4.11 LAND USE

This section evaluates the land use impacts of the proposed Plan. The information presented has been compiled from multiple sources, including local general plans, community plans, and other related planning documents.

4.11.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS

REGIONAL SETTING

Historic Land Use and Regional Growth Patterns

The San Diego region is located in the southwestern corner of the United States and is bordered by Mexico to the south, the Pacific Ocean to the west, Orange, and Riverside counties to the north, and Imperial County to the east. The San Diego region encompasses over 4,260 square miles and includes 18 incorporated cities, 17 tribal reservations, and unincorporated San Diego County.

Existing Land Use

There are 2,726,964 acres in the San Diego region. As of 2012, approximately 815,479 acres (30 percent) are developed (e.g., residential, commercial, industrial) or used for some type of man-made activity, such as agriculture, military use, recreation, and infrastructure (transportation, communication, utilities). Open space parks account for largest land area, with 1,356,421 acres, or about 50 percent of the region. Vacant land (526,582 acres) accounts for another 19 percent, while the remaining approximately one percent of the land area is covered by water (28,483). Table 4.11-1 breaks down the entire San Diego region by land use type for 2012.

Existing Regional Growth Pattern

Historically, development has occurred along the coast in the western third of the region. As of 2012, the western third of the region along the coast is primarily defined by single family residential development interspersed with open space parks and recreation land. Most of the region’s multi-family residential, commercial and office, and industrial land use also are found in the western third of the region, along with the region’s military lands. All 18 of the region’s incorporated cities are located in the western third. The eastern two-thirds of the region are the jurisdiction of the unincorporated County as well as 17 tribal governments. It is predominantly characterized by open space, parks, but also the tribal reservations, vacant land, spaced rural residential land, agriculture, and small pockets of single family residential. Development in the eastern two-thirds is generally rural and low-density relative to the higher density urban development of the western third. Table 4.11-2 provides details about growth and development in the local jurisdictions. The 2012 land use pattern is shown in Figure 4.11-1.
### Table 4.11-1
Existing Land Use in the San Diego Region (2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>117,738*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial and Office</td>
<td>17,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Institutions</td>
<td>22,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy and Light Industry</td>
<td>18,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>133,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Homes</td>
<td>6,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>16,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Parks</td>
<td>1,356,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>38,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>139,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaced Rural Residential</td>
<td>193,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Communications, Utilities</td>
<td>108,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td>3,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>526,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>28,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,726,964</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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*For SANDAG land use, the agricultural category is defined as orchards and vineyards, intensive agriculture, and field crops. Other types of agricultural and farmlands, such as grazing lands and truck crops, are included in other land use categories, primarily open space parks and spaced rural residential.*

### Table 4.11-2
Jurisdictional Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>107,674</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>I-5, SR 78</td>
<td>LOSSAN, NCTD bus</td>
<td>14,735</td>
<td>1,437</td>
<td>8,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>249,382</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>I-5, I-805, SR 125, SR 54</td>
<td>Trolley, MTS bus</td>
<td>23,634</td>
<td>4,176</td>
<td>5,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>23,187</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>SR 75, SR 282</td>
<td>MTS bus</td>
<td>4,602</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4,194</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>LOSSAN, NCTD bus</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>100,562</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>I-8, SR 125, SR 67</td>
<td>Trolley, MTS bus</td>
<td>8,631</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>60,346</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>LOSSAN, NCTD bus</td>
<td>9,341</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>2,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>146,057</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>I-15, SR 78</td>
<td>SPRINT, NCTD bus, MTS bus</td>
<td>15,903</td>
<td>1,883</td>
<td>6,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>26,609</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>SR 75</td>
<td>MTS bus</td>
<td>1,719</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>58,296</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>I-8, SR 125, SR 94</td>
<td>Trolley, MTS bus</td>
<td>5,589</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>25,603</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>SR 125, SR 94</td>
<td>Trolley, MTS bus</td>
<td>2,382</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>58,967</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>I-5, I-805, SR 54</td>
<td>Trolley, MTS bus</td>
<td>4,355</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1,404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Community Development Trends

There is a continuing trend in the San Diego region to provide more housing and job opportunities in the existing urbanized areas. Since 1999, more than three-quarters of the local jurisdictions have made or are in the process of making significant updates to their general plans. In 1999, SANDAG projected 21 percent of future housing growth would occur in the unincorporated areas of the County of San Diego under the local general plans at the time. Under the proposed Plan, SANDAG expects 17 percent of growth to occur in the unincorporated areas, and much of that is focused in existing villages such as Lakeside, Valley Center, Ramona, and Alpine. As a result of these updates, SANDAG has identified sufficient housing opportunities in the existing general plans for the first time in nearly two decades.

The forecasted growth also reflects the most recent adopted general plans from the local jurisdictions. At the turn of the century, about 90 percent of vacant residential land in the cities was planned for single-family use. The proposed Plan forecasts 82 percent of housing growth by 2050 being multifamily. Local and regional conservation programs also continue to protect more of the San Diego region's sensitive lands. Currently, more than 50 percent of the region is preserved as open space, parks, or habitat.

Tribal Governments

The San Diego region is home to 18 Native American reservations represented by 17 tribal governments, the most in any county in the United States. There are more than 73,000 acres of tribal reservation lands in the region. As sovereign domestic nations, tribal governments govern land use on their reservations and land holdings. SANDAG and the regional tribal governments work together to facilitate government-to-government planning and coordination. Table 4.11-3 details information regarding tribal nations in the San Diego region.
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### Table 4.11-3

**Tribal Nations in the San Diego Region**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribal Nation</th>
<th>Reservation Name</th>
<th>Population (2010 Census)</th>
<th>Housing Units (2010 Census)</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barona Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>Barona</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>7,102</td>
<td>Barona Indian Reservation near Lakeside, about 30 miles northeast of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campo Band of Mission Indians of the Kumeyaay Nation</td>
<td>Campo</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>15,674</td>
<td>Southeastern San Diego County in the Laguna Mountains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Power Authority between Barona and Viejas</td>
<td>Capitan Grande</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,632</td>
<td>Northwest quadrant of the Cleveland National Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewiaapayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians</td>
<td>Ewiaapaye p</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,549</td>
<td>Immediately east of Cleveland National Forest and west of Anza Borrego Desert State Park off Highway 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inaja Cosmit Band of Diegueno Mission Indians</td>
<td>Inaja and Cosmit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>Within the boundaries of Cleveland National Forest, southwest of Julian, off Highway 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamul Indian Village of Kumeyaay Nation</td>
<td>Jamul Indian Village</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10 miles southeast of El Cajon, along Highway 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Jolla Band of Luiseño Indians</td>
<td>La Jolla</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>8,882</td>
<td>On Mount Palomar; off Highway 76, 25 miles east of Escondido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Posta Band of the Kumeyaay Nation</td>
<td>La Posta</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3,737</td>
<td>56 miles east of San Diego and 46 miles west of El Centro in the Laguna Mountains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Coyotes Band of Cahuilla/Cupeño Indians</td>
<td>Los Coyotes</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24,788</td>
<td>50 miles east of San Diego between Cleveland National Forest and Anza-Borrego Desert State Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manzanita Band of Diegueño Mission Indians</td>
<td>Manzanita</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4,551</td>
<td>In southeastern San Diego County off of Interstate 8, near the town of Boulevard and in the Carrizo Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa Grande Band of Diegueño Mission Indians</td>
<td>Mesa Grande</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1,833</td>
<td>Near Santa Ysabel, north of Highway 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pala Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>Pala</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>12,724</td>
<td>40 miles northeast of San Diego, on the San Luis Rey River</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribal Nation</th>
<th>Reservation Name</th>
<th>Population (2010 Census)</th>
<th>Housing Units (2010 Census)</th>
<th>R Acreage</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pauma Band of Luiseño Indians</td>
<td>Pauma and Yuima</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5,891</td>
<td>Northeastern corner of San Diego County, in the foothills of Mount Palomar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians</td>
<td>Rincon</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>4,034</td>
<td>Northeastern corner of San Diego County, along the San Luis Rey River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pasqual Band of Diegueño Mission Indians</td>
<td>San Pasqual</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>1,964</td>
<td>12 miles from Escondido, adjoining the community of Valley Center and on Highway 5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel</td>
<td>Santa Ysabel</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>15,368</td>
<td>Near Santa Ysabel and Julian along Highway 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation</td>
<td>Sycuan</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2,227</td>
<td>6 miles from El Cajon between Interstate 8 and State Highway 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians</td>
<td>Viejas</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>1,687</td>
<td>35 miles east of San Diego, north of Interstate 8 and Alpine, 30 miles north of the Mexican border</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Military Installations

San Diego’s location on the Pacific Ocean is ideal for many military operations in the southwest portion of the country. San Diego’s military installations include a variety of sizes and uses, and provide a large employment base for the region. Major military installations in the region are described below.

MCB Camp Pendleton is located at the northern boundary of San Diego County near Oceanside and encompasses more than 125,000 acres. Located approximately 38 miles from downtown San Diego, MCB Camp Pendleton offers a broad spectrum of training facilities for many active and reserve Marine, Army, and Navy units, as well as national, state, and local agencies (MCB Camp Pendleton 2011).

Naval Base Point Loma is located on approximately 280 acres of coastal land just west and north of downtown San Diego. Naval Base Point Loma provides support to 70 U.S. Pacific Fleet afloat and shore-based tenant commands headquartered on the base and is a highly technical hub of naval activity (Naval Base Point Loma 2011).

Marine Corps Recruit Depot (MCRD) San Diego is located on 506 acres northwest of downtown San Diego, adjacent to SDIA. MCRD San Diego provides training for marines as well as military community and family services.

Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Miramar is located on approximately 23,000 acres in the western central portion of the region. It is home to the 3d Marine Aircraft Wing and is centrally located near more than 10 West Coast Navy and Marine Corps installations (MCAS 2011).
Naval Base Coronado (NBC) is a consolidated Navy installation encompassing eight military facilities stretching from San Clemente Island, which is located 70 miles west of San Diego, to the La Posta Mountain Warfare Training Facility, which is located 60 miles east of San Diego. Those facilities include Naval Air Station North Island; Naval Amphibious Base Coronado; Naval Outlying Landing Field Imperial Beach; Naval Auxiliary Landing Field San Clemente Island; Silver Strand Training Complex; Camp Michael Monsoor; and the Survival, Evasion, Resistance and Escape Facility in Warner Springs. Naval Air Station North Island is the anchor base of NBC (NBC 2011).

Port of San Diego

The Unified Port of San Diego (Port) was created by the California State Legislature to manage San Diego Bay and surrounding waterfront land. The Port oversees two maritime cargo terminals, two cruise ship terminals, 20 public parks, various wildlife reserves and environmental initiatives, the Harbor Police department, and the leases of more than 600 tenant and subtenant businesses around San Diego Bay.

The Port has been granted authority for an approximate total of 5,483 acres or about 37 percent of the total tidelands on San Diego Bay. The shoreline frontage approaches 33 miles, which is equivalent to 61 percent of the total bay shoreline. The Port has a Port Master Plan, adopted October 2012, that is intended to provide the official planning policies, consistent with a general statewide purpose, for the physical development of the tide and submerged lands conveyed and granted in trust to the Port District (San Diego Unified Port District 2012).

Airport Authority

San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (SDCRAA) was created on January 1, 2003, as an independent agency to manage the day-to-day operations of SDIA and also serve as the region’s Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) to ensure the adoption of land use plans that protect public health and safety for areas surrounding all 16 of the San Diego region’s airports. It accomplishes this by the orderly development of airports and the adoption of land use measures that minimize the public’s exposure to excessive noise and safety hazards around airports (SDCRAA 2014).

4.11.2 REGULATORY SETTING

FEDERAL LAWS, REGULATIONS, PLANS, AND POLICIES

Coastal Zone Management Act

The U.S. Congress passed the 1972 Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC Section 1451 et seq.) to manage the nation’s coastal resources. The CZMA is administered by the U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management. The CZMA balances competing land and water issues in coastal zones through the National Coastal Zone Management Program. Its goal is to preserve, protect, develop, and, where possible, restore or enhance the resources of the nation's coastal zone. Federal activities within or affecting the coastal zone must, to the maximum extent practicable, be consistent with the state’s coastal management program.
Cleveland National Forest Plan

The Cleveland National Forest Plan consists of a three-part (vision, strategy, and design criteria) land and resource management plan (forest plan). The legislative mandate for the management of national forests requires that public lands be conservatively used and managed in order to ensure their sustainability and to guarantee that future generations will continue to benefit from their many values. Forest plans are founded on the concept of sustainable use of the national forests. The first part of the plan describes the national forest in the future, the niche it occupies in the community framework, and the desired conditions the Forest Service is striving to realize, as well as the challenges the national forest will resolve in getting there. The second part defines and describes each of the land use zones. The land use zones are an on-the-ground manifestation of the desired conditions and are the primary tools used to describe the strategic direction, including the management intent and suitable uses for areas of the national forest where the zone is used. The final part of the forest plan is the design criteria and constitutes the “rules” that the Forest Service will follow as the national forest implements projects and activities over time (USDA 2005).

BLM Eastern San Diego County Resource Management Plan

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has developed a Resource Management Plan (RMP) for the Eastern San Diego County Planning Area. The RMP covers approximately 102,869 acres of BLM administered lands. The purpose of the plan is to provide guidance in the management of the lands and resources in eastern San Diego County that will achieve the following:

1. Address conflicts between motorized, mechanized, and nonmotorized/nonmechanized recreationists;
2. Protect sensitive natural and cultural resources from impacts due to recreational use, livestock grazing, and other land uses;
3. Provide guidance for renewable energy development; and
4. Provide groundwater recharge and additional recreational opportunities within the Planning Area.

The Eastern San Diego County RMP is comprehensive in nature, providing guidance for management of all uses and resources in the Eastern San Diego County Planning Area (BLM 2008).

STATE LAWS, REGULATIONS, PLANS, AND POLICIES

California Coastal Act

The California Coastal Act of 1976 was enacted to “protect, maintain and where feasible, enhance and restore the overall quality of the coastal zone environment and its natural and artificial resources” (Public Resources Code Section 30001.5 et seq.). The Act applies to the Coastal Zone, which is generally defined as extending offshore to the limits of California’s jurisdiction and from the shoreline 1,000 yards upland from the mean high tide line. The Act requires each jurisdiction within the Coastal Zone to prepare a local coastal program consisting of land use plans, zoning, and other implementing actions as needed to comply with the policies set forth in Chapter 3 of the Act. These affect housing and other land uses, coastal access, and public works, including all types of transportation facilities. The coastal cities and the Port District are wholly or partially within the Coastal Zone and are subject to these requirements. The adopted local coastal programs are administered by the local agencies with ultimate approval by the California Coastal Commission.
California Department of Transportation

The Caltrans jurisdiction includes rights-of-way of state and interstate routes within California. Any work within the right-of-way of a federal or state highway is subject to Caltrans regulations governing allowable actions and modifications to the right-of-way. Caltrans includes the Division of Aeronautics, which is responsible for airport permitting and establishing an ALUC for each county with one or more public airports. ALUCs are responsible for the preparation of land use plans for areas near aviation facilities. (See Section 4.12.2 for further details.)

California Planning and Zoning Law

The legal framework in which California cities and counties exercise local planning and land use functions is provided in the California Planning and Zoning Law (Government Code Section 65000 et seq.) Under state planning law, each city and county is required to adopt a general plan “for the physical development of the county or city, and any land outside its boundaries which bears relation to its planning” (Government Code Section 65300 et seq.).

The California Supreme Court has called the general plan the “constitution for future development” (Lesher Communications, Inc. v. City of Walnut Creek (1990) 52 Cal. 3d). The general plan expresses the community’s development goals and embodies public policy relative to the distribution of future land uses, both public and private. A general plan consists of a number of elements, including land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open space, noise, and safety; other elements may be included at the discretion of the jurisdiction that relate to the physical development of the county or city. The general plan must be comprehensive and internally consistent. Of particular importance is the consistency between the circulation and land use elements; the general location and extent of existing and proposed major thoroughfares, transportation routes, terminals, and other public utilities and facilities must be consistent with the general distribution and intensity of land used for housing, business, industry, open space, education, public areas, waste disposal facilities, agriculture, and other public and private uses.

In addition, every local jurisdiction within the region has land use regulations that implement the general plan. The zoning ordinance is the primary land use regulation used to implement the goals and policies of its general plan. Zoning ordinances, which are required to be consistent with the general plan, provide detailed direction related to development standards; permitted, conditionally permitted, and prohibited uses; and other regulations such as parking standards and sign regulations. A more detailed discussion of the general plans for the individual jurisdictions within the San Diego region is included in the Regional and Local Laws, Regulations, Plans, and Policies section below.

Local jurisdictions may also adopt specific plans, which are used to implement the general plan in particular geographic areas (Government Code Section 65450). Zoning ordinances and land use approvals must be consistent with applicable specific plans as well as the general plan.

Cities and counties are also required to comply with the Subdivision Map Act (Government Code Section 66410 et seq.). The Subdivision Map Act sets forth the conditions for approval of a subdivision map and requires enactment of subdivision ordinances by which local governments have direct control over the types of subdivision projects to be approved and the physical improvements to be installed.
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Senate Bill 375 (Chapter 728, Statues of 2008)

SB 375 provides for a planning process to coordinate land use planning and regional transportation plans and funding priorities to help California meet the GHG reductions established in AB 32. SB 375 requires regional transportation plans developed by MPOs including SANDAG to incorporate a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) that demonstrates how the region would achieve GHG emission reduction targets set by ARB. SB 375 does not require local governments to revise their “land use policies and regulations, including [their] general plan,” to be consistent with the SCS (Government Code Section 65080 et seq.) The land use portion of the SCS would be implemented through voluntary local government actions. See Section 4.8 of the EIR for more detail on GHG reduction targets.

Local Agency Formation Commission Law

The Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (Government Code Section 56000 et seq.) requires that each county must have a local agency formation commission (LAFCO) responsible for creating orderly local government boundaries. The goals of the Act include encouraging orderly growth, efficient public services for cities and special districts, the preservation of prime agricultural and open space lands, and discouraging urban sprawl. While LAFCOs have no direct authority over land use, their actions determine which government agency will be responsible for new planning areas. LAFCOs address a wide range of boundary actions, including creation of spheres of influences for cities, adjustment to boundaries of special districts, annexations, incorporations, detachments of areas from cities, and dissolution of cities.

REGIONAL AND LOCAL LAWS, REGULATIONS, PLANS, AND POLICIES

San Diego Local Agency Formation Commission

The San Diego LAFCO was established in 1963 and is a regulatory agency with quasi-legislative authority. LAFCO has county-wide jurisdiction and is independent of county government. LAFCO is responsible for coordinating, directing, and overseeing logical and timely changes to local governmental boundaries, including annexation and detachment of territory; incorporation of cities; formation of special districts; and consolidation, merger, and dissolution of districts. In addition, LAFCO is charged with reviewing ways to reorganize, simplify, and streamline governmental structure. A primary objective of LAFCO is to initiate studies and furnish information that contributes to the logical and reasonable development of public agencies. In 1994, LAFCOs were given the authority to initiate proposals involving district consolidation, dissolution, subsidiary district establishment, merger, and reorganization (LAFCO 2014).

Regional Comprehensive Plan

Adopted by SANDAG in 2004, the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) integrates land uses, transportation systems, infrastructure needs, and public investment strategies within a regional framework intended to preserve and improve quality of life, maximize mobility and transportation choices, and conserve and protect natural resources. It seeks to promote sustainability, economic prosperity, and outstanding quality of life in the San Diego region. AB 361 (Chapter 508, Statutes of 2003) governs the contents and process for the RCP. The statutory requirements for the RCP are included in the proposed Plan.
2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

The 2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2050 RTP/SCS) is the predecessor to the proposed Plan. The 2050 RTP/SCS presents a transportation system designed to maximize transit enhancements, integrate biking and walking elements, and promote programs to reduce transportation demand and increase efficiency (SANDAG 2011). One key theme of the RTP is to improve the connections between land use and transportation plans by using smart growth principles. The 2050 RTP includes a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) that integrates regional land use, housing, and transportation planning. The RTP/SCS achieves the region’s state-mandated targets for per capita greenhouse gas reductions from passenger vehicles. The SCS includes a land use pattern that accommodates the region’s future employment and housing needs, and protects sensitive habitats and resource areas. The RTP/SCS land use pattern focuses housing and jobs growth in existing urbanized areas, protects about 1.3 million acres of land, and invests in a transportation network that provides residents and workers with alternatives to driving alone. New development would be more compact and more accessible to public transit and other travel choices, such as walking and bicycling.

California-Baja California Border Master Plan

The California-Baja California Border Master Plan (Caltrans 2008) is a binational comprehensive approach to coordinate planning and delivery of projects at land ports of entry (POEs) and transportation infrastructure serving those POEs in the California-Baja California region. Caltrans, in partnership with the Secretariat of Infrastructure and Urban Development of Baja California (Secretaría de Infraestructura y Desarrollo Urbano del Estado de Baja California or SIDUE) and the U.S./Mexican Joint Working Committee (JWC), retained the SANDAG Service Bureau to assist in the development of this master plan.

Otay Mesa – Mesa de Otay Binational Corridor Strategic Plan

SANDAG and the City of Tijuana’s Municipal Planning Institute (Instituto Municipal de Planeación or IMPlan) developed the Otay Mesa-Mesa de Otay Binational Corridor Strategic Plan (SANDAG 2007), in collaboration with the State of Baja California’s Secretariat of Infrastructure and Urban Development (Secretaría de Infraestructura y Desarrollo Urbano or SIDUE), and Caltrans District 11. The Otay Mesa-Mesa de Otay binational corridor was identified as an area of opportunity to create an effective binational planning partnership. Transportation, housing, economic development, and environmental conservation are four key issue areas that are evaluated in the strategic plan.

Airport Land Use Commission and Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans

The California State Legislature directs each county with an airport to establish an ALUC. In each county containing a public use airport, an ALUC is required to assist local agencies in ensuring compatible land uses in the vicinity of existing or proposed airports; to coordinate planning at state, regional, and local levels; to prepare and adopt an airport land use plan as required by Public Resources Code Section 21675; to review plans or regulations submitted by local agencies; and to review and make recommendations regarding the land uses, building heights, and other issues relating to air navigation safety and promotion of air commerce. The SDCRAA is the ALUC for the San Diego region. It is responsible for the preparation of Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans (ALUCPs), which identify policies and procedures for land use and airport compatibility for areas surrounding each civilian public use and military airport. Military airports are exempt from the state’s requirements for an ALUC, although the Department of Defense agreed to the development of an ALUCP for MCAS Miramar (formerly NAS Miramar). Local jurisdictions are responsible for land use compatibility controls around the airports.
Unified Port of San Diego – Port Master Plan

The Port Master Plan is the land use document governing the land and water development within the jurisdiction governed by the Port District. It was originally adopted by the Board of Port Commissioners in 1980 and was certified by the California Coastal Commission on January 21, 1981. The document was last amended in August 2009 (San Diego Unified Port District 2012) The document serves as the governing planning document pursuant to the California Coastal Act for the land and water area within Port District jurisdiction, which extends from the western edge of Pacific Highway coincident with the historic mean high tide line to several hundred feet into San Diego Bay (Tidelands). The Port Master Plan divides the Tidelands into 10 Planning Districts, or precise plans. Each Planning District is further divided into Planning Subareas, which group together Tideland properties into functional units, thereby facilitating planning efforts. The document provides the official planning policies, consistent with a general statewide purpose, for the physical development of the tidelands and submerged lands conveyed and granted in trust to the Port District.

General Plans and Land Use Regulations

All cities in the San Diego region have a general plan that designates appropriate land uses throughout the jurisdiction and identifies the community’s land use, circulation, environmental, economic, and social goals and policies as they relate to land use and development. The general plans also provide a basis for local government decision-making, including decisions on development approvals and exactions, and they provide citizens with opportunities to participate in the planning and decision-making processes of their communities. The County of San Diego General Plan focuses on areas not included in city general plans (i.e., unincorporated areas).

The cities of Carlsbad, Solana Beach, and Encinitas are in the process of updating their general plans which were last updated in 2004 while the following jurisdictions recently completed their general plan updates: Escondido (2012); National City (2011); San Marcos (2012); La Mesa (2013); Vista (2012); the County of San Diego (2011); and the City of San Diego (2008). The City of Chula Vista completed its general plan update in 2005. As of 2010, the jurisdictions of Carlsbad, Chula Vista, Coronado, El Cajon, Encinitas, Escondido, Imperial Beach, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, National City, Oceanside, San Diego, San Marcos, Solana Beach, Vista and the County of San Diego have updated their housing elements, prepared climate action plans, and prepared active transportation plans such as Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plans.

Adopted general plan land use assumptions are used to develop SANDAG’s regional growth forecast. The forecast is based on the most recent planning assumptions, considering local general plans and other factors, as required by SB 375 (Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(B)). Every local jurisdiction within the region has land use regulations that implement the general plan, such as a subdivision ordinance and zoning ordinance. Zoning ordinances, which are required to be consistent with the general plan, provide detailed direction related to development standards; permitted, conditionally permitted, and prohibited uses; and other regulations such as parking standards and sign regulations.
Community Plans and Specific Plans

A city or county may also provide land use planning by developing community or subregional plans, including specific plans for smaller, more specific areas within its jurisdiction. These more localized plans provide for focused guidance for developing a specific area, with development standards tailored to the area, as well as systematic implementation of the general plan. Both the County of San Diego and the City of San Diego have numerous community and specific plans. A community plan is used to plan the future of a particular area to a finer level of detail than the general plan and supplements the policies of the general plan; however, these community and specific plans must be consistent with the jurisdiction’s general plan. All of the jurisdictions within the San Diego region have developed and implemented numerous specific plans that delineate land uses, infrastructure, development standards and criteria, and environmental conservation measures.

To support the preparation of the analysis in Section 4.11.4, SANDAG worked closely with each jurisdiction to gather information about adopted community plans and specific plans that have yet to be implemented to assess whether the proposed Plan has any inconsistencies with these plans, per CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(d). Each jurisdiction compiled a list of adopted plans not yet fully implemented. Information as to the type of development allowed, buildout assumptions, development completed to date, and the buildout year of each plan was provided. A comprehensive table of this community and specific plan information by jurisdiction is included in Appendix H.

4.11.3 SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines (“Appendix G”) provides criteria for determining the significance of a project’s environmental impacts, in the form of Initial Study checklist questions. Unless otherwise noted, the significance criteria specifically developed for this EIR are based on the checklist questions that address the criteria in Appendix G. In some cases SANDAG has combined checklist questions, edited their wording, or changed their location in the document in an effort to develop significance criteria that reflect the programmatic level of analysis in this EIR, the unique nature of the proposed Plan’s land use impacts, and the unique characteristics of the proposed Plan.

All criteria identified in the CEQA Guidelines (Appendix G) are addressed here, with the exception of criterion (c) related to conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. That criterion is addressed in Section 4.4 Biological Resources. The portion of criterion (b) that addresses conflicts with regional plans is not addressed in this section, but rather in the sections on environmental resources for which the regional plans were prepared. For example, consistency with air quality plans is addressed in Section 4.3 Air Quality, and consistency with the San Diego Region Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) is addressed in Section 4.10 Hydrology and Water Quality. For the purposes of this EIR, implementation of the proposed Plan would have a significant land use impact if it would:

LU-1 Physically divide an established community.

LU-2 Conflict with the land use portion of adopted local general plans or other applicable land use plans, including specific plans and community plans adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.
4.11  Land Use

4.11.4  ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

LU-1   PHYSICALLY DIVIDE AN ESTABLISHED COMMUNITY.

ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

The analysis of regional growth and land use changes analyzes whether new development of housing units, employment land uses and related physical changes under the proposed Plan would physically divide established communities. Forecasted growth that occurs in new developments outside of established communities would, by definition, not physically divide established communities, and is not addressed further under Impact LU-1. For regional growth and land use change, the analysis focuses on development within established communities.

The analysis of transportation network improvements and programs considers whether new or expanded transportation projects improvements under the proposed Plan would physically divide established communities. Increased frequencies on existing rail corridors and bus routes, new bus service on existing roadways, and transportation program investments (e.g., the Regional Vanpool Program, mobility hubs, vehicle technologies) under the proposed Plan would not physically divide established communities and are not addressed further under Impact LU-1. The impacts of the proposed Plan on community character are not addressed here but in Section 4.1 Aesthetics and Visual Resources.

2020

Regional Growth and Land Use Change

By 2020, the region is forecasted to increase by 292,284 people; housing by 83,836 units; and employment by 173,211 jobs. Approximately 75 percent of the forecasted regional population increase by 2020 is in the City of San Diego (45 percent), County of San Diego (17 percent) and the City of Chula Vista (13 percent). The 2020 land use pattern is shown on Figure 2.0-11. This forecasted growth would result in the physical development of new housing units, mixed use developments, commercial areas, industrial buildings, and related land uses such as schools in both undeveloped areas and within established communities located throughout the region. While some growth would be in the form of new developments or communities, such as in the City of San Diego communities of Pacific Highlands Ranch, Black Mountain Ranch, and Mission Valley and in eastern Chula Vista, a substantial portion of new growth also would occur within existing established communities such as the City of San Diego communities of Mira Mesa, Otay Mesa, Downtown, Kearny Mesa, Navajo and University City and rural communities in the unincorporated County of San Diego such as Lakeside, Otay, North County Metro, Pendleton-De Luz, Fallbrook, Spring Valley, Ramona and Valley Center.

Physical barriers such as freeways and highways, rail lines, and large institutional land uses such as military facilities often form the boundaries of existing established communities in the region, and also internally divide existing established communities. For example, the major interstate highways form large physical barriers that divide several established communities throughout the region, and large institutional facilities like military facilities and the San Diego Convention Center separate established communities from San Diego Bay. The established communities of the region generally feature extensive, interconnected roadway networks. The proposed Plan forecasts a general intensification of existing land uses within established communities and along key transportation corridors.
The development of new housing units and employment land uses within these established communities would typically occur on vacant or underutilized sites such as surface parking lots, and low-rise commercial strips, industrial buildings, and warehouses. Moreover, infill development in established communities would occur in accordance with the adopted general plans and other subregional plans of the cities and County of San Diego, as well as their zoning and subdivision ordinances. Adopted general plans and subregional plans for established communities routinely prevent developments that would physically divide established communities, and often include policies to remove existing physical barriers. For example, the community plan for Downtown San Diego includes policies to re-connect streets historically divided by large scale developments and neighborhoods physically divided by construction of the I-5.

Construction activities associated with development routinely involve temporary disruptions within established communities such as lane or road closures and service delays or detours for bus routes. Local jurisdictions routinely require traffic control plans and related measures to ensure that construction activities accommodate vehicular and pedestrian access, such as designating alternate routes or scheduling disruptive activities late at night or on weekends. Construction activities would not result in the physical division of established communities. Therefore, regional growth and land use change would not physically divide established communities. This impact is less than significant.

**Transportation Network Improvements and Programs**

The proposed Plan includes a variety of network improvements and programs by 2020. Most network improvements are additions to existing highways, rail corridors, or local roads located in established communities, such as the addition of a second track along the LOSSAN rail corridor in the cities of San Diego and Encinitas, the addition of new managed lanes along I-5 through the coastal cities of Encinitas, Carlsbad, and Oceanside, and the addition of new general purpose lanes along SR 76 through the communities of Bonsall and Fallbrook in the unincorporated County of San Diego. Existing highways, rail corridors, local roads, and similar facilities physically divide existing established communities. Therefore, these and other additions or enhancements to existing facilities within established communities would not physically divide those communities where a physical division does not already exist. Increases in transit service frequencies along existing rail corridors, highways, and roadways would not physically divide established communities and are not addressed further in this section.

The proposed Plan also includes the construction of new facilities by 2020, such as the Mid-Coast Trolley Extension through existing communities from Old Town to University City in the City of San Diego and construction of the SR 11 from the Otay Mesa East Port of Entry to SR 905. The Mid-Coast Trolley Extension would be located in part along the existing LOSSAN rail corridor and along the I-5, which combined already form a physical barrier through the surrounding communities. In addition, the portion through University City would include features such as elevated structures to ensure that established communities are not physically divided. The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Final SEIS/SEIR (SANDAG 2014c) concludes that the project would not result in a significant impact by physically dividing an established community. The SR 11 and Otay Mesa East Port of Entry Final EIR/EIS (Caltrans 2012) concluded that the project would not divide any existing business complexes or disrupt existing pedestrian or vehicle circulation patterns in the area. SR 11 would represent a community access benefit through enhanced connectivity between the Port of Entry and local East Otay Mesa businesses. As reported in the Final EIS/EIR, the SR 11 project would not physically divide an established community.
Construction of additions to existing facilities and new facilities routinely involve temporary disruptions within established communities such as lane or road closures along roads and highways and service delays or detours for bus routes and passenger rail. Local jurisdictions routinely require traffic control plans and related measures to ensure that construction activities accommodate vehicular and pedestrian access, such as designating alternate routes or scheduling disruptive activities late at night or on weekends. Construction activities would not result in the physical division of established communities. Therefore, construction and operation of transportation network improvements by 2020 under the proposed Plan would not physically divide established communities. This impact is less than significant.

**2020 Conclusion**

Implementation of regional growth and land use change and transportation network improvements would not physically divide established communities. Therefore, this impact (LU-1) in the year 2020 is less than significant.

**2035**

**Regional Growth and Land Use Change**

From 2021 to 2035, regional population is forecasted to increase by 417,985 people (12 percent), 145,099 housing units (12 percent), and 145,814 jobs (10 percent). The 2035 regional land use pattern is shown in Figure 2.0-12. Approximately 78 percent of the forecasted regional population increase between 2021 and 2035 is in the City of San Diego (51 percent), County of San Diego (18 percent), and City of Chula Vista (9 percent). Similarly, these three jurisdictions accommodate approximately 81 percent of new housing units and 66 percent of new jobs, respectively, between 2021 and 2035.

In the City of San Diego, the communities with the highest proportion of the forecasted population and housing unit increases include Downtown, College Area, Mira Mesa, Otay Mesa, Mission Valley, Navajo, and Uptown. The highest proportions of forecasted job increases are in the communities of Downtown, Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Mission Valley, University City, and Otay Mesa. In the unincorporated County of San Diego, the communities with the highest proportion of the forecasted population and housing unit increases include Lakeside, North County Metro, Otay, Fallbrook, Spring Valley, San Dieguito, and Ramona. The highest proportions of forecasted job increases are in the communities of Lakeside, Spring Valley, North County Metro, Otay, and Fallbrook.

Physical barriers such as freeways and highways, rail lines, and large institutional land uses such as military facilities often form the boundaries of existing established communities in the region, and also internally divide existing established communities. For example, the major interstate highways form large physical barriers that divide several established communities throughout the region, and large institutional facilities like military facilities and the San Diego Convention Center separate established communities from San Diego Bay. The established communities of the region generally feature extensive, interconnected roadway networks. The proposed Plan forecasts a general intensification of existing land uses within established communities and along key transportation corridors. The development of new housing units and employment land uses within these established communities would typically occur on vacant or underutilized sites such as surface parking lots, and low-rise commercial strips, industrial buildings, and warehouses.
Moreover, infill development in established communities would occur in accordance with the adopted general plans and other subregional plans of the cities and County of San Diego, as well as their zoning and subdivision ordinances. Adopted general plans and subregional plans for established communities routinely prevent developments that would physically divide established communities, and often include policies to remove existing physical barriers. For example, the community plan for Downtown San Diego includes policies to re-connect streets historically divided by large scale developments and neighborhoods physically divided by construction of the I-5.

Construction activities associated with development routinely involve temporary disruptions within established communities such as lane or road closures and service delays or detours for bus routes. Local jurisdictions routinely require traffic control plans and related measures to ensure that construction activities accommodate vehicular and pedestrian access, such as designating alternate routes or scheduling disruptive activities late at night or on weekends. Construction activities would not result in the physical division of established communities. Therefore, regional growth and land use change would not physically divide established communities. This impact is less than significant.

**Transportation Network Improvements and Programs**

In 2035, most transportation network improvements would affect existing transportation facilities, such as LOSSAN and SPRINTER rail corridor double-tracking, rail grade separations, additional managed lanes and general purposes lanes along existing freeways and highways, improvements to regional arterials, and active transportation projects. New street cars would be constructed within public rights-of-way. While portions of these improvements to existing transportation facilities would likely involve temporary and permanent right-of-way acquisition adjacent to existing facilities, the improvements to existing facilities or within existing public rights-of-way would not physically divide established communities. Increases in transit service frequencies along existing rail corridors, highways, and roadways would not physically divide established communities and are not addressed further in this section. The planned rail grade separations along the LOSSAN and SPRINTER corridors and Orange and Blue Trolley lines would improve connections between communities currently physically divided by rail lines.

Other planned transportation network improvements including new Trolley extensions would require acquisition of new rights-of-way in highly developed established communities. This includes the planned Trolley extensions from UTC to Mira Mesa via Sorrento Mesa/Carroll Canyon and from San Ysidro to Kearny Mesa via Mission Valley, Mid-City, National City/Chula Vista via Highland Avenue and 4th Avenue. The future alignments and engineering designs for these Trolley extensions have not yet been determined, but are likely to be located to the extent feasible within existing public rights-of-way such as along existing freeways, roadways, and rail corridors in order to minimize costs associated with property acquisition and impacts to owners of private property, including businesses and residents. As a result, these Trolley extensions would generally not physically divide established communities.

However, at this time, it cannot be guaranteed that all segments of future Trolley extensions would have alignments and design features that would avoid physically dividing established communities. Individual transportation network improvements including the planned Trolley extensions would undergo separate environmental review subject to CEQA and NEPA where applicable. The corresponding project-specific environmental documentation would identify significant impacts with regard to the physical division of established communities, if any, and identify mitigation measures to avoid or lessen the impact. Nevertheless, it cannot be concluded at this time that all project-level physical division of established communities associated with planned Trolley extensions would be avoided or substantially lessened. Therefore, transportation network improvements would physically divide established communities. This is a significant impact.
2035 Conclusion

Implementation of transportation network improvements, but not regional growth and land use change, would physically divide established communities. Therefore, this impact (LU-1) in the year 2035 is significant.

2050

Regional Growth and Land Use Change

From 2036 to 2050, regional population is forecasted to increase by 215,061 people (6 percent), 97,152 housing units (7 percent), and 141,467 jobs (8 percent). The 2050 regional land use pattern is shown on Figure 2.0-13. Approximately 75 percent of the forecasted regional population increase between 2036 and 2050 is in the City of San Diego (52 percent), County of San Diego (14 percent), and City of Chula Vista (9 percent). Similarly, these three jurisdictions accommodate approximately 78 percent of new housing units and 77 percent of new jobs, respectively, between 2036 and 2050.

In the City of San Diego, the communities with the highest proportion of the forecasted population and housing unit increases include the City Heights and Eastern Area of Mid-City, Greater North Park, Uptown, Linda Vista, Clairemont Mesa, and Downtown. The highest proportions of forecasted job increases are in the communities of Downtown, Otay Mesa, and University City. In the unincorporated County of San Diego, the communities with the highest proportion of the forecasted population and housing unit increases include Lakeside, North County Metro, and Spring Valley. The highest proportions of forecasted job increases are in the communities of Otay, Lakeside, and North County Metro.

Physical barriers such as freeways and highways, rail lines, and large institutional land uses such as military facilities often form the boundaries of existing established communities in the region, and also internally divide existing established communities. For example, the major interstate highways form large physical barriers that divide several established communities throughout the region, and large institutional facilities like military facilities and the San Diego Convention Center separate established communities from San Diego Bay. The established communities of the region generally feature extensive, interconnected roadway networks. The proposed Plan forecasts a general intensification of existing land uses within established communities and along key transportation corridors. The development of new housing units and employment land uses within these established communities would typically occur on vacant or underutilized sites such as surface parking lots, and low-rise commercial strips, industrial buildings, and warehouses. Moreover, infill development in established communities would occur in accordance with the adopted general plans and other subregional plans of the cities and County of San Diego, as well as their zoning and subdivision ordinances. Adopted general plans and subregional plans for established communities routinely prevent developments that would physically divide established communities, and often include policies to remove existing physical barriers. For example, the community plan for Downtown San Diego includes policies to re-connect streets historically divided by large scale developments and neighborhoods physically divided by construction of the I-5.

Construction activities associated with development routinely involve temporary disruptions within established communities such as lane or road closures and service delays or detours for bus routes. Local jurisdictions routinely require traffic control plans and related measures to ensure that construction activities accommodate vehicular and pedestrian access, such as designating alternate routes or scheduling disruptive activities late at night or on weekends. Construction activities would not result in the physical division of established communities. Therefore, regional growth and land use change would not physically divide established communities. This impact is less than significant.


**Transportation Network Improvements and Programs**

In 2050, most transportation network improvements would affect existing transportation facilities, such as LOSSAN rail corridor double-tracking, rail grade separations, additional managed lanes and general purposes lanes along existing freeways and highways, improvements to regional arterials, and active transportation projects. New street cars would be constructed within public rights-of-way. A new Trolley line from Downtown San Diego to SDSU, along the Park Boulevard and El Cajon Boulevard corridors via Balboa Park, North Park, and City Heights (transition of Mid-City Rapid) would be located within public rights-of-way generally along the alignment of the existing bus route. While portions of these improvements to existing transportation facilities would likely involve temporary and permanent right-of-way acquisition, the improvements to existing facilities or within existing public rights-of-way would not physically divide established communities. Increases in transit service frequencies along existing rail corridors, highways, and roadways would not physically divide established communities and are not addressed further in this section. The planned rail grade separations along the LOSSAN corridor and Trolley Blue line would improve connections between communities currently physically divided by rail lines.

Other planned transportation network improvements including new Trolley and SPRINTER extensions would require acquisition of new rights-of-way in highly developed areas with high-density housing along transportation corridors. This includes the planned Trolley extensions from Pacific Beach to Grossmont Center via Clairemont, Kearny Mesa, Mission Valley, and SDSU; and from Pacific Beach to Balboa to Kearney Mesa to Carmel Valley. It also includes the branch extension of the SPRINTER from Escondido to Westfield North County.

The future alignments and engineering designs for these Trolley extensions have not yet been determined, but are likely to be located to the extent feasible within existing public rights-of-way such as along existing freeways, roadways, and rail corridors in order to minimize costs associated with property acquisition and impacts to owners of private property, including businesses and residents. As a result, these Trolley extensions would generally not physically divide established communities.

However, at this time, it cannot be guaranteed that all segments of future Trolley and SPRINTER extensions would have alignments and design features that would avoid physically dividing established communities. Individual transportation network improvements including the planned Trolley and SPRINTER extensions would undergo separate environmental review subject to CEQA and NEPA where applicable. The corresponding project-specific environmental documentation would identify significant impacts with regard to the physical division of established communities, if any, and identify mitigation measures to avoid or lessen the impact. Nevertheless, it cannot be concluded at this time that all project-level physical division of established communities associated with planned Trolley and SPRINTER extensions would be avoided or substantially lessened. Therefore, transportation network improvements would physically divide established communities. This is a significant impact.

**2050 Conclusion**

Implementation of transportation network improvements, but not regional growth and land use change, would physically divide established communities. Therefore, this impact (LU-1) in the year 2050 is significant.

**MITIGATION MEASURES**
LU-1  Physically Divide an Established Community

2035 and 2050

LU-1A Provide Access and Connections. During planning, design, and project-level CEQA review of transportation network improvements including new trolley extensions, and roadway widening improvements, SANDAG shall, and other transportation project sponsors can and should, design new transportation network improvements within established communities to avoid the creation of barriers that physically divide such communities with measures that include, but are not limited to:

- Selecting alignments within or adjacent to existing public rights-of-way.
- Designing sections above- or below-grade to avoid physical division of communities.
- Providing for direct crossings, overcrossings, or undercrossings at regular intervals for various modes of travel (e.g., pedestrians/bicyclists, vehicles).

In addition, Mitigation Measure POP-2A Design Projects to Reduce Displacement would also help to reduce the impact of physical division of established communities.

SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

2035 and 2050

Implementation of Mitigation Measure LU-1A would reduce the physical division of established communities impacts associated with transportation network improvements through implementation of feasible alignments, design options, and other design features that avoid or substantially reduce impacts on community division. However, there is no guarantee that the physical division of established communities impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels for all projects. Therefore, the physical division of established communities impacts resulting from regional growth and land use change and transportation network improvements is a significant and unavoidable impact of implementing the proposed Plan.

LU-2  CONFLICT WITH THE LAND USE PORTION OF ADOPTED LOCAL GENERAL PLANS OR OTHER APPLICABLE LAND USE PLANS, INCLUDING SPECIFIC PLANS AND COMMUNITY PLANS ADOPTED FOR THE PURPOSE OF AVOIDING OR MITIGATING AN ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT.

ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

This section focuses on aspects of the proposed Plan that would conflict with land use portions of adopted general plans, local coastal programs, or other applicable subregional plans, such as specific plans and community plans, that were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Where there are conflicts, the analysis examines the effects of those conflicts on the physical environment. Conflicts with plans are not themselves physical environmental impacts, but rather indicate significant impacts to specific environmental resources analyzed in other EIR resource sections. Consistency with airport land use compatibility plans is addressed in Impact HAZ-3 and consistency with habitat conservation plans is addressed in Section 4.4.
Regional Growth and Land Use Change

The forecasted land use pattern of the proposed Plan’s SCS is based on the Series 13 Regional Growth Forecast, which is based on the adopted general plans of the cities and County of San Diego. It is based on the most recent planning assumptions, considering local general plans and other factors, as required by SB 375 (Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(B)). The Regional Growth Forecast is described in detail in Appendix J to the proposed Plan. Growth forecasted to occur under the proposed Plan would be consistent with the adopted land use plans of the cities and County of San Diego. Local Coastal Programs are components of local general plans. Subregional plans, such as Specific Plans, are required to be consistent with adopted general plans. Because the proposed Plan is based on and consistent with the land use designations of adopted general plans, the proposed Plan would not conflict with local coastal programs or subregional plans. Subregional plans identified by local jurisdictions that have been adopted but not yet fully built-out are identified in Appendix H to this EIR.

From 2012 to 2020, regional population is forecasted to increase by 292,284 people (9 percent), 83,866 housing units (7 percent), and 173,211 jobs (13 percent). The 2020 regional land use pattern is shown in Figure 2.0-11. Approximately 75 percent of the forecasted regional population increase by 2020 is in the City of San Diego (45 percent), County of San Diego (17 percent), and City of Chula Vista (13 percent). Similarly, these three jurisdictions accommodate approximately 77 percent of new housing units and 69 percent of new jobs, respectively, by 2020.

In the City of San Diego, the communities with the highest proportion of the forecasted population and housing unit increases include Mira Mesa, Otay Mesa, Downtown, Pacific Highlands Ranch, Black Mountain Ranch, University City, Navajo, and Mission Valley. The highest proportions of forecasted job increases are in the communities of Downtown, Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Mission Valley, University City, and Otay Mesa. In the unincorporated County of San Diego, the communities with the highest proportion of the forecasted population and housing unit increases include Lakeside, Otay, North County Metro, Pendleton-De Luz, Fallbrook, Spring Valley, Ramona, and Valley Center. The highest proportions of forecasted job increases are in the communities of Lakeside, Spring Valley, North County Metro, Fallbrook, and Ramona.

Development patterns would focus more residential, commercial, and office uses in existing urban areas; growth in the unincorporated areas would be focused within existing rural communities. These development patterns, which would be served by transit capital projects, improvements in transit service, and active transportation projects, are consistent with local land use plans, policies and subregional plans in urban areas calling for higher density development served by high quality transit and bicycle and pedestrian improvements. The proposed Plan’s focus on development in the urbanized western portions of the San Diego region is also consistent with the planning goals of smaller rural communities in the eastern portion of the region to maintain a more rural, nonurbanized character.

Therefore, regional growth and land use change by 2020 would not conflict with the land use portions of adopted local general plans or other applicable land use plans, including specific plans and community plans, adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigation an environmental effect. This impact is less than significant.
**Transportation Network Improvements and Programs**

The transportation network improvements planned for 2020 include new rail and transit facilities such as the Mid-Coast Trolley Extension from Old Town to UTC, Blue/Orange line rail enhancements including rail grade separations, double-tracking of the LOSSAN rail corridor, rail grade separations, additional managed lanes and general purposes lanes along existing freeways and highways, improvements to regional arterials, and active transportation projects. While portions of these improvements to existing transportation facilities and the active transportation projects would likely involve temporary and permanent right-of-way acquisition adjacent to existing facilities or rights-of-way, the improvements to existing facilities or within existing public rights-of-way would not conflict with the land use portions of adopted general plans or other applicable land use plans, including specific plans and community plans, adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Improvements to regional arterials are projects identified in adopted Circulation Elements, which are required by law to be consistent with adopted land use plans. The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Final SEIS/SEIR (SANDAG 2014c) concludes that the Mid-Coast Trolley extension would not conflict with applicable regional and local land use plans, goals, objectives, policies, or regulations.

Subregional plans identified by local jurisdictions that have been adopted but not yet fully built-out are identified in Appendix H to this EIR. For example, San Marcos has drafted specific plans for the San Marcos Creek and University districts, adding mixed-use development near California State University, San Marcos and the SPRINTER rail corridor. The City of San Diego includes mixed-use residential and commercial developments in areas such as Carmel Valley and along the San Diego River in the Mission Valley area. Eastern Chula Vista also includes specific plans for new planned communities in Otay Ranch, near the planned South Bay Rapid Transit BRT. Major development projects planned by the Port of San Diego include the Chula Vista Bayfront and the future Convention Center expansion. The planned improvements along the major transportation corridors would not conflict with development of these projects. Individual transportation network improvements would undergo separate environmental review subject to CEQA and NEPA where applicable. The corresponding project-specific environmental documentation would identify significant impacts with regard to conflicts with land use portions of adopted plan, if any, and identify mitigation measures to avoid or lessen physical impacts to the environment resulting from any conflicts. The transportation network improvements would not conflict with land use portions of adopted general plans or other applicable land use plans, including specific plans and community plans, adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. This impact is less than significant.

**2020 Conclusion**

Implementation of the proposed Plan, including transportation network improvements and regional growth and land use change, would not conflict with land use portions of adopted general plans or other applicable land use plans, including specific plans and community plans, adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Therefore, this impact (LU-2) in the year 2020 is less than significant.
2035

Regional Growth and Land Use Change

The forecasted land use pattern of the proposed Plan’s SCS is based on the Series 13 Regional Growth Forecast, which is based on the adopted general plans of the cities and County of San Diego. It is based on the most recent planning assumptions, considering local general plans and other factors, as required by SB 375 (Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(B)). The Regional Growth Forecast is described in detail in Appendix J to the proposed Plan. Growth forecasted to occur under the proposed Plan would be consistent with the adopted land use plans of the cities and County of San Diego. Local Coastal Programs are components of local general plans. Subregional plans, such as Specific Plans, are required to be consistent with adopted general plans, Because the proposed Plan is based on and consistent with the land use designations of adopted general plans, the proposed Plan would not conflict with local coastal programs or subregional plans. Subregional plans identified by local jurisdictions that have been adopted but not yet fully built-out are identified in Appendix H to this EIR.

From 2021 to 2035, regional population is forecasted to increase by 417,985 people (12 percent), 145,099 housing units (12 percent), and 145,814 jobs (10 percent). The 2035 regional land use pattern is shown in Figure 2.0-12. Approximately 78 percent of the forecasted regional population increase between 2021 and 2035 is in the City of San Diego (51 percent), County of San Diego (18 percent), and City of Chula Vista (9 percent). Similarly, these three jurisdictions accommodate approximately 81 percent of new housing units and 66 percent of new jobs, respectively, between 2021 and 2035.

In the City of San Diego, the communities with the highest proportion of the forecasted population and housing unit increases include Downtown, College Area, Mira Mesa, Otay Mesa, Mission Valley, Navajo, and Uptown. The highest proportions of forecasted job increases are in the communities of Downtown, Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Mission Valley, University City, and Otay Mesa. In the unincorporated County of San Diego, the communities with the highest proportion of the forecasted population and housing unit increases include Lakeside, North County Metro, Otay, Fallbrook, Spring Valley, San Dieguito, and Ramona. The highest proportions of forecasted job increases are in the communities of Lakeside, Spring Valley, North County Metro, Otay, and Fallbrook.

Development patterns would focus more residential, commercial, and office uses in existing urban areas; growth in the unincorporated areas would be focused within existing rural communities. These development patterns, which would be served by transit capital projects, improvements in transit service, and active transportation projects, are consistent with local land use plans and policies calling for higher density development served by high quality transit and bicycle and pedestrian improvements. The proposed Plan’s focus on development in the urbanized western portions of the San Diego region is consistent with the urban subregional plans and the planning goals of smaller rural communities in the eastern portion of the region to maintain a more rural, nonurbanized character.

Therefore, regional growth and land use change by 2035 would not conflict with the land use portion of adopted local general plans or other applicable land use plans, including specific plans and community plans adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigation an environmental effect. This impact is less than significant.
4.11 Land Use

*Transportation Network Improvements and Programs*

In 2035, most transportation network improvements would affect existing transportation facilities, such as LOSSAN and SPRINTER rail corridor double-tracking, rail grade separations, additional managed lanes and general purposes lanes along existing freeways and highways, improvements to regional arterials, and active transportation projects. New street cars would be constructed within public rights-of-way. While portions of these improvements to existing transportation facilities and the active transportation projects would likely involve temporary and permanent right-of-way acquisition adjacent to existing facilities or rights-of-way, the improvements to existing facilities or within existing public rights-of-way would not conflict with the land use portions of adopted general plans or other applicable land use plans, including specific plans and community plans, adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Improvements to regional arterials are projects identified in adopted Circulation Elements, which are required by law to be consistent with adopted land use plans.

Subregional plans identified by local jurisdictions that have been adopted but not yet fully built-out are identified in Appendix H to this EIR. Planned development in local general plans and specific plans include mixed-use residential and commercial uses in the northern coastal cities such as Del Mar, Carlsbad, and Encinitas, City of San Diego (Carmel Valley) as well as inland communities in Vista, San Marcos and unincorporated County of San Diego lands (Harmony Grove Village, Hidden Meadows, Warner Springs). Mixed use residential, commercial and industrial uses are also planned in the Southbay region (East Otay Mesa, Otay Ranch). As previously stated, the Port of San Diego also anticipates development along the South Bay coastal region associated with the Chula Vista Bayfront development and Convention Center expansion, near Petco Park and Harbor Drive in downtown San Diego. The planned improvements along the major transportation corridors would not conflict with development of these projects.

Other planned transportation network improvements including new Trolley extensions would require acquisition of new rights-of-way in highly developed established communities. This includes the planned Trolley extensions from UTC to Mira Mesa via Sorrento Mesa/Carroll Canyon and from San Ysidro to Kearny Mesa via Mission Valley, Mid-City, National City/Chula Vista via Highland Avenue and 4th Avenue. The future alignments and engineering designs for these Trolley extensions have not yet been determined, but are likely to be located to the extent feasible within existing public rights-of-way such as along existing freeways, roadways, and rail corridors in order to minimize costs associated with property acquisition and impacts to owners of private property, including businesses and residents. As a result, these Trolley extensions would generally not conflict with land use portions of adopted plans.

However, at this time, it cannot be guaranteed that all segments of future Trolley extensions would have alignments and design features that would avoid land use conflicts with adopted plans. Individual transportation network improvements including the planned Trolley extensions would undergo separate environmental review subject to CEQA and NEPA where applicable. The corresponding project-specific environmental documentation would identify significant impacts with regard to conflicts with land use portions of adopted plan, if any, and identify mitigation measures to avoid or lessen physical impacts to the environment resulting from any conflicts. Nevertheless, it cannot be concluded at this time that all project-level conflicts with land use portions of adopted plans associated with planned Trolley extensions would be avoided or substantially lessened. Therefore, transportation network improvements would conflict with land use portions of adopted general plans or other applicable land use plans, including specific plans and community plans, adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. This is a significant impact.
2035 Conclusion

Implementation of transportation network improvements, but not regional growth and land use change, would conflict with land use portions of adopted general plans or other applicable land use plans, including specific plans and community plans, adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Therefore, this impact (LU-2) in the year 2035 is significant.

2050

Regional Growth and Land Use Change

The forecasted land use pattern of the proposed Plan’s SCS is based on the Series 13 Regional Growth Forecast, which is based on the adopted general plans of the cities and County of San Diego. It is based on the most recent planning assumptions, considering local general plans and other factors, as required by SB 375 (Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(B)). The Regional Growth Forecast is described in detail in Appendix J to the proposed Plan. Growth forecasted to occur under the proposed Plan would be consistent with the adopted land use plans of the cities and County of San Diego. Local Coastal Programs are components of local general plans. Subregional plans, such as Specific Plans, are required to be consistent with adopted general plans. Because the proposed Plan is based on and consistent with the land use designations of adopted general plans, the proposed Plan would not conflict with local coastal programs or subregional plans. Subregional plans identified by local jurisdictions that have been adopted but not yet fully built-out are identified in Appendix H to this EIR.

From 2036 to 2050, regional population is forecasted to increase by 215,061 people (6 percent), 97,152 housing units (7 percent), and 141,467 jobs (8 percent). The 2050 regional land use pattern is shown in Figure 2.0-13. Approximately 75 percent of the forecasted regional population increase between 2036 and 2050 is in the City of San Diego (52 percent), County of San Diego (14 percent), and City of Chula Vista (9 percent). Similarly, these three jurisdictions accommodate approximately 78 percent of new housing units and 77 percent of new jobs, respectively, between 2036 and 2050.

In the City of San Diego, the communities with the highest proportion of the forecasted population and housing unit increases include the City Heights and Eastern Area of Mid-City, Greater North Park, Uptown, Linda Vista, Clairemont Mesa, and Downtown. The highest proportions of forecasted job increases are in the communities of Downtown, Otay Mesa, and University City. In the unincorporated County of San Diego, the communities with the highest proportion of the forecasted population and housing unit increases include Lakeside, North County Metro, and Spring Valley. The highest proportions of forecasted job increases are in the communities of Otay, Lakeside, and North County Metro.

Development patterns would focus more residential, commercial, and office uses in existing urban areas; growth in the unincorporated areas would be focused within existing rural communities. These development patterns, which would be served by transit capital projects, improvements in transit service, and active transportation projects, are consistent with local land use plans policies, and urban subregional plans calling for higher density development served by high quality transit and bicycle and pedestrian improvements. The proposed Plan’s focus on development in the urbanized western portions of the San Diego region is also consistent with the planning goals of smaller rural communities in the eastern portion of the region to maintain a more rural, nonurbanized character.
Therefore, regional growth and land use change by 2050 would not conflict with the land use portion of adopted local general plans or other applicable land use plans, including specific plans and community plans adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigation an environmental effect. This impact is less than significant.

**Transportation Network Improvements and Programs**

In 2050, most transportation network improvements would affect existing transportation facilities, such as LOSSAN rail corridor double-tracking, rail grade separations, additional managed lanes and general purposes lanes along existing freeways and highways, improvements to regional arterials, and active transportation projects. New street cars would be constructed within public rights-of-way. A new Trolley line from Downtown San Diego to SDSU, along the Park Boulevard and El Cajon Boulevard corridors via Balboa Park, North Park, and City Heights (transition of Mid-City Rapid) would be located within public rights-of-way generally along the alignment of the existing bus route. While portions of these improvements to existing transportation facilities and the active transportation projects would likely involve temporary and permanent right-of-way acquisition adjacent to existing facilities or rights-of-way, the improvements to existing facilities or within existing public rights-of-way would not conflict with the land use portions of adopted general plans or other applicable land use plans, including specific plans and community plans, adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Subregional plans identified by local jurisdictions that have been adopted but not yet fully built-out are identified in Appendix H to this EIR. As described under the 2035 analysis, planned development in local general plans and specific plans include mixed-use residential, commercial, and park uses in the northern coastal cities such as Del Mar, Carlsbad, and Encinitas, City of San Diego (Carmel Valley) as well as inland communities in Vista, San Marcos and unincorporated County of San Diego lands (Harmony Grove Village, Hidden Meadows, Warner Springs). Mixed-use residential, commercial, industrial, park/open space uses are also planned in the Southbay region (East Otay Mesa, Otay Ranch). The planned improvements along the major transportation corridors are primarily urban infill and redevelopment projects that would be completed over time, such as the Urban Core Specific Plan and Palomar Gateway Specific Plan in eastern Chula Vista/County of San Diego region. Some of the specific plan developments incorporate transit oriented development and encourage accessible multi-modal communities. The planned improvements along the major transportation corridors would not conflict with development of these projects.

Other planned transportation network improvements including new Trolley and SPRINTER extensions would require acquisition of new rights-of-way in highly developed areas with high-density housing along transportation corridors. This includes the planned Trolley extensions from Pacific Beach to Grossmont Center via Clairemont, Kearny Mesa, Mission Valley, and SDSU; and from Pacific Beach to Balboa to Kearney Mesa to Carmel Valley. It also includes the branch extension of the SPRINTER from Escondido to Westfield North County. The future alignments and engineering designs for these Trolley and SPRINTER extensions have not yet been determined, but are likely to be located to the extent feasible within existing public rights-of-way such as along existing freeways, roadways, and rail corridors in order to minimize costs associated with property acquisition and impacts to owners of private property, including businesses and residents. As a result, these Trolley and SPRINTER extensions would generally not conflict with land use portions of adopted plans.
However, at this time, it cannot be guaranteed that all segments of future Trolley and SPRINT extension would have alignments and design features that would avoid land use conflicts with adopted plans. Individual transportation network improvements including the planned Trolley and SPRINT extensions would undergo separate environmental review subject to CEQA and NEPA where applicable. The corresponding project-specific environmental documentation would identify significant impacts with regard to conflicts with land use portions of adopted plan, if any, and identify mitigation measures to avoid or lessen physical impacts to the environment resulting from any conflicts. Nevertheless, it cannot be concluded at this time that all project-level conflicts with land use portions of adopted plans associated with planned Trolley and SPRINT extensions would be avoided or substantially lessened. Therefore, transportation network improvements would conflict with land use portions of adopted general plans or other applicable land use plans, including specific plans and community plans, adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. This is a significant impact.

2050 Conclusion

Implementation of transportation network improvements, but not regional growth and land use change, would conflict with land use portions of adopted general plans or other applicable land use plans, including specific plans and community plans, adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Therefore, this impact (LU-2) in the year 2050 is significant.

LU-2 CONFLICT WITH THE LAND USE PORTION OF PLANS

MITIGATION MEASURES

2035 and 2050

LU-2A Reduce Conflicts with Land Use Plans. During planning, design, and project-level CEQA review of transportation network improvements, SANDAG shall, and other transportation project sponsors can and should, implement measures to reduce conflicts with land use plans adopted for the purpose of mitigating an environmental effect, including but not limited to (1) consulting with the County of San Diego and cities, and other local jurisdictions early in the planning process, to identify conflicts and address them through the facility planning and design process, and (2) incorporating design features that would avoid or reduce such conflicts.

In addition, Mitigation Measure POP-2A Design Projects to Reduce Displacement would also help to reduce land use conflicts.

Significance after Mitigation

2035 and 2050

Implementation of Mitigation Measure LU-2A would reduce existing land use plan conflicts associated with Trolley line extensions. However, there is no guarantee that significant land use plan conflicts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels for all projects. Therefore, land use plan conflicts resulting from regional growth and land use change and transportation network improvements and programs is a significant and unavoidable impact of implementing the proposed Plan.
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