5 ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

This chapter discusses the alternatives to the proposed Plan considered in this EIR and provides an analysis of impacts associated with those alternatives.

5.1 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(a) 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 eliminated from further consideration 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] Factors taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives include site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, other plans or regulatory limitations, and jurisdictional boundaries. [Section 15126.6(f)]

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, greenhouse gas (GHG), and biological resources, transportation and land use impacts were of particular concern to the public during the EIR scoping and planning processes. The comments provided on the Notice of Preparation (NOP), available in Appendix A-2 of this Draft EIR, and during development of the proposed Plan focused on reducing GHG emission and air quality impacts through reductions in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and land use planning that supported conservation efforts (Appendix A-2). The proposed Plan achieves GHG and VMT reductions by increasing transit utilization and aligning the SCS land use pattern with jurisdiction-specific general plans which concentrate development in urban areas. These strategies 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 comments. This chapter provides:

- 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 can avoid or substantially lessen 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.

5.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN DETAIL

Aside from Alternative 1: No Project, the alternatives analyzed in detail are considered potentially feasible for the purposes of CEQA analysis of alternatives to the proposed Plan, although some elements of the alternatives may require major changes in legislation, policy, or in the availability of funding. This analysis focuses on the characteristics that differentiate the alternatives from the proposed Plan.

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

- Table M-1 provides a list of the "No Build" projects that are assumed to be implemented for the No Project Alternative. No-Build projects are projects that would be built in the region in absence of the 2025 Regional Plan because they are in progress or recently completed.
- Table M-2 provides performance measures data for the proposed Plan and Alternatives Considered in Detail in this EIR, including population, housing, and employment information.
- Table M-3 provides Senate Bill (SB) 375 GHG reduction for Alternatives Considered in Detail in this EIR.
- Table M-4 provides the EMFAC 2017 onroad output summary for Alternatives Considered in Detail in this EIR.

5.2.1 Alternative 1: No Project

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

The proposed Plan involves updating the existing plan, the Amended 2021 Regional Plan. The No Project Alternative therefore reflects continuation of the existing plan. [CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(3)(A)] The No Project Alternative assumes the Series 15 Regional Growth Forecast with the Amended 2021 Regional Plan land use pattern. Alternative 1 would result in more concentrated development patterns than the proposed Plan because Alternative 1's land use pattern focused growth primarily in mobility hubs, resulting in a denser development pattern than the proposed Plan. 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. Table M-2 (Appendix M of this EIR) provides a comparison of the population, housing, and employment for the proposed Plan and the alternatives. The No Project Alternative includes "No Build" transportation projects likely to be implemented if the proposed Plan were not adopted. A list of No-Build projects is included in Appendix M. 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 in January 2026.

5.2.2 Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions

Alternative 2 incorporates and adapts elements of the proposed Plan, such as the proposed Plan transportation network and many policies and programs. Unlike the proposed Plan, Alternative 2 would include a land use pattern with more focused growth in areas with available multimodal transportation, higher parking pricing than what is included in the proposed Plan, and speed reductions on arterials and freeways not 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. This alternative increases mode shift to transit and other non-solo driving transportation modes due to higher parking pricing and reduces GHG emissions due to speed reductions on arterials and freeways. Percent of work trips during peak period for modes other than solo driving increases by 2.7% in 2035 and ~~3.7~~3.8% in 2050 for Alternative 2 (see Appendix M). Per capita GHG emissions reductions from 2005 levels are 23.6% in 2035 and ~~24.6~~24.3% in 2050 for Alternative 2, compared to ~~19.32~~19.35% in 2035 and ~~19.51~~19.38% in 2050 for proposed Plan (see Appendix M). Land use in Alternative 2 would focus all growth in areas with available multimodal transportation and expect new growth to only be found in such locations. The land use pattern in Alternative 2 increases capacity for density only in locations with existing multi-family, commercial and office land uses. Alternative 2 includes the same transportation network as the proposed Plan, and funding for Alternative 2 would be the same as described for the proposed Plan. Table 5-1 provides a comparison of the components of each of the alternatives considered in detail.

5.2.3 Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit

Alternative 3 incorporates and adapts elements of the proposed Plan, such as the proposed Plan transportation network and many policies and programs. a land use pattern similar to the proposed Plan that concentrates growth in areas with available multimodal transportation to provide convenient, and increased mode shift to low-VMT options for moving around the region. Unlike the proposed Plan, Alternative 3 would include a land use pattern with more focused growth in areas with available multimodal transportation, higher parking and managed lane pricing policies than what is included in the proposed Plan, and availability of free transit not 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. This alternative increases mode shift to transit and other non-solo driving transportation modes and reduces GHG emissions due to higher parking pricing, higher managed lane pricing, and access to free transit. Percent of work trips during peak period for modes other than solo driving increases by ~~2.6~~2.7% in 2035 and 3.6% in 2050 for Alternative 3 (see Appendix M). Per capita GHG emissions reductions from 2005 are ~~22~~22.2% in 2035 and ~~22.9~~22.8% in 2050 for Alternative 3, compared to ~~19.32~~19.35% in 2035 and ~~19.51~~19.38% in 2050 for the proposed Plan (see Appendix M)]. Like Alternative 2, land use in Alternative 3 would focus all growth in areas with available multimodal transportation and expect new growth to only be found in such locations. The land use pattern in Alternative 3 increases capacity for density only in locations with existing multi-family, commercial and office land uses. 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 5-1 provides a comparison of the components of each of the alternatives considered in detail.

Table 5-1 Summary of Alternatives Considered in Detail

Components	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
Land Use Pattern	Amended 2021 Regional Plan	Land use pattern focuses new growth in areas with available multimodal transportation	Land use pattern focuses new growth in areas with available multimodal transportation
Transportation Network	"No Build" Projects	Same as proposed Plan	Same as proposed Plan
Parking Pricing	Amended 2021 Regional Plan	Increases parking costs by 100% compared to proposed Plan	Increases parking costs by 100% compared to proposed Plan
Managed Lane Pricing	Amended 2021 Regional Plan	Same as proposed Plan	Increases managed lane pricing by 100% compared to proposed Plan

Components	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
Speed Reductions	No	Reduces speeds on arterials and freeways by 5 mph	No
Free Transit	No	No	Yes
Funding	Committed funding	Same as proposed Plan	Same as proposed Plan

5.2.4 Project Objectives

Alternatives were generated to feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the proposed Plan. As stated in Chapter 2, these basic objectives are to:

- Focus population and employment growth to protect sensitive habitat and natural resource areas.
- Provide transportation investments that support compact land development patterns and reduce vehicle miles traveled.
- Meet greenhouse gas emissions targets established for the San Diego region by the California Air Resources Board.
- Provide transportation investments and land use patterns that promote social equity.
- Provide transportation investments and a land use pattern that improves air quality.
- Provide multimodal access to employment centers and key destinations for all communities.
- Enhance the efficiency of the transportation network for moving people and goods through the deployment of new technologies.

Table 5-2 shows that the 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 that an alternative can at least partially, if not fully, meet project objectives.

Table 5-2 Ability for Alternatives Considered in Detail in this EIR to Meet Basic Project Objectives

Project Objectives	Proposed Plan	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
Focus population and employment growth to protect sensitive habitat and natural resource areas.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Provide transportation investments that support compact land development patterns and reduce vehicle miles traveled.	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Meet greenhouse gas emissions targets established for the San Diego region by the California Air Resources Board.	Yes	No	Yes	Yes

Project Objectives	Proposed Plan	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
Provide transportation investments and land use patterns that promote social equity.	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Provide transportation investments and a land use pattern that improves air quality.	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Provide multimodal access to employment centers and key destinations for all communities.	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Enhance the efficiency of the transportation network for moving people and goods through the deployment of new technologies.	Yes	No	Yes	Yes

5.3 ALTERNATIVES COMPARISON

Table 5-3 (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 M of this EIR.

5.4 Environmentally Superior Alternative

Based on the analysis of alternatives provided in Table 5-3, Alternative 2 is the environmentally superior alternative. Although Alternative 2 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 2 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, geology and soils, paleontological resources, greenhouse gas emissions, mineral resources, noise and vibration, public services, recreation, utilities, transportation, tribal cultural resources, water supply, and wildfire. Compared to the proposed Plan's significant impacts, Alternative 2 would have increased impacts for only a few significance criteria for the following resource areas: land use and population and housing.

Among the alternatives, Alternative 2 would achieve the greatest reductions of GHG emissions VMT, and air quality emissions as compared to the proposed Plan. Alternative 2 would result in a ~~24.6~~24.3 percent per capita GHG reduction below 2005 levels in 2050, which would result in a greater reduction than the proposed Plan (~~19.51~~19.38 percent below 2005 levels in 2050). In addition, Alternative 2 would result in a SB743-based VMT per capita of ~~14.55~~14.7 in 2050 compared to VMT per capita of ~~15.39~~15.4 VMT under the proposed Plan in 2050 (see Appendix M). SB-743 based VMT per capita reflects non-commercial VMT per resident in the region. In addition, Alternative 2 would result in an increase in SB 375- based total regionwide VMT of ~~959,729~~1,986,314 vehicle miles per day in 2050 compared to Baseline Year 2019 conditions. This increase would be less than the increase of ~~4,343,189~~ 4,724,434 miles per day in 2050 under the proposed Plan (see Appendix M). Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in decreased impacts as it would achieve a higher VMT reduction than the proposed Plan. Because

VMT reductions correlate to GHG reductions, Alternative 2 would result in decreased GHG impacts as compared to the proposed Plan. Alternative 2 would also result in a decrease in reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrous oxides (NO_X), carbon monoxide (CO), fine and respirable particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10}), and sulfur oxide (SO_X) emissions compared to the proposed Plan from onroad sources.

5.5 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT EXCLUDED FROM FURTHER ANALYSIS

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.

SANDAG received several comment letters focused on specific environmental issues, land uses, and individual transportation projects rather than alternatives to the proposed Plan. Those comments are not discussed in this section.

5.5.1 LA PLAYA PLAN

In a January 8, 2023, NOP comment letter, Katheryn Rhodes requested that the proposed Plan include analysis of an alternative La Playa Plan (LPP) for a Full Tidelands Reclamation project, suggesting this alternative would significantly reduce GHG emissions impacts in the SANDAG region. The LPP alternative suggests several projects already included in the proposed Plan (enhanced active transportation corridors and improved fleet connectivity to San Diego International Airport [SDIA] facilities). Funding for the LPP would be subject to confirmation that SDIA is a Grandfathered Airport, which would allow normally restricted Federal Aviation Administration airport revenue to be diverted towards airport transportation projects, including the proposed annexation of port tidelands.

REASONS FOR REJECTION:

The LPP alternative focuses on a limited geographical portion of the region. In addition, most of the major elements of the LPP alternative are already included in the proposed Plan and/or Alternatives 2 and 3 analyzed in this EIR, such as enhanced active transportation corridors and improved fleet connectivity to SDIA facilities.

The LPP alternative is an individual project in a limited geographical portion of the region rather than an alternative for the proposed Plan as a whole, and CEQA does not require analysis of alternatives to individual components 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 nor would it meet most of the project objectives. For these reasons, this alternative has been excluded from further consideration.

5.5.2 ACCELERATED PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

As discussed in Section 4.16, Transportation and Section 4.8, Greenhouse Gases, 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 2035 and 2050, greater transit ridership would need to be achieved earlier than projected. To accomplish this the implementation of the transportation network improvements in the proposed Plan would need to be accelerated and the projects would need to be constructed sooner than contemplated in the proposed Plan.

REASONS FOR REJECTION:

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 25-year life of the proposed Plan. Two thirds of anticipated revenues are not expected to become available until the 2036–2050 timeframe. Accelerating Plan implementation ahead of this timeframe, and in light of the funding constraints, would not allow SANDAG to accomplish the Alternative within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic and logistical factors. Thus, the Alternative would be infeasible.

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

5.5.3 FOCUSED GROWTH, HIGHER PARKING PRICING, AND ROAD USAGE CHARGE

SANDAG received comments during the scoping period about the use of focused growth and pricing to reduce VMT and GHG impacts in the region. As discussed in Section 4.16, Transportation, implementation of the proposed Plan would result in significant VMT and GHG impacts. Therefore, SANDAG evaluated the effect of focused growth, higher parking pricing, and a road usage charge on the proposed Plan's significant impacts.

This analysis includes the proposed Plan transportation network, a land use pattern that concentrates growth in areas with available multimodal transportation to provide convenient, low-VMT options for moving around the region, higher parking pricing than what is included in the proposed Plan, a road usage charge and the same funding availability as the proposed Plan.

REASONS FOR REJECTION:

Major elements of this alternative are already included in Alternatives 2 and 3, evaluated in detail in this EIR. Alternative 2 achieves greater reductions in the proposed Plan's impacts than this alternative and is still environmentally superior to the Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Road Usage Charge Alternative. An EIR need not consider additional alternatives that are permutations of alternatives already evaluated in detail. *Village Laguna v. of Laguna Beach, Inc. v. Board of Supervisors* (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 1022, 1028.

Similar to Alternatives 2 and 3 analyzed in this EIR, this alternative also meets the project objectives for the proposed Project. However, the combination of focused growth, higher parking pricing, and a road usage charge would not reduce any of the proposed Plan's significant impacts to less-then-significant levels. Regional PM10 emissions would be slightly lower compared to the proposed Plan, but would result in a similar significant impact In addition, GHG emissions would be lower than the proposed Plan, but would not meet the reduction target reference points for 2030, 2045, and 2050 and thus would result in a similar significant impact as the proposed Plan. VMT would also be lower than the proposed Plan, but the alternative would not achieve the substantial VMT

reductions needed to help achieve statewide GHG reduction goals. This alternative would not avoid or substantially lessen a number of significant environmental impacts of the proposed Plan.

As a financial strategy, higher parking pricing coupled with a road usage charge would provide an additional revenue source for the region. However, the region's residents, including those in disadvantaged communities, would bear these increased costs in addition to other existing economic challenges like the recent rise in inflation. Compared to the proposed Plan, the percentage of income consumed by out-of-pocket transportation costs would be substantially greater in 2035 and 2050. This makes this alternative undesirable from a policy standpoint, and therefore infeasible.

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

5.5.4 WOLFORD BRIEF

In a February 20, 2023, NOP comment letter, Albert Perdon submitted the Wolford Brief as an alternative to the 5 Big Moves of the 2021 Regional Plan and an alternative to the proposed Plan. The Wolford Brief proposes setting new population, housing and economic growth targets for the year 2123 (from 3.4 million people to 9.1 million people), densifying land use including the development of four or more megacities for populations of two million each, developing transit corridors including 200+ mph high-speed train/Maglev plus connected local transit and integrated 24-city/800-mile high-speed trains, building a new integrated airport/high-speed train/housing complex at Miramar, and implementing a benefit assessment-based funding plan. The letter presents the Wolford Brief as an effective alternative to the proposed Plan, suggesting it would significantly reduce VMT and GHG emissions impacts in the SANDAG region.

REASONS FOR REJECTION:

The population and employment projections for the proposed Plan are a forecast rather than a target, as required by state and federal law and regulations (See 23 CFR 450.324 (e) and California Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(B)(ii)). The Series 15 Growth Forecast meets the legal requirements of SB 375 and aligns with the State of California Department of Finance and the U.S. Census Bureau projections. A full description of the process for developing the Series 15 Growth Forecast population, housing, and jobs numbers can be found in Appendix F to the proposed Plan. SANDAG is legally required to provide a transportation plan for at least a 20-year time horizon consistent with its population and employment forecasts. Implementation of the Wolford Brief Alternative on the proposed 100-year time horizon is remote and speculative, and would be increasingly speculative the further out that SANDAG forecasted. [Guidelines, § 15126.6(f)(3)] Based on the Series 15 Growth Forecast, the population of San Diego County is expected to be 3.4 million by 2050, which is inconsistent with the megacities and supporting transit corridors proposed in the Wolford Brief. The Wolford Brief asks that SANDAG accelerate construction of high speed rail in San Diego County. The proposed Plan does include high speed rail consistent with state planning assumptions. However, SANDAG is not the implementing agency for high speed rail and the Wolford Brief includes high speed rail implementation assumptions that are inconsistent with current state planning assumptions, Therefore, it is not feasible for SANDAG to implement high speed rail in a manner consistent with the Wolford Brief.

The proposed population target upon which the alternative is based is inconsistent with state and federal law and regulations. While this alternative might meet some of the project objectives for the proposed Plan, forecasting population and employment growth for 100 years is remote and speculative. For these reasons, this alternative has been excluded from further consideration.

Table 5-3 provides a list of impacts and their level of 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 M of this EIR. The designation "significant impact" in Table 5-3 refers to the level of significance of the impact identified for the proposed Plan as analyzed in this EIR. Within the parentheses is a comparison of the magnitude of the alternative's impact to the magnitude of the proposed Plan's impacts (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 relatively increased or decreased without changing the significance determination.

Table 5-3 Comparison of Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 Impacts to the Proposed Plan Impacts

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
	Aesthetics and Visual Resources		
2035	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 1 would result in significant impacts in 2035 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 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, or conflicting with regulations governing scenic quality; and **AES-4,** substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of 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 decreased compared to the proposed Plan in 2035 because Alternative 1's land use pattern would be more concentrated in urban areas than the proposed Plan, which would result in less impacts on scenic vistas, scenic resources within scenic highways, visual character in rural and less developed areas of the region, and new sources of substantial light or glare.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Impacts **AES-1**, **AES-2**, **AES-3**, and **AES-4** would be significant for Alternative 2 in 2035. Impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed Plan in 2035 because Alternative 2 would result in more compact development patterns compared to the proposed Plan, which would result in reduced impacts on scenic vistas, scenic resources within scenic highways, visual character in rural and less developed areas of the region, and new sources of substantial light or glare.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Impacts **AES-1**, **AES-2**, **AES-3**, and **AES-4** would be significant for Alternative 3in 2035. Impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed Plan in 2035 because Alternative 3 would result in more compact development patterns compared to the proposed Plan, which would result in reduced impacts on scenic vistas, scenic resources within scenic highways, visual character in rural and less developed areas of the region, and new sources of substantial light or glare.
2035	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-AES-1**, making a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects related to aesthetics and visual resources. Cumulative impacts would decrease compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-AES-1**, making a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects related to aesthetics and visual resources. Cumulative impacts would decrease compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-AES-1**, making a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects related to aesthetics and visual resources. Cumulative impacts would decrease compared to the proposed Plan.
2050	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Impacts **AES-1**, **AES-2**, **AES-3**, and **AES-4** would be significant for Alternative 1 in 2050 and decreased compared to the proposed Plan. The rationale described under 2035 also applies to 2050.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Impacts **AES-1**, **AES-2,** **AES-3**, and **AES-4** would be significant for Alternative 2 in 2050 and reduced compared to the proposed Plan. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Impacts **AES-1**, **AES-2**, **AES-3**, and **AES-4** would be significant for Alternative 3 in 2050 and reduced compared to the proposed Plan. The rationale described under 2035 also applies to 2050.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
2050	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-AES-1**, making a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects related to aesthetics and visual resources. Cumulative impacts would decrease compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-AES-1**, making a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects related to aesthetics and visual resources. Cumulative impacts would decrease compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-AES-1**, making a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects related to aesthetics and visual resources. Cumulative impacts would decrease compared to the proposed Plan.
	Agriculture and Forestry Resources		
2035	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 1 would result in significant impacts on agricultural and forest resources (**AG-1**, **AG-2**, and **FR-1**). **AG-1** would occur due to conversion of agricultural lands to nonagricultural uses, **AG-2** would occur as a result of conflict with land zoned for agricultural use or with Williamson Act contracts, and **FR-1** would result from direct loss of forest land. Impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed Plan in 2035 because Alternative 1 land use would be denser in urban areas than the proposed Plan and would thus result in less conversion of agricultural lands to nonagricultural uses and result in less land use conflicts with agricultural and forest resources.	**Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 2 would result in significant impacts on agricultural and forest resources (**AG-1**, **AG-2**, and **FR-1**). Impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed Plan in 2035 because Alternative 2 land use would be denser in urban areas than the proposed Plan and would thus result in less conversion of agricultural lands to nonagricultural uses and result in less land use conflicts with agricultural and forest resources.	**Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 3 would result in significant impacts on agricultural and forest resources (**AG-1**, **AG-2**, and **FR-1**). Impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed Plan in 2035 because Alternative 3 land use would be denser in urban areas than the proposed Plan and would thus result in less conversion of agricultural lands to nonagricultural uses and result in less land use conflicts with agricultural and forest resources.
2035	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-AG-1**, making a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects on agriculture and forestry resources. Cumulative impacts would decrease compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-AG-1**, making a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects on agriculture and forestry resources. Cumulative impacts would decrease compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-AG-1**, making a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects on agriculture and forestry resources. Cumulative impacts would decrease compared to the proposed Plan.
2050	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 1 would result in significant impacts on agricultural and forest resources (**AG-1**, **AG-2**, and **FR-1**) and the impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed Plan. The rationale described under 2035 also applies to 2050.	**Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 2 would result in significant impacts on agricultural and forest resources (**AG-1**, **AG-2**, and **FR-**1) and the impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed Plan. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050.	**Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 3 would result in significant impacts on agricultural and forest resources (**AG-1**, **AG-2**, and **FR-**1) and the impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed Plan. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
2050	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-AG-1**, making a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects on agriculture and forestry resources. Cumulative impacts would decrease compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-AG-1**, making a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects on agriculture and forestry resources. Cumulative impacts would decrease compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-AG-1**, making a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects on agriculture and forestry resources. Cumulative impacts would decrease compared to the proposed Plan.
	Air Quality		
2035	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than- significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-1,** conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable Air Quality Attainment Plans. As with the proposed Plan, this alternative would result in population growth that is similar to or less than that assumed in the 2022 RAQS, the 2020 SIP, and the CERP. Therefore, this alternative would be consistent with the 2022 RAQS, the 2020 SIP, and the CERP.	**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 result in population growth that is similar to or less than that assumed in the 2022 RAQS, the 2020 SIP, and the CERP. Therefore, this alternative would be consistent with the 2022 RAQS, the 2020 SIP, and the CERP.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 3 would result in a less-than- significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-1**. As with the proposed Plan, this alternative would result in population growth that is similar to or less than that assumed in the 2022 RAQS, the 2020 SIP, and the CERP. Therefore, this alternative would be consistent with the 2022 RAQS, the 2020 SIP, and the CERP.
2035	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-2,** result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in nonattainment or attainment criteria pollutants**.** Alternative 1 would increase VMT and on-road emissions compared to the proposed Plan. However, Alternative 1 would result in less emissions (or no change in emissions) than the baseline (2022) conditions for all emission types except for $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10}, which would see a marginal increase due to the increase in VMT and associated road dust; refer to Appendix M, Table M-4. Alternative 1 would result in increased emissions of $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} compared to the proposed Plan, an, compared to baseline (2022) conditions. As such, Alternative 1 would also result in a similar but slightly higher significant impact.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-2**. Alternative 2 would decrease VMT and on-road emissions compared to the proposed Plan. Alternative 2 would result in higher VMT but lower emissions than the baseline (2022) conditions. All emission types would decrease relative to both the proposed Plan and baseline (2022) conditions; refer to Appendix M, Table M-4. Therefore, because Alternative 2 would result in reduced emissions compared to the proposed Plan and compared to baseline (2022) conditions, Alternative 2 would have a less-than-significant impact the net increase in nonattainment or attainment criteria pollutants.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a less-than- significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-2**. Alternative 3 would decrease VMT and on-road emissions compared to the proposed Plan. Alternative 3 would result in higher VMT and lower emissions than baseline (2022) conditions; refer to Appendix M, Table M-4. Therefore, because Alternative 3 would result in reduced emissions compared to the proposed Plan and compared to baseline (2022) conditions, Alternative 3 would have a less-than-significant impact the net increase in nonattainment or attainment criteria pollutants.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
2035	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-3,** result in construction-related emissions above mass emission thresholds. Alternative 1 would result in decreased construction-related emissions compared to the proposed Plan because fewer transportation projects would be constructed, and would result in decreased 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 because the same number of transportation projects would be constructed, 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 because the same number of transportation projects would be constructed, and would result in similar impacts.
2035	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-4,** expose sensitive receptors to substantial PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations. As shown in Appendix M, Table M-4, Alternative 1 would result in higher PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions compared to the proposed Plan. Thus, Alternative 1 would have higher PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ concentration impacts on sensitive receptors compared to the proposed Plan and would also result in a similar significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-4**, and would expose sensitive receptors to substantial PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations. As shown in Appendix M Table M-4, Alternative 2 would result in slightly lower PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions compared to the proposed Plan and the baseline (2022) conditions. Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in a similar but slightly lower 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 PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions compared to the proposed Plan and the baseline (2022) conditions; refer to Appendix M, Table M-4. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in a similar but slightly lower significant impact.
2035	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-5,** expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations. As shown in Appendix M Table M-2, Alternative 1 would result in lower transit ridership and increased VMT, which would increase TAC emissions from roadways. Overall, the decrease in diesel exposure due to commuter rail lines due to lower transit demand would be offset by an increase in roadway TACs from increased on-road VMT. Thus, Alternative 1 would have higher TACs compared to the proposed Plan, resulting in a similar significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-5**. As shown in Appendix M Table M-2, Alternative 2 would result in increased transit ridership and reduced VMT, which would increase TAC emissions from commuter rail lines but would reduce TAC emissions from roadways. Overall, the increase in diesel exposure from commuter rail lines due to higher transit demand would be offset by a decrease in roadway TACs due to reduced on-road VMT. Thus, Alternative 2 would have lower TACs compared to the proposed Plan, and would result in a similar but slightly lower significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-5**. As shown in Appendix M Table M-2, Alternative 3 would result in increased transit ridership and reduced VMT, which would increase TAC emissions from commuter rail lines but would reduce TAC emissions from roadways. Overall, the increase in diesel exposure from commuter rail lines due to higher transit demand would be offset by a decrease in roadway TACs due to reduced on-road VMT. Thus, Alternative 3 would have lower TACs compared to the proposed Plan, and result in a similar but slightly lower significant impact.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
2035	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 1 would result in a less-than- significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-6,** expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of CO. According to Appendix M, Table M-4, Alternative 1 would result in lower winter CO emissions compared to the proposed Plan, and substantially lower winter CO emissions than the baseline (2022) conditions. Thus, exposure of sensitive receptors to CO concentrations would decrease under Alternative 1 as under the proposed Plan and result in a less-than- significant impact.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 2 would result in a less-than- significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-6**. According to Appendix M, Table M-4, Alternative 2 would result in slightly lower winter CO emissions compared to the proposed Plan, and substantially lower CO emissions than the baseline (2022) conditions. Thus, similar to the proposed Plan, Alternative 2 would have a less-than-significant impact.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 3 would result in a less-than- significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-6**. According to Appendix M, Table M-4, Alternative 3 would result in slightly lower winter CO emissions compared to the proposed Plan, and substantially lower CO emissions than the baseline (2022) conditions. Thus, similar to the proposed Plan, Alternative 3 would have a less-than-significant impact.
2035	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 1 would result in a less-than- significant impact in 2035 for **AQ-7,** expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors. Exposure of people to objectionable odors would be the same as the proposed Plan because Alternative 1 would not result in major increases in construction or operation of typical land uses that cause odor impacts, such as agricultural activities, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting facilities, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. Furthermore, Alternative 1 would be required to comply with all SDAPCD, city, county, and other odor rules, regulations and programs. Alternative 1 would have similar construction and operational impacts as the proposed Plan and thus similar odor impacts. Thus, Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact.	**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.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
2035	**Cumulatively Considerable (increased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts related to **C-AQ-1**, net increase in nonattainment or attainment criteria pollutants (AQ-2); expose sensitive receptors to substantial PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations (AQ-4); expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations (AQ-5). Cumulative impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan. **Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts related to **C-AQ-1**, increase in construction-related emissions (AQ-3). Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (same/increased)** – Similar to the proposed Plan, Alternative 1 would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts for **C-AQ-1** related to consistency with plans (AQ-1), exposing sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of CO (AQ-6), and objectionable odors (AQ-7).	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts related to **C-AQ-1**, expose sensitive receptors to substantial PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations (AQ-4); expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations (AQ-5). Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Cumulatively Considerable (same)** - Alternative 2 would result in a cumulatively considerable impacts related to **C-AQ-1,** increase in construction-related emissions (AQ-3), the same as the proposed Project. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (same/decreased)** – Similar to the proposed Plan, Alternative 2 would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts for **C-AQ-1** related to consistency with plans (AQ-1), net increase in nonattainment or attainment criteria pollutants (AQ-2), exposing sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of CO (AQ-6), and objectionable odors (AQ-7).	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts related to **C-AQ-1**, expose sensitive receptors to substantial PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations (AQ-4); expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations (AQ-5). Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Cumulatively Considerable (same)** - Alternative 3 would result in a cumulatively considerable impacts related to **C-AQ-1,** increase in construction-related emissions (AQ-3), the same as the proposed Project. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (same/decreased)** – Similar to the proposed Plan, Alternative 3 would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts for **C-AQ-1** related to consistency with plans (AQ-1), net increase in nonattainment or attainment criteria pollutants (AQ-2), exposing sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of CO (AQ-6), and objectionable odors (AQ-7).
2050	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than- significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-1,** conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable Air Quality Attainment Plans. As with the proposed Plan, this alternative would result in population growth that is similar to or less than that assumed in the 2022 RAQS, the 2020 SIP, and the CERP. Therefore, this alternative would be consistent with the 2022 RAQS, the 2020 SIP, and the CERP.	**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 result in population growth that is similar to or less than that assumed in the 2022 RAQS, the 2020 SIP, and the CERP. Therefore, this alternative would be consistent with the 2022 RAQS, the 2020 SIP, and the CERP.	**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 result in population growth that is similar to or less than that assumed in the 2022 RAQS, the 2020 SIP, and the CERP. Therefore, this alternative would be consistent with the 2022 RAQS, the 2020 SIP, and the CERP.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
2050	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-2,** result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in nonattainment or attainment criteria pollutants. As shown in Appendix M, Table M-4, Alternative 1 would increase on-road emissions compared to the proposed Plan. However, Alternative 1 would result in less emissions (or no change in emissions) than the baseline (2022) conditions for all emission types except for $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10}, which would increase due to the increase in VMT and associated road dust. Therefore, Alternative 1 would result in increased emissions compared to the proposed Plan and, for $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10}, compared to baseline (2022) conditions. As such, Alternative 1 would also result in a similar but slightly higher significant impact.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-2**. As shown in Appendix M, Table M-4, Alternative 2 would decrease VMT and on-road emissions compared to the proposed Plan but would result in higher VMT but lower emissions than baseline (2022) conditions. All emission types would decrease relative to both the proposed Plan and baseline (2022) conditions; refer to Appendix M, Table M-4. Therefore, because Alternative 2 would result in reduced emissions compared to the proposed Plan and compared to baseline (2022) conditions, Alternative 2 would have a less-than-significant impact the net increase in nonattainment or attainment criteria pollutants.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a less-than- significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-2**. As shown in Appendix M, Table M-4, Alternative 3 would decrease VMT and on-road emissions compared to the proposed Plan. Alternative 3 would result in higher VMT and lower emissions the baseline (2022) conditions. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in reduced emissions compared to the proposed Plan and compared to baseline (2022) conditions, Alternative 3 would have a less-than-significant impact the net increase in nonattainment or attainment criteria pollutants.
2050	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-3,** result in construction-related emissions above mass emission thresholds. Alternative 1 would result in lower construction-related emissions compared to the proposed Plan because fewer transportation projects would be constructed, and would result in decreased impacts.	**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 because the same number of transportation projects would be constructed, 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 because the same number of transportation projects would be constructed, and would result in similar impacts.
2050	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-4**. As shown in Appendix M, Table M-4, Alternative 1 would result in higher PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions compared to the proposed Plan. Thus, Alternative 1 would also result in a similar, but slightly increased, significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-4**. As shown in Appendix M, Table M-4, Alternative 2 would result in lower PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions compared to the proposed Plan. Thus, Alternative 2 would have a similar, but slightly decreased, significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-4**. Alternative 3 would result in a small decrease of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions compared to the proposed Plan; refer to Appendix M, Table M-4. Thus, Alternative 3 would have a similar, but slightly decreased, significant impact.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
2050	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-5**. As shown in Appendix M Table M-2, Alternative 1 would result in lower transit ridership and increased VMT, which would increase TAC emissions from roadways. Overall, while diesel exposure due to commuter rail lines would decrease due to lower transit demand, this would be offset by an increase in roadways TACs due to increased on-road VMT. Thus, Alternative 1 would have higher TACs compared to the proposed Plan, resulting in a similar significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-5**. As shown in Appendix M Table M-2, Alternative 2 would result in increased transit ridership and reduced VMT, which would increase TAC emissions from commuter rail lines but would reduce TAC emissions from roadways. Overall, decrease in diesel exposure from commuter rail lines due to higher transit demand would be offset by a decrease in roadway TACs due to reduced on-road VMT. Thus, Alternative 2 would have lower TACs compared to the proposed Plan, resulting in a similar significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased**) – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-5**. As shown in Appendix M Table M-2, Alternative 3 would result in increased transit ridership and reduced VMT, which would increase TAC emissions from commuter rail lines but reduce TAC emissions from roadways. Overall, decrease in diesel exposure from commuter rail lines due to higher transit demand would be offset by a decrease in roadway TACs due to reduced on-road VMT. Thus, Alternative 3 would have lower TACs compared to the proposed Plan, resulting in a similar significant impact.
2050	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 1 would result in a less-than- significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-6**. According to Appendix M, Table M-4, Alternative 1 would result in lower winter CO emissions than the proposed Plan, and substantially lower winter CO emissions than baseline (2022) conditions. Thus, exposure of sensitive receptors to CO concentrations would decrease under Alternative 1 and would result in a less-than- significant impact.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-6**. According to Appendix M, Table M-4, Alternative 2 would result in lower winter CO emissions than the proposed Plan, and substantially lower winter CO emissions than baseline (2022) conditions. Thus, exposure of sensitive receptors to CO concentrations under Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 3 would result in a less-than- significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-6**. According to Appendix M, Table M-4, Alternative 3 would result in lower winter CO emissions than the Proposed Plan, and substantially lower winter CO emissions than baseline (2022) conditions. Thus, exposure of sensitive receptors to CO concentrations under Alternative 3 would result in a less- than-significant impact.
2050	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **AQ-7**. Exposure of people to objectionable odors would be the same as the proposed Plan because Alternative 1 would not result in major increases in construction or operation of typical land uses that cause odor impacts, such as agricultural activities, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting facilities, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. Furthermore, Alternative 1 would be required to comply with all SDAPCD, city, county, and other odor rules, regulations and programs. Alternative 1 would have similar construction and operational impacts as the proposed Plan and thus similar odor impacts. Thus, Alternative 1 would result in a less-than- significant impact.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 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. 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**. 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. 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: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
2050	**Cumulatively Considerable (increased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts related to **C-AQ-1**, net increase in nonattainment or attainment criteria pollutants (AQ-2); expose sensitive receptors to substantial PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations (AQ-4); expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations (AQ-5). Cumulative impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan. **Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts related to **C-AQ-1**, increase in construction-related emissions (AQ-3). Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (same/decreased)** – Similar to the proposed Plan, Alternative 1 would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts for **C-AQ-1** related to consistency with plans (AQ-1), exposing sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of CO (AQ-6), and objectionable odors (AQ-7).	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts related to **C-AQ-1**, expose sensitive receptors to substantial PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations (AQ-4); expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations (AQ-5). Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Cumulatively Considerable (same)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts related to **C-AQ-1,** increase in construction-related emissions (AQ-3), the same as the proposed Project. **Less than Cumulatively Considerable (same/decreased)** – Similar to the proposed Plan, Alternative 2 would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts for **C-AQ-1** related to consistency with plans (AQ-1), net increase in nonattainment or attainment criteria pollutants (AQ-2), exposing sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of CO (AQ-6), and objectionable odors (AQ-7).	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts related to **C-AQ-1**, expose sensitive receptors to substantial PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations (AQ-4); expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations (AQ-5). Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Cumulatively Considerable (same)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts related to **C-AQ-1,** increase in construction-related emissions (AQ-3), the same as the proposed Project. **Less than Cumulatively Considerable (same/decreased)** – Similar to the proposed Plan, Alternative 3 would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts for **C-AQ-1** related to consistency with plans (AQ-1), net increase in nonattainment or attainment criteria pollutants (AQ-2), exposing sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of CO (AQ-6), and objectionable odors (AQ-7).
	Biological Resources		
2035	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 1 would result in significant impacts on biological resources for **BIO-1**, adverse effects on sensitive natural communities and regulated aquatic resources; **BIO-2**, adverse effects on candidate, sensitive, endangered, rare, threatened, or special status species; and **BIO-3**, substantial interference with wildlife movement. The impacts of Alternative 1 in 2035 would be reduced compared to the proposed Plan because Alternative 1 would result in more concentrated development patterns, which would reduce impacts on natural communities, plant and animal species, and wildlife movement. As such, Alternative 1 would also result in a similar but decreased significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – 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 2035 would be reduced compared to the proposed Plan because Alternative 2 would result in more concentrated development patterns, which would reduce impacts on natural communities, plant and animal species, and wildlife movement. As such, Alternative 2 would also result in a similar but decreased significant impact.	**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 2035 would be reduced compared to the proposed Plan because Alternative 3 would result in more compact development patterns, which would reduce impacts on natural communities, plant and animal species, and wildlife movement. As such, Alternative 3 would also result in a similar but decreased significant impact.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
2035	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 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 NCCP preserve areas from regional growth and land use change, and, to a lesser extent, transportation network improvements, would require biologically equivalent or superior compensation of habitat or project redesign, the same as the proposed Plan. Therefore, due to more concentrated development, Alternative 1 would result in reduced impacts compared to the proposed Plan.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for **BIO-4**. Encroachment into NCCP preserve areas from regional growth and land use change, and, to a lesser extent, transportation network improvements, would require biologically equivalent or superior compensation of habitat or project redesign, the same as the proposed Plan. Therefore, due to more concentrated development, Alternative 2 would result in reduced impacts compared to the proposed Plan.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for **BIO-4**. Encroachment into NCCP preserve areas from regional growth and land use change, and, to a lesser extent, transportation network improvements, would require biologically equivalent or superior compensation of habitat or project redesign, the same as the proposed Plan. Therefore, due to more concentrated development, Alternative 3 would result in decreased impacts compared to the proposed Plan.
2035	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-BIO-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects on biological resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Similar to the proposed Plan, Alternative 1 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-BIO-1** in 2035 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.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-BIO-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects on biological resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Similar to the proposed Plan, Alternative 2 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-BIO-1** in 2035 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.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-BIO-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects on biological resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Similar to the proposed Plan, Alternative 3 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-BIO-1** in 2035 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.
2050	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – 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 reduced compared to the proposed Plan because Alternative 1 would result in more concentrated development patterns, which would reduce impacts on natural communities, plant and animal species, and wildlife movement. As such, Alternative 1 would also result in a similar but decreased significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – 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 reduced compared to the proposed Plan because Alternative 2 would result in more concentrated development patterns, which would reduce impacts on natural communities, plant and animal species, and wildlife movement. As such, Alternative 2 would also result in a similar but decreased significant impact.	**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 2050 would be reduced compared to the proposed Plan because Alternative 3 would result in more concentrated development patterns, which would reduce impacts on natural communities, plant and animal species, and wildlife movement. As such, Alternative 3 would also result in a similar but decreased significant impact.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
2050	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **BIO-4**. Encroachment into NCCP preserve areas from regional growth and land use change, and, to a lesser extent, transportation network improvements, would require biologically equivalent or superior compensation of habitat or project redesign, the same as the proposed Plan. Therefore, due to more compact development, Alternative 1 would result in reduced less than significant impacts compared to the proposed Plan.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **BIO-4**. Encroachment into NCCP preserve areas from regional growth and land use change, and, to a lesser extent, transportation network improvements, would require biologically equivalent or superior compensation of habitat or project redesign, the same as the proposed Plan. Therefore, due to more compact development, Alternative 2 would result in reduced less than significant impacts compared to the proposed Plan.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **BIO-4**. Encroachment into NCCP preserve areas from regional growth and land use change, and, to a lesser extent, transportation network improvements, would require biologically equivalent or superior compensation of habitat or project redesign, the same as the proposed Plan. Therefore, due to more compact development, Alternative 3 would result in reduced less than significant impacts compared to the proposed Plan.
2050	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-BIO-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects on biological resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Similar to the proposed Plan, Alternative 1 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-BIO-1** in 2050 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.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-BIO-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects on biological resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Similar to the proposed Plan, Alternative 2 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-BIO-1** in 2050 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.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-BIO-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects on biological resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Similar to the proposed Plan, Alternative 2 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-BIO-1** in 2050 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.
	Cultural Resources		
2035	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact on cultural resources for **CULT-1,** substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource or unique archaeological resource. The impacts of Alternative 1 in 2035 would be reduced compared to the proposed Plan. Alternative 1's land use pattern would be more concentrated compared to the proposed Plan, resulting in fewer ground-disturbing activities on previously undisturbed land that could encounter and adversely affect historical or archaeological resources. Therefore, Alternative 1 would result in a similar, but decreased, significant impact compared to the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact on cultural resources for **CULT-1**. The impacts of Alternative 2 in 2035 would be reduced compared to the proposed Plan because Alternative 2's land use pattern would be more concentrated compared to the proposed Plan, resulting in fewer ground-disturbing activities on previously undisturbed land that could encounter and adversely affect historical or archaeological resources. Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in a similar, but decreased, significant impact compared to the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact on cultural resources for **CULT-1**. The impacts of Alternative 3 in 2035 would be reduced compared to the proposed Plan because Alternative 3's land use pattern would be more concentrated compared to the proposed Plan, resulting in fewer ground-disturbing activities in previously undisturbed land that could encounter and adversely affect historical or archaeological resources. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in a similar, but decreased, significant impact compared to the proposed Plan.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
2035	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 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 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.
2035	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-CULT-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects on cultural resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-CULT-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects on cultural resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-CULT-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects on cultural resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.
2050	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact on cultural resources for **CULT-1**. The impacts of Alternative 1 in 2050 would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan because the land use pattern would be more concentrated, which would result in fewer ground-disturbing activities in previously undisturbed land that could encounter and adversely affect historical or archaeological resources. Therefore, Alternative 1 would result in a similar, but decreased, significant impact compared to the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact on cultural resources for **CULT-1**. The impacts of Alternative 2 in 2050 would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan because the land use pattern would be more concentrated, which would result in fewer ground-disturbing activities in previously undisturbed land that could encounter and adversely affect historical or archaeological resources. Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in a similar, but decreased, significant impact compared to the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact on cultural resources for **CULT-1**. The impacts of Alternative 3 in 2050 would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan because the land use pattern would be more concentrated, which would result in fewer ground-disturbing activities in previously undisturbed land that could encounter and adversely affect historical or archaeological resources. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in a similar, but decreased, significant impact compared to the proposed Plan.
2050	**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.
2050	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-CULT-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects on cultural resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-CULT-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects on cultural resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-CULT-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects on cultural resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
	Energy		
2035	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 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 concentrate more new growth in areas with available multimodal transportation than the proposed Plan, resulting in more efficient energy usage for transportation during project operations. Thus, Alternative 2 would result in decreased, less-than-significant impacts.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** 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 concentrate more new growth in areas with available multimodal transportation than the proposed Plan, resulting in more efficient energy usage for transportation during project operations. Alternative 2 would result in more efficient energy usage from incentives to use transit as compared to the proposed Plan, thus decreasing reliance on gasoline and diesel fuel to power automobiles. Thus, Alternative 2 would result in decreased, less-than-significant 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, the land use pattern would be more concentrated as compared to the proposed Plan. Alternative 3 would also concentrate more new growth in areas with available multimodal transportation than the proposed Plan, resulting in more efficient energy usage for transportation during project operations. Moreover, the free transit component of Alternative 3 could incentivize increased reliance on transit leading to decreased energy per capita for on-road transportation as compared to the proposed Plan. This could occur as gasoline and diesel fuel consumption associated with on-road vehicles shifts to transit, which may be powered by electricity or condensed natural gas. Thus, Alternative 3 would result in decreased, less-than-significant impacts.
2035	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for **EN-2,** 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 efficiency and renewable energy and thus would result in the same less-than-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 efficiency and renewable energy and thus would result in the same less-than-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 efficiency and renewable energy and thus would result in the same less-than-significant impact as the proposed Plan.
2035	**Not Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 1 would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-EN-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects related to energy. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Not Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 2 would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-EN-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects related to energy. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Not Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 3 would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-EN-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects related to energy. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
2050	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **EN-1**. Existing State and regional regulations and programs to reduce energy use would continue to apply to Alternative 1; however, Alternative 1 would concentrate new growth in areas with available multimodal transportation more than the proposed Plan. Thus, Alternative 1 would result in a decreased, less-than-significant impact.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **EN-1**. Existing State and regional regulations and programs to reduce energy use would continue to apply to Alternative 2; however, Alternative 2 would concentrate new growth in areas with available multimodal transportation as compared to the proposed Plan. Alternative 2 would result in more efficient energy usage from incentives to use transit as compared to the proposed Plan, thus decreasing reliance on gasoline and diesel fuel to power automobiles. Thus, Alternative 2 would result in a decreased, less-than-significant impact.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 3 would result in a less-than- significant impact in 2050 for **EN-1**. Existing State and regional regulations and programs to reduce energy use would continue to apply to Alternative 3; however, Alternative 3 would concentrate new growth in areas with available multimodal transportation as compared to the proposed Plan, resulting in more efficient energy usage for transportation during project operations. Moreover, the free transit component of Alternative 3 could incentivize increased reliance on transit leading to decreased energy per capita for on-road transportation as compared to the proposed Plan. This could occur as gasoline and diesel fuel consumption associated with on-road vehicles shifts to transit, which may be powered by electricity or condensed natural gas. Thus, Alternative 3 would result in a decreased, less-than-significant impact.
2050	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **EN-2**. Alternative 1 would be consistent with adopted plans to address energy and thus 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 for **EN-2**. Alternative 2 would be consistent with adopted plans to address energy and thus 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 for **EN-2**. Alternative 3 would be consistent with adopted plans to address energy and thus would result in the same significant impact as the proposed Plan.
2050	**Not Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 1 would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-EN-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects related to energy. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Not Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 1 would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-EN-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects related to energy. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Not Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 3 would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-EN-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects related to energy. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
	Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources		
2035	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 1 would result in similar less-than-significant impacts in 2035 for **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; **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; 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 and thus would result in the same less-than-significant impact as the proposed Plan.	**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 and thus would result in the same less-than-significant impact as the proposed Plan.	**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 and thus would result in the same less-than-significant impact as the proposed Plan.
2035	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **GEO-5**, directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature. Impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan in 2035 because Alternative 1 land use pattern would be more concentrated in urban areas than the proposed Plan, which would result in less land use conflict with, and likelihood of disturbing, unique paleontological and geologic resources. Alternative 1 would thus result in a similar, but decreased, significant impact compared to the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **GEO-5**. Impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan in 2035 because Alternative 2 land use pattern would be more concentrated in urban areas than the proposed Plan, which would result in less land use conflict with, and likelihood of disturbing, unique paleontological and geologic resources. Alternative 2 would thus result in a similar, but decreased, significant impact compared to the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in significant impact in 2035 for **GEO-5**. Impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan in 2035 because Alternative 3 land use pattern would be more concentrated in urban areas than the proposed Plan, which would result in less land use conflict with, and likelihood of disturbing, unique paleontological and geologic resources. Alternative 3 would thus result in a similar, but decreased, significant impact compared to the proposed Plan.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
2035	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-PALEO-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects on paleontological resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (same)** – Similar to the proposed Plan, Alternative 1 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact in 2035 for **C-GEO-1,** geologic or seismic hazards or unstable soils.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-PALEO-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects on paleontological resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (same)** – Similar to the proposed Plan, Alternative 2 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact in 2035 for **C-GEO-1**, geologic or seismic hazards or unstable soils.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-PALEO-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects on paleontological resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (same)** – Similar to the proposed Plan, Alternative 3 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact in 2035 for **C-GEO-1,** geologic or seismic hazards or unstable soils.
2050	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same) –** The proposed Plan would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2050 for **GEO-1**, **GEO-2**, **GEO-3,** and **GEO-4**. Alternative 1 would result in the same less-than-significant impact as the proposed Plan 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 for **GEO-1**, **GEO-2**, **GEO-3,** and **GEO-4**. Alternative 2 would result in the same less-than-significant impact as the proposed Plan 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 for **GEO-1**, **GEO-2**, **GEO-3,** and **GEO-4**. Alternative 3 would result in the same less-than-significant impacts as the proposed Plan due to adherence to applicable laws and regulations.
2050	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **GEO-5**. Impacts from regional growth and land use change would be reduced compared to the proposed Plan in 2050 due to a more concentrated land use pattern. Therefore, this alternative would result in less impacts to unique paleontological and geologic resources. Alternative 1 would thus result in a similar, but decreased, significant impact compared to the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **GEO-5**. Impacts from regional growth and land use change would be reduced compared to the proposed Plan in 2050 due to a more concentrated land use pattern. Therefore, this alternative would result in less impacts to unique paleontological and geologic resources. Alternative 2 would thus result in a similar, but decreased, significant impact compared to the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **GEO-5**. Impacts from regional growth and land use change would decrease compared to the proposed Plan in 2050 due to a more concentrated land use pattern. Thus, Alternative 3 would result in less impacts to unique paleontological and geologic resources. Alternative 3 would thus result in a similar, but decreased, significant impact compared to the proposed Plan.
2050	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-PALEO-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects on paleontological resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (same)** – Similar to the proposed Plan, Alternative 1 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact in 2050 for **C-GEO-1,** geologic or seismic hazards or unstable soils.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-PALEO-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects on paleontological resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (same)** – Similar to the proposed Plan, Alternative 2 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact in 2050 for **C-GEO-1,** geologic or seismic hazards or unstable soils.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-PALEO-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects on paleontological resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (same)** – Similar to the proposed Plan, Alternative 2 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact in 2050 for **C-GEO-1,** geologic or seismic hazards or unstable soils.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
	Greenhouse Gas Emissions		
2035	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 1 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 for **GHG-1,** directly or indirectly result in an increase in GHG emissions compared to existing conditions (2022); and **GHG-3,** conflict with or impede the implementation of local plans adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. As shown in Appendix M, Tables M-3 and M-4, regional growth, land uses, and transportation network improvements for Alternative 1 would result in higher GHG emissions than the proposed Plan, due higher VMT, but lower emissions than 2022 baseline levels Population projections are anticipated to be the same as the proposed Plan under this Alternative, so future year emission estimates for other sectors (e.g., electricity, natural gas) would be similar under this Alternative (**GHG-1**). Alternative 1 would not conflict with or impede the implementation of local plans because it would not impair a local jurisdiction's independent capacity to implement measures of a climate action plan (CAP) or greenhouse gas reduction plan (GHGRP) (**GHG-3**). Thus, Alternative 1 would result in similar, but increased, less-than-significant impacts.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 (**GHG-1** and **GHG-3**). As shown in Appendix M, Tables M-3 and M-4, regional growth, land uses, and transportation network improvements for Alternative 2 would result in lower GHG emissions than the proposed Plan due to more compact development around available multimodal transportation, increased parking pricing, and freeway speed reductions. Similar to the proposed Plan, Alternative 2's 2035 GHG emissions would be lower than 2022 baseline levels. Population projections are anticipated to be the same as the proposed Plan under this Alternative, so future year emission estimates for other sectors (e.g., electricity, natural gas) would be similar under this Alternative (**GHG-1**). Alternative 2 would not conflict with or impede the implementation of local plans because it would not impair a local jurisdiction's independent capacity to implement measures of a CAP or GHGRP (**GHG-3**). Thus, Alternative 2 would result in similar, but decreased, less-than-significant impacts.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 (**GHG-1** and **GHG-3**). As shown in Appendix M, Tables M-3 and M-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 available multimodal transportation, increased parking pricing, and free transit, and would result in decreased impacts. Similar to the proposed Plan, Alternative 3's 2035 GHG emissions would be lower than 2022 baseline levels. Population projections are anticipated to be the same as the proposed Plan under this Alternative, so future year emission estimates for other sectors (e.g., electricity, natural gas) would be similar under this Alternative (**GHG-1).** Alternative 3 would not conflict with or impede the implementation of local plans because it would not impair a local jurisdiction's independent capacity to implement measures of a CAP or GHGRP (**GHG-3**). Thus, Alternative 3 would result in similar, but decreased, less-than-significant impacts.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
2035	**Significant Impact (increased) -** Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **GHG-2**, conflict with achievement of SB 375 GHG emissions reduction targets for 2035. Notably, Alternative 1 would increase the significance determination compared to the proposed Plan, which has a less-than-significant impact. As shown in Appendix M, Table M-3, Alternative 1 would result in a ~~16.3~~17.8% per capita GHG reduction below 2005 levels, which would not meet the 2035 reduced goal of 19% below 2005. Alternative 1 would result in less reductions than the proposed Plan because under Alternative 1, transportation projects would be funded for a shorter duration, thus not achieving the VMT and associated GHG reductions as compared to the proposed Plan. Thus, Alternative 1 would have a significant impact.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased)-** Alternative 2 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. As shown in Appendix M, Table M-3, Alternative 2 would result in a 23.6% per capita GHG reduction, which would exceed the 2035 reduction goal of 19% below 2005. Alternative 2 would result in greater GHG reductions than the proposed Plan because of the VMT and associated GHG reductions achieved as compared to the proposed Plan. Thus, Alternative 2 would have a similar, but decreased, less-than-significant impact.	**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. As shown in Appendix M, Table M-3, Alternative 3 would result in a ~~22~~22.2% per capita GHG reduction, which would exceed the 2035 reduction goal of 19% below 2005, and would result in a greater reduction than the proposed Plan. Alternative 3 would result in greater GHG reductions than the proposed Plan because of the VMT and associated GHG reductions achieved as compared to the proposed Plan. Thus, Alternative 3 would have a similar, but decreased, less-than-significant impact.
2035	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **GHG-4**, be inconsistent with the State's ability to achieve the 2030 reduction target of SB 32 and 2045 reduction goal of AB 1279. As shown in Appendix M, Tables M-3 and M-4, Alternative 1 would result in higher GHG emissions associated with increases in VMT and GHG emissions as compared to the proposed Plan due to decreased funding for transportation projects. For this reason, Alternative 1 would not meet the reduction target reference points for 2030 and 2045, which would be based on the total mobile source emissions for Alternative 1 plus other sector emissions (e.g., stationary, area, energy, water, wastewater, solid waste) which would be same as the proposed Plan. Therefore, Alternative 1 would result in increased impacts compared to the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **GHG-4**. As shown in Appendix M, Tables M-3 and M-4, Alternative 3 would result in lower GHG emissions associated with decreases in VMT and GHG emissions as compared to the proposed Plan due to focused growth, higher parking pricing, and speed reductions as compared to the proposed Plan. Nevertheless, Alternative 2 would not meet the reduction target reference points for 2030 and 2045, which would be based on the total mobile source emissions for Alternative 2 plus other sector emissions (e.g., stationary, area, energy, water, wastewater, solid waste) which would be same as the proposed Plan. Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in decreased impacts compared to the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **GHG-4**. As shown in Appendix M, Tables M-3 and M-4, Alternative 3 would result in lower GHG emissions compared to the proposed Plan associated with decreases in VMT and GHG emissions due to focused growth, higher parking and managed lane pricing, and free transit as compared to the proposed Plan. Nevertheless, Alternative 3 would not meet the reduction target reference points for 2030 and 2045, which would be based on the total mobile source emissions for Alternative 3 plus other sector emissions (e.g., stationary, area, energy, water, wastewater, solid waste) which would be same as the proposed Plan. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in decreased impacts compared to the proposed Plan.
2035	**Cumulatively Considerable (increased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-GHG-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects related to GHG emissions. Cumulative impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-GHG-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects related to GHG emissions. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-GHG-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects related to GHG emissions. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
2050	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 1 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2050 for **GHG-1** and **GHG-3**. As shown in Appendix M, Tables M-3 and O-4, regional growth, land uses, and transportation network improvements for Alternative 1 would result in higher GHG emissions in 2050 than the proposed Plan, due to fewer transit-oriented transportation network improvement projects, but lower emissions than 2022 baseline levels (**GHG-1**). Alternative 1's GHG emissions would not conflict with or impede the implementation of local plans because it would not impair a local jurisdiction's independent capacity to implement measures of a CAP or GHGRP (**GHG-3**). Alternative 1 would result in similar, but increased, less-than-significant impacts.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2050 for **GHG-1** and **GHG-3**. As shown in Appendix M, Tables M-3 and M-4, regional growth, land uses, and transportation network improvements for Alternative 2 would result in lower GHG emissions than the proposed Plan due to more compact development, increased parking pricing, and freeway speed reductions. and would result in decreased impacts. Similar to the proposed Plan, Alternative 2's 2050 GHG emissions would be lower than 2022 baseline levels (**GHG-1**). Alternative 2's GHG emissions would not conflict with or impede the implementation of local plans because it would not impair a local jurisdiction's independent capacity to implement measures of a CAP or GHGRP (**GHG-3**). Thus, Alternative 2 would result in similar, but decreased, less-than-significant impacts.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2050 for **GHG-1** and **GHG-3**. As shown in Appendix M, Tables M-3 and M-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, increased parking pricing, and free transit, and would result in decreased impacts. Similar to the proposed Plan, Alternative 3's 2050 GHG emissions would be lower than 2022 baseline levels (**GHG-1**). Alternative 3's GHG emissions would not conflict with or impede the implementation of local plans because it would not impair a local jurisdiction's independent capacity to implement measures of a CAP or GHGRP (**GHG-3**). Thus, Alternative 3 would result in similar, but decreased, less-than-significant impacts.
2050	**No Impact (same)** - **GHG-2**, conflict with achievement of SB 375 GHG emissions reduction targets for 2035, does not consider impacts in 2050.	**No Impact (same)** - **GHG-2**, conflict with achievement of SB 375 GHG emissions reduction targets for 2035, does not consider impacts in 2050.	**No Impact (same)** - **GHG-2**, conflict with achievement of SB 375 GHG emissions reduction targets for 2035, does not consider impacts in 2050.
2045 and 2050	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **GHG-4**. As shown in Appendix M, Tables M-3 and M-4, Alternative 1 would result in higher GHG emissions associated with increases in VMT and GHG emissions as compared to the proposed Plan due to decreased funding for transportation projects. For this reason, Alternative 1 would not meet the reduction target reference points for 2045 and 2050, which would be based on the total mobile source emissions for Alternative 1 plus other sector emissions (e.g., stationary, area, energy, water, wastewater, solid waste) which would be same as the proposed Plan. Therefore, Alternative 1 would result in increased impacts compared to the proposed Plan.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **GHG-4**. Alternative 2 would result in lower GHG emissions associated with decreases in VMT and GHG emissions as compared to the proposed Plan due to focused growth, higher parking pricing, and speed reductions as compared to the proposed Plan. Nevertheless, Alternative 2 still would not meet the reduction target reference points for 2045 and 2050, which would be based on the total mobile source emissions for Alternative 2 plus other sector emissions (e.g., stationary, area, energy, water, wastewater, solid waste) which would be same as the proposed Plan. Alternative 2 would result in decreased impacts compared to the proposed Plan. Refer to Appendix M, Table M-3 and M-4.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **GHG-4**. Alternative 3 would result in lower GHG emissions associated with decreases in VMT and GHG emissions due to focused growth, higher parking and managed lane pricing, and free transit as compared to the proposed Plan. Nevertheless, Alternative 3 still would not meet the reduction target reference points for 2045 and 2050 which would be based on the total mobile source emissions for Alternative 3 plus other sector emissions (e.g., stationary, area, energy, water, wastewater, solid waste) which would be same as the proposed Plan. Alternative 3 would result in decreased impacts compared to the proposed Plan. Refer to Appendix M, Table M-3 and M-4.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
2050	**Cumulatively Considerable (increased)** - Alternative 1 would result in less than cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-GHG-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects related to GHG emissions. Cumulative impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-GHG-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects related to GHG emissions. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 3would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-GHG-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects related to GHG emissions. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.
	Hazards and Hazardous Materials		
2035	**Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **HAZ-4,** impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan or result in inadequate emergency access. This impact would be the same as the proposed Plan because regional growth would be more compact in Alternative 1, which would lead to shorter emergency response times but more people using the same evacuation routes. Alternative 1 would thus result in similar significant impacts.	**Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **HAZ-4**. This impact would be the same as the proposed Plan because regional growth would be more compact in Alternative 2, which would lead to shorter emergency response times but more people using the same evacuation routes. Alternative 2 would thus result in similar significant impacts.	**Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **HAZ-4**. This impact would be the same as the proposed Plan because regional growth would be more compact in Alternative 3, which would lead to shorter emergency response times but more people using the same evacuation routes. Alternative 3 would thus result in similar significant impacts.
2035	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 1 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 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; and **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. 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 to apply to Alternative 1.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 for **HAZ-1**, **HAZ-2**, and **HAZ-3**. 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 apply to Alternative 2.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 for **HAZ-1**, **HAZ-2**, and **HAZ-3**. 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 apply to Alternative 3.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
2035	**Cumulatively Considerable (same)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-HAZ-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects related to emergency response and evacuation plan or result in inadequate emergency access, the same as the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (same)** - Similar, to the proposed Plan, Alternative 1 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-HAZ-1** in 2035 for the other hazards significant thresholds (HAZ-1, HAZ-2, and HAZ-3).	**Cumulatively Considerable (same)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-HAZ-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects related to emergency response and evacuation plan or result in inadequate emergency access, the same as the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (same)** - Similar, to the proposed Plan, Alternative 2 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-HAZ-1** in 2035 for the other hazards significant thresholds (HAZ-1, HAZ-2, and HAZ-3).	**Cumulatively Considerable (same)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-HAZ-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects related to emergency response and evacuation plan or result in inadequate emergency access, the same as the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (same)** - Similar, to the proposed Plan, Alternative 3 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-HAZ-1** in 2035 for the other hazards significant thresholds (HAZ-1, HAZ-2, and HAZ-3).
2050	**Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **HAZ-4** and the impact would be the same as the proposed Plan. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050.	**Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **HAZ-4** and the impact would be the same as the proposed Plan. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050.	**Significant Impact (same) –** Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **HAZ-4** and the impact would be the same as the proposed Plan. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050.
2050	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 1 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2050 for **HAZ-1**, **HAZ-2**, and **HAZ-3** and the impacts would be the same as the proposed Plan. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 2 would result in less-than- significant impacts in 2050 for **HAZ-1**, **HAZ-2**, and **HAZ-3** and the impacts would be the same as the proposed Plan. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 3 would result in less-than- significant impacts in 2050 for **HAZ-1**, **HAZ-2**, and **HAZ-3** and the impacts would be the same as the proposed Plan. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050.
2050	**Cumulatively Considerable (same)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-HAZ-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects related to emergency response and evacuation plan or result in inadequate emergency access, the same as the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (same)** - Similar, to the proposed Plan, Alternative 1 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-HAZ-1** in 2050 for the other hazards significant thresholds (HAZ-1, HAZ-2, and HAZ-3).	**Cumulatively Considerable (same)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-HAZ-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects related to emergency response and evacuation plan or result in inadequate emergency access, the same as the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (same)** - Similar, to the proposed Plan, Alternative 2 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-HAZ-1** in 2050 for the other hazards significant thresholds (HAZ-1, HAZ-2, and HAZ-3).	**Cumulatively Considerable (same)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-HAZ-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects related to emergency response and evacuation plan or result in inadequate emergency access, the same as the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (same)** - Similar, to the proposed Plan, Alternative 3 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-HAZ-1** in 2050 for the other hazards significant thresholds (HAZ-1, HAZ-2, and HAZ-3).

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
	Hydrology and Water Quality		
2035	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 1 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 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 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; and **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 continue to be in effect, and design measures would be implemented, the same as under the proposed Plan. However, the land use pattern would be more concentrated in Alternative 1 compared to the proposed project, which would result in less impervious surfaces and less stormwater run-off region wide, decreasing the risk and rate of flood flows and associated pollutant releases (**HWQ-1**, **HWQ-2**, **HWQ-3**, and **HWQ-4**). Alternative 1 would thus have similar, but decreased, less-than-significant impacts.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 for **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, the land use pattern would be more concentrated in Alternative 2 compared to the proposed project, which would result in less impervious surfaces and less stormwater run-off region wide, decreasing the risk and rate of flood flows and associated pollutant releases (**HWQ-1**, **HWQ-2**, **HWQ-3**, and **HWQ-4**). Alternative 2 would thus have similar, but decreased, less-than-significant impacts.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 for **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, the land use pattern would be more concentrated in Alternative 3 compared to the proposed project, which would result in less impervious surfaces and less stormwater run-off region wide, decreasing the risk and rate of flood flows and associated pollutant releases (**HWQ-1**, **HWQ-2**, **HWQ-3**, and **HWQ-4**). Alternative 3 would thus have similar, but decreased, less-than-significant impacts.
2035	**Not Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** – Similar to the proposed Plan, Alternative 1 would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts for **C-HWQ-1** related to hydrology and water quality in 2035.	**Not Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** – Similar to the proposed Plan, Alternative 2 would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts for **C-HWQ-1** related to hydrology and water quality in 2035.	**Not Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** – Similar to the proposed Plan, Alternative 3 would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts for **C-HWQ-1** related to hydrology and water quality in 2035.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
2050	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 1 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2050 for **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 concentrated in areas with available multimodal transportation in Alternative 1 compared to the proposed project, which would result in less impervious surfaces and less stormwater run-off region wide. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050. Alternative 1 would thus have similar, but decreased, less-than-significant impacts.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2050 for **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 concentrated in areas with available multimodal transportation in Alternative 2 compared to the proposed project, which would result in less impervious surfaces and less stormwater run-off region wide. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050. Alternative 2 would thus have similar, but decreased, less-than-significant impacts.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2050 for **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 concentrated in areas with available multimodal transportation in Alternative 3 compared to the proposed project, which would result in less impervious surfaces and less stormwater run-off region wide. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050. Alternative 3 would thus have similar, but decreased, less-than-significant impacts.
2050	**Not Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** – Similar to the proposed Plan, Alternative 1 would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts for **C-HWQ-1** related to hydrology and water quality in 2050.	**Not Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** – Similar to the proposed Plan, Alternative 2 would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts for **C-HWQ-1** related to hydrology and water quality in 2050.	**Not Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** – Similar to the proposed Plan, Alternative 3 would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts for **C-HWQ-1**related to hydrology and water quality in 2050.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
	Land Use		
2035	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for **LU-1**, physically divide an established community. This impact would be increased for Alternative 1 because land use would be more concentrated in urban areas than under the proposed Plan and would therefore result in greater potential to divide existing communities. Focusing development projects in existing urbanized areas reduces the potential to physically divide an established community as result of dispersed development patterns. Alternative 1 would thus have a similar, but increased, less-than-significant impact. In addition, Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for **LU-2,** cause a significant environmental impact by conflicting with a land use plan, policy, or regulation (including the General Plan, Local Coastal Program, or Zoning Ordinance) and resulting in a physical change to the environment not already addressed in the EIR. The impact for Alternative 1 would be increased compared to the proposed Plan because this alternative proposes more dense development in urban areas, which occasionally may conflict with the land use portions of adopted general plans and specific plans. Alternative 1 would thus have a similar, but increased, less-than-significant impact.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **LU-1**. This impact would be increased for Alternative 2 because land use would be more concentrated in urban areas than under the proposed Plan and would therefore result in greater potential to divide existing communities. Focusing development projects in existing urbanized areas reduces the potential to physically divide an established community as result of dispersed development patterns. Alternative 2 would thus have a similar, but increased, less-than-significant impact. In addition, Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for **LU-2**. The impact for Alternative 2 would be increased compared to the proposed Plan because this alternative proposes more dense development in urban areas, which occasionally may conflict with the land use portions of adopted general plans and specific plans. Alternative 2 would thus have a similar, but increased, less-than-significant impact.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for **LU-1**. This impact would be increased for Alternative 3 because land use would be more concentrated in urban areas than under the proposed Plan and would therefore result in greater potential to divide existing communities. Focusing development projects in existing urbanized areas reduces the potential to physically divide an established community as result of dispersed development patterns. Alternative 3 would thus have a similar, but increased, less-than-significant impact. In addition, Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for **LU-2**. The impact for Alternative 3 would be increased compared to the proposed Plan because this alternative proposes more dense development in urban areas, which occasionally may conflict with the land use portions of adopted general plans and specific plans. Alternative 3 would thus have a similar, but increased, less-than-significant impact.
2035	**Not Cumulatively Considerable (increased)** –Alternative 1 would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-LU-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts to land use and planning. Cumulative impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Not Cumulatively Considerable (increased)** –Alternative 2 would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-LU-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts to land use and planning. Cumulative impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Not Cumulatively Considerable (increased)** – Alternative 3 would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-LU-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts to land use and planning. Cumulative impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
2050	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **LU-1** and the impact would be increased compared to the proposed Plan. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050. Alternative 1 would thus have a similar, but increased, significant impact.	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result a significant impact in 2050 for **LU-1** and the impact would be increased compared to the proposed Plan. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050. Alternative 2 would thus have a similar, but increased, significant impact.	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **LU-1** and the impact would be increased compared to the proposed Plan. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050. Alternative 3 would thus have a similar, but increased, significant impact.
2050	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **LU-2** and the impact would be increased compared to the proposed Plan. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050. Alternative 1 would thus have a similar, but increased, less-than-significant impact.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **LU-2** and the impact would be increased compared to the proposed Plan. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050. Alternative 2 would thus have a similar, but increased, less-than-significant impact.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **LU-2** and the impact would be increased compared to the proposed Plan. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050. Alternative 3 would thus have a similar, but increased, less-than-significant impact.
2050	**Cumulatively Considerable (increased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-LU-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to land use and planning. Cumulative impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (increased)** - Similar, to the proposed Plan, Alternative 1 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-LU-**1 in 2050 for threshold LU-2.	**Cumulatively Considerable (increased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-LU-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to land use and planning. Cumulative impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (increased)** - Similar, to the proposed Plan, Alternative 2 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-LU-1** in 2050 for threshold LU-2.	**Cumulatively Considerable (increased)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-LU-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to land use and planning. Cumulative impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (increased)** - Similar, to the proposed Plan, Alternative 2 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-LU-1** in 2050 for threshold LU-2.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
	Mineral Resources		
2035	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact on mineral resources in 2035 for **MR-1,** result in the loss of availability of known aggregate and mineral resources supply sites that would be of value to the 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 impact would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan because Alternative 1 land use would be more concentrated in urban areas than under the proposed Plan and would therefore result in less potential for land use conflicts with mineral resources in previously undeveloped areas. Alternative 1 would thus have a similar, but decreased, significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact on mineral resources in 2035 for **MR-1**. The impact would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan because Alternative 2 land use would be more concentrated in urban areas than under the proposed Plan and would therefore result in less potential for land use conflicts with mineral resources in previously undeveloped areas. Alternative 2 would thus have a similar, but decreased, significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact on mineral resources in 2035 for **MR-1**. The impact would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan because Alternative 3 land use would be more concentrated in urban areas than under the proposed Plan and would therefore result in less potential for land use conflicts with mineral resources in previously undeveloped areas. Alternative 3 would thus have a similar, but decreased, significant impact.
2035	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-MR-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to mineral resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-MR-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to mineral resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-MR-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to mineral resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.
2050	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact on mineral resources in 2050 for **MR-1** and the impact would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050. Alternative 1 would thus have a similar, but decreased, significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact on mineral resources in 2050 for **MR-1** and the impact would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050. Alternative 2 would thus have a similar, but decreased, significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact on mineral resources in 2050 for **MR-1** and the impact would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050. Alternative 3 would thus have a similar, but decreased, significant impact.
2050	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-MR-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to mineral resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-MR-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to mineral resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-MR-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to mineral resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
	Noise and Vibration		
2035	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 1 would result in significant impacts in 2035 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. The impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan in 2035 because Alternative 1 land use would be more concentrated in areas with available multimodal transportation than under the proposed Plan, which would result in the exposure of fewer sensitive receptors to high noise and vibration levels than the proposed Plan. Alternative 1 would thus have a similar, but decreased, significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in significant impacts in 2035 for **NOI-1** and **NOI-2**. The impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan in 2035 because Alternative 2 land use would be more concentrated in areas with available multimodal transportation than under the proposed Plan, which would result in the exposure of fewer sensitive receptors to high noise and vibration levels than the proposed Plan. Alternative 2 would thus have a similar, but decreased, significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in significant impacts in 2035 for **NOI-1** and **NOI-2**. The impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan in 2035 because Alternative 3 land use would be more concentrated in areas with available multimodal transportation than under the proposed Plan, which would result in the exposure of fewer sensitive receptors to high noise and vibration levels than the proposed Plan. Alternative 3 would thus have a similar, but decreased, significant impact.
2035	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 1 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 for **NOI-3**, for a project located in the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan, or, where a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public 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. To prevent incompatible uses in areas with higher aircraft noise, ALUCPs and AICUZs establish land use policies and criteria (e.g., noise compatibility zones) to limit future incompatible uses in certain areas to minimize noise impacts to people living and working within the ALUCP or AICUZ. Both Alternative 1 and the proposed Plan would comply with such policies and criteria. Alternative 1 would thus have a similar, less-than-significant impact.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 for **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. To prevent incompatible uses in areas with higher aircraft noise, ALUCPs and AICUZs establish land use policies and criteria (e.g., noise compatibility zones) to limit future incompatible uses in certain areas to minimize noise impacts to people living and working within the ALUCP or AICUZ. Both Alternative 2 and the proposed Plan would comply with such policies and criteria. Alternative 2 would thus have a similar, less-than-significant impact.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 for **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. To prevent incompatible uses in areas with higher aircraft noise, ALUCPs and AICUZs establish land use policies and criteria (e.g., noise compatibility zones) to limit future incompatible uses in certain areas to minimize noise impacts to people living and working within the ALUCP or AICUZ. Both Alternative 3 and the proposed Plan would comply with such policies and criteria. Alternative 3 would thus have a similar, less-than-significant impact.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
2035	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-NOI-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to noise and vibration. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (same)** - Similar, to the proposed Plan, Alternative 1 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-NOI-1** in 2035 for threshold NOI-3.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-NOI-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to noise and vibration. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (same)** - Similar, to the proposed Plan, Alternative 2 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-NOI-1** in 2035 for threshold NOI-3.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-NOI-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to noise and vibration. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (same)** - Similar, to the proposed Plan, Alternative 3 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-NOI-1** in 2035 for threshold NOI-3.
2050	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 1 would result in significant impacts in 2050 for **NOI-1** and **NOI-2**. The impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan in 2050 because Alternative 1's land use pattern would be more concentrated in areas with available multimodal transportation than under the proposed Plan, which would result in the exposure of fewer sensitive receptors to high noise and vibration levels than the proposed Plan. Alternative 1 would thus have a similar, but decreased, significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in significant impacts in 2050 for **NOI-1** and **NOI-2**. The impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan in 2050 because Alternative 2 land use would be more concentrated in areas with available multimodal transportation than under the proposed Plan, which would result in the exposure of fewer sensitive receptors to high noise and vibration levels than the proposed Plan. Alternative 2 would thus have a similar, but decreased, significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in significant impacts in 2050 for **NOI-1** and **NOI-2**. The impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan in 2050 because Alternative 3 land use would be more concentrated in areas with available multimodal transportation than under the proposed Plan, which would result in the exposure of fewer sensitive receptors to high noise and vibration levels than the proposed Plan. Alternative 3 would thus have a similar, but decreased, significant impact.
2050	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **NOI-3**. Alternative 1 would have the same impact as the proposed Plan because Alternative 1 would not meaningfully change exposure of people to excessive noise levels from aircraft. Alternative 1 would thus have a similar, less-than-significant impact.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **NOI-3**. Alternative 2 would have the same impact as the proposed Plan because Alternative 2 would not meaningfully change exposure of people to excessive noise levels from aircraft. Alternative 2 would thus have a similar, less-than-significant impact.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **NOI-3**. Alternative 3 would have the same impact as the proposed Plan because Alternative 3 would not meaningfully change exposure of people to excessive noise levels from aircraft. Alternative 3 would thus have a similar, less-than-significant impact.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
2050	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-NOI-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to noise and vibration. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (same)** - Similar, to the proposed Plan, Alternative 1 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-NOI-1** in 2050 for threshold NOI-3.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-NOI-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to noise and vibration. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (same)** - Similar, to the proposed Plan, Alternative 2 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-NOI-1** in 2050 for threshold NOI-3.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-NOI-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to noise and vibration. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (same)** - Similar, to the proposed Plan, Alternative 3 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-NOI-1** in 2050 for threshold NOI-3.
	Population and Housing		
2035	**Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 1 would result in significant impacts 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), and **POP-2,** displace substantial numbers of people or housing units, necessitating construction of replacement housing elsewhere, in 2035. Alternative 1 would have greater impacts than the proposed Plan because increased densification in areas with available multimodal transportation and improved accessibility and connectivity could facilitate population and economic growth in areas of the region that are currently not developed or underdeveloped. Therefore, Alternative 1 would result in greater potential for unplanned population growth in transit served areas than with the proposed Plan (**POP-1**). In addition, more compact land use patterns and transportation projects in developed areas would result in greater displacement of people and housing units (**POP-2**). Alternative 1 would thus have similar, but increased, significant impacts.	**Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 2 would result in significant impacts for **POP-1** and **POP-2** in 2035. Growth under Alternative 2, may exceed what is anticipated in local general plans, leading to unplanned population growth. Impacts for Alternative 2 would be greater than the proposed Plan because increased densification in areas with available multimodal transportation and improved accessibility and connectivity, could facilitate population and economic growth in areas of the region that are currently not developed or underdeveloped. Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in greater potential for unplanned population growth in transit served areas than with the proposed Plan (**POP-1**). In addition, more compact land use patterns and transportation projects in developed areas would result in greater displacement of people and housing units (**POP-2**). Alternative 2 would thus have similar, but increased, significant impacts.	**Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 3 would result in significant impacts for **POP-1** and **POP-2** in 2035. Growth under Alternative 3, may exceed what is anticipated in local general plans, leading to unplanned population growth. Impacts for Alternative 3 would be greater than the proposed Plan because increased densification in areas with available multimodal transportation and improved accessibility and connectivity, could facilitate population and economic growth in areas of the region that are currently not developed or underdeveloped. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in greater potential for unplanned population growth in transit served areas. In addition, more compact land use patterns and transportation projects in developed areas would result in greater displacement of people and housing units. Alternative 3 would thus have similar, but increased, significant impacts.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
2035	**Cumulatively Considerable (increased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-POP-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to population and housing. Cumulative impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (increased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-POP-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to population and housing. Cumulative impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (increased)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-POP-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to population and housing. Cumulative impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan.
2050	**Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 1 would result in significant impacts for **POP-1** and **POP-2** in 2050 and the impacts would be greater compared to the proposed Plan impact. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050. Alternative 1 would thus have similar, but increased, significant impacts.	**Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 2 would result in significant impacts for **POP-1** and **POP-2** in 2050 and the impacts would be greater compared to the proposed Plan impact. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050. Alternative 2 would thus have similar, but increased, significant impacts.	**Significant Impact (increased) –** Alternative 3 would result in significant impacts for **POP-1** and **POP-2** in 2050 and the impacts would be greater compared to the proposed Plan impact. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050. Alternative 3 would thus have similar, but increased, significant impacts.
2050	**Cumulatively Considerable (increased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-POP-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to population and housing. Cumulative impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (increased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-POP-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to population and housing. Cumulative impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (increased)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-POP-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to population and housing. Cumulative impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
	Public Services, Recreation, and Utilities		
2035	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 1 would result in significant impacts in 2035 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 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. The impacts for Alternative 1 would be decreased for each of these significance thresholds compared to the proposed Project because development would be more compact and would be focused in areas that are already served by existing public services, recreation facilities, and utilities. Alternative 1 would thus have similar, but decreased, significant impacts.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in significant impacts in 2035 for **PS-1**, **REC-1**, **U-1**, and **U-2**. The impacts for Alternative 2 would be decreased for each of these significance thresholds compared to the proposed Project because development would be more compact and would be focused in areas that are already served by existing public services, recreation facilities, and utilities. Alternative 2 would thus have similar, but decreased, significant impacts.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in significant impacts in 2035 for **PS-1**, **REC-1**, **U-1**, and **U-2**. The impacts for Alternative 3 would be decreased for each of these significance thresholds compared to the proposed Project because development would be more compact and would be focused in areas that are already served by existing public services, recreation facilities, and utilities. Alternative 3 would thus have similar, but decreased, significant impacts.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
2035	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-PS-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to public services; **C-U-1,** a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to utilities; and **C-REC-1,** a cumulative considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to recreational resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-PS-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to public services; **C-U-1,** a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to utilities; and **C-REC-1** a cumulative considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to recreational resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-PS-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to public services; **C-U-1,** a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to utilities; and **C-REC-1,** a cumulative considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to recreational resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.
2050	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 1 would result in significant impacts in 2050 for **PS-1**, **REC-1**, **U-1**, and **U-2** and the impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan impacts. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050. Alternative 1 would thus have similar, but decreased, significant impacts.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in significant impacts in 2050 for **PS-1**, **REC-1**, **U-1**, and **U-2** and the impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan impacts. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050. Alternative 2 would thus have similar, but decreased, significant impacts.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in significant impacts in 2050 for **PS-1**, **REC-1**, **U-1**, and **U-2** and the impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan impacts. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050. Alternative 3 would thus have similar, but decreased, significant impacts.
2050	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-PS-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to public services; **C-U-1,** a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to utilities; and, **C-REC-1,** a cumulative considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to recreational resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-PS-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to public services; **C-U-1,** a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to utilities; and, **C-REC-1,** a cumulative considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to recreational resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-PS-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to public services, **C-U-1,** a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to utilities; and, **C-REC-1,** a cumulative considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to recreational resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
	Transportation		
2030	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2030 for **TRA-2**, 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. The SANDAG ABM3 Model does not provide a 2030 scenario. Therefore, this data was interpolated between base year 2022 and year 2035 data. Alternative 1 would result in a SB-743 based VMT per capita of 16.7~~16.63~~ in 2030, exceeding the proposed Plan's 2030 VMT per capita of ~~16.21~~16.3. In addition, Alternative 1 would result in an increase in total VMT of ~~3,872,723~~ 3,997,140 vehicle miles per day in 2030 compared to Baseline Year 2019 conditions. This increase would be greater than the increase of ~~2,629,048~~2,733,111 miles per day in 2030 under the proposed Plan. Therefore, Alternative 1 would result in greater impacts as it would achieve a smaller VMT reduction as compared to the proposed Plan. This is considered significant since Alternative 1 would not achieve the substantial VMT reductions needed to help achieve statewide GHG reduction goals. Alternative 1 would thus have a similar, but increased, significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2030 for **TRA-2**. The SANDAG ABM3 Model does not provide a 2030 scenario. Therefore, this data was interpolated between base year 2022 and year 2035 data. Alternative 2 would result in a SB-743 based VMT per capita of ~~15.31~~15.9 in 2030 compared to VMT per capita of ~~16.21~~16.3 VMT under the proposed Plan in 2030. Alternative 2 would result in an increase in total VMT of ~~944,380~~1,414,268 vehicle miles per day in 2030 compared to Baseline Year 2019 conditions. This increase would be less than the increase of 2,733,111 ~~2,629,048~~ miles per day in 2030 under the proposed Plan. Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in less impacts as it would achieve a higher VMT reduction as compared to the proposed Plan. This is considered significant since Alternative 2 would not achieve the substantial VMT reductions needed to help achieve statewide GHG reduction goals. Alternative 2 would thus have a similar, but decreased, significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2030 for **TRA-2**. The SANDAG ABM3 Model does not provide a 2030 scenario. Therefore, this data was interpolated between base year 2022 and year 2035 data. Alternative 3 would result in a SB-743 based VMT per capita in 2035 of ~~15.36~~15.9 in 2030 compared to the VMT per capita of ~~16.21~~16.3 under the proposed Plan in 2030. Alternative 3 would result in an increase in total VMT of ~~1,137,334~~1,196,963 vehicle miles per day in 2030 compared to Baseline Year 2019 conditions. This increase would be less than the increase of 2,733,111~~2,629,048~~ miles per day in 2030 under the proposed Plan. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in less impacts as it would achieve a higher VMT reduction as compared to the proposed Plan. This is considered significant since Alternative 3 would not achieve the substantial VMT reductions needed to help achieve statewide GHG reduction goals. Alternative 3 would thus have a similar, but decreased, significant impact.
2030	**Cumulatively Considerable (increased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2030 for **C-TRA-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to transportation. Cumulative impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2030 for **C-TRA-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to transportation. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2030 for **C-TRA-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to transportation. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
2035	**Less-than-Significant Impact (same)** – Alternative 1 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 for **TRA-1,** conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities; and **TRA-3,** substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses. The impact of Alternative 1 is the same as proposed Plan impact because Alternative 1 would be consistent with adopted plans, programs, and design standards. Alternative 1 would thus have similar, less-than-significant impacts.	**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 Alternative 2 is the same as proposed Plan impact because Alternative 2 would be consistent with adopted plans, programs, and design standards. Alternative 2 would thus have similar, less-than-significant impacts.	**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 Alternative 3 is the same as proposed Plan impact because Alternative 3 would be consistent with adopted plans, programs, and design standards. Alternative 3 would thus have similar, less-than-significant impacts.
2035	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **TRA-2**, 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. As shown in Appendix M, Table M-2, Alternative 1 would result in a SB-743 based VMT per capita of ~~16.58~~16.6 in 2035, exceeding the proposed Plan's 2035 VMT per capita of 16.0~~15.95~~. In addition, Alternative 1 would result in an increase in total VMT of ~~5,845,041~~4 6,029,482 vehicle miles per day in 2035 compared to Baseline Year 2019 conditions. This increase would be greater than the increase of ~~3,824,069~~3,975,434 miles per day in 2035 under the proposed Plan. This is considered significant since Alternative 1 would not achieve the substantial VMT reductions needed to help achieve statewide GHG reduction goals. Therefore, Alternative 1 would result in greater impacts as it would achieve a smaller VMT reduction as compared to the proposed Plan. Alternative 1 would thus have a similar, but increased, significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **TRA-2**. As shown in Appendix M, Table M-2, Alternative 2 would result in a SB-743 based VMT per capita of ~~15.31~~15.4 in 2035 compared to VMT per capita of ~~15.95~~16.0 VMT under the proposed Plan in 2035. Alternative 2 would result in an increase in total VMT of ~~1,086,485~~1,832,314 vehicle miles per day in 2035 compared to Baseline Year 2019 conditions. This increase would be less than the increase of 3,975,434~~3,824,069~~ miles per day in 2035 under the proposed Plan. Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in less impacts as it would achieve a higher VMT reduction as compared to the proposed Plan. This is considered significant since Alternative 2 would not achieve the substantial VMT reductions needed to help achieve statewide GHG reduction goals. Alternative 2 would thus have a similar, but decreased, significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for **TRA-2**. As shown in Appendix M, Table M-2, Alternative 3 would result in a SB-743 based VMT per capita in 2035 of 15.9~~15.36~~ in 2035 compared to the VMT per capita of ~~15.95~~16.0 under the proposed Plan in 2035. Alternative 3 would result in an increase in total VMT of ~~1,400,034~~1,479,194 vehicle miles per day in 2035 compared to Baseline Year 2019 conditions. This increase would be less than the increase of 3,975,434 ~~3,824,069~~ miles per day in 2035 under the proposed Plan. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in less impacts as it would achieve a higher VMT reduction as compared to the proposed Plan. This is considered significant since Alternative 3 would not achieve the substantial VMT reductions needed to help achieve statewide GHG reduction goals. Alternative 3 would thus have a similar, but decreased, significant impact.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
2035	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for **TRA-4,** lead to a lack of parking supply, causing significant secondary environmental impacts not already analyzed in this EIR. Alternative 1 would result in increased impacts because it would not include parking related programs that are anticipated to better manage the existing available public parking supply as compared to the proposed Plan. Alternative 1 would thus have a similar, but increased, less-than-significant impact.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for **TRA-4**. Alternative 2 would result in decreased impacts because it would increase development in areas with multimodal transportation and include increased parking costs that are anticipated to better manage the existing available public parking supply than the proposed Plan. Alternative 2 would thus have a similar, but decreased, less-than-significant impact.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for **TRA-4**. Alternative 3 would result in decreased impacts because it would increase development in areas with multimodal transportation, increase parking costs, and include free transit, measures which are anticipated to better manage the existing available public parking supply than the proposed Plan. Alternative 3 would thus have a similar, but decreased, less-than-significant impact.
2035	**Cumulatively Considerable (increased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2030 for **C-TRA-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to transportation. Cumulative impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (same/increased)** - Similar, to the proposed Plan, Alternative 1 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-TRA-1** in 2035 for thresholds TRA-1, TRA-3, and TRA-4. As compared to the proposed Plan, impacts would be the same for TRA-1 and TRA-4 but increased for TRA-4.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2030 for **C-TRA-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to transportation. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (same/decreased)** - Similar, to the proposed Plan, Alternative 2 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-TRA-1** in 2035 for thresholds TRA-1, TRA-3, and TRA-4. As compared to the proposed Plan, impacts would be the same for TRA-1 and TRA-4 but decreased for TRA-4.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2030 for **C-TRA-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to transportation. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (same/decreased)** - Similar, to the proposed Plan, Alternative 3 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-TRA-1** in 2035 for thresholds TRA-1, TRA-3, and TRA-4. As compared to the proposed Plan, impacts would be the same for TRA-1 and TRA-4 but decreased for TRA-4.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
2045	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2045 for **TRA-2**. The SANDAG ABM3 Model does not provide a 2045 scenario. Therefore, this data was interpolated between year 2035 and year 2050 data. Alternative 1 would result in a SB-743 based VMT per capita of 16.5~~16.41~~ in 2045 compared to VMT per capita of ~~15.57~~15.8 VMT under the proposed Plan in 2045. In addition, Alternative 1 would result in an increase in total VMT of 6,645,533~~7,019,463~~ vehicle miles per day in 2045 compared to Baseline Year 2019 conditions. This increase would be greater than the increase of ~~4,170,149~~4,225,101 miles per day in 2045 under the proposed Plan. Therefore, Alternative 1 would result in greater impacts as it would achieve a smaller VMT reduction than the proposed Plan. This is considered significant since Alternative 1 would not achieve the substantial VMT reductions needed to help achieve statewide GHG reduction goals. Alternative 1 would thus have a similar, but increased, significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2045 for **TRA-2**. The SANDAG ABM3 Model does not provide a 2045 scenario. Therefore, this data was interpolated between year 2035 and year 2050 data. Alternative 2 would result in a SB-743 based VMT per capita of ~~14.80~~15.2 in 2045 compared to VMT per capita of ~~15.57~~15.8 VMT under the proposed Plan in 2045. In addition, Alternative 2 would result in an increase in total VMT of 1,883,647~~1,001,981~~ vehicle miles per day in 2045 compared to Baseline Year 2019 conditions. This increase would be less than the increase of 4,225,101~~4,170,149~~ miles per day in 2045 under the proposed Plan. Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in decreased impacts as it would achieve a higher VMT reduction than the proposed Plan. This is considered significant since Alternative 2 would not achieve the substantial VMT reductions needed to help achieve statewide GHG reduction goals. Alternative 2 would thus have a similar, but decreased, significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2045 for **TRA-2**. The SANDAG ABM3 Model does not provide a 2045 scenario. Therefore, this data was interpolated between year 2035 and year 2050 data. Alternative 3 would result in a SB-743 based VMT per capita of 15.1~~14.86~~ in 2045 compared to VMT per capita of ~~15.57~~15.8 VMT under the proposed Plan in 2045. In addition, Alternative 3 would result in an increase in total VMT of 1,571,106~~1,367,026~~ vehicle miles per day in 2045 compared to Baseline Year 2019 conditions. This increase would be less than the increase of 4,225,101 ~~4,170,149~~ miles per day in 2045 under the proposed Plan. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in decreased impacts as it would achieve a higher VMT reduction than the proposed Plan. This is considered significant since Alternative 3 would not achieve the substantial VMT reductions needed to help achieve statewide GHG reduction goals. Alternative 3 would thus have a similar, but decreased, significant impact.
2045	**Cumulatively Considerable (increased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2045 for **C-TRA-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to transportation. Cumulative impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2045 for **C-TRA-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to transportation. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2045 for **C-TRA-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to transportation. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.
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 alternative would be consistent with adopted plans, programs, and design standards. Alternative 1 would thus have similar, less-than-significant impacts.	**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 alternative would be consistent with adopted plans, programs, and design standards. Alternative 2 would thus have similar, less-than-significant impacts.	**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 alternative would be consistent with adopted plans, programs, and design standards. Alternative 3 would thus have similar, less-than-significant impacts.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
2050	**Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **TRA-2**. As shown in Appendix M, Table M-2, Alternative 1 would result in a SB-743 based VMT per capita of 16.4~~16.33~~ in 2050 compared to VMT per capita of ~~15.39~~15.4 VMT under the proposed Plan in 2050. In addition, Alternative 1 would result in an increase in total VMT of ~~7,606,674~~7,877,634 vehicle miles per day in 2050 compared to Baseline Year 2019 conditions. This increase would be greater than the increase of ~~4,343,189~~ 4,724,434 miles per day in 2050 under the proposed Plan. Therefore, Alternative 1 would result in greater impacts as it would achieve a smaller VMT reduction than the proposed Plan. This is considered significant since Alternative 1 would not achieve the substantial VMT reductions needed to help achieve statewide GHG reduction goals. Alternative 1 would thus have a similar, but increased, significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **TRA-2**. As shown in Appendix M, Table M-2, Alternative 2 would result in a SB-743 based VMT per capita of 14.7~~14.55~~ in 2050 compared to VMT per capita of ~~15.39~~15.4 VMT under the proposed Plan in 2050. In addition, Alternative 2 would result in an increase in total VMT of 1,986,314~~959,729~~ vehicle miles per day in 2050 compared to Baseline Year 2019 conditions. This increase would be less than the increase of 4,724,434 ~~4,343,189~~ miles per day in 2050 under the proposed Plan. Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in decreased impacts as it would achieve a higher VMT reduction than the proposed Plan. This is considered significant since Alternative 2 would not achieve the substantial VMT reductions needed to help achieve statewide GHG reduction goals. Alternative 2 would thus have a similar, but decreased, significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for **TRA-2**. As shown in Appendix M, Table M-2, Alternative 3 would result in a SB-743 based VMT per capita of ~~14.61~~14.6 in 2050 compared to VMT per capita of ~~15.39~~15.4 VMT under the proposed Plan in 2050. In addition, Alternative 3 would result in an increase in total VMT of 1,754,930~~1,367,026~~ vehicle miles per day in 2050 compared to Baseline Year 2019 conditions. This increase would be less than the increase of 4,724,434 ~~4,343,189~~ miles per day in 2050 under the proposed Plan. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in decreased impacts as it would achieve a higher VMT reduction than the proposed Plan. This is considered significant since Alternative 3 would not achieve the substantial VMT reductions needed to help achieve statewide GHG reduction goals. Alternative 3 would thus have a similar, but decreased, significant impact.
2050	**Less-than-Significant Impact (increased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **TRA-4**. Alternative 1 would result in increased impacts because it would not include parking related strategies and programs that are anticipated to better manage the existing available public parking supply as compared to the proposed Plan. Alternative 1 would thus have a similar, but increased, less-than-significant impact.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **TRA-4**. Alternative 2 would result in decreased impacts because it would increase development in areas with multimodal transportation and include additional parking related programs that are anticipated to better manage the existing available public parking supply as compared to the proposed Plan. Alternative 2 would thus have a similar, but decreased, less-than-significant impact.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **TRA-4**. Alternative 3 would result in decreased impacts because it would increase development in areas with multimodal transportation, increase parking costs, and include free transit, measures which are anticipated to manage the existing available public parking supply better than the proposed Plan. Alternative 3 would have a similar, but decreased, less-than-significant impact.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
2050	**Cumulatively Considerable (increased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-TRA-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to transportation. Cumulative impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (same/increased)** - Similar, to the proposed Plan, Alternative 1 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-TRA-1** in 2050 for thresholds TRA-1, TRA-3, and TRA-4. As compared to the proposed Plan, impacts would be the same for TRA-1 and TRA-4 but increased for TRA-4.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-TRA-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to transportation. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (same/increased)** - Similar, to the proposed Plan, Alternative 2 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-TRA-1** in 2050 for thresholds TRA-1, TRA-3, and TRA-4. As compared to the proposed Plan, impacts would be the same for TRA-1 and TRA-4 but increased for TRA-4.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-TRA-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to transportation. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (same/increased)** - Similar, to the proposed Plan, Alternative 3 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-TRA-1** in 2050 for thresholds TRA-1, TRA-3, and TRA-4. As compared to the proposed Plan, impacts would be the same for TRA-1 and TRA-4 but increased for TRA-4.
	Tribal Cultural Resources		
2035	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact on tribal cultural resources in 2035 for **TCR-1**, potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource. The impact of Alternative 1 in 2035 would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan because development would be more compact, which would result in less ground-disturbing activities that could encounter and adversely affect tribal cultural resources. Alternative 1 would thus have a similar, but decreased, significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact on tribal cultural resources in 2035 for **TCR-1**. The impact of Alternative 2 in 2035 would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan because development would be more compact, which would result in less ground-disturbing activities that could encounter and adversely affect tribal cultural resources. Alternative 2 would thus have a similar, but decreased, significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact on tribal cultural resources in 2035 for **TCR-1**. The impact of Alternative 3 in 2035 would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan because development would be more compact, which would result in less ground-disturbing activities that could encounter and adversely affect tribal cultural resources. Alternative 3 would thus have a similar, but decreased, significant impact.
2035	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-TCR-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to tribal cultural resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-TCR-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to tribal cultural resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-TCR-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to tribal cultural resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.
2050	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact on tribal cultural resources in 2050 for **TCR-1** and the impact would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050. Alternative 1 would thus have a similar, but decreased, significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact on tribal cultural resources in 2050 for **TCR-1** and the impact would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050. Alternative 2 would thus have a similar, but decreased, significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact on tribal cultural resources in 2050 for **TCR-1** and the impact would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050. Alternative 3 would thus have a similar, but decreased, significant impact.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
2050	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-TCR-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to tribal cultural resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-TCR-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to tribal cultural resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-TCR-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to tribal cultural resources. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.
	Water Supply		
2035	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 1 would result in a less than significant impact in 2035 for Impact **WS-1,** not have sufficient water supplies available to serve the projected regional demand during normal, dry, and multiple dry years. The impact on regional water demand under Alternative 1 would be less than the proposed Plan because Alternative 1 would result in lower water demand, including less demand for water landscaping, associated with more compact development. Alternative 1 would thus have a similar, but decreased, less-than-significant impact.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in a less than significant impact in 2035 for Impact **WS-1**. The impact on regional water demand under Alternative 2 would be less than the proposed Plan because Alternative 2 would result in lower water demand, including less demand for water landscaping, associated with more compact development. Alternative 2 would thus have a similar, but decreased, less-than-significant impact.	**Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased)** – Impact **WS-1** would be less than significant in 2035 for Alternative 3. The impact on regional water demand under Alternative 3 would be less than the proposed Plan because this alternative would result in lower water demand, including less demand for water landscaping, associated with more compact development. Alternative 3 would thus have a similar, but decreased, less-than-significant impact.
2035	**Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for Impact **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**.** The impacts of Alternative 1 would be less than the proposed Plan because Alternative 1 would reduce groundwater demand associated with more compact development and less demand for landscaping watering (**WS-2**). In addition, Alternative 1 would have less demand for new or expanded water facilities because development would occur in developed areas that are already served by existing infrastructure. (**WS-3**). Alternative 1 would thus have a similar, but decreased, significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased) –** Impact **WS-2** and **WS-3** would be significant for Alternative 2 in 2035. The impacts of Alternative 2 would be less than the proposed Plan because Alternative 2 would reduce groundwater demand associated with more compact development and less demand for landscaping watering (**WS-2**). In addition, Alternative 2 would have less demand for new or expanded water facilities because development would occur in developed areas that are already served by existing infrastructure. (**WS-3**). Alternative 2 would thus have a similar, but decreased, significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased) –** Impact **WS-2** and **WS-3** would be significant for Alternative 3 in 2035. The impacts of Alternative 3 in 2035 would be less than the proposed Plan because Alternative 3 would result in reduced groundwater demand associated with more compact development and less demand for landscaping watering (**WS-2**). In addition, Alternative 3 would have less demand for new or expanded water facilities because development would occur in developed areas that are already served by existing infrastructure (**WS-3**). Alternative 3 would thus have a similar, but decreased, significant impact.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
2035	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-WS-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to water supply. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Similar, to the proposed Plan, Alternative 1 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-WS-1** in 2035 for threshold WS-1.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-WS-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to water supply. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Similar, to the proposed Plan, Alternative 2 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-WS-1** in 2035 for threshold WS-1.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-WS-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to water supply. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Similar, to the proposed Plan, Alternative 3 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-WS-1** in 2035 for threshold WS-1.
2050	~~**Less-than-**~~**Significant Impact (decreased)–** Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **WS-1** and the impact would be reduced compared to the proposed Plan. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050. Alternative 1 would thus have a similar, but decreased, ~~less-than-~~significant impact.	~~**Less-than-**~~**Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **WS-1** and the impact would be reduced compared to the proposed Plan. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050. Alternative 2 would thus have a similar, but decreased, ~~less-than-~~significant impact.	~~**Less-than-**~~**Significant Impact (decreased) –** Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for **WS-1** and the impact would be reduced compared to the proposed Plan. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050. Alternative 3 would thus have a similar, but decreased, ~~less-than-~~significant impact.
2050	**Significant Impact (decreased) –** Impact **WS-2** and **WS-3** would be significant in 2050 under Alternative 1 and reduced compared to the proposed Plan. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050. Alternative 1 would thus have a similar, but decreased, significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased) –** Impact **WS-2** and **WS-3** would be significant in 2050 under Alternative 2 and reduced compared to the proposed Plan. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050. Alternative 2 would thus have a similar, but decreased, significant impact.	**Significant Impact (decreased) –** Impact **WS-2** and **WS-3** would be significant in 2050 under Alternative 3 and reduced compared to the proposed Plan. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050. Alternative 3 would thus have a similar, but decreased, significant impact.
2050	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-WS-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to water supply. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Similar, to the proposed Plan, Alternative 1 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-WS-1** in 2050 for threshold WS-1.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-WS-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to water supply. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Similar, to the proposed Plan, Alternative 2 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-WS-1** in 2050 for threshold WS-1.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-WS-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to water supply. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. **Not Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Similar, to the proposed Plan, Alternative 3 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for **C-WS-1** in 2050 for threshold WS-1.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
	Wildfire		
2035	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 1 would result in significant impacts in 2035 for **WF-1**, increase risk of wildland fire ignition and directly or indirectly expose people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires; **WF-2,** due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, thereby exposing project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire, or exposing people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires; **WF-3**, 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 environment; and **WF-4,** 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 decreased wildfire impacts for each of these significance thresholds because this alternative would result in more compact land development than the proposed Plan and therefore more of the regional growth and land use change would be located in dense urban areas outside of the wildland-urban interface. Alternative 1 would thus have similar, but decreased, significant impacts.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in significant impacts in 2035 for **WF-1**, **WF-2**, **WF-3**, and **WF-4**. Alternative 2 would result in decreased wildfire impacts for each of these significance thresholds because this alternative would result in more compact land development than the proposed Plan and therefore more of the regional growth and land use change, would be located in dense urban areas outside of the wildland-urban interface. Alternative 2 would thus have similar, but decreased, significant impacts.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in significant impacts in 2035 for **WF-1**, **WF-2**, **WF-3**, and **WF-4**. Alternative 3 would result in decreased wildfire impacts for each of these significance thresholds because this alternative would result in more compact land development than the proposed Plan and therefore more of the regional growth and land use change, would be located in dense urban areas outside of the wildland-urban interface. Alternative 3 would thus have similar, but decreased, significant impacts.
2035	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-WF-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to wildfire. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-WF-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to wildfire. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2035 for **C-WF-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to wildfire. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Focused Growth, Higher Parking Pricing, and Arterial and Freeway Speed Reductions	Alternative 3: Focused Growth, Higher Parking and Managed Lane Pricing, and Free Transit
2050	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 1 would result in significant impacts in 2050 for **WF-1**, **WF-2**, **WF-3**, and **WF-4** and the impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050. Alternative 1 would thus have similar, but decreased, significant impacts.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 2 would result in significant impacts in 2050 for **WF-1**, **WF-2**, **WF-3**, and **WF-4** and the impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050. Alternative 2 would thus have similar, but decreased, significant impacts.	**Significant Impact (decreased)** – Alternative 3 would result in significant impacts in 2050 for **WF-1**, **WF-2**, **WF-3**, and **WF-4** and the impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan. The rationale described for 2035 applies to 2050. Alternative 3 would thus have similar, but decreased, significant impacts.
2050	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 1 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-WF-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to wildfire. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 2 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-WF-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to wildfire. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.	**Cumulatively Considerable (decreased)** - Alternative 3 would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in 2050 for **C-WF-1**, a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse impacts related to wildfire. Cumulative impacts would be decreased compared to the proposed Plan.

This page is intentionally left blank.