4.0 ALTERNATIVES

The alternatives analysis consists of the following components: an overview of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements for alternatives analysis, descriptions of the alternatives evaluated, a comparison between the anticipated environmental effects of the alternatives and those of the proposed Renewable Energy Streamlining Program (RESP or Program), and identification of an "environmentally superior" alternative.

4.1 CEQA REQUIREMENTS FOR ALTERNATIVES

The CEQA Guidelines require that an environmental impact report (EIR) describe a reasonable range of alternatives to a project that would feasibly attain the basic project objectives but would avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the project's significant effects (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a)).

In addition, CEQA Guidelines Sections 15126.6(a) and (b) require the consideration of alternatives that could reduce or eliminate any significant adverse environmental effects of the proposed project, including alternatives that may be more costly or could otherwise impede the project's objectives. The range of alternatives considered must include those that offer substantial environmental advantages over the proposed project and may be feasibly accomplished in a successful manner considering economic, environmental, social, technological, and legal factors. The CEQA Guidelines also require analysis of a "No Project" alternative and identification of the environmentally superior alternative among those analyzed.

4.2 DEVELOPMENT OF PROGRAM ALTERNATIVES

This section discusses the reasoning for selecting the alternatives and summarizes the assumptions identified for the alternatives. The range of alternatives included for analysis in an EIR is governed by the "rule of reason." The primary objective is formulating potential alternatives and choosing which ones to analyze to ensure that the selection and discussion of alternatives fosters informed decision-making and informed public participation. This is accomplished by providing sufficient information to enable readers to reach conclusions themselves about such alternatives. This approach avoids assessing an unmanageable number of alternatives or analyzing alternatives that differ too little to provide additional meaningful insights about their environmental effects. The alternatives addressed in this Draft EIR were selected in consideration of one or more of the following factors:

- The extent to which the alternative would accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project.
- The extent to which the alternative would avoid or reduce any of the identified significant effects of the project.
- The feasibility of the alternative, taking into account site suitability and parcel sizes, as well as consistency with applicable public plans, policies, and regulations.
- The appropriateness of the alternative in contributing to a reasonable range of alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice.

The alternatives analyzed in this DEIR were ultimately chosen based on each alternative's ability to feasibly attain the basic Program objectives while avoiding or reducing one or more of the Program's significant effects. The analysis provides readers with adequate information to compare the effectiveness of identified mitigation or significant adverse impacts and to enable readers to make decisions about the project. CEQA requires EIRs to address a reasonable range of reasonable alternatives, not all potential alternatives.

The County adopted an iterative approach to development of the performance standards included in the RESP. As each section of the code was completed, environmental analysis was conducted and then changes were made to the code to reduce or eliminate impacts that were identified. In essence, this project analysis and feedback loop constituted a comprehensive alternatives analysis where an alternative was analyzed then revised to avoid environmental impacts. The result was that numerous versions of the Program (i.e., alternatives) were considered and dismissed from further evaluation, ultimately leading to the project evaluated in this EIR.

While the RESP was under continual refinement, not all of the potential environmental impacts could be reduced to less than significant levels (Class III). The performance standards contained in the RESP are intended to result in self-mitigation for most projects. Projects that could not be fully mitigated are required to complete a discretionary review process and comply with CEQA. This self-mitigating aspect is why there are no mitigation measures in the EIR. Any action that would be considered a mitigation measure for the Program is included as a performance standard.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

As noted above, an EIR must describe a reasonable range of alternatives to a project that would feasibly attain the basic project objectives while avoiding or reducing one or more of the project's significant effects (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a)). In identifying the range of alternatives for analysis in this EIR, the following four objectives were considered:

1) Create a Renewable Energy (RE) Combining Designation that identifies locations where certain renewable solar electric facilities will qualify for permit streamlining if they meet specified standards and conditions for project size, site characteristics, and environmental protections.

2) Revise the Land Use Ordinance (LUO) to foster permit streamlining for other specified types of renewable energy facilities throughout the non-Coastal Zone portions of the unincorporated county (both within and outside of the RE Combining Designation).

3) Support achievement of the County's goal to increase the production of renewable energy from small- and commercial-scale energy installations to account for 10 percent of total local energy by 2020 as presented in the County EnergyWise Plan.

4) Provide a clear process and expectations for renewable energy projects in suitable locations that minimize environmental impacts.

IMPACTS FOUND SIGNIFICANT

Implementation of the proposed Program would result in significant, unavoidable, and adverse impacts (Class I) for three impact areas as shown in **Table 4.0-1**. The impacts are identified in the EIR because even with full compliance with the standards set forth in Title 22, Section 22.14.100, it is likely that one or more of the impacts will remain. The intent of the alternatives is to determine whether changes to the project would reduce or eliminate some of the Class I impacts. As noted in **Table ES-1** of Section ES, Executive Summary, all other impacts are considered to have less than significant or beneficial impacts (Class III and IV).

TABLE 4.0-1
CLASS I IMPACTS FROM IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RESP

Aesthetics and Visual Resources		
Impact 3-1-1 **Solar**	Implementation of the proposed Program could result in the development of solar energy projects that have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic view.	Significant, Unavoidable, and Adverse
Impact 3-1-1 **Policy Changes**	Implementation of the proposed Program could result in the development of renewable energy projects that have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic view.	Significant, Unavoidable, and Adverse
Impact 3-1-3 **Solar**	Implementation of the proposed Program could substantially degrade the visual character of an area.	Significant, Unavoidable, and Adverse
Impact 3-1-3 **Policy Changes**	Implementation of the proposed Program could substantially degrade the visual character of an area.	Significant, Unavoidable, and Adverse
Agricultural Resources		
Impact 3-2-1 **Solar**	Implementation of the proposed Program could convert Important Agricultural Soils to nonagricultural use.	Significant, Unavoidable, and Adverse
Impact 3-2-1 **Policy Changes**	Implementation of the proposed Program could result in changes to countywide policies that could indirectly result in the conversion of Important Agricultural Soils to nonagricultural use.	Significant, Unavoidable, and Adverse
Land Use and Planning		
Impact 3-9-4	The proposed Program could indirectly create a disturbance that could diminish the function of a particular land use.	Significant, Unavoidable, and Adverse

4.3 ALTERNATIVE DESCRIPTIONS AND ANALYSIS

DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES

Alternative 1: Limited Combining Designation Scope

Alternative 1 consists of an RE Combining Designation that is more limited in scope than that of the proposed RESP by limiting projects to rooftop and structure-mounted projects, and ground mounted projects of 40 acres or less. This alternative would also limit streamlining (i.e. ministerial approvals) to only those projects that could be fully screened from public view adjacent to a project site, and would require that Tier 1 ground-mounted SEFs not be located on Important Agricultural Soils. The intent of this alternative is to reduce the project's Class I impacts to aesthetics and visual resources, agricultural resources, and land use and planning, and reduce overall impacts to other resource areas by substantially reducing the maximum allowed project footprint.

Alternative 2: Smaller Combining Designation Footprint

Alternative 2 consists of a RE Combining Designation that excludes all land with Important Agricultural Soils. This would reduce the total acreage of the RE Combining Designation from 801,910 acres to approximately 483,570 acres, a reduction of approximately 40 percent. The sole intent of this alternative is to reduce the potential for Class I impacts associated with the conversion of agricultural land to nonagricultural uses, identified in the Sections 3.2 and 3.9. All other aspects of the Program as proposed would remain unchanged.

Alternative 3: No Project

Alternative 3 is the CEQA-mandated No Project Alternative. Under Alternative 3, existing policies governing renewable energy development in the county would remain in place. Environmental impacts may be reduced in some instances because all projects would be evaluated individually and with potentially greater scrutiny. However, Alternative 3 could also result in more cumbersome permitting processes with less certain outcomes, thus resulting in less renewable energy development than would occur under the proposed Program.

ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES

Each alternative is compared to the proposed Program. As provided under CEQA Section 15126.6(f), the project alternatives are evaluated in less detail than those of the proposed project, and the impacts are described in terms of difference in outcome compared with implementing the proposed Program. **Table 4.0-2** at the end of this section provides an "at-a-glance" comparison of the environmental benefits and impacts of each alternative as compared to the proposed Program.

Comparative Impacts of Alternative 1: Limited Combining Designation Scope

Aesthetics and Visual Resources

This alternative is intended to eliminate the Class I impacts associated with the views of larger (160-acre) SEF projects and WECS projects with 100-foot ground-mounted wind turbines. As noted in the EIR, projects of this size can be screened from view along the adjacent roadway, but fully screening them from public view may not always be technically feasible. By reducing the potential size of the project from 160 acres to 40 acres, the potential for aesthetic impact is less than with the proposed project. Even with this reduction in size, however, projects may still be visible from off-site public views and would remain a Class I impact.

Agricultural Resources

Because this alternative would not allow ministerial approvals for ground-mounted Tier 1 SEF projects located on Important Agricultural Soils, the potential impact on agricultural resources would be less than that of the proposed project and would reduce the Class I impact to Class III.

Air Quality

This alternative would result in smaller individual projects but may result in the same amount of land being disturbed as the proposed project, as there is no prohibition on the number of projects, only the size. It is also possible that smaller project sizes would result in more overall land being disturbed because more area for access roads and utility equipment would be needed to

serve more individual projects. Overall, construction and operational air quality impacts would be similar to those of the proposed Program (Class III).

Biological Resources

An emphasis on roof-mounted and smaller ground-based SEF and WECS projects envisioned by this alternative would reduce the potential for biological impacts when compared to the proposed project. Provisions of the Program require a biological analysis for ground-mounted projects, and similar provisions would be required for any project under this alternative. As a result, impacts to biological resources would be considered Class III, similar to the proposed project.

Cultural Resources

Limiting project sites to building sites and making the overall sites smaller than those envisioned by the proposed project could reduce the potential for cultural resource impacts. However, as there is no cap on the number of projects, it is possible that the same land area would be developed, only in smaller pieces. Adherence to state law as well as to the provisions of the Program would result in Class III impacts, similar to those of the proposed project.

Geology and Soils

An emphasis on roof-mounted and smaller ground-based SEF and WECS projects envisioned by this alternative could reduce the potential for soil disturbance and associated impacts when compared to the proposed project. Multiple smaller projects directed away from Important Agricultural Soils may still disturb the same amount of land as the proposed project.

Provisions of the Program require a detailed grading plan (Section 22.08.030) as part of the application and site review process. Because any project meeting the criteria for a grading plan would have a similar review and approval process with the County, the impacts of this alternative would be similar to those of the proposed project. As a result, impacts to geology and soils would be considered Class III, similar to the proposed project.

Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change

While smaller individual projects would result in less grading and construction per project, there is no cap on the number of renewable energy projects. Therefore, this alternative may result in a similar amount of area being developed. Further, it is possible that multiple smaller projects may result in more land being developed, as there would be more area needed for access and equipment than if there were fewer but larger projects. Overall, this alternative would result in similar Class III and IV impacts with respect to greenhouse gases and climate change.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

This alternative could result in smaller individual projects than the proposed project. Smaller projects are likely to have a smaller quantity of potentially hazardous materials in a single location, which reduces the magnitude of impact from an accidental spill or misuse. However the larger number of projects would increase the number of areas that store material and therefore also increase the potential for spill or misuse. The County regulates the storage and use of potentially hazardous materials through existing ordinances and provisions of the Program, and these regulations would also apply to any project under this alternative. The impacts of

project development on hazards and hazardous materials are considered Class III, similar to those of the proposed project.

Land Use and Planning

This alternative would still permit Tier 1 and smaller Tier 2 projects on land in the county. Impacts associated with land use are considered mostly similar to those of the proposed project. However, this alternative would not allow ministerial approvals for ground-mounted Tier 1 SEFs located on Important Agricultural Soils, thereby reducing impacts related to agricultural land to less than significant (Class III).

Noise

Transformers associated with SEF projects are known to make noise, and both setbacks and screening included in the RESP address this issue. Because this alternative could result in a greater number of smaller projects, there could accordingly be more transformers. However the smaller projects would result in smaller transformers and less noise. Regardless, because setback and screening requirements would still apply, impacts would remain similar to the proposed project. The Program addresses these issues and would apply to any project in this alterative, resulting in a Class III impact.

Water Resources

While the project size would be smaller, the number of projects would increase. Water usage is incidental to the project overall and is needed to wash the solar panels. Therefore, whether there are panels in a single location or in several locations, the amount of water usage is likely to stay the same. There would still be the need for dust control during construction and washing of the SEF installations to ensure performance. Similar to the proposed project, this would represent a Class III impact.

Summary of Alternative 1

This alternative would result in smaller projects overall and would only allow projects in areas largely disturbed by existing land use practices. Overall, this alternative would reduce Class I agricultural resources and related land use and planning impacts to Class III, while aesthetics and visual resources impacts would remain Class I, and other impact areas would have similar Class III impacts to those of the proposed project

This alternative would meet objectives 1 and 4 by providing a clear statement as to where facilities could be located and establishing precise standards for construction in the RESP. Objectives 2 and 3 would not be fully realize, as the alternative places greater restrictions on project size and siting. This would not further the intent of encouraging renewable energy generation in more areas of the county.

Comparative Analysis of Alternative 2: Smaller Combining Designation Footprint

Aesthetics and Visual Resources

This alternative would avoid conversion of Important Agricultural Soils but still result in project sizes and features similar to those of the proposed project. Screening for larger (160-acre) sites is effective only when the observer is relatively close to the project site. From a distance or with even a slight topographic elevation, SEF projects will be visible. The EIR determined that, even

with the screening measures required by the Program, the visual impact of the proposed project is considered Class I with no certainty of effective and feasible mitigation for all future projects under the Program. This alternative would have a similar Class I impact.

Agricultural Resources

This alternative would not permit a SEF or WECS project on any land with Important Agricultural Soils. Because none of the identified significant agricultural soil categories would be affected, the alternative would reduce a Class I impact to a Class III impact.

Air Quality

This alternative assumes that Important Agricultural Soils would be avoided but that a similar amount of land area may be affected. Land disturbance would be similar to that of the proposed project. Overall, construction and operational air quality impacts would be similar to those of the proposed Program (Class III).

Biological Resources

This alternative would have less land disturbance and therefore has a less of a potential to impact biological resources. Provisions of the Program require a biological analysis for ground-mounted projects, and similar provisions would be required for any project under this alternative. As a result, impacts to biological resources would be considered Class III, similar to the proposed project.

Cultural Resources

The potential land area for development with this alternative is less than that of the proposed project. With less land area potentially affected by construction, the impact to cultural resources would also be less than that of the proposed project. Construction requirements of the County and the Program would result in similar Class III impacts to cultural resources.

Geology and Soils

Provisions of the LUO require a detailed grading plan (Section 22.08.030) as part of the application and site review process. Because any project meeting the criteria of the LUO for a grading plan would have a similar review and approval process with the County, the impacts of this alternative would be similar to those of the Program (Class III).

Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change

The potential buildout scenario under this alternative would be similar to that of the proposed Program. Total land disturbed and construction and operational emissions would likewise be similar and accordingly this alternative would result in similar Class III and IV impacts with respect to greenhouse gases and climate change.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Program as proposed would result in potential for larger facilities to store hazardous materials such as herbicides and dust palliatives. This alternative assumes projects with storage needs similar to those of the proposed Program. The County regulates the storage and use of potentially hazardous materials through existing ordinances and provisions in the Program, and

these regulations would also apply to any project under this alternative. The impacts of project development on hazards and hazardous materials are considered Class III, similar to those of the proposed Program.

Land Use and Planning

The emphasis on avoiding Important Agricultural Soils would result in a Class III land use and planning impact related to agricultural land conversion, compared to the Class I impact associated with the proposed project. However, the elimination of these agricultural lands may result in some of these projects moving into other areas of the county and affecting different resources. Further, restricting the ability of existing farms to make use of SEF or WECS projects to offset operational costs may affect the viability of smaller farms, leading to a request for land conversion.

Noise

Transformers associated with SEF projects are known to make noise, and both setbacks and screening included in the proposed Program address this issue. Projects associated with this alternative will have transformers in need of setback and noise attenuation. Therefore, noise impacts would remain similar to the Program. The Program addresses noise by establishing design criteria that also apply to any future project that would be proposed in this alterative, resulting in a similar Class III impact.

Water Resources

This alternative assumes project sizes similar to those allowed in the proposed Program and needing the same amounts of water during construction and operation as the proposed Program. Therefore, this alternative would result in similar Class III impact to water resources.

Summary of Alternative 2

This alternative could result in similarly sized projects as the proposed Program but may result in smaller projects overall in order to avoid Important Agricultural Soils. The Class I agricultural resources and land use and planning impacts associated with the proposed project would be reduced to Class III impacts under this alternative, while the Class I aesthetics and visual resources impact would remain.

An indirect impact of this alternative may be a need to expand the combining designation in order to meet the projected need for renewable energy projects. The expansion may need to occur on slopes, ridgelines, and other areas that are not suited to agriculture.

Another indirect impact may be that farmers with lands meeting these criteria may be prevented from installing renewable energy systems on their lands simply because of the soils involved. This would be counter to the intent of the program and could result in an undue burden on the agricultural use. This alternative would meet objectives 1, 2, and 4. Objective 3 would be met, albeit to a lesser extent than that of the proposed project, as it is likely that fewer projects would be developed due to the 40 percent reduction in the RE Combining Designation area.

Comparative Analysis of Alternative 3: No Project

Aesthetics and Visual Resources

Existing County policies allow the installation of roof-mounted solar panels with issuance of a building permit. There are no provisions for ground-mounted panels or installation of wind turbines; however, as long as the setback provisions of Title 22 are met, permits for these types of projects are also issued as a ministerial act.

The proposed Program establishes location and screening criteria that address visual impacts for all project sizes. The no project alternative would not result in a single set of standards and could therefore result in a variety of visual impacts.

Customized visual mitigation would likely be required as each project moved through the approval process, and in most cases would probably result in less than significant impacts with mitigation incorporated (Class II) if the project is visible from a public road. If not visible from a public road, projects would be Class III.

The current process, while taking longer than the proposed, may result in reduced impacts when compared to the project. Projects likely to have Class I impacts would be required to prepare an independent project-specific EIR, with mitigation measures and findings as appropriate. For smaller projects, the cost and time associated with preparation of an EIR may reduce the extent or prevent participation in the program.

As proposed, Tier 2 and above projects outside of the combining district will require discretionary review and may result in site-specific mitigation in addition to the program requirements. Because each project would be required to mitigate impacts to an individual level, the potential for Class I impacts will be reduced when compared to the proposed Program.

Agricultural Resources

Currently each request for a renewable energy project is addressed individually. Elements of the proposed Program also require site information specific to the development request. The Class I impact identified for the proposed project is related to SEFs of 20 acres or less that may be located on Important Agricultural Soils (albeit disturbed), without need for mitigation. Under the no project alternative, it is likely that this type of project would trigger discretionary review, CEQA analysis, and mitigation, thus resulting in a Class II impact.

Air Quality

Due to lack of a streamlining program, this alternative could result in fewer projects and less land area affected. Construction requirements of the County and conditions of approval from the discretionary project review required under this alternative would likely result in Class II or III impacts for this alternative. Note that the Class II determination would be a function of mitigation measures proposed for individual projects. The proposed Program includes these measures as permit requirements. Overall, impacts would be similar to those of the proposed Program.

Biological Resources

Due to lack of a streamlining program, this alternative could result in fewer projects, less land area affected, and potentially lesser impacts to biological resources. All projects (save for roof-mounted SEFs) would require discretionary review and appropriate mitigation measures for impacts to biological resources. While such impacts be considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated (Class II), this is equivalent to equivalent to the Class III impacts identified for the proposed Program, since the biological resource protective measures and standards have been incorporated into the Program.

Cultural Resources

The potential land area for development with this alternative is less than that of the proposed project. However, the alternative could result in an equivalent overall land footprint and thus impacts to cultural resources would be similar to those of the proposed Program. Construction requirements of the County and CEQA would result in a determination of less than significant with mitigation incorporated (Class II), equivalent to the Class III impacts identified for the proposed Program, since the cultural resource protective measures and standards have been incorporated into the Program.

Geology and Soils

The County Code already requires grading plans for ground disturbance, which would address any impacts under this alternative. As a result, impacts to geology and soils would be considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated (Class II), which is equivalent to the Class III impacts identified for the proposed Program since the resource protective measures and standards have been incorporated into the Program. The impacts of this alternative would be similar to those of the proposed Program.

Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change

Due to lack of a streamlining program, this alternative could result in fewer projects and less land area affected. Construction requirements of the County and conditions of approval from the discretionary project review required under this alternative would likely result in Class II or III impacts for this alternative. Note that the Class II determination would be a function of mitigation measures proposed for individual projects. The proposed Program includes these measures as permit requirements. Overall, impacts would be similar to those of the proposed Program.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

This alternative assumes projects with storage needs similar to those of the proposed Program. The County regulates the storage and use of potentially hazardous materials through existing ordinances and these regulations would apply to any project under this alternative. As a result, impacts to would be considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated (Class II), which is equivalent to the Class III impacts identified for the proposed Program, since the resource protective measures and standards have been incorporated into the Program. The impacts of this alternative would be similar to those of the proposed Program.

Land Use and Planning

The no project alternative would allow each property owner to approach the County for renewable energy projects where allowable by the current LUO, or where the proposed project is considered an accessory electric generating plant generating power for on-site use only. Overall, the impact on land use and planning would be lesser (Class III) for this alternative, as it is reasonably foreseeable that conversion of important agricultural land would be mitigated or avoided through the discretionary review and CEQA compliance processes.

Noise

Projects associated with this alternative will have transformers in need of setback and noise attenuation. Therefore, noise impacts would remain similar to the proposed Program. Compliance with the CEQA process for each project would address noise by establishing design criteria that apply to each project in this alterative, resulting in a determination of less than significant with mitigation incorporated (Class II), which is the same as the Class III, anticipated by meeting the performance standards incorporated into the proposed Program.

Water Resources

This alternative assumes project types and sizes similar to the proposed Program and using the same amounts of water during construction and operation. Compliance with the CEQA process for each project would address water resources, likely resulting in a determination of a less than significant impact (Class III) or less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated (Class II). Overall, impacts would be similar to those of the proposed Program. Summary of Alternative 3

This alternative is likely to result in fewer projects overall due to the absence of a permit streamlining program. As each project will need to conduct its own CEQA analysis and permit approval process, there are greater assurances that significant impacts related to aesthetics and visual resources and agricultural land conversion would be mitigated or avoided. Overall, this alternative could result in a lesser degree of aesthetic and visual resource, agricultural resource, and land use and planning impacts (Class II and III). However, this alternative would not successfully meet the primary objectives of the proposed Program.

4.4 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

Tables 4.0-2 and **4.0-3** provide a summary of each alternative's comparable impacts and ability to meet objectives of the Program. Based on the results of this section, Alternative 2 would be the environmentally superior alternative, as it results in lesser impacts overall, specifically reduces the Class I agricultural resources and related land use and planning impacts to Class III, and meets most of the key Program objectives.

TABLE 4.0-2
ALTERNATIVES IMPACTS COMPARISON

Environmental Issue	Proposed Program Impact Finding	Alternative		
		1 Reduced Scope	2 Reduced Footprint	3 No Project
Aesthetics and Visual Resources	Class I, III	<	<	<
Agricultural Resources	Class I, III	<	<	<
Air Quality	Class III	=	=	=
Biological Resources	Class III	=	=	=
Cultural Resources	Class III	=	=	=
Geology and Soils	Class III	=	=	=
Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change	Class III, IV	=	=	=
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Class III	=	=	=
Land Use and Planning	Class I, III	<	<	<
Noise	Class III	=	=	=
Water Resources	Class III	=	=	=

< Impacts less than those under proposed Program
> Impacts greater than those under proposed Program
= Impacts similar to those under proposed Program

TABLE 4.0-3
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

Objectives	Alternative		
	1 Reduced Scope	2 Reduced Footprint	3 No Project
Create a Renewable Energy (RE) Combining Designation that identifies locations where certain renewable solar electric facilities will qualify for permit streamlining if they meet specified standards and conditions for project size, site characteristics, and environmental protections.	✓	✓	×
Revise the Land Use Ordinance to foster permit streamlining for other specified types of renewable energy facilities throughout the non-Coastal Zone portions of the unincorporated county (both within and outside of the RE Combining Designation).	×	✓	×
Support achievement of the County's goal to increase the production of renewable energy from small- and commercial-scale energy installations to account for 10 percent of total local energy by 2020 as presented in the County EnergyWise Plan.	×	✓	×
Provide a clear process and expectations for renewable energy projects in suitable locations that minimize environmental impacts.	✓	✓	×

× Alternative does not meet the objective
✓ Alternative meets the objective