative by 2025 resulting in noise and vibration impacts similar to the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in significant impacts in 2025 (**NOI-1** and **NOI-2**). Land use patterns under Alternative 3 would result in more dense development, which could result in exposure of fewer sensitive receptors to high noise levels compared to the proposed Plan. Additionally, regional growth and transportation network improvements would occur under this alternative by 2025 resulting in noise and vibration impacts similar to the proposed Plan.
	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 1 would result in the following less-than-significant impact in 2025 (**NOI-3)** for a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted,	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 1 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2025 (**NOI-3**). The impact of this alternative is the same as under the proposed Plan because this alternative would not meaningfully change	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2025 (**NOI-3**). The impact of this alternative is the same as under the proposed Plan because this alternative would not meaningfully change

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, the project would expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. The impact of this alternative is the same as under the proposed Plan because this alternative would not meaningfully change exposure of people to excessive noise levels from aircraft.	exposure of people to excessive noise levels from aircraft.	exposure of people to excessive noise levels from aircraft.
2035	**Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 1 would result in significant impacts in 2035 (**NOI-1** and **NOI-2**). Land use patterns would be less compact under Alternative 1, which could expose more sensitive receptors to high noise levels. In addition, no transportation network improvements would occur under this alternative after 2035, resulting in less noise and vibration impacts than to the proposed Plan. The net change would result in noise impacts similar to the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in significant impacts in 2035 (**NOI-1** and **NOI-2**). Land use patterns would be less compact than the proposed Plan, which could expose more sensitive receptors to high noise levels. Additionally, regional growth and transportation network improvements would occur under this alternative by 2035 resulting in noise and vibration impacts similar to the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in significant impacts in 2035 (**NOI-1** and **NOI-2**). Land use patterns would be more compact than the proposed Plan, which could result in the exposure of fewer sensitive receptors to high noise levels than the proposed Plan. In addition, regional growth and transportation network improvements would occur under this alternative by 2035 resulting in noise and vibration impacts similar to the proposed Plan.
	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 1 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 (**NOI-3**). The impact of this alternative is the same as under the proposed Plan because this alternative would not meaningfully change exposure of people to excessive noise levels from aircraft.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 (**NOI-3**). The impact of this alternative is the same as under the proposed Plan because this alternative would not meaningfully change exposure of people to excessive noise levels from aircraft.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 (**NOI-3**). The impact of this alternative is the same as under the proposed Plan because this alternative would not meaningfully change exposure of people to excessive noise levels from aircraft.
2050	**Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 1 would result in significant impacts in 2050	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in significant	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in significant

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	(**NOI-1** and **NOI-2**). Land use patterns would be less compact under Alternative 1, which could expose more sensitive receptors to high noise levels. In addition, no transportation network improvements would occur under this alternative after 2035, resulting in less noise and vibration impacts than to the proposed Plan. The net change would result in noise impacts similar to the proposed Plan.	impacts in 2050 (**NOI-1** and **NOI-2**). Land use patterns would be less compact under Alternative 2, which could expose more sensitive receptors to high noise levels. Additionally, regional growth and transportation network improvements would occur under this alternative by 2050 resulting in noise and vibration impacts similar to the proposed Plan.	impacts in 2050 (**NOI-1** and **NOI-2**). Land use patterns would be more compact under Alternative 3, which could result in the exposure of fewer sensitive receptors to high noise levels. Additionally, regional growth and transportation network improvements would occur under this alternative by 2050 resulting in noise and vibration impacts similar to the proposed Plan.
	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 1 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2050 (**NOI-3**). The impact of this alternative is the same as under the proposed Plan because this alternative would not meaningfully change exposure of people to excessive noise levels from aircraft.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 1 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2050 (**NOI-3**). The impact of this alternative is the same as under the proposed Plan because this alternative would not meaningfully change exposure of people to excessive noise levels from aircraft.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 (**NOI-3**). The impact of this alternative is the same as under the proposed Plan because this alternative would not meaningfully change exposure of people to excessive noise levels from aircraft.
Population and Housing			
2025	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 1 would result in the following significant impacts in 2025 for **POP-1** induce substantial unplanned population growth in the region, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes or businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure). The impact of this alternative would be less than the proposed Plan impact because fewer	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in significant impacts in 2025 for **POP-1**. The impact of this alternative would be less than the proposed Plan impacts because fewer transportation improvement projects and a less compact land use pattern would result in less induced unplanned growth than the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 3 would result in significant impacts in 2025 for **POP-1**. The impact of this alternative would be greater than the proposed Plan impacts because growth would occur in dense developed areas, and more transportation improvement projects would occur within developed areas, resulting in greater induced unplanned growth.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	transportation improvement projects and less compact development consistent with the General Plans would result in less induced unplanned growth than the proposed Plan in 2025. implementation of the proposed Plan.		
	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 1 would result in the following significant impact for 2025 for **POP-2** which discusses displacing substantial numbers of people or housing units which would necessitate the construction of replacement homes elsewhere. Alternative 1 would result in less impacts than the proposed Plan because less compact land use patterns and fewer transportation projects would result in less displacement of people and housing units than the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact for 2025 for **POP-2**. Alternative 2 would result in less impacts than the proposed Plan because less compact land use patterns and fewer transportation projects in developed areas would result in less displacement of people and housing units than the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact for 2025 for **POP-2**. Alternative 3 would result in greater impacts than the proposed Plan because more compact land use patterns and more transportation projects in developed areas would result in greater displacement of people and housing units. In addition, the growth that could occur under this alternative would be even further beyond what is anticipated in local general plans compared to the unplanned population growth that could occur under the proposed Plan.
2035	**Significant Impact (decreased) –** Impact **POP-1** would be significant in 2035, and the same as the proposed Plan impact. Under this alternative, less compact land use patterns and no proposed transportation improvements would result in less impacts related to induced unplanned growth when compared to the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Impact **POP-1** would be significant in 2035, and greater than the proposed Plan impact. Under this alternative, less compact development and fewer transportation improvements would result in a decreased impact related to induced unplanned growth when compared to the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (increased) –** Impacts **POP-1** would be significant in 2035, and greater than proposed Plan impacts. Increased densification around mobility hubs would result in a greater potential for unplanned population growth in transit served areas than with the proposed Plan.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	Significant Impact (decreased) – Impact **POP-2** would be significant in 2035, and less than proposed Plan impact. Under this alternative, displacement impact would be less than proposed Plan impact because more vacant land would be developed and less existing urban land redeveloped, and because the proposed Plan's transportation network improvements would not be built.	**Significant Impact (decreased**) – Impact **POP-2** would be significant in 2035, and less than proposed Plan impact. Under this alternative, displacement impact would be less than proposed Plan impact because more vacant land would be developed and less existing urban land redeveloped, and because fewer transportation projects in developed areas would result in less displacement of people and housing units than the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact for 2035 for **POP-2**. Increased compact land use patterns and more transportation projects in developed areas would result in greater displacement of people and housing units. In addition, the growth that could occur under this alternative would be even further beyond what is anticipated in local general plans compared to the unplanned population growth that could occur under the proposed Plan.
2050	**Significant Impact (decreased) –** Impact **POP-1** would be significant in 2050, and the same as the proposed Plan impact. Under this alternative, less compact land use patterns and no proposed transportation improvements would result in less impacts related to induced unplanned growth when compared to the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Impact **POP-1** would be significant in 2035, and the same as proposed Plan impact. Under this alternative, less compact land use patterns and no proposed transportation improvements would result in less impacts related to induced unplanned growth when compared to the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (increased) –** Impacts **POP-1** would be significant in 2050, and greater than proposed Plan impacts. Increased densification around mobility hubs would result in a greater potential for unplanned population growth in transit served areas than with the proposed Plan.
	Significant Impact (decreased) – Impact **POP-2** would be significant in 2035, and less than proposed Plan impact. Under this alternative, displacement impact would be less than proposed Plan impact because more vacant land would be developed and less existing urban land redeveloped, and because the proposed Plan's transportation network improvements would not be built.	**Significant Impact (decreased) –** Impact **POP-2** would be significant in 2035, and less than proposed Plan impact. Under this alternative, displacement impact would be less than proposed Plan impact because more vacant land would be developed and less existing urban land redeveloped, and because fewer transportation projects in developed areas would result in less displacement of	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact for 2050 for **POP-2**. Increased compact land use patterns and more transportation projects in developed areas would result in greater displacement of people and housing units. In addition, the growth that could occur under this alternative would be even further beyond

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
		people and housing units than the proposed Plan.	what is anticipated in local general plans compared to the unplanned population growth that could occur under the proposed Plan.
Public Services and Utilities			
2025	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 1 would result in the following significant impacts in 2025 for **PS-1** result in substantial physical deterioration of public facilities or cause substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of or need for new or physically altered (i.e. expanded) public facilities, in order to maintain adequate fire and police protection, emergency services, schools, libraries, and recreation facilities; **REC-1** increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated; **U-1** result in the expansion or construction of wastewater collection and treatment, stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities to adequately meet projected capacity needs, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts; **U-2** generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure; negatively	**Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 2 would result in the following significant impacts in 2025 for **PS-1**, **REC-1**, **U-1**, and **U-2**. Under this alternative, land use patterns would be more dispersed than the proposed Plan, which would spread out the population and increase demand for public services, recreational facilities and utilities, and therefore the impact would be increased.	**Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 3 would result in the following significant impacts in 2025 for **PS-1**, **REC-1**, **U-1**, and **U-2**. Under this alternative, land use patterns would be more compact which would concentrate the population, resulting in a decrease in demand for public services, recreational facilities and utilities, and therefore the impact would be decreased.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	impact the provision of solid waste services or impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals; or fail to comply with federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Under Alternative 1, land use patterns would be more dispersed than the proposed Plan, which would spread out the population and increase demand for public services, recreational facilities and utilities in different areas, and therefore the impact would be increased.		
2035	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in the following significant impacts in 2035 for **PS-1**, **REC-1**, **U-1**, and **U-2**. Under this alternative, land use patterns would be less compact, which would result in a greater demand for public services, recreational facilities and utilities, and therefore the impact would be increased.	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in the following significant impacts in 2035 for **PS-1**, **REC-1**, **U-1**, and **U-2**. Under this alternative, land use patterns would be less compact, which would result in a greater demand for public services, recreational facilities and utilities, and therefore the impact would be increased.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in the following significant impacts in 2035 for **PS-1**, **REC-1**, **U-1**, and **U-2**. Under this alternative, land use patterns would be more compact, which would result in less demand for public services, recreational facilities and utilities, and therefore the impact would be decreased.
2050	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in the following significant impacts in 2050 for **PS-1**, **REC-1**, **U-1**, and **U-2**. Under this alternative, land use patterns would be less compact, which would result in a greater demand for public services, recreational facilities and utilities, and therefore the impact would be increased.	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in the following significant impacts in 2050 for **PS-1**, **REC-1**, **U-1**, and **U-2**. Under this alternative, land use patterns would be less compact, which would result in a greater demand for public services, recreational facilities and utilities, and therefore the impact would be increased.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in the following significant impacts in 2050 for **PS-1**, **REC-1**, **U-1**, and **U-2**. Under this alternative, land use patterns would be more compact, which would result in less demand for public services, recreational facilities and utilities, and therefore the impact would be decreased.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
Transportation			
2025	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 1 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2025 for **TRA-1.** Alternative 1 would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities; and **TRA-3** Alternative 1 would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature. The impact of this alternative is the same as proposed Plan impact because this alternative would be consistent with adopted plans, programs, and design standards.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2025 for **TRA-1** and **TRA-3**. The impact of this alternative is the same as proposed Plan impact because this alternative would be consistent with adopted plans, programs, and design standards.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2025 for **TRA-1** and **TRA-3**. The impact of this alternative is the same as proposed Plan impact because this alternative would be consistent with adopted plans, programs, and design standards.
	Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 1 would result in significant impacts in 2025 for **TRA-2.** Alternative 1 would conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 by not achieving the substantial VMT reductions needed to help achieve statewide GHG reduction goals. Alternative 1 would result in VMT per capita of 19.3 in 2025 (for all vehicle classes), which would be greater than the VMT per capita for the proposed Plan of 18.1 (see Appendix O, Table O-2). Additionally, Alternative 1 would result in an increase in total VMT of 4,545,715 miles per day in year 2025, as compared to Baseline Year 2016 conditions.	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2025 (**TRA-2**). Alternative 2 would result in VMT per capita of 18.8 (for all vehicle classes) in 2025, which would be greater than the VMT per capita for the proposed Plan of 18.1 (see Appendix O, Table O-2). Additionally, Alternative 2 would result in an increase in total VMT of 2,961,708 miles per day in year 2025, as compared to Baseline Year 2016 conditions. This increase would be greater than the 477,196 miles for the proposed Plan. Alternative 2 would result in a greater impact because it would not	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2025 (**TRA-2**). Alternative 3 would result in a slightly decreased VMT per capita of 18.0 (for all vehicle classes) compared to the proposed Plan VMT per capita of 18.1. (see Appendix O, Table O-2). Alternative 3 would result in an overall decrease in total VMT of 237,605 miles per day in year 2025, as compared to Baseline Year 2016 conditions. This reduction in total VMT is lower than the projected increase in the total VMT of 477,196 miles under the proposed Plan. Alternative 3 would result in less impacts because it

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	The increase would be greater than the 477,196 miles for the proposed Plan. Alternative 1 would result in a greater impact because it would result in less VMT reduction than the proposed Plan.	achieve as much VMT reduction as the proposed Plan.	would achieve a higher VMT reduction than the proposed Plan.
	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 1 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2025 for **TRA-4** leading to a lack of parking supply that would cause significant secondary environmental impacts not already analyzed in the other resource chapters of this EIR. Alternative 1 would result in less impacts because it would not propose as many transit-oriented transportation network improvements and programs, and would not include parking user fees to disincentivize parking that would be included in the proposed Plan; thus, Alternative 1 would result in decreased impacts.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 (**TRA-4**). Alternative 2 would result in less impacts because it would not propose as many transit-oriented transportation network improvements and programs that could affect parking supply.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 (**TRA-4**). Alternative 3 would result in more impacts related to parking supply because it would increase the density of land uses in urban areas and include increased parking fees which could adversely affect parking supply.
2035	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 1 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 for **TRA-1** and **TRA-3**. The impact of this alternative is the same as proposed Plan impact because this alternative would be consistent with adopted plans, programs, and design standards.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 for **TRA-1** and **TRA-3**. The impact of this alternative is the same as proposed Plan impact because this alternative would be consistent with adopted plans, programs, and design standards.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 for **TRA-1** and **TRA-3**. The impact of this alternative is the same as proposed Plan impact because this alternative would be consistent with adopted plans, programs, and design standards.
	Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 1 would result in a significant	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	impact in 2035 (**TRA-2**). Alternative 1 would result in VMT per capital of 19.4 (for all vehicle classes) in 2035 compared to the proposed Plan's VMT per capita of 17.3 in 2035 (see Appendix O, Table O-2). Additionally, Alternative 1 would result in an increase in total VMT of 11,029,722 miles per day in year 2035, as compared to Baseline Year 2016 conditions. This increase would be greater than the 2,520,860 miles for the proposed Plan. Alternative 1 would result in greater impacts because it would not achieve as much VMT reduction as the proposed Plan.	impact in 2035 (**TRA-2**). Alternative 2 would result in VMT per capita of 18.8 (for all vehicle classes) compared to the proposed Plan VMT per capita of 17.3 (see Appendix O, Table O-2). Additionally, Alternative 2 would result in an increase in total VMT of 8,645,857 miles per day in year 2035, as compared to Baseline Year 2016 conditions. This increase would be greater than the 2,520,860 miles for the proposed Plan. Alternative 2 would result in greater impacts because it would not achieve as much VMT reduction as the proposed Plan.	impact in 2035 (**TRA-2**). Alternative 3 would result in VMT per capita in 2035 of 16.9 (for all vehicle classes) compared to the proposed Plan's VMT per capita of 17.3 (see Appendix O, Table O-2). Alternative 3 would result in an increase in total VMT of 986,460 miles per day in year 2035, as compared to Baseline Year 2016 conditions. This increase in total VMT is lower than the projected increase in the total VMT of 2,520,860 miles under the proposed Plan. Alternative 3 would result in less impacts because it would achieve a higher VMT reduction than the proposed Plan.
	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 (**TRA-4**). Alternative 1 would result in less impacts because it would not propose as many transit-oriented transportation network improvements programs and would not include parking user fees to disincentivize parking that would be included in the proposed Plan; thus, Alternative 1 would result in decreased impacts.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 (**TRA-4**). Alternative 2 would result in less impacts because it would not propose as many transit-oriented transportation network improvements and programs that could affect parking supply.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 (**TRA-4**). Alternative 3 would result in more impacts related to parking supply because it would increase the density of land uses in urban areas and increase parking user fees, which could adversely affect parking supply.
2050	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 1 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2050 for **TRA-1** and **TRA-3**. The impact of this alternative is the same as proposed Plan impact because this	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2050 for **TRA-1** and **TRA-3**. The impact of this alternative is the same as proposed Plan impact because this	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2050 for TRA-1 and TRA-3. The impact of this alternative is the same as proposed Plan impact because this

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	alternative would be consistent with adopted plans, programs, and design standards.	alternative would be consistent with adopted plans, programs, and design standards.	alternative would be consistent with adopted plans, programs, and design standards.
	Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2050 (**TRA-2**). Alternative 1 would result in VMT per capita of 19.6 (for all vehicle classes) compared to the proposed Plan VMT per capita of 16.8 in 2050 (see Appendix O, Table O-2). Additionally, Alternative 1 would result in an increase in total VMT of 16,362,799 miles per day in year 2050, as compared to Baseline Year 2016 conditions. This increase would be greater than the 5,611,752 miles for the proposed Plan. Alternative 1 would result in greater impacts because it would not achieve as much VMT reduction as the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2050 (**TRA-2**). Alternative 2 would result in VMT per capita of 18.6 (for all vehicle classes) compared to the proposed Plan VMT per capita of 16.8 in 2050 (see Appendix O, Table O-2). Additionally, Alternative 1 would result in an increase in total VMT of 13,395,418 miles per day in year 2050, as compared to Baseline Year 2016 conditions. This increase would be greater than the 5,611,752 miles for the proposed Plan. Alternative 2 would result in greater impacts because it would not achieve as much VMT reduction as the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2050 (**TRA-2**). Alternative 3 would result in VMT per capita of 16.3 (for all vehicle classes) compared to the proposed Plan VMT per capita of 16.8 in 2050. (see Appendix O, Table O-2). Alternative 3 would result in an increase in total VMT of 3,479,273 miles per day in year 2050, as compared to Baseline Year 2016 conditions. This increase in total VMT is lower than the projected increase in the total VMT of 5,611,752 miles under the proposed Plan. Alternative 3 would result in less impacts because it would achieve a higher VMT reduction than the proposed Plan.
	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 (**TRA-4**). Alternative 1 would result in less impacts because it would not propose as many transit-oriented transportation network improvements and programs that could affect parking supply.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 (**TRA-4**). Alternative 2 would result in less impacts because it would not propose as many transit-oriented transportation network improvements and programs that could affect parking supply.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 (**TRA-4**). Alternative 3 would result in more impacts related to parking supply because it would increase the density of land uses in urban areas and increase parking user fees, which could adversely affect parking supply.
Tribal Cultural Resources			

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
2025	**Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact on tribal cultural resources in 2025 from the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource (**TCR-1**). The impacts of Alternative 1 in 2025 would be similar to the proposed Plan due to similar ground-disturbing activities that could encounter and adversely affect tribal cultural resources. Growth associated with Alternative 1 would be more spread-out in the region potentially resulting in more impacts to previously undisturbed land. However, there would be less disturbance due to transportation improvements; thus, the impact would be similar to the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact on tribal cultural resources in 2025 (**TCR-1**). The impacts of Alternative 2 in 2025 would be increased compared to the proposed Plan due to similar ground-disturbing activities related to less compact growth and transportation improvements focused on highways and roadways more than mobility hubs that could encounter and adversely affect tribal cultural resources.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact on cultural resources in 2025 (**TCR-1**). The impacts of Alternative 3 in 2025 would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan because more compact development and less roadway and highway-related transportation improvements would occur, which would result in less ground-disturbing activities that could encounter and adversely affect tribal cultural resources.
2035	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact on tribal cultural resources in 2035 (**TCR-1**). The impacts of Alternative 1 in 2035 would be less than the proposed Plan because growth associated with Alternative 1 would be more spread-out in the region potentially resulting in more impacts to previously undisturbed land. However, there would be significantly less disturbance due to transportation improvements because there would be no new improvements beyond	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact on tribal cultural resources in 2035 (**TCR-1**). The impacts of Alternative 2 in 2035 would greater than the proposed Plan due to similar ground-disturbing activities related to less compact growth and transportation improvements focused on highways rather than mobility hubs that could encounter and adversely affect tribal cultural resources.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact on tribal cultural resources in 2035 (**TCR-1**). The impacts of Alternative 3 in 2035 would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan because more compact development and less roadway and highway-related transportation improvements would occur, which would result in less ground-disturbing activities that could encounter and adversely affect tribal cultural resources.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	2025; thus, the impact would be less than the proposed Plan.		
2050	**Significant Impact (decreased** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact on tribal cultural resources in 2050 (**TCR-1**). The impacts of Alternative 1 in 2050 would be less than the proposed Plan because growth associated with Alternative 1 would be more spread-out in the region potentially resulting in more impacts to previously undisturbed land. However, there would be significantly less disturbance due to transportation improvements because there would be no new improvements beyond 2025; thus, the impact would be less than the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact on tribal cultural resources in 2050 (**TCR-1).** The impacts of Alternative 2 in 2050 would be increased compared to the proposed Plan due to similar ground-disturbing activities related to less compact growth and transportation improvements focused on highways rather than mobility hubs that could encounter and adversely affect tribal cultural resources.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact on tribal cultural resources in 2050 (**TCR-1**). The impacts of Alternative 3 in 2050 would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan because more compact development and less roadway and highway-related transportation improvements would occur, which would result in less ground-disturbing activities that could encounter and adversely affect tribal cultural resources.
Water Supply			
2025	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 related to having insufficient water supplies available to serve the projected regional demand during normal, dry and multiple dry years (**WS-1**). Alternative 1 would have a less compact development pattern than the proposed Plan which would result in higher demand for water supply. Thus, Alternative 1 would have an increased impact compared to the proposed Plan.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 (**WS-1**). Alternative 2 would have a less compact development pattern than the proposed Plan, which would result in increased water supply demand. Thus, Alternative 2 would have increased impact compared to the proposed Plan. regional water demand impacts would be similar to the proposed Plan because sufficient water supplies exist in 2025 per SDCWA and MWD planning documents.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 (**WS-1**).Alternative 3 would have a more compact development pattern than the proposed Plan, which would result in decreased water supply demand. Thus, Alternative 3 would have a decreased impact compared to the proposed Plan.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 1 would result in the following significant impacts in 2025 for **WS-2** substantially reduce groundwater supplies, groundwater recharge, or the sustainable management of groundwater basins; and **WS-3** require or result in the construction of new or expanded water facilities, the construction of which could cause a significant environmental effect. Compared to the proposed Plan, regional groundwater impacts would be greater due to a less compact development pattern, as well as the additional water distribution facilities that would be needed to serve more dispersed development.	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in significant impacts in 2025 for **WS-2** and **WS-3**. Compared to the proposed Plan, regional groundwater impacts would be greater due to a less compact development pattern, as well as the additional water distribution facilities that would be needed to serve more dispersed development.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in significant impacts in 2025 for **WS-2** and WS-3. Compared to proposed Plan, regional groundwater impacts would be less decrease due to a more compact development pattern, and fewer water distribution facilities that would be needed to serve more dispersed development. Regional groundwater impacts would also be less than the proposed Plan because this alternative would result in more compact development and less demand for landscape watering, thereby reducing the need for additional water distribution facilities.
2035	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased)** – Impact **WS-1** would be less than significant in 2035 under Alternative 1, and increased compared to the proposed Plan impact. The rationale described under 2025 also applies to 2035.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased)** – Impact **WS-1** would be less than significant in 2035 under Alternative 2, and increased compared to the proposed Plan impact. The rationale described under 2025 also applies to 2035.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased)** – Impact **WS-1** would be less than significant in 2035 under Alternative 3, and decreased compared to the proposed Plan impact. The rationale described under 2025 also applies to 2035.
	Significant Impact (increased) – Impact **WS-2** and **WS-3** would be significant in 2035 under this alternative, and greater than the proposed Plan impact. The rationale described under 2025 also applies to 2035.	**Significant Impact (increased) –** Impact **WS-2** and **WS-3** would be significant in 2035 under this alternative, and greater than the proposed Plan impact. The rationale described under 2025 also applies to 2035.	**Significant Impact (decreased) –** Impact **WS-2** and **WS-3** would be significant in 2035 under this alternative, and less than the proposed Plan impact. The rationale described under 2025 also applies to 2035.
2050	**Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2050 (**WS-1**). Regional water	**Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2050 (**WS-1**). Regional water	**Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2050 (**WS-1**). However, regional

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	demand impacts for this alternative would be greater than the proposed Plan impact due higher water demand associated with a less compact development pattern.	demand impacts for this alternative would be greater than the proposed Plan impact due to higher water demand associated with a less compact development pattern.	water demand impacts under this alternative would be less than the proposed Plan because it would result in lower water demand associated with more compact development and less demand for landscape watering, reducing the regional growth/land use change impact of the proposed Plan.
	Significant Impact (increased) – Impact **WS-2** and **WS-3** would be significant in 2050 under this alternative, and greater than the proposed Plan impact. The rationale described under 2025 also applies to 2050.	**Significant Impact (increased) –** Impact **WS-2** and **WS-3** would be significant in 2050 under this alternative, and greater than the proposed Plan impact. The rationale described under 2025 also applies to 2050.	**Significant Impact (decreased) –** Impact **WS-2** and **WS-3** would be significant in 2035 under this alternative, and less than the proposed Plan impact. The rationale described under 2025 also applies to 2050.
Wildfire			
2025	**Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 1 would result in the following significant impacts in 2025: **WF-1** due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire; or expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires; **WF-2** require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts on the	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in significant impacts in 2025 (**WF-1**, **WF-2**, and **WF-3**). Alternative 2 would result in greater impacts because it would result in more regional growth, land use change, and transportation network improvements in the wildland-urban interface than the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 3 would result in significant impacts in 2025 (**WF-1**, **WF-2**, and **WF-3**). Alternative 3 would result in the same impacts as the proposed Plan because it would result in similar regional growth and land use change in dense urban areas and less in wildland-urban interface up to 2025 compared to the proposed Plan.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth Focused in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies
	environment; and WF-3 expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. Alternative 1 would result in similar impacts as the proposed Plan because it would result in similar regional growth, land use change, and transportation network improvements in wildland-urban interface as the proposed Plan up to 2025.		
2035	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in significant impacts in 2035 (**WF-1**, **WF-2**, and **WF-3**). Alternative 1 would result in greater impacts because it would result in more regional growth, land use change, and transportation network improvements in wildland-urban interface than the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in significant impacts in 2035 (**WF-1**, **WF-2**, and **WF-3**). Alternative 2 would result in greater impacts because it would result in more regional growth, land use change, and transportation network improvements in wildland-urban interface than the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in significant impacts in 2035 (**WF-1**, **WF-2**, and **WF-3**). Alternative 3 would result in less impacts because it would result in more regional growth and land use change in dense urban areas and less in wildland-urban interface compared to the proposed Plan.
2050	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in significant impacts in 2050 (**WF-1**, **WF-2**, and **WF-3**). Alternative 1 would result in greater impacts because it would result in more regional growth, land use change, and transportation network improvements in wildland-urban interface than the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in significant impacts in 2050 (**WF-1**, **WF-2**, and **WF-3**). Alternative 2 would result in greater impacts because it would result in more regional growth, land use change, and transportation network improvements in wildland-urban interface than the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in significant impacts in 2050 (**WF-1**, **WF-2**, and **WF-3**). Alternative 3 would result in less impacts because it would result in more regional growth and land use change in dense urban areas and less in wildland-urban interface compared to the proposed Plan.