3.8 LAND USE AND AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

This section describes the current land uses in the SCAG region, discusses the potential impacts of the 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategies (2012-2035 RTP/SCS or Plan) on land use, identifies mitigation measures for these impacts, and evaluates the residual impacts of this Plan.

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

Federal

United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). The USEPA implements the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). NEPA provides information on expected environmental effects of federally funded projects. Impacts on land uses and conflicts with state, regional, or local plans and policies are among the considerations included in the regulations. The regulations also require that projects requiring NEPA review seek to avoid or minimize adverse effects of proposed actions and restore and enhance environmental quality as much as possible.

United States Forest Service (USFS). The USFS manages approximately 2.3 million acres of national forests in the SCAG region. The four national forests in the region are the Angeles National Forest, San Bernardino National Forest, Los Padres National Forest, and the Cleveland National Forest.

United States Forest Service (USFS) National Scenic Byways Program. The USFS also has a National Scenic Byways Program, independent from the BLM program, to indicate roadways of scenic importance that pass through national forests. The SCAG region includes Forest Service Scenic Byways in the counties of San Bernardino, Ventura, Los Angeles, and Riverside.

United States Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). The NRCS maps soils and farmland uses to provide comprehensive information necessary for understanding, managing, conserving and sustaining the nation's limited soil resources. The NRCS manages the Farmland Protection Program, which provides funds to help purchase development rights to keep productive farmland in agricultural uses.

Federal Farm and Ranchland Protection Program (FRPP). The FRPP, also referred to as the Farmland Protection Program (FPP), is a voluntary easement purchase program that helps farmers and ranchers keep their land in agriculture. Pursuant to the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) of 1981 Sections 1539-1549, the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to establish and carry out a program to "minimize the extent to which Federal programs contribute to the unnecessary and irreversible conversion of farmland to nonagricultural uses, and to the extent practicable, will be compatible with state, unit of local government, and private programs and policies to protect farmland."(7 USC 4201-4209 & 7 USC 658).

The program provides matching funds to state, tribal, or local governments and nongovernmental organizations with existing farmland protection programs to purchase conservation easements or other interests in land. FPP is reauthorized in the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (Farm Bill). The NRCS manages the program. Funds are awarded to qualified entities to conduct their farmland protection programs. Although a minimum of 30 years is required for conservation easements, priority is given to applications with perpetual easements.

United States Forest Service (USFS) National Scenic Byways Program. The USFS also has a National Scenic Byways Program, independent from the BLM program, to indicate roadways of scenic importance that pass through national forests. The SCAG region includes Forest Service Scenic Byways in the counties of San Bernardino, Ventura, Los Angeles, and Riverside.

Federal Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP). EQIP is a voluntary program that provides assistance to farmers and ranchers who face threats to soil, water, air, and related natural resources on their land.

United States Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE). Among its responsibilities, the ACOE administers Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA), which governs specified activities in waters of the United States, including wetlands. In this role, the ACE requires that a permit be obtained if a project would place structures, including dredged or filled materials, within navigable waters or wetlands, or result in alteration of such areas.

United States Bureau of Land Management (BLM). The BLM manages approximately 10 million acres of the SCAG region, primarily in the eastern portion of the region. The California Desert Conservation Area Plan is used to manage BLM-controlled areas. The BLM also implements biological resource management policies through its designation of Areas of Critical Environmental Concern.

United States National Park Service (NPS). The NPS manages national parks and wilderness areas. Two national parks and one wilderness area are located in the SCAG region: Joshua Tree National Park, a portion of Death Valley National Park, and the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). The USFWS administers the federal Endangered Species Act and designates critical habitat for endangered species. The USFWS also manages the National Wildlife Refuges in the SCAG region. These include the Salton Sea National Wildlife Refuge (in Imperial County) and Hopper Mountain National Wildlife Refuge (in Ventura County).

State

California Coastal Commission. The California Coastal Commission plans for and regulates development in the coastal zone consistent with the policies of the California Coastal Act. The Commission also administers the federal Coastal Zone Management Act in California.[1] As part of the Coastal Act, cities and counties are required to prepare a local coastal program (LCP) for the portion of its jurisdiction within the coastal zone. With an approved LCP, cities and counties control coastal development that accords with the local coastal plan. If no local coastal plan has been approved, the Coastal Commission controls coastal development.[2]

California Department of Conservation. In 1982, the State of California created the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program within the California Department of Conservation to carry on the mapping activity from the NRCS on a continuing basis. The California Department of Conservation administers the California Land Conservation Act of 1965, also known as the Williamson Act, for the conservation of farmland and other resource-oriented laws. Farmland maps are compiled by the Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP,) pursuant to the provisions of Section 65570 of the California Government Code. These maps utilize data from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Services (NRCS) soil surveys and represent an inventory of agricultural resources. The maps use eight classification categories, the top four of which are regarded as

[1]The other federally designated agency is the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) which operates outside of the SCAG region.

[2]Fulton, W. 1999. *Guide to California Planning*. Point Arena, CA: Solano Press Books.

"Important Farmland" for mapping purposes, and include Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Local Importance.

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). The land use mandate of the CDFG is to protect rare, threatened, and endangered species by managing habitat in legally designated ecological reserves or wildlife areas. CDFG reserves located in the SCAG region include the Bolsa Chica Ecological Reserve (Orange County) and Imperial State Wildlife Area (Imperial County).

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (DFF). The DFF reviews and approves plans for timber harvesting on private lands. In addition, through its responsibility for fighting wildland fires, the CDFG plays a role in planning development in forested areas.

California Department of Parks and Recreation. The California Department of Parks and Recreation manages and provides sites for a variety of recreational and outdoor activities. The California Department of Parks and Recreation is a trustee agency that owns and operates all state parks and participates in land use planning that affects State parkland.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). The Caltrans jurisdiction includes right-of-ways of state and interstate routes within California. Any work within the right-of-way of a federal or State transportation corridor is subject to Caltrans regulations governing allowable actions and modifications to the right-of-way. Caltrans includes the Division of Aeronautics, which is responsible for airport permitting and establishing a county Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) for each county with one or more public airports. ALUCs are responsible for the preparation of land use plans for areas near aviation facilities.

California Farmland Conservancy Program (CFCP). The CFCP seeks to encourage the long-term, private stewardship of agricultural lands through the voluntary use of agricultural conservation easements. The CFCP provides grant funding for projects which use and support agricultural conservation easements for protection of agricultural lands. As of April 2005, the CFCP has funded more than 50 easement projects in California, including nearly 25,000 acres in more than a dozen counties. CFCP has also funded a number of planning grants, including some with regional or statewide value. Within the eight-county study area, CFCP has awarded grants for planning and policy projects within the counties of Kern and Ventura.

California Land Conservation Act (Williamson Act). The Williamson Act is the only established program that directly involves State government in an administrative or fiscal capacity. The Act creates an arrangement whereby private landowners voluntarily restrict their land to agricultural and compatible open space uses under a rolling ten-year contract. In return, parcels are assessed for property tax purposes at a rate consistent with their actual use, rather than their potential market value.

Farmland Security Zone (FSZ). In August of 1998, the legislature enhanced the Williamson Act with the FSZ provisions. The FSZ provisions offer landowners greater property tax reduction in return for a minimum rolling contract term of 20 years.

Local Agencies and Regulations

Public agencies are entrusted with compliance with the CEQA and its provisions are enforced, as necessary, through litigation and the threat thereof. CEQA defines a significant effect on the environment as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in the physical conditions within the area affected by the project. Land use is a required impact assessment category under CEQA.

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). As related to land use, SCAG is authorized to undertake intergovernmental review for federal assistance and direct federal development pursuant to Presidential Executive Order 12,372. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Sections 21083 and 21087 and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15206 and 15125(b), SCAG reviews projects of regional significance for consistency with regional plans. SCAG is also responsible for preparation of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA), pursuant to California Government Code Sections 65584 to 65584.05. Among other purposes, SCAG's RHNA provides a tool for providing local affordable housing development strategies.

Local Agency Formation Commissions (LAFCO). The LAFCO is the agency in each county that has the responsibility to create orderly local government boundaries, with the goal of encouraging "planned, well-ordered, efficient urban development patterns," the preservation of open-space lands, and the discouragement of urban sprawl. While LAFCOs have no direct land use authority, their actions determine which local government will be responsible for planning new areas. LAFCOs address a wide range of boundary actions, including creation of spheres of influence for cities, adjustments to boundaries of special districts, annexations, incorporations, detachments of areas from cities, and dissolution of cities.

Land Conservation Trust. Land conservation trust is another type of organization devoted to protecting open space, agricultural lands, wildlife habitats, and natural resource lands. A land trust is a nonprofit organization that, as all or part of its mission, actively works to conserve land by undertaking or assisting in land or conservation easement acquisition, or by its stewardship of such land or easements. There are approximately 80 established trusts in California. Local and regional land trusts, organized as charitable organizations under federal tax laws, are directly involved in conserving land for its natural, recreational, scenic, historical and productive values.

Coastal Conservancy. Since its establishment in 1976, the Coastal Conservancy has completed over 600 projects, with over 300 projects currently active. These projects include construction of trails and other public access facilities, restoration and enhancement of wetlands and other wildlife habitat, restoration of public piers and urban waterfronts, preservation of farmland, and other projects in line with the goals of California's Coastal Act, the San Francisco Bay Plan, and the San Francisco Bay Area Conservancy.

General Plans. The most comprehensive land use planning for the SCAG region is provided by city and county general plans, which local governments are required by State law to prepare as a guide for future development. General plans contain goals and policies concerning topics that are mandated by State law or which the jurisdiction has chosen to include. Required topics are land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open space, noise, and safety. Other topics that local governments frequently choose to address include public facilities, parks and recreation, community design, and growth management, among others. City and county general plans must be consistent with each other. County general plans must cover areas not included by city general plans (i.e., unincorporated areas).

Specific and Master Plans. A city or county may also provide land use planning by developing community or specific plans for smaller, more specific areas within their jurisdiction. These more localized plans provide for focused guidance for developing a specific area, with development standards tailored to the area, as well as systematic implementation of the general plan.

Zoning. City and county zoning codes are the set of detailed requirements that implement the general plan policies at the level of the individual parcel. The zoning code presents standards for different uses and identifies which uses are allowed in the various zoning districts of the jurisdiction. Since 1971, State law has required the city or county zoning code to be consistent with the jurisdiction's general plan.

Growth Control. Local growth control measures endeavor to manage community growth by various methods, including tying development to infrastructure capacity, limiting the number of new housing units, setting limits on the increase of commercial square footage, and the adoption of urban growth boundaries, among others.

EXISTING SETTING

The SCAG region is comprised of six counties: Imperial, Orange, Los Angeles, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura, and totals approximately 38,000 square miles in area (almost 25 million acres). The region stretches from the state borders with Nevada and Arizona to the Pacific Ocean and from the southernmost edge of the Central Valley to the Mexican border. The region includes the county with the largest area in the nation, San Bernardino County, as well as the county with the highest population in the nation, Los Angeles County. This vast area includes millions of acres of open space and recreational land as well as large amounts of farmland and a population of more than 18 million people.[3] Regional distribution of important farmlands and grazing lands are shown on **Map 3.8-1** located in Chapter 8 (Maps). **Map 3.8-2** shows persons per square mile within each of the six counties within the SCAG Region. The SCAG region is comprised of numerous types of land uses including residential, commercial/office, industrial, institutional, agricultural, and open space land uses, as shown in **Map 3.8-3**. **Map 3.8-4** shows the existing General Plan land use designations. Each land use is discussed in further detail below.

Based on available data from the California Legacy Project (CLP 2005), nearly 17 million acres in the SCAG region are in public ownership, primarily federal. **Map 3.8-5** shows the general ownership of open space and recreation lands, water, vacant, and agriculture by subregion. As a whole, nearly 23 million acres are considered "open space." Vacant lands account for more than 20 of the 25 million acres and include the region's national forests, state parks, military installations, other public lands, and various private holdings. Federal and state recreation lands included in the vacant category include lands administered by the BLM, Los Padres National Forest, Angeles National Forest, Cleveland National Forest, San Bernardino National Forest, Joshua Tree National Park, Death Valley National Park, the Mojave Preserve, and Anza Borrego Desert State Park. Military lands included in the vacant category include: Barstow Marine Corps Logistics Base, Edwards Air Force Base, El Centro Naval Air Facility, Fort Irwin, Los Angeles Air Force Base, March Air Reserve Base, Naval Warfare Assessment Station Corona, Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, Point Magu Naval Air Weapons Station, Twenty-nine Palms Marine Corps Combat Center, and Chocolate Mountains Aerial Gunnery Range. With limited exceptions, the military lands are not open to the public. Farmlands and certain ranch operations account for more than 1 million acres; this excludes large areas of rangelands that are encompassed in the "vacant undifferentiated" category. Approximately 2.1 million acres in the region are developed, including approximately 100,000 acres used for transportation facilities.

As shown in **Map 3.8-6**, urban centers in the SCAG region is in the form of clusters, linked by freeways and commercial corridors interspersed with identifiable activity centers. Most existing urban development is found along the coastal plains of Los Angeles, Orange, and Ventura counties, as well as in adjoining valleys that extend inland from the coastal areas. Urban development also has moved into the inland valleys such as the Antelope, San Bernardino, Yucca, Moreno, Hemet–San Jacinto, Coachella, and Imperial Valleys. A map depicting city and county boundaries is provided as **Map 3.8-7**.

Downtown Los Angeles is the largest urbanized center within the SCAG region. Other urbanized areas in Los Angeles County include Long Beach, Burbank, Glendale, Pasadena and Pomona. Office-core centers have emerged in Woodland Hills, Universal City, Westwood, around Los Angeles International Airport (LAX), and Century City. In the other five counties within the SCAG region, urban centers exist in the cities

[3]SCAG projections for 2011 indicate a population total of **18,257,907**.

of Riverside, San Bernardino, Santa Ana, Anaheim, Irvine, Oxnard and Ventura. Development centers in desert areas include the Lancaster-Palmdale corridor in the Antelope Valley (Los Angeles County); the Hesperia-Victorville corridor in Yucca Valley (San Bernardino County); and the Palm Springs-Palm Desert - Indio corridor in the Coachella Valley (Riverside County). El Centro is the county seat and focal point of activity in Imperial County. There is also substantial activity occurring in Imperial County at the three ports of entry along the border with Mexico.

Much of the development in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties has been on unincorporated county land. Areas that were rural twenty years ago are quickly becoming suburban. Riverside County adopted the County General Plan that strives to create a high quality, balanced, and sustainable environment for the citizens of Riverside County and to make Riverside County's communities great places to live, work, and play. The County of Ventura and cities within the county have developed policies seeking to maintain a balance of protecting agricultural land while providing jobs and housing within a heavily used transportation network. The approach has been to provide urban growth boundaries as a way of channeling development and preserving farmland. These plans and initiatives affect how land is used in the future.

Within the older central cities, communities are being revitalized as buildings are converted into artist lofts and apartments. As the population ages, as land becomes scarce, and as the ethnic make-up of the region continues to change, developers have been turning to different types of housing and commercial developments, including townhouses, condominiums, apartments, and mixed-use developments that combine commercial and office uses. Residential units are appearing in traditionally commercial areas in Los Angeles, Long Beach, Santa Ana, and Pasadena. Senior housing located near amenities is gaining popularity. At the same time buildings are being recycled into new uses and there are movements across the region to preserve historic structures and places. Increasingly, communities across the region are recognizing the value of different styles of architecture and the different features that make a place unique.

Tribal Lands

Indian Trust Assets (ITAs) include land, natural resources, money, or other assets held by the federal government in trust or that are restricted against alienation for Indian tribes or individuals. The Department of Interior Order No. 3175 requires all its bureaus and offices to explicitly address anticipated effects on ITAs in planning, decision, and operation documents. The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) develops inventories of ITAs for all Indian tribes. Tribes must conduct soil and range inventories, land evaluations and range utilization; collect data about soil productivity, erosion, stability problems, and other physical land factors for program development, conservation planning, and water rights claims settlements. In addition, tribes are required to develop land management plans.[4] Sixteen tribal lands each with respective governments exist throughout the SCAG region and include Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, Augustine Band of Mission Indians, Cabazon Band of Mission Indians, Cahuilla Band of Mission Indians, Chemehuevi Reservation, Colorado River Reservation, Fort Mojave Indian Tribe, Fort Yuma Reservation, Morongo Band of Mission Indians, Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians, Ramona Band of Mission Indians, San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, Santa Rosa Band of Mission Indians, Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, Torres-Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians, and Twentynine Palms Band of Mission Indians. **Map 3.8-8** shows the tribal lands located within the SCAG region.

Agricultural Land

Farmlands and rangelands are agricultural lands that are part of the region's open landscape and entail various types and degrees of modifications to natural lands. Farmlands include irrigated and non-irrigated

[4] Bureau of Indian Affairs, Branch of Agriculture and Rangeland Development, Accessed September 26, 2011, *http://www.bia.gov/WhoWeAre/BIA/OTS/NaturalResources/AgrRngeDev/index.htm*.

crop production. Rangelands include any expanse of natural land that is not fertilized, irrigated, or cultivated and is predominately used for grazing by livestock and wildlife.

The distribution of farmlands and rangelands in the SCAG region and vicinity is based primarily on data provided by the California Department of Conservation. It also provides a summary of existing plans and programs in the region to conserve agricultural lands, plus a summary of growth management plans in other states that include provisions for conserving agricultural lands.

Based on 2008 estimates prepared by the California Department of Conservation (CDC), there are approximately 2.65 million acres of agricultural lands in the SCAG region: approximately 1.17 acres of farmland and 1.48 million acres of rangeland. This estimate is substantially higher that the estimate in the 2005 SCAG land use inventory because the latter includes substantial areas of rangeland under the "vacant" category. It also should be noted that the CDC estimate is based on a selective inventory of agricultural lands, and the SCAG inventory is based on aerial imagery interpretation.[5]

As indicated in Table 3.3-3 in Section 3.3 Biological Resources and Open Space, there is substantially more farmland than rangeland in Ventura, Riverside, and Imperial counties and the reverse in Los Angeles, Orange, and San Bernardino counties. By comparison, Kern County has more farmland than the six SCAG counties combined and also has more total acres of rangeland. As discussed above, **Map 3.8-1** shows the regional distribution of important farmlands and grazing lands.

Historically, development patterns in the region have been tied as much to the conversion of agricultural lands as to the consumption of natural lands for urban uses. A key issue in the region today is whether the high rate of farmland conversion in recent years can be slowed to prevent irreversible losses. An estimated 230,000 acres of farmland and grazing land were converted to non-agricultural uses and/or applied for development entitlements between 1996 and 2004. If this trend continues unabated, the existing inventory of agricultural lands could be reduced by 700,000 before 2030.

Forest Land

The montane and subalpine vegetation in the SCAG region consists of conifer-dominated forests and woodland. These generally occur at elevations of 3,000 feet or more in the Transverse and Peninsular Ranges. Oak-dominated woodlands and forests are found at low- to mid-elevations of the Transverse and Peninsular Ranges. Canyon live oak (*Quercus chrysolepis*) forms forests with Coulter pine (*Pinus coulteri*), bigcone-fir (*Pseudotsuga macrocarpa*), Douglas-fir (*P. menziesii*), and interior live oak (*Quercus wislizenii*) on the higher and inner slopes of the mountains, as well as forming riparian forests along seasonal streams. Coast live oak woodland forms on more coastal slopes, while Engelmann oak (*Q. engelmannii*) woodland and valley oak (*Q. lobata*) woodland grow on deeper alluvial slopes and valleys. California walnut (*Juglans californica*) is found associated with coast live oak, usually on north slopes, and in some places becomes the dominant species. Woodland consists of trees with an understory of grasses and herbs. Introduced grasses dominate the understory, although in some cases native bunchgrasses may be present.

The CDFG recognizes valley oak woodland, Engelmann oak woodland, and California walnut woodland as sensitive woodland communities in the SCAG region. These communities have shown a dramatic decline due to urban and agricultural development in this century. Hardwood upland forests are found on higher, wetter sites than oak woodlands and are distinguished from woodlands by a higher tree density. Walnut forests found on the south side of the San Gabriel Mountains to the Santa Ana Mountains, mainland cherry

[5]State of California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program: Important Farmland Data Availability, Land Use Conversion Tables, http://redirect.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp/county_info_results.asp, accessed October 18, 2011.

forest historically found in Los Angeles County, island cherry (*Prunus ilicifolia* ssp. *lyonii)* forest and island ironwood (*Lyonothamnus floribundus*) forest found on the Channel Islands are considered sensitive natural communities.

At the lower elevations, Coulter pine forms open woodland with canyon live oak, black oak (Quercus kelloggii), and ponderosa pine and Jeffrey pine. At somewhat higher elevations, yellow (ponderosa and Jeffrey) pine forest dominate. Farther upslope, upper montane conifer forests are present, consisting of white fir and sugar pine, followed by mountain juniper (Juniperus occidentalis ssp. australis) woodland on open slopes and ridges and lodgepole pine (Pinus contorta) forest on flats and gentle slopes. The highest elevation forests are dominated by limber pine. These forests are found at the highest elevations of the San Bernardino Mountains. The actual elevation range of each forest type is dependent on other site factors, such as precipitation, moisture-holding capability of the soil, slope and aspect.

There are no true alpine areas within the highest mountains of the Transverse Range; that is, no areas that are climatically unable to support high-elevation conifer species. However, there are some treeless areas of talus, meadow, and exfoliating rock. Alpine vegetation is found in the talus of Mt. San Gorgonio. Such vegetation includes several species of sedge, rush, and various perennial herbs.

No state or federally listed species occur in the alpine barren and rock habitat. One special status plant species, Sierra podistera (*Podistera nevadensis*), is known from this habitat in the mountains of San Bernardino County, although it is currently believed to be extirpated there.

The Tecate cypress (*Cypressus forbesii*), is a fire-adapted conifer species found only on low fertility soils. This species grows in several stands in the SCAG region in the vicinity of Sierra Peak in Orange County. Tecate cypress forest is considered a special status natural community by the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), and the Tecate cypress itself is a California Native Plant Society listed species.

The following describes in detail six overarching land uses across the region: residential, commercial/office, industrial, institutional, agricultural, and open space land uses.

Residential

The residential pattern of the SCAG region is largely shaped by topography. Most residents live in southern parts of Ventura, Los Angeles, and San Bernardino Counties with the urban form limited by national forests and mountains. In Orange County, residents live near the coast and west of the Cleveland National Forest. Residents also have moved inland to the high desert in northern Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties and the low desert in the Coachella and Imperial Valleys.

The majority of medium- and high-density housing in the region is found in the urban core of the region, in Downtown Los Angeles, East Los Angeles, and the "West Side" of Los Angeles. Large cities, such as Long Beach, Santa Ana, Glendale, Oxnard, and Pasadena, also have concentrations of high-density development in their downtown areas. Several beach communities, such as the Cities of Santa Monica, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, Huntington Beach, and Newport Beach, have high density close to the ocean.

Surrounding suburbs are predominantly low-density housing tracts. Low-density housing expands west into Ventura County, east through southeast Los Angeles County, throughout much of Orange County, and through the western Inland Empire. The resort communities and cities of the Coachella Valley in Riverside County also are built primarily on a low-density scale.

The developing land on the urban fringe, such as the Antelope Valley of Los Angeles County and the Victorville-Hesperia area, Lucerne Valley, and Yucca Valley of San Bernardino County, also are primarily low density residential. The Imperial Valley in Imperial County is primarily an agricultural region with a growing, yet still regionally small, population that lives in primarily low-density developments.

Map 3.8-9 shows the household density across the region. This map illustrates that the urban core is the densest part of the region and that suburban household densities also are prevalent through the region.

Commercial/Office

Across the region, commercial development typically follows transportation corridors. Office development generally locates at the terminals of major transportation features, particularly airports and train stations, or at the intersection of major freeways. Downtown Los Angeles is the historical center of jobs in the region. LAX and John Wayne Airport have considerable office clusters around them. Office buildings tend to cluster around major intersections, including areas such as the "El Toro Y" (intersection of the I-5 and the I-405) and the "Orange Crush" (intersection of I-5, SR-22, and SR-57) in Orange County.

Map 3.8-10 depicts the employment density across the region. This map illustrates jobs located at major transportation intersections and along transportation corridors.

Industrial

The focal points of industrial activity in the region are the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. Put together, these adjacent ports handle approximately 40 percent of the volume imported into the country and approximately 24 percent of the nation's exports. The industrial activity spreads north from the ports along the Alameda Corridor to Downtown Los Angeles and extends east through the City of Industry and the City of Commerce toward San Bernardino County.

Many manufacturing industries, distribution centers, and warehouses have established businesses in Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. This activity has made the Inland Empire a distribution center for the region, State, and nation. Adding to the goods coming by highway and rail through San Bernardino County are goods coming to the county by air through several airports that cater to air cargo, primarily Ontario International Airport. Industrial uses tend to cluster around cargo-handling airports to take advantage of transportation options.

Significant air cargo and associated industrial land uses also are located around LAX. A third port in the region, located in Port Hueneme in Ventura County, is also surrounded with industrial activity. Along the Mexican border, the three ports of entry in Imperial County have large amounts of commerce going back and forth between the two countries.

Extraction activities in the region focus on oil and minerals. Ventura County has extensive extraction activities in the far southwestern part of the county and along Route 126. These activities extend into Los Angeles County to the area around the City of Santa Clarita. Oil wells and oil refineries remain across southern Los Angeles County. Oil drilling and refining also takes place in Orange County, near Huntington Beach and Newport Beach. Significant mining operations take place in the eastern portion of Imperial County. Wind energy generation facilities are located in the San Gorgonio Pass between Banning and Palm Springs.

Institutional

Institutional land uses, which include large government and private operations, such as military bases, airports, and universities, encompass a considerable footprint in the region. Military operations consume a substantial quantity of land. The ten active duty military facilities in the SCAG region are listed below.[6]

- El Centro Naval Air Facility
- Los Angeles Air Force Base
- Joint Forces Training Base, Los Alamitos
- Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach
- Naval Warfare Assessment Station, Corona
- March Air Reserve Base
- Barstow Marine Corps Logistics Base
- Fort Irwin
- Twenty-nine Palms Marine Corps Combat Center
- Naval Base Ventura County

In addition, land controlled by Edwards Air Force Base, based in Kern County, extends into Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties. The Chocolate Mountains Aerial Gunnery Range in Imperial and Riverside Counties is also an institutional use that is off limits to the public.

A substantial quantity of land is dedicated to airports in Los Angeles County. In the Antelope Valley, a large portion of land is dedicated to airport uses at Palmdale Airport. LAX is another major institutional land use. Bob Hope Airport and Long Beach Airport are the other commercial airports in Los Angeles County. Airports in other parts of the region include Ontario International Airport, Southern California Logistics Airport, and San Bernardino International Airport in San Bernardino County, Palm Springs International Airport and March Inland Port in Riverside County, John Wayne Airport in Orange County, and numerous general aviation airports scattered across the SCAG region.

University and college campuses are located in every county of the SCAG region. The largest are universities in the University of California system (Irvine, Los Angeles, and Riverside) and the California State University system (Channel Islands, Dominguez Hills, Fullerton, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Northridge, San Bernardino, and San Diego-Imperial Valley Campus). California Polytechnic University at Pomona and the University of Southern California are the other large universities in the region. There are numerous smaller universities and colleges in the region, both public and private, as well as an extensive community college system that spans the SCAG region.

Open Space

Map 3.8-12 shows Existing Open Space, Recreation and Agricultural Land Uses throughout the region. Open spaces vary in size and location and generally include public parks, recreational facilities, and areas planned for such uses. Some open spaces also provide critical habitat, as discussed in Section 3.3 Biological Resources & Open Space.

[6]California military bases: Bases by county. Retrieved May 22, 2007, from U.S. Senator Barbara Boxer website: http://boxer.senate.gov/CAbases/county.cfm.

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on CEQA Appendix G, and as appropriate for the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS, the Plan would have a significant impact related to land use, agriculture and forest resources if it would:

- Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect;
- Physically divide an established community;
- Convert Prime Farmland Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural uses;
- Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract;
- Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production;
- Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; and/or
- Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

Methodology

The following summarizes the methodology used to evaluate the expected impacts of implementation of the proposed Plan on existing land uses, existing agriculture and forestry resources, and existing land use plans and policies.

Cumulative Analysis

The 2012-2035 RTP/SCS addresses transportation projects and land use distribution patterns, including land use scenarios. These land use distribution patterns identify growth distribution and anticipated land use development to accommodate growth projections. The Regional Travel Demand Model (RTDM) used for this analysis captures pass-through traffic that does not have an origin or destination in the region, but does impact the region, so that too is included in the project analysis. Although a similar level of development is anticipated even without the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS, this Plan would influence growth, including distribution patterns, throughout the region. To address this, the analysis in the PEIR covers overall impacts of all transportation projects and land development described in the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS. In addition, this PEIR considers cumulative impacts from other regional plans (e.g., the South Coast Air Quality Management Plan), which could result in additional impacts inside and outside the region.

Comparison with the No Project Alternative

The analysis of land use, agriculture, and forestry resources includes a comparison of the expected future conditions with the Plan and the expected future conditions if no Plan were adopted (No Project). **Map 3.8-13** shows the expected land use distribution for future (2035) with implementation of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS. This evaluation is not included in the determination of the significance of impacts (which is based on a comparison to existing conditions); however, it provides a meaningful perspective on the effects of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS.

Determination of Significance

The methodology for determining the significance of land use impacts compares the existing conditions to future (2035) conditions, as required in CEQA Section 15126.2(a).

The 2012-2035 RTP/SCS consists of a combination of transportation policies, objectives, investments, and land use-transportation measures (see Chapter 2.0 Project Description of this PEIR for the Plan's goals, policies transportation investments and land use policies). In addition, project growth forecasts were developed for a range of alternatives (see Chapter 4.0 Alternatives). For each alternative, differing sets of policies, objectives, and investments were applied. Alternative growth forecasts vary in their reliance on local input trend data and existing General Plans. The growth forecast for the No Project Alternative relies exclusively on trend data adjusted to reflect 2012-2035 RTP/SCS growth totals. The No Project Alternative indicates the land use pattern that could be expected without implementation of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS. The 2035 population, households, and employment growth projections for each alternative are held constant at the regional level, but differ from one another in land use patterns. Changes in investments and policies would shift the land use patterns as a function of changes in mobility and land use decisions.

The potential for community disruption was assessed by evaluating the location of proposed transportation projects in relation to surrounding land uses and community development. Highway and transit extensions and major interchange projects were assumed to have a higher potential to disrupt or divide existing communities since they would involve the creation of new roadways. Highway widening and other projects along established transportation rights-of-way were assumed to have a lower potential to divide or disrupt existing communities and neighborhoods.

The following analysis is based on general descriptions of projects in the Plan (see Chapter 2 Project Description and Appendix B 2012-2035 RTP/SCS Project List) and is regional and programmatic in nature. This section is intended to serve as a regional cumulative analysis for local jurisdictions in the preparation of project specific environmental documentation and to provide a framework for mitigation measures.

Implementation of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS would affect land use patterns and the consumption of agricultural land and forest resources. Expected significant impacts include substantial land use density growth in areas of the region adjacent to transit, right-of-way acquisitions that could separate residences from community facilities and services, and significant impacts on vacant natural lands, including agricultural and forested lands.

Both short-term construction related impacts as well as offsite impacts from new facilities would occur as a result of implementation of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS. Indirect impacts from changes in land use patterns expected to occur due to the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS's transportation investments and land use policies are also identified.

IMPACTS

Impact 3.8-1: Potential to result in inconsistencies with currently applicable adopted local land use plans and policies.

SCAG has developed a land use distribution pattern to address actions and strategies included in the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) portion of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS. The SCS demonstrates the region's ability to attain and exceed the GHG emission reduction targets set forth by the ARB. The SCS outlines a plan for integrating the transportation network and related strategies with an overall land use pattern that responds to projected growth, housing needs and changing demographics, and transportation demands. The SCS focuses the majority of new housing and job growth in high-quality transit areas (HQTAs) and other opportunity areas in existing main streets, downtowns, and commercial corridors, resulting in an improved jobs-housing balance and more opportunity for transit-oriented development. This overall land use development pattern supports and compliments the proposed transportation network that emphasizes system preservation, active transportation, and transportation demand management measures. In

addition, the RTP contains the following goal: "[e]ncourage land use and growth patterns that facilitate transit and non-motorized transportation."

The 2012-2035 RTP/SCS contains transportation projects and strategies to help more efficiently distribute population, households, and employment growth in the region. Many of the of the land use strategies that support the region's transportation strategies were developed as a result of SCAG's Compass Blueprint Growth Vision process outlined in the SCS. This process involved extensive outreach to and input from local jurisdictions, including, counties, subregions and local city planners. SCAG has developed an integrated growth forecast that establishes population, employment, households and housing units forecast in the region for use in both the RHNA and the RTP. This integrated forecast is the basis for developing the land use assumptions at the regional and small area level.

In addition, the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS was built primarily from local General Plans and input from local governments, subregional COGs and County Transportation Commissions, using the Local Sustainability Tool. The adopted sub-regional SCSs of the Gateway Cities COG and the Orange County COG were integrated as provided into the regional SCS. These sub-regional SCSs were developed in close collaboration with SCAG and utilize various strategies that help achieve estimated GHG reduction targets.

As a result of this comprehensive and integrated approach, the transportation projects and strategies included in the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS are generally consistent with the county and regional level general plan data available to SCAG. However, general plans are updated on an inconsistent basis. Some of the general plans that SCAG relied upon when creating the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS are not current and may not reflect current planning policy or practice. In addition, the RTP/SCS's 2035 horizon year is beyond the timeline of many of the most recent general plans. It is likely that over the period of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS, transportation projects and resulting growth will be inconsistent with currently adopted general plans. With these limitations, there will be inconsistencies with general plans and potentially significant effects. However, the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS recognizes that inconsistencies may still exist and therefore includes the policy to continue public outreach efforts and incorporate local input through the integrated growth forecast process in an aim to develop a more accurate forecast in future RTP/SCSs.

SCAG has no authority to adopt local land use plans or approve local land use projects that will implement the SCS. As described in the section below, SB 375 specifically provides that nothing in the law supersedes the land use authority of cities and counties. In addition, cities and counties are not required to change their land use plans and policies, including general plans, to be consistent with an RTP/SCS. However, local jurisdictions are encouraged by SCAG to consider the Proposed Actions and Strategies provided in Chapter 4, Sustainable Communities Strategy, of the Plan including strategies addressing Land Use, the Transportation Network, Transportation Demand Management (TDM), Transportation Systems Management (TSM) and Clean Vehicle Technology, which are discussed in Chapter 2, Project Description. In other words, SCAG encourages local jurisdictions to adopt and update general plans that are consistent with the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS in order to accomplish the goals of SB 375. To this end, implementation of **Mitigation Measures MM-LU1** through **MM-LU10** would reduce impacts related to potential conflicts with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project; however, impacts would remain significant.

Impact 3.8-2: Potential to disrupt or divide established communities.

While the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS aims to complete major highway projects (such as the CETAP Intercounty Corridor A to connect Orange County with Riverside County), reduce travel delay by adding lanes to highways and arterials, and create complete streets such that vehicles and non-motorized transit can both use the streets simultaneously; construction and implementation of new transportation facilities or expansion of existing facilities could disrupt or divide established communities. Short-term construction impacts would include physical barriers that limit access to a community or restrict movement within a community.

Additional short-term construction related impacts could result from disturbances due to construction equipment; these impacts are discussed under other impact categories (e.g., Noise, Aesthetics, and Air Quality). Long-term impacts could result from the construction of new or expanded roadways or transit facilities in existing communities. For example, the widening of a roadway could be perceived as too great a distance to cross by a pedestrian, thereby dividing a community. An elevated grade crossing may create a physical barrier in some locations. Impacts would most likely occur in urbanized or urbanizing parts of the region, although urban areas would be unlikely to be impacted by new or expanded roadways (as these areas are already developed and have little available land to expand roadways). New transit facilities are often planned in areas that have existing communities and although they often create a community benefit by reducing congestion in the area, connecting communities, and providing a new mode of travel or relieving overcrowding on an existing mode of travel; new transit track and expanded transit facilities for light rail, heavy rail or Metrolink all have the potential to disrupt or divide established communities.

The addition of new lanes to existing freeway routes also has the potential to divide a community. As overcrossings and under-crossings associated with the freeway routes are widened, it can create a real or perceived barrier to pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists. New freeway segments that occur in rural areas would have the least potential to divide established communities. Rural areas do not typically have the same degree of established communities as urban areas; however, the potential for impacts still exists.

SCAG used GIS data to analyze where major freeway, rail, and transit projects in the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS intersect residential areas. For purposes of identifying potential land use incompatibility a 150-foot potential impact zone was drawn around the freeway, rail, and transit projects in the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS to identify the number of acres potentially affected (air quality and noise impacts extend further and are addressed in Sections 3.2 Air Quality and 3.9 Noise). See **Table 3.8-1** for residential and business land uses within 150 feet of Plan and No Project conditions and **Table 3.8-2** for total acreage of land uses under the Plan and No Project conditions. The analysis shows that 3,236 acres of residential land uses would be located within the 150-foot radius of the freeway, transit, and freight rail projects included in the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS.

TABLE 3.8-1: RESIDENTIAL AND BUSINESS LAND USES WITHIN 150-FOOT RADIUS OF PLAN PROJECTS

Land Use	No Project (Acres)	Plan (Acres)
RESIDENTIAL		
Low Density Residential	255.83	1,993.22
Medium to High Density Residential	97.13	1,048.38
Rural Density Residential	5.65	194.21
Residential total	**358.60**	**3,235.80**
BUSINESS		
Extraction	0.00	79.62
Commercial	266.11	3,703.80
Industrial	117.21	2,028.49
Mixed Commercial and Industrial	8.02	103.55
Mixed Urban	0.06	26.41
Business Total	**391.40**	**5,941.88**

SOURCE: SCAG GIS Analysis, 2011; SCAG Land Use, 2008.

While this PEIR analyzes land use impacts on the community as a whole, it is notable that certain communities may be affected by the growth associated with the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS, as well as by potential gentrification and associated displacement. While the SCAG region population is increasingly using transit and showing more interest in living in transit-rich neighborhoods, this favored trend is tempered by a growing concern about gentrification and displacement. Current neighborhood residents, many of them low income and/or people of color, may not benefit from planned transit investment, stations, and many other amenities that come with transit-induced neighborhood revitalization. More affluent and less diverse residents can displace them because new development near transit areas can be unaffordable. Gentrification

can divide existing communities as effectively as physical barriers.[7] As discussed above, the disruption or division of existing communities could be a significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measures **MM-LU11** through **MM-LU13** would reduce impacts related to dividing an established community; however, impacts would remain significant.

Impact 3.8-3: Potential to result in substantial disturbance and/or loss of forestlands, prime farmlands and/or grazing lands, throughout the six-county SCAG region.

Implementation of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS could result in long-term impacts to agricultural or forest lands in the region, by adding transportation infrastructure to parts of the region that currently serve as agricultural lands or through development on agricultural lands. **Map 3.8-3** and **Map 3.8-1** show the general distribution of agricultural lands in the six-county SCAG region. These areas are interspersed throughout urban areas and are also located in less developed portions of the counties. Where there would be new facilities constructed outside of the urbanized areas, undisturbed/vacant land could be utilized for transportation purposes, additionally development associated with new urban uses could also be located on agricultural or forest lands. Such lands may have historically been farmed or may currently be used for agriculture, including lands currently under Williamson Act contracts, as well as potentially forest or timber lands. Projects that are most likely to result in significant impacts to agricultural lands include highway expansion and potential connectors. For example, the High Desert Corridor project could result in the consumption of grazing and unique prime farmlands. The mixed flow, Express/HOT lane project along SR-395 could also consume grazing land. Additional projects such as roadway improvements, toll road improvements and connections, grade separated facilities for busways, goods movement roadway facilities, and HOV/HOT connectors in areas that currently serve as agricultural could also result in significant impacts.

In addition to impacts from transportation projects included in the Plan, anticipated development associated with the Plan could also result in the consumption of agricultural lands and forestlands. Although the Plan would target development in urbanized areas (primarily the HQTAs), some development is anticipated to occur on areas that are currently in use as agricultural lands. This would be a significant impact.

The loss and disturbance of agricultural lands would be significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measures **MM-LU14** through **MM-LU35** would reduce impacts related to disturbance and/or loss of prime farmlands and/or grazing lands; however, impacts would remain significant.

Impact 3.8-4: Potential to influence the pattern of urbanization in the region such that land use incompatibilities could occur.

Implementation of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS would affect a number of land uses. In general, land uses within 150 feet of transportation improvements could experience some kind of land use impact (as noted above noise and air quality impacts would extend beyond this distance); commercial and industrial uses are less sensitive to transportation projects. **Table 3.8-2,** shows the estimated acreage of different land use categories that occur within 150 feet of either side of the proposed transportation project alignments included in the Plan and the No Project Alternative. Under both the Plan and the No Project Alternative impacts could occur. In addition to these direct impacts on land use, the total vacant land that is expected to be consumed under the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS is estimated to be approximately 334 square miles or 213,800 acres compared to up to 742 square miles or 474,900 acres under the No Project Alternative.

[7]This issue is addressed in the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS Environmental Justice Appendix (page 83).

TABLE 3.8-2: LAND USES AFFECTED BY PLAN PROJECTS		
Land Use	**No Project (acres)**	**2012-2035 RTP/SCS (acres)**
Commercial	266	3,704
Extraction	0	80
Industrial	117	2,028
Medium to High Residential	97	1,048
Mixed Commercial and Industrial	8	104
Open Space and Recreation	185	733
Transportation, Communications, and Utilities	1,869	3,913
Undevelopable	161	4
Vacant	953	9,188
Water	0	78
SCAG Region	3,657	20,879
SOURCE: SCAG GIS Analysis, 2011; SCAG Land Use, 2008		

The 2012-2035 RTP/SCS includes policies that would influence the distribution of the growing population. The land use measures included in the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS would encourage use of underutilized urban land, and in some cases would help increase the intensity of the use to achieve mobility and other benefits. However, stable single-family neighborhoods would be protected, regardless of whether or not they were built at the maximum allowable density, as indicated by general plans.

Implementation of the innovative strategies in the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS could result in changes in land uses by changing concentrations of development throughout the six-county region. Implementation of Mitigation Measures **MM-LU36** through **MM-LU85** would reduce land use impacts; however, potential for significant incompatibilities with transportation projects and anticipated development remain.

Cumulative Impact 3.8-5: Potential to change patterns of growth beyond the SCAG region.

Implementation of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS would result in an increase in density and land use development over the next 25 years. By 2035, the SCAG region is anticipated to add an additional 3.9 million people with or without the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS. The improved accessibility from the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS could help facilitate urbanization to areas outside the region. Changes in the land use patterns in the region, for example through the conversion of agricultural land has the potential to set a precedent that could affect areas outside the region resulting in the conversion of agricultural lands or increased urbanization in other areas as well. Implementation of Mitigation Measures **MM-LU1** through **MM-LU85** would reduce cumulative impacts; however, the impacts would remain significant.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measures **MM-LU1** through **MM-LU10**, **MM-LU21** and **MM-LU22**, **MM-LU32**, **MM-LU37**, **MM-LU 52**, **MM-LU64**, and **MM-LU74** (jointly with local jurisdictions) shall be implemented by SCAG over the lifetime of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS. All other Land Use mitigation measures can and should be implemented by project sponsors (for both development and transportation projects) as applicable. Project specific environmental documents may adjust these mitigation measures as necessary to respond to site-specific conditions. Projects taking advantage of CEQA Streamlining provisions of SB 375 can and should apply mitigation measures as appropriate to site-specific conditions.

Consistency with General Plans

MM-LU1: SCAG shall encourage cities and counties in the region to provide SCAG with electronic versions of their most recent general plan (and associated environmental document) and any updates as they are produced.

MM-LU2: SCAG shall encourage, through regional policy comments, that cities and counties update their general plans at least every ten years, as recommended by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research.

MM-LU3: SCAG shall work with its member cities and counties to ensure that transportation projects and growth are consistent with the RTP and general plans.

MM-LU4: SCAG shall coordinate with member cities and counties to encourage that general plans reflect RTP/SCS policies and strategies. SCAG will work to build consensus on how to address inconsistencies between general plans and RTP/SCS policies.

MM-LU5: SCAG shall provide technical assistance and regional leadership to implement the RTP/SCS goals and strategies and integrate growth and land use planning with the existing and planned transportation network.

MM-LU6: SCAG shall provide planning services to local jurisdictions through Compass Blueprint Demonstration Projects. These projects will help local jurisdictions:

- Update General Plans to reflect Compass Blueprint principles and integrate land use and transportation planning.
- Develop specific plans, zoning overlays and other planning tools to enable and stimulate desired land use changes that are consistent with the future land development pattern in the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS
- Complete the economic analysis and community involvement efforts that will ensure that the planned changes are market feasible and responsible to stakeholder concerns.
- Visualize potential changes, through innovative graphics and mapping technology to inform the dialogue about growth, development and transportation at the local and regional level.

MM-LU7: SCAG shall continue with a targeted public relations strategy that emphasizes regional leadership, the benefits and implications of Compass Blueprint principles and sustainable growth, and builds a sense of common interests among Southern Californians.

MM-LU8: SCAG shall use its Intergovernmental Review Process to provide review and comment on large development projects regarding their consistency with the RTP and other regional planning efforts.

MM-LU9: SCAG shall develop and implement coordinated mitigation programs for regional projects, with an emphasis on regional transportation projects.

MM-LU10: Local jurisdictions can and should provide for new housing consistent with the regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) to accommodate their share of the forecasted regional growth.

Division of Communities

MM-LU11: Significant adverse impacts to community cohesion resulting from the displacement of residences or businesses can and should be mitigated with specific relocation measures as dictated by local, state or federal requirements on a project-by project basis. Such measures include assistance in finding a new location, assistance with moving, or compensation for losses. Where it has been determined that displacement is necessary and displaced individuals are eligible, a relocation assistance program consistent with the State Uniform Location Assistance and Real Properties Acquisition Policies Act provides compensation and assistance in finding new residence for displaced individuals.

MM-LU12: Project sponsors can and should design new transportation facilities that consider access to existing community facilities. During the design phase of the project, community amenities and facilities can and should be identified and considered in the design of the project.

MM-LU13: Project sponsors can and should design roadway improvements that minimize barriers to pedestrians and bicyclists. During the design phase, pedestrian and bicycle routes should be determined that permit connections to nearby community facilities.

Loss of Farmland and Forest Lands

MM-LU14: For projects that require approval or funding by the USDOT, project sponsors can and should comply with Section 4(f) U.S. Department of Transportation Act of 1966 (U.S. DOT Act).

MM-LU15: Project sponsors can and should ensure that at least one acre of unprotected open space is permanently conserved for each acre of open space developed as a result of transportation projects/improvements.

MM-LU16: Local jurisdictions can and should seek funding to prepare specific plans and related environmental documents to facilitate mixed-use development at selected sites, and to allow these areas to serve as receiver sites for transfer of development rights away from environmentally sensitive lands and rural areas outside established urban growth boundaries.

MM-LU17: Local jurisdictions can and should preserve and create open space and parks. Preserve existing trees, and plant replacement trees at a set ratio.

MM-LU18: Project sponsors can and should consider corridor realignment, buffer zones and setbacks, and berms and fencing where feasible, to avoid agricultural lands and to reduce conflicts between transportation uses and agricultural lands.

MM-LU19: Prior to final approval of each project and when feasible and prudent, the project sponsor can and should establish conservation easement programs to mitigate impacts to prime farmland.

MM-LU20: Prior to final approval of each project, the project sponsor can and should to the extent practical and feasible, avoid impacts to prime farmlands or farmlands that support crops considered valuable to the local or regional economy.

MM-LU21: SCAG shall use its intergovernmental review (IGR) process to review projects with potentially significant impacts to important farmlands and recommend impact avoidance and mitigation measures.

MM-LU22: SCAG shall work with member agencies and the region's farmland interests to develop regional guidelines for buffering farmland from urban encroachment, resolving conflicts that prevent farming on hillsides and other designated areas, and closing loopholes that allow conversion of non-farm uses without a grading permit.

MM-LU23: Local jurisdictions can and should establish programs to direct growth to less agriculturally valuable lands and ensure, where possible, the continued protection of the most agriculturally valuable land within each county. The following are offered as examples of programs:

- The development or participation in transfer of development rights programs to encourage the preservation of agricultural lands.

- Tools for the preservation of agricultural lands such as eliminating estates and ranchettes and clustering to retain productive agricultural land.
- Easing restrictions on farmer's markets and encourage cooperative farming initiatives to increase the availability of locally grown food.
- Considering partnering with school districts to develop farm-to-school programs

MM-LU24: Local jurisdictions can and should avoid the premature conversion of farmlands by promoting infill development and the continuation of agricultural uses until urban development is imminent; if development of agricultural lands is necessary, growth can and should be directed to those lands on which the continued viability of agricultural production has been compromised by surrounding urban development on the loss of local markets.

MM-LU25: Local jurisdictions can and should encourage patterns of urban development and land use, which reduce costs on infrastructure and make better use of existing facilities. Strategies local jurisdictions can and should pursue include:

- Increase the accessibility to natural areas lands for outdoor recreation.
- Promote infill development and redevelopment to revitalize existing communities
- Utilize "green" development techniques
- Promote water-efficient land use and development.

MM-LU26: Project sponsors and local jurisdictions can and should promote infill development and redevelopment to encourage the efficient use of land and minimize the development of agricultural and open space lands.

MM-LU27: Local jurisdictions can and should consider the following land use principles that use resources efficiently, and to the extent practical and feasible minimize pollution and reduce waste generation:

- Mixed-use residential and commercial development that is connected with public transportation and utilizes existing infrastructure
- Land use and planning strategies to increase biking and walking trips.

MM-LU28: Individual projects must be consistent with federal, state, and local policies that preserve agricultural lands and support the economic viability of agricultural activities, as well as policies that provide compensation for property owners if preservation is not feasible.

MM-LU29: For projects in agricultural areas, project sponsors can and should contact the California Department of Conservation and each county's Agricultural Commissioner's office to identify the location of prime farmlands and lands that support crops considered valuable to the local or regional economy. Impacts to such lands can and should be evaluated in project-specific environmental documents. The analysis can and should use the land evaluation and site assessment (LESA) analysis method (CEQA Guidelines §21095), as appropriate. The project sponsors or local jurisdictions can and should be responsible for ensuring adherence to the mitigation measures prior to construction. Mitigation measures may include conservation easements or the payment of in-lieu fees.

MM-LU30: For those projects that require federal funding, the federal agency evaluates the effects of the action to agricultural resources using the criteria set forth in the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA). The FPPA is administered by the NRCS, which determines impacts to farmland that could occur due to the proposed project. The determination is made through coordination between the federal agency proposing or supporting the project and NRCS. The

assessment of potential impacts to farmland from corridor type projects, which is typical of transportation projects analyzed in this PEIR, will require completion of Form NRCS-CPA-106, Farmland Conservation Impact Rating for Corridor Type Projects. NRCS will make a determination, using set thresholds, as to whether additional project specific mitigation would be required.

MM-LU31: Prior to final approval of each project, the project sponsor can and should encourage enrollments of agricultural lands for counties that have Williamson Act programs, where applicable.

MM-LU32: SCAG shall support policies that preserve and promote the productivity and viability of agricultural lands, including promoting the availability of locally grown and organic food in the region.

MM-LU33: Project sponsors and local jurisdictions can and should submit for IGR review projects with potentially significant impacts to important farmlands. Projects can and should include mitigation measures to reduce impacts and demonstrate project alternatives that avoid or lessen impact to agricultural lands. Mitigation can and should occur at a 1:1 ratio.

MM-LU34: Preserve forested areas, agricultural lands, wildlife habitat and corridors, wetlands, watersheds, groundwater recharge areas and other open space that provide carbon sequestration benefits.

MM-LU35: Require best management practices in agriculture and animal operations to reduce emissions, conserve energy and water, and utilize alternative energy sources, including biogas, wind and solar.

Land Use Incompatibility

MM-LU36: Local jurisdictions can and should encourage patterns of urban development and land use, which reduce costs on infrastructure and make better use of existing facilities.

MM-LU37: SCAG's Compass Blueprint program and other ongoing regional planning efforts will be used to build a consensus in the region to support changes in land use to accommodate future population growth while maintaining the quality of life in the region.

MM-LU38: Local jurisdictions can and should adopt and implement General Plan Housing Elements that accommodate the housing need identified through the RHNA process. Affordable housing can and should be provided consistent with the RHNA income category distribution adopted for each jurisdiction.

MM-LU39: Local jurisdictions can and should consider shared regional priorities, as outlined in the Compass Blueprint, 2012-2035 RTP/SCS and other ongoing regional planning efforts, in determining their own development goals and drafting local plans.

MM-LU40: Local jurisdictions and subregional organizations can and should encourage the cleanup and redevelopment of brownfield sites.

MM-LU41: Local jurisdictions or agencies can and should adopt and implement a development pattern that utilizes existing infrastructure; reduces the need for new roads, utilities and other public works in new growth areas; and enhances non-automobile transportation.

MM-LU42: Local jurisdictions or agencies can and should establish an urban growth boundary (UBG) with related ordinances or programs to limit suburban sprawl; local jurisdictions or agencies can and should restrict urban development beyond the UGB and streamline entitlement processes within the UGB for consistent projects.

MM-LU43: Urban development can and should occur only where urban public facilities and services exist or can be reasonably made available.

MM-LU44: The improvement and expansion of one urban public facility or service can and should not stimulate development that significantly precedes the local jurisdiction's ability to provide all other necessary urban public facilities and services at adequate levels.

MM-LU45: Local jurisdictions can and should redirect new growth into existing city/urban reserve areas

MM-LU46: Local jurisdictions can and should maintain a one dwelling unit per 10-acre minimum lot size or lower density in areas outside designated urban service lines.

MM-LU47: Local jurisdictions can and should encourage high-density, mixed-use, infill development and creative reuse of brownfield, under-utilized and/or defunct properties within the urban core.

MM-LU48: Local jurisdictions can and should increase densities in urban core areas to support public transit.

MM-LU49: Local jurisdictions can and should remove barriers to the development of accessory dwelling units in existing residential neighborhoods as appropriate

MM-LU50: Local jurisdictions can and should reduce required road width standards wherever feasible to calm traffic and encourage alternative modes of transportation.

MM-LU51: Local jurisdictions can and should reduce parking space requirements, unbundle parking from rents and charge for parking in new developments.

MM-LU52: Local jurisdictions can and should add bicycle facilities to streets and public spaces.

MM-LU53: SCAG shall promote infill, mixed-use, and higher density development, and provide incentives to support the creation of affordable housing in mixed use zones.

MM-LU54: Local jurisdictions can and should plan for and create incentives for mixed-use development.

MM-LU55: Local jurisdictions can and should identify sites suitable for mixed-use development and establish appropriate site-specific standards to accommodate the mixed uses. Site-specific standards could include:

- Increasing allowable building height or allowing height limit bonuses;
- Allowing flexibility in applying development standards (such as FAR2 and lot coverage) based on the location, type, and size of the units, and the design of the development;
- Allowing the residential component to be additive rather than within the established FAR for that zone, and eliminating maximum density requirements for residential uses in mixed use zones;

- Allowing reduced and shared parking based on the use mix, and establishing parking maximums where sites are located within 0.25 miles of a public transit stop;
- Allowing for tandem parking, shared parking and off-site parking leases;
- Requiring all property owners in mixed-use areas to unbundle parking from commercial and residential leases;
- Creating parking benefit districts, which invest meter revenues in pedestrian infrastructure and other public amenities;
- Establishing performance pricing of street parking, so that it is expensive enough to promote frequent turnover and keep 15 percent of spaces empty at all times.

MM-LU56: Local jurisdictions can and should enable prototype mixed-use structures for use in neighborhood center zones that can be adapted to new uses over time with minimal internal remodeling.

MM-LU57: Local jurisdictions can and should identify and facilitate the inclusion of complementary land uses not already present in local zoning districts, such as supermarkets, parks and recreational fields, schools in neighborhoods, and residential uses in business districts, to reduce the vehicle miles traveled and promote bicycling and walking to these uses.

MM-LU58: Local jurisdictions can and should work with employers developing larger projects to ensure local housing opportunities for their employees, and engage employers to find ways to provide housing assistance as part of their employee benefits packages; major projects in mixed-use areas can and should include work-force housing where feasible.

MM-LU59: Local jurisdictions can and should revise zoning ordinance(s) to allow local-serving businesses, such as childcare centers, restaurants, banks, family medical offices, drug stores, and other similar services near employment centers to minimize midday vehicle use.

MM-LU60: Local jurisdictions can and should develop form-based community design standards to be applied to development projects and land use plans, using a comprehensive community outreach, for areas designated mixed-use.

MM-LU61: Local jurisdictions can and should mix affordable housing units with market rate units as opposed to building segregated affordable housing developments.

MM-LU62: Where practical and feasible, local jurisdictions can and should develop programs that enable the reuse of underutilized commercial, office and/or industrial properties for housing or mixed-use housing.

MM-LU63: Local jurisdictions can and should ensure consistency with “smart growth” principles – mixed-use, infill, and higher density projects that provide alternatives to individual vehicle travel and promote the efficient delivery of services and goods.

MM-LU64: Local jurisdictions can and should meet recognized “smart growth” benchmarks.

MM-LU65: SCAG shall educate the public about the many benefits of well-designed, higher density development.

MM-LU66: Project sponsors can and should incorporate public transit into the project’s design.

MM-LU67: Project sponsors can and should include pedestrian and bicycle facilities within projects and ensure that existing non-motorized routes are maintained and enhanced.

MM-LU68: Local jurisdictions can and should encourage residential development in High Quality Transit Areas (HQTAs). Such development can and should include a generally a walkable transit village that has a minimum density of 20 dwelling units per acre and is within a 0.5 miles of a well-serviced transit stop, and includes transit corridors with minimum 15-minute or less service frequency during peak commute hours.

MM-LU69: Local jurisdictions can and should promote greater linkage between land uses and transit, as well as other modes of transportation.

MM-LU70: Local jurisdictions can and should ensure new development is designed to make public transit a viable choice for residents, including:

- Locating medium-high density development near activity centers that can be served efficiently by public transit and alternative transportation modes;
- Locating medium-high density development near streets served by public transit whenever feasible;
- Linking neighborhoods to bus stops by continuous sidewalks or pedestrian paths.

MM-LU71: Local jurisdictions can and should establish city-centered corridors, directing development to existing transportation corridors.

MM-LU72: Local jurisdictions can and should develop form-based community design standards to be applied to development projects and land use plans, using a comprehensive community outreach program, for areas designated mixed-use

MM-LU73: Local jurisdictions can and should locate affordable housing in transit-oriented development whenever feasible

MM-LU74: Local jurisdictions can and should consider jobs/housing balance, to the extent practical and feasible, and encourage the development of communities where people live closer to work, bike, walk, and take transit as a substitute for personal auto travel.

MM-LU75: SCAG and local jurisdictions shall minimize public expenditure for infrastructure and facilities to support urban type land uses in areas where public health and safety could not be guaranteed.

MM-LU76: Project sponsors can and should consider community cohesion in designing projects through communities. Transit facilities should be designed to integrate with the community and encourage walking and bicycling as well as park and ride. New or widened roadways (and freeways) should be designed to minimize impacts to the extent feasible through landscaping, pedestrian furniture as appropriate. New roadways or freeways should consider feasible innovative designs such as cap parks that maintain community cohesion.

MM-LU77: Local jurisdictions can and should promote development and preservation of neighborhood characteristics that encourage walking and bicycle riding in lieu of automobile-based travel.

MM-LU78: Local jurisdictions can and should create and preserve distinct, identifiable neighborhoods whose characteristics support pedestrian travel, especially within, but not limited to, mixed-use and transit-oriented development areas, including:

- Designing or maintaining neighborhoods where the neighborhood center can be reached in approximately five minutes of walking;
- Increasing housing densities from the perimeter to the center of the neighborhood;
- Directing retail, commercial, and office space to the center of the neighborhood;
- Encouraging pedestrian-only streets and/or plazas within developments, and destinations that may be reached conveniently by public transportation, walking, or bicycling;
- Allowing flexible parking strategies in neighborhood activity centers to foster a pedestrian-oriented streetscape;
- Providing continuous sidewalks with shade trees and landscape strips to separate pedestrians from traffic;
- Encouraging neighborhood parks and recreational centers near concentrations of residential areas (preferably within one quarter mile) and include pedestrian walkways and bicycle paths that encourage non-motorized travel.

MM-LU79: Local jurisdictions can and should ensure pedestrian access to activities and services, especially within, but not limited to, mixed-use and transit-oriented development areas, including:

- Ensuring new development that provides pedestrian connections in as many locations as possible to adjacent development, arterial streets, thoroughfares;
- Ensuring a balanced mix of housing, workplaces, shopping, recreational opportunities, and institutional uses, including mixed-use structures;
- Locating schools in neighborhoods, within safe and easy walking distances of residences served;
- For new development, primary entrances shall be pedestrian entrances, with automobile entrances and parking located to the rear;
- Support development where automobile access to buildings does not impede pedestrian access, by consolidating driveways between buildings or developing alley access;
- Street parking provided shall be utilized as a buffer between sidewalk pedestrian traffic and the automobile portion of the roadway;
- Establish pedestrian and bicycle connectivity standards for new development, with block sizes between 1 and 2 acres;
- For existing areas that do not meet established connectivity standards, prioritize the physical development of pedestrian connectors;
- Prioritizing grade-separated bicycle / pedestrian crossings where appropriate to enhance connectivity or overcome barriers such as freeways, railways and waterways.

MM-LU80: Local jurisdictions can and should review fee structures and other opportunities to provide financial and administrative incentives to support desired land uses, development patterns, and alternative modes of transportation.

MM-LU81: Local jurisdictions can and should promote desired land uses by scaling developer fees based on desired criteria, for example:

- Increasing or reducing fees proportionally with distance from the city center or preferred transit sites;
- Increasing or reducing fees based on the degree to which mixed uses are incorporated into the project;
- Reducing fees for creative re-use of brownfield sites;
- Increasing fees for the use of greenfield sites.

MM-LU82: Local jurisdictions can and should provide fast-track permitting and reductions in processing fees for desired projects. Local jurisdictions can and should research and implement a program of incentives for development projects that are fully consistent with the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS.

MM-LU83: Local jurisdictions can and should provide incentive funding and/or infrastructure loans to support desired projects.

MM-LU84: Local jurisdictions can and should give preference for infrastructure improvements that support or enhance desired land uses and projects.

MM-LU85: Local jurisdictions can and should reduce heat gain from pavement and other hardscaping, including:

- Reduce street rights-of-way and pavement widths to pre-World War II widths (typically 22 to 34 feet for local streets, and 30 to 35 feet for collector streets, curb to curb), unless landscape medians or parkway strips are allowed in the center of roadways;
- Reinstate the use of parkway strips to allow shading of streets by trees;
- Include shade trees on south- and west-facing sides of structures;
- Include low-water landscaping in place of hardscaping around transportation infrastructure and in parking areas;
- Install cool roofs, green roofs, and use cool paving for pathways, parking, and other roadway surfaces;
- Establish standards that provide for pervious pavement options:
  - Remove obstacles to xeriscaping, edible landscaping and low-water landscaping.

SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACTS AFTER MITIGATION

Consistency with Currently Applicable Adopted Local Land Use Plans and Policies

It is likely that in some instances currently adopted general plans and adopted plans will be inconsistent with RTP policies. This impact would remain significant after the implementation of Mitigation Measures **MM-LU1** through **MM-LU10**.

Division of a Community

The 2012-2035 RTP/SCS proposes projects that have the potential to disrupt or divide communities and, considering the scale and number of these projects, even with mitigation, it is likely that in some cases impacts will not be mitigated to a less than significant level. This impact would remain significant after the implementation of Mitigation Measures **MM-LU11** through **MM-LU13**

Forest Lands, Agricultural and Farm Lands

It is anticipated that impacts to forest and agricultural land would not be able to be mitigated in every instance. Therefore, this impact would remain significant. This impact would remain significant after the implementation of Mitigation Measures **MM-LU14** through **MM-LU35.**

Land Use Compatibility

The 2012-2035 RTP/SCS through transportation investments and development patterns would influence the pattern of urbanization in the region. Even with mitigation, it is likely that this impact would remain significant. This impact would remain significant after the implementation of Mitigation Measures **MM-LU36** through **MM-LU85.**

Cumulative Impacts

Implementation of Mitigation Measures **MM-LU1** through **MM-LU85** would reduce cumulative land use impacts. However, this impact would remain significant.

COMPARISION WITH THE NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

In the No Project Alternative, the population of the SCAG region would still grow by about 3.9 million people, however no regional transportation investments would be made above the existing programmed projects and no land use strategies would be in place. The population distribution would follow past trends, uninfluenced by additional transportation investments.

Direct Impacts

The No Project Alternative includes fewer transportation projects than the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS and does not include any land use strategies. It would have a lesser potential for conflicting with general plans as the only growth strategies that would occur would be local land use controls. It also would have less of an influence on the patterns of urbanization in the region. Nonetheless, urbanization with significant potential for land use incompatibility would occur. The No Project Alternative would result in a more dispersed land use pattern. The No Project Alternative would consume an estimated 742 square miles of open space/ vacant land, while the Plan would consume only 334 square miles of open space/vacant land. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have greater impacts related to conversion of farmland and agricultural lands. The No Project Alternative would likely have similar or possibly greater impact on land use incompatibility because redevelopment in existing communities would still occur and more land in general would be impacted.

The No Project Alternative contains fewer transportation investments than the Plan Alternative. Consequently, there would be fewer places where businesses and homes would be displaced by transportation projects and fewer places where communities would be disrupted. As shown in Table 3.8-1, the No Project Alternative would occur within 150 feet of 391 acres of business land uses (commercial, industrial and extraction land uses) and 359 acres of residential land uses (rural, low, and medium to high density housing land uses). For the Plan 5,942 acres of business land uses and about 3,236 acres of residential land uses would be affected by transportation projects. **The impacts of transportation projects alone under the Plan would result in greater impacts as compared to the No Project Alternative for Impacts 3.8-1, 3.8-2 and 3.8-3. Development impacts are less clear, since under the Plan development would be concentrated in urban areas. In contrast, in the No Project Alternative land uses would change to a much greater extent in undeveloped areas.**

Cumulative Effects

The No Project Alternative is expected to accommodate the same increase in total population as the proposed Plan. However, the Plan includes land use measures that would help reduce the consumption and disturbance of agricultural lands, vacant lands, open space, and recreation lands. These policies and mitigation strategies are absent in the No Project Alternative. Under the No Project Alternative, up to

approximately 742 square miles or 474,900 acres of vacant, open space and agricultural lands would be consumed, compared 334 square miles or 213,800 acres under the Plan. The more dispersed land use pattern of the No Project Alternative would consume more vacant land, but also could impact areas outside the region through setting a precedent for the conversion of non-urban lands. This would happen as development spreads out along existing freeways or similar methods of expansion. **Under the No Project Alternative land use changes could affect jurisdictions outside the SCAG region, by setting a precedent for and/or inducing consumption of agricultural lands; such impacts would be cumulatively considerable. The Plan would decrease congestion potentially making it easier for people to live and work outside the region, thereby inducing land uses changes outside the region, these impacts also could be cumulatively considerable.**