Chapter 1
Introduction

1.1 Overview

~~The~~ County of San Diego (County) Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) is proposing the development of an approximately 25-acre local active park within ~~approximately~~ 96.6 acres of undeveloped land in the unincorporated community of Alpine in east San Diego County. ~~The~~ County DPR proposes to conserve the remainder of the property as open space~~/preserve~~.

The project would develop the local active park with amenities such as multi-use turf areas, a baseball field, an all-wheel area, a bike skills area, recreational courts (~~i.e.,~~g., for basketball, pickleball~~, game table plaza~~), fitness stations, a leash-free dog area, restroom facilities, an administrative facility/ranger station, equestrian staging with a corral, a nature play area, a community garden, a volunteer pad, picnic areas with shade structures and picnic tables, a game table plaza, and trails. The project would also include a parking area capable of accommodating ~~approximately 250–275~~up to 240 single vehicle spaces; ~~10~~ Americans with Disability Act (ADA) spaces would be available near the primary entrance and administrative building, and in the eastern portion of the site, along South Grade Road. Volunteer pad parking spaces, an equestrian staging area (vehicle parking), and corrals would be located in the northern portion of the project site. For utilities, the project proposes to connect to the existing sewer system or include a septic system to serve the restroom facilities, administration facility/ranger station, and volunteer pad. Stormwater retention basins ~~will~~would be located throughout the park.

The project would be open to the public from sunrise to sunset. Dogs on leashes would be allowed within all areas of the park, and dogs off leash would be permitted within the designated leash-free dog area. ~~"No Parking" signs would be installed along~~Should overflow parking occur, parking is allowed within the ~~shoulder~~ public right-~~of South Grade Road,~~ way as ~~deemed necessary by~~long it does not create a safety issue. As the park is constructed, County DPR will continue to monitor parking usage and coordinate with the Department of Public Works (DPW) ~~Traffic Division, to prevent potential overflow parking on South Grade Road.~~to install "No Parking" signs where appropriate. County DPR will work with DPW and the San Diego Sheriff's Department to enforce parking regulations, including ticketing or towing any vehicles parked within a no-parking area. The project would ~~involve one~~include an onsite ranger, ~~two~~ maintenance staff, and ~~one~~a live-on volunteer. The live-on volunteer would live on site full time to help with maintenance and management of the property.

The project includes maintenance of approximately 1 mile of existing trails, and would close approximately 3,300 linear feet of existing, informal use trails. These existing trails are ~~located~~ north and west of the active park area.

The remaining 70 acres for open space~~/preserve~~ would allow for restoration/habitat enhancement.

In addition to the project overview provided above, this chapter briefly discusses (1) the purpose of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and this ~~Draft~~Final EIR, (2) the intended uses for this ~~Draft~~Final EIR, (3) the scope and content of this ~~Draft~~Final EIR, and (4) the organization of this ~~Draft~~Final EIR.

1.2 Purpose of the California Environmental Quality Act and the Environmental Impact Report

This ~~Draft~~Final EIR evaluates the environmental effects of the project and has been prepared in compliance with CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) and the procedures for implementation of CEQA set forth in the ~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Title 14, Section 15000 et seq.).

CEQA was enacted by the California legislature in 1970. As noted under ~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines Section 15002, CEQA has four basic purposes.

1. Inform governmental decision-makers and the public about the potential significant environmental effects of proposed activities.
2. Identify the ways in which environmental damage can be avoided or significantly reduced.
3. Prevent significant, avoidable damage to the environment by requiring changes in projects through the use of alternatives or mitigation measures when the governmental agency finds the changes to be feasible.
4. Disclose to the public the reasons why a governmental agency approved the project in the manner the agency chose if significant environmental effects are involved.

An EIR is an informational document, the purpose of which is to inform members of the public and agency decision-makers of the significant environmental effects of a proposed project, identify feasible ways to reduce the significant effects of the proposed project, and describe a reasonable range of feasible alternatives to the project that would reduce one or more significant effects and still meet the proposed project's objectives. In instances where significant impacts cannot be avoided or mitigated, the proposed project may nonetheless be carried out or approved if the approving agency finds that economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits outweigh the unavoidable significant environmental impacts.

1.3 Intended Uses of the Environmental Impact Report

This section discusses the intended uses for this ~~Draft~~Final EIR and includes (1) a list of agencies that would be expected to use this ~~Draft~~Final EIR for decision-making, and (2) a list of required permits and other approvals that would be required to implement the project. Environmental review and consultation requirements under federal, state, or local laws, regulations, or policies that are in addition to CEQA are discussed in the applicable individual resource sections within Chapter 4, *Environmental Analysis*.

1.3.1 Agencies Expected to Use this ~~Draft~~Final Environmental Impact Report

~~The~~ County DPR is the CEQA lead agency, as defined under ~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines Section 15050, because it has principal responsibility for carrying out and approving the project. As the lead agency, ~~the~~ County DPR also has primary responsibility for complying with CEQA. As such, ~~the~~ County DPR

has analyzed the environmental effects of the project, and the results of that analysis are presented in this ~~Draft~~Final EIR. The Board of Supervisors, in its role as the decision-making body of the County ~~of San Diego~~, is responsible for certifying the Final EIR and approving the Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations pursuant to Sections 15090–15093 of the ~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines prior to project approval.

No responsible agencies, as defined under ~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines Section 15381, have been identified. The project is consistent with the ~~County of San Diego~~ Alpine Community Plan and therefore a General Plan amendment is not required.

Table 1-1 provides a summary list of the approvals and permits that would be required.

Table 1-1. List of Required Discretionary Actions and Permits

Discretionary Action/Permits	Agency
Certification of Final EIR	County of San Diego
Adoption of Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program	County of San Diego
Adoption of Findings of Fact	County of San Diego
Adoption of Statement of Overriding Considerations	County of San Diego
Alpine Park Project Habitat Conservation Plan	County of San Diego
Building Permit	County of San Diego
General Construction Storm Water Permit	Regional Water Quality Control Board
Onsite Wastewater Treatment System (Septic) Permit	County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health and Quality
Incidental Take Permit(s)	California Department of Fish and Wildlife

1.4 Scope and Content of the ~~Draft~~Final Environmental Impact Report

As the CEQA lead agency, ~~the~~ County DPR is responsible for determining the scope and content of this ~~Draft~~Final EIR, a process referred to as "scoping." As part of the scoping process, ~~the~~ County DPR considered the environmental resources present on site and in the surrounding area and identified the probable environmental effects of the project. On March 8, 2021, ~~the~~ County DPR posted a Notice of Preparation (NOP) with the County Clerk in accordance with Section 15082 of the ~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines. The NOP was mailed to public agencies, organizations, and other interested individuals to solicit their comments on the scope and content of the environmental analysis. ~~The~~ County DPR also held a virtual scoping meeting on March 30, 2021. ~~The "virtual" manner of conducting the scoping meeting was made necessary by the intervention of Covid-19 and its associated restrictions on public gatherings.~~

Comments received in response to the NOP and during the public scoping meeting were used to determine the scope of th~~is~~e Draft EIR. The NOP period began on March 8, 2021, and concluded on April 7, 2021. The comments are summarized in Table 1-2. Based on ~~the~~ County DPR's preliminary

evaluation of the probable effects of the project and a thorough review of the comments on the NOP, the Draft EIR analyzes effects associated with the following resources.

- Aesthetics and Visual Resources
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Air Quality and Health Risk
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Energy
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise and Vibration
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Wildfire

1.4.1 Comments Received in Response to the Notice of Preparation

~~A number of~~Several specific environmental issues were raised in the comments on the NOP. A summary of these comments and the sections where they are addressed in th~~is~~e Draft EIR are provided in Table 1-2. Only comments that pertain to the environmental scope of th~~is~~e Draft EIR are summarized. ~~Copies~~The NOP is included as Appendix A of the Draft EIR and copies of all NOP comment letters are provided in Appendix B ~~of this Draft EIR, and the NOP is included as Appendix A~~.

Table 1-2. Summary of NOP Comments Received

Commenter	Environmental Topic(s)	Location Where Addressed in this ~~Draft~~Final EIR
State		
California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), David Mayer, Environmental Program Manager, April 7, 2021	CDFW is a Responsible Agency under CEQA and may need to exercise regulatory authority as provided by the Fish and Game Code. CDFW also administers the Natural Community Conservation Planning (NCCP) program, a California regional habitat conservation planning program. The County participates in the NCCP program by implementing its approved Subarea Plan (SAP) under the County Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP).	Section 4.4, *Biological Resources*
	Due to the presence of highly sensitive habitats (clay soils, native grassland) and species on and/or adjacent to conserved areas of Wright's Field, CDFW recommends that the forthcoming Draft EIR include an alternative location or locations that would meet the needs of the	Section 4.4, *Biological Resources*

Commenter	Environmental Topic(s)	Location Where Addressed in this ~~Draft~~Final EIR
	community yet avoid or minimize impacts while not reducing the remaining acreage of the large block of habitat encompassing the Wright's Field conservation area. CDFW requests the Draft EIR include the following: 1. Measures to fully avoid and otherwise protect Sensitive Natural Communities from project-related impacts. 2. A complete floristic assessment within and adjacent to the project area, with particular emphasis upon identifying endangered, threatened, sensitive, and locally unique species and sensitive habitats. 3. A complete, recent, assessment of the biological resources associated with each habitat type onsite and within adjacent areas that could also be affected by the project. 4. A complete, recent, assessment of rare, threatened, and endangered, and other sensitive species on site and within the area of potential effect, including California Species of Special Concern and California Fully Protected Species (Fish and Game Code Sections 3511, 4700, 5050 and 5515). 5. A recent wildlife and rare plant survey.	
	CDFW recommends that a site Resource Management Plan (RMP) for the 73-acre open space should be completed before any trails are opened to the public. A discussion is needed on the impacts of the designated trails that will be located throughout the Preserve and the cumulative impacts that will result from an increase in human activity.	Section 4.4, *Biological Resources*
	The marina expansion has the potential to result in potentially significant impacts that are in addition to the marina's current operation.	Section 4.4, *Biological Resources*
	CDFW recommends that the Draft EIR should make provisions to avoid the occupied area; however, further discussion should be included in the final document to address indirect impacts to the Quino checkerspot butterfly.	Section 4.4, *Biological Resources*
	CDFW states the project site is adjacent to the Backcountry Land Trust (BCLT) Wright's Field Preserve, which has vernal pools present. CDFW recommends to fully avoid impacts on vernal pools and depressions, the entire sub-watershed that supports the hydrology of the pool/depression should be avoided and conserved.	Section 4.4, *Biological Resources*

Commenter	Environmental Topic(s)	Location Where Addressed in this ~~Draft~~Final EIR
	CDFW recommends that the Draft EIR thoroughly analyze how the open space and biological diversity within it may be impacted by project activities. CDFW requests the following to be addressed in the Draft EIR: 1. A discussion regarding indirect project impacts on biological resources, including resources in nearby public lands, open space, adjacent natural habitats, riparian ecosystems, and any designated and/or proposed or existing reserve lands (e.g., preserve lands associated with an NCCP). 2. A discussion of potential adverse impacts from lighting, noise, temporary and permanent human activity, and exotic species and identification of any mitigation measures. 3. A discussion on project-related changes on drainage patterns downstream of the project site; the volume, velocity, and frequency of existing and post-project surface flows; polluted runoff; soil erosion and/or sedimentation in streams and water bodies; and post-project fate of runoff from the project site. 4. An analysis of impacts from land use designations and zoning located nearby or adjacent to natural areas that may inadvertently contribute to wildlife-human interactions. A discussion of possible conflicts and mitigation measures to reduce these conflicts should be included in the Draft EIR. 5. A cumulative effects analysis, as described under CEQA Guidelines section 15130. General and specific plans, as well as past, present, and anticipated future projects, should be analyzed relative to their impacts on similar plant communities and wildlife habitats.	Section 4.4, *Biological Resources* Section 4.10, *Hydrology and Water Quality*
	CDFW recommends that measures be taken to avoid project impacts on nesting birds.	Section 4.4, *Biological Resources*
	Based on the occurrences of special status bird species the project vicinity, CDFW recommends project activities including but not limited to staging and disturbances to native and nonnative vegetation, structures, and substrates should occur outside of the avian breeding season which generally runs from February 15 through August 31 (as early as January 1 for some raptors) to avoid take of birds or their eggs.	Section 4.4, *Biological Resources*

Commenter	Environmental Topic(s)	Location Where Addressed in this ~~Draft~~Final EIR
	Due to landscaped areas and the proposed community garden, CDFW recommends that the Draft EIR stipulate that no invasive plant material shall be used. Furthermore, CDFW recommends using native, locally appropriate plant species for landscaping on the project site.	Section 4.4, *Biological Resources*
	CDFW recommends the following information be included in the Draft EIR: 1. A complete discussion of the purpose and need for, and description of, the project, including all staging areas and access routes to the construction and staging areas; and 2. A range of feasible alternatives to project component location and design features to ensure that alternatives to the proposed project are fully considered and evaluated. The alternatives should avoid or otherwise minimize direct and indirect impacts to sensitive biological resources and wildlife movement areas.	Section 4.4, *Biological Resources*
	CDFW recommends that the Draft EIR should include mitigation measures for adverse project-related impacts on sensitive plants, animals, and habitats.	Section 4.4, *Biological Resources*
	For proposed preservation and/or restoration, CDFW recommends that the Draft EIR should include measures to protect the targeted habitat values from direct and indirect negative impacts in perpetuity.	Section 4.4, *Biological Resources*
California Native Plant Society, Frank Landis, April 6, 2021	The California Native Plant Society (CNPS) noted that energy and tribal cultural resources were not identified in the NOP and requests that these resource issues be addressed in the Draft EIR.	Section 4.6, *Energy* Section 4.18, *Tribal Cultural Resources*
	CNPS requests that current biological surveys be conducted.	Section 4.4, *Biological Resources*
	CNPS expresses concerns over impacts related to native plants, animals, vegetation communities, and wetlands as a result of the project increasing biking, hiking, and horseback riding and recreational activities on both Wright's Field and the project site. CNPS would like to ensure these impacts are addressed in the Draft EIR.	Section 4.4, *Biological Resources*
	~~CNPS attached a copy of a *California Fish and Wildlife Journal* issue and requested that it be included in the written record.~~	~~N/A~~
	CNPS requests that the project and all alternatives are analyzed for consistency with the Alpine Community Plan Update.	Throughout Chapter 4, *Environmental Analysis*

Commenter	Environmental Topic(s)	Location Where Addressed in this ~~Draft~~Final EIR
	CNPS expressed that the CEQA requirement for a scoping meeting was not met.	Chapter 1, *Introduction*
	CNPS requests that the project meet legal requirements for protection of the Quino checkerspot butterfly.	Section 4.4, *Biological Resources*
	In order to meet carbon neutral goals by 2035, CNPS requests that impacts associated with future park maintenance, upgrades and reconstruction be addressed in the Draft EIR. CNPS also requests that as part of the design process, the lifespan of all amenities and maintenance requirements be considered.	Section 4.6, *Energy* Section 4.8, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change*
	Related to the proposed solar panels, CNPS requests that trees not be planted close to the solar panels and that solar panels be placed in areas with unobstructed access to sunlight, and configured to be south-facing and/or west-facing areas.	Section 4.6, *Energy*
	CNPS requests reconsideration for the addition of solar panels noting that shading from trees may limit the energy produced by the solar panels and the shading caused by the solar panels would limit the trees ability to sequester carbon.	Section 4.6, *Energy*
	CNPS expresses concern regarding wildfire impacts, specifically as it relates to evacuation.	Section 4.20, *Wildfire*
	CNPS requests the analysis of a project alternative with a smaller, nature-focused, minimally developed park that has no impacts on the biological, cultural, and other resources of the project site, Wright's Field Ecological Preserve, and neighboring properties.	Chapter 6, *Alternatives*
Regional		
San Diego County Archaeological Society, Environmental Review Committee, James W Royale, Jr., Chairperson, April 5, 2021	Requests a copy of the Draft EIR and the archaeological technical report when they become available for public review.	Section 4.5, *Cultural Resources* Section 4.18, *Tribal Cultural Resources*
Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians, Ray Teran Viejas Tribal Government, March 10, 2021	Viejas requests that a Kumeyaay Cultural Monitor be on site for ground-disturbing activities and to be informed of any new developments such as inadvertent discovery of cultural artifacts, cremation sites, or human remains.	Section 4.5, *Cultural Resources* Section 4.18, *Tribal Cultural Resources*
Organizations		
Alpine Community Planning Group	ACPG requests that ~~the~~ County DPR review the sustainability of watering the grass field playing areas.	Section 4.19, *Utilities and Service Systems*

Commenter	Environmental Topic(s)	Location Where Addressed in this ~~Draft~~Final EIR
(ACPG), Travis Lyon, April 7, 2021	ACPG requests that ~~the~~ County DPR work directly with Alpine Fire Protection District and the County Fire Authority on a fire safety plan for the park.	Section 4.15, *Public Services*
	ACPG requests that ~~the~~ County DPR reviews the feasibility of all-way stop signs at both entrances to the park to provide traffic calming measures on South Grade Road.	Section 4.17, *Transportation and Circulation*
Greater Alpine Fire Safe Council (GAFSC), Neville Connell, March 11, 2021	GAFSC's top concern is that the final design of the park should match the available resources on Wright's Field. Particularly, water resource availability to maintain the aesthetic of the park for years to come.	Section 4.19, *Utilities and Service Systems*
	GAFSC requests that open flames or any kind not be permitted to minimize fire risks. Related to this, the GAFSC requests that water supply be sufficient in the event of a fire.	Section 4.19, *Utilities and Service Systems* Section 4.20, *Wildfire*
	GAFSC requests that design of the park pay detailed attention to how children in particular with skate boards and bikes will access the park from the town center and from Joan McQueen Middle School.	Section 4.17, *Transportation and Circulation*
Preserve Alpine's Heritage, Julie Simper, April 1, 2021	The commenter expressed concerns regarding aesthetics, biological resources, hydrology and water quality, noise, public services, traffic, wildfire, and requests analysis of alternate sites.	Section 4.1, *Aesthetics* Section 4.4, *Biological Resources* Section 4.10, *Hydrology and Water Quality* Section 4.13, *Noise and Vibration* Section 4.15, *Public Services* Section 4.17, *Transportation and Circulation* Section 4.20, *Wildfire* Chapter 6, *Alternatives*
Alpine Historical & Conservation Society, Tom Myers, April 30, 2021	The commenter expresse~~s~~d concern regarding impacts on wildlife related to the project.	Section 4.4, *Biological Resources*
Individuals		
Alex Carroll, April 7, 2021	The commenter expressed concerns about noise impacts associated with the all-wheel~~s~~ park, bike ~~course~~skills area, basketball, baseball/softball fields and cemented areas that will carry noise through the field/hills and into the residential areas; as well as safety hazards related to pedestrians and proximity to South Grade Road.	Section 4.13, *Noise and Vibration* Section 4.17, *Transportation and Circulation*
Miles and Amanda Pavich, April 6, 2021	The commenter expressed concerns regarding light pollution, traffic safety, noise, maintenance	Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*

Commenter	Environmental Topic(s)	Location Where Addressed in this ~~Draft~~Final EIR
	costs, property value decline, and wildfire, and requests analysis of alternate sites.	Section 4.13, *Noise* and Vibration Section 4.17, *Transportation and Circulation* Section 4.20, *Wildfire* Chapter 6, *Alternatives*
Calle De Compadres Residents (Tom and Julie Dyer, Beverly and David Francis, Larry and Tamara Ham, Jeff and Alanna Light, Kyle Ogle, Dominique Norton, and Al and Kelly Wilkey), April 3, 2021	The commenter expressed concerns regarding traffic, groundwater, noise, light pollution, septic impacts, water quality, biological resources, and wildfire, and requests analysis of alternate sites.	Section 4.1, *Aesthetics* Section 4.4, *Biological Resources* Section 4.10, *Hydrology and Water Quality* Section 4.13, *Noise and Vibration* Section 4.17, *Transportation and Circulation* Section 4.20, *Wildfire* Chapter 6, *Alternatives*
Robert Figari, April 5, 2021	The commenter expressed concerns regarding tribal cultural resources, hazardous materials, water quality, biological resources, and wildfire, and requests analysis of alternate sites.	Section 4.4, *Biological Resources* Section 4.9, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials* Section 4.10, *Hydrology and Water Quality* Section 4.18, *Tribal Cultural Resources* Section 4.20, *Wildfire* Chapter 6, *Alternatives*
Frank Landis, March 31, 2021	The commenter expressed concerns about the format of the NOP scoping meeting. The commenter notes that energy and tribal cultural resources were not identified in the NOP and requests that these resource issues be addressed in the Draft EIR.	Section 4.6, *Energy* Section 4.18, *Tribal Cultural Resources*
~~Sandy Castle, March 10, 2021~~	~~The commenter expressed general support for the project.~~	~~N/A~~
Elaine and Mike Heidtbrink, March 29, 2021	The commenter expressed disapproval of the size of the proposed park and concern related to potential litter, noise, light pollution, wildlife, traffic, and aesthetic impacts associated with the project.	Throughout Chapter 4, *Environmental Analysis*
Brad Bach, March 9, 2021	~~Requested~~The commenter requested to see the environmental impact analysis.	Throughout Chapter 4, *Environmental Analysis*
Domonique Norton, March 18, 2021	The commenter request~~s~~ed additional information regarding the agencies, stakeholders, and the identified members of the public who are included as recipients of notice of the project.	Chapter 3, *Project Description*

Commenter	Environmental Topic(s)	Location Where Addressed in this ~~Draft~~Final EIR
	The commenter requested background information on the park proposal and public input.	
	~~The commenter requests information about funding for the project.~~	~~N/A~~
	The commenter ha~~s~~d general questions regarding significant environmental effects of the project.	Throughout Chapter 4, *Environmental Analysis*
Christine Figari, April 5, 2021	Given the significant changes to the property as it currently exists, the commenter request~~s~~ed evidence that the park will not have a substantial negative impact on the scenic vista and quality of public views. The commenter requests that the EIR analysis include visual simulations from a variety of locations.	Section 4.1, *Aesthetics and Visual Resources*
	Given the fire danger in the area, the commenter request~~s~~ed analysis of available evacuation routes in the event of a wildfire when the proposed park is at full capacity, and confirmation that emergency evacuation plans will not be impacted.	Section 4.20, *Wildfire*
	The commenter request~~s~~ed traffic impact analysis that focuses on level of service/peak hour trips (particularly the impact on emergency services and access), in addition to the vehicle miles traveled analysis.	Section 4.17, *Transportation and Circulation*
	The commenter request~~s~~ed that the noise assessment in the EIR includes an analysis for all sensitive receptors such as hikers, biological species, and tribal cultural resources.	Section 4.13, *Noise and Vibration*
	The commenter request~~s~~ed that the alternatives analysis include several alternatives at different locations and of different sizes, all of which are analyzed fully (not just considered but dismissed) with substantial evidence for why other sites for a proposed park are not feasible.	Chapter 6, *Alternatives*
G.A. Neville Connell (on behalf of the Board of the Greater Alpine Fire Safe Council, NO DATE	The commenter expressed concern regarding water supply, fire, and traffic calming and pedestrian as it relates to traffic hazards.	Section 4.17, *Transportation and Circulation* Section 4.19, *Utilities and Service Systems* Section 4.20, *Wildfire*
Patrick Williams, April 6, 2021	The commenter expressed concerns regarding geology (as it relates to boulders on site), biological issues, wildfire, noise, and traffic. The commenter requests the Draft EIR identify an alternative that analyzes a smaller park that avoids impacts.	Section 4.1, *Aesthetics and Visual Resources* Section 4.4, *Biological Resources* Section 4.13, *Noise and Vibration*

Commenter	Environmental Topic(s)	Location Where Addressed in this ~~Draft~~Final EIR
		Section 4.17, *Transportation and Circulation* Chapter 6, *Alternatives*
~~Peggy Easterling, March 31, 2021~~	~~The commenter requests that the proposed community garden be changed to a sage, songbird, and butterfly garden.~~	~~N/A~~
Patricia Barton, March 10, 2021	The commenter expressed opposition to the project and expressed concern regarding aesthetics, noise, soil composition as it relates to grading, alternative locations, crime, fire, water resources, traffic, and growth inducing impacts.	Throughout Chapter 4, *Environmental Analysis* Chapter 6, *Alternatives* Chapter 7, *Additional Consequences of Project Implementation*
Nicole Stockmoe, March 10, 2021	The commenter expressed concerns regarding aesthetics, land use and planning, noise, recreational opportunities, transportation, and wildfire.	Section 4.1, *Aesthetics and Visual Resources* Section 4.11, *Land Use and Planning* Section 4.16, *Recreation* Section 4.17, *Transportation and Circulation* Section 4.20, *Wildfire*
Michelle Rader, April 7, 2021	The commenter expressed concerns regarding aesthetics, transportation, location of the proposed park, biological resources, and cultural resources.	Section 4.1, *Aesthetics and Visual Resources* Section 4.4, *Biological Resources* Section 4.5, *Cultural Resources* Section 4.17, *Transportation and Circulation*
Yolaine M. Stout, NO DATE	The commenter expressed concern regarding biological resources, specifically impacts on Quino checkerspot, Hermes copper, San Diego thornmint, and Native Valley needle grassland. The commenter requests a consistency analysis with the project and the County's Biological Mitigation Ordinance. The commenter also requests paleontological resources be evaluated and a financial feasibility study for costs associated with developing the project.	Section 4.4, *Biological Resources* Section 4.7, *Geology and Soils*
Virginia Walker, March 10, 2021	The commenters expressed concerns regarding aesthetics, maintenance costs, grassland removal and impacts on wildlife, and noise.	Section 4.1, *Aesthetics and Visual Resources* Section 4.4, *Biological Resources* Section 4.13, *Noise and Vibration*
Virginia Walker, April 6, 2021	The commenter expressed concerns regarding aesthetics, maintenance costs, grassland removal and impacts on wildlife, and noise. The commenter requested that alternatives be considered that would avoid impacts.	Section 4.1, *Aesthetics and Visual Resources* Section 4.4, *Biological Resources*

Commenter	Environmental Topic(s)	Location Where Addressed in this ~~Draft~~Final EIR
		Section 4.13, *Noise and Vibration* Chapter 6, *Alternatives*
Louis Russo, March 10, 2021	The commenter expressed support for the project and provided input on environmental issues raised including cultural resources, fire risks, road safety, water resources, light pollution, noise, and biological resources.	Throughout Chapter 4, *Environmental Analysis*
~~Susan Sweeny, March 9, 2021~~	~~The commenter requests information regarding the enrollment report.~~	~~N/A~~
Kyle Ogle and Domonique Norton, April 7, 2021	The commenters expressed concerns regarding aesthetics, light pollution, noise, traffic, water supplies, septic/sewer, and wildfire. The commenter requested that alternatives be considered that would avoid impacts.	Section 4.1, *Aesthetics and Visual Resources* Section 4.13, *Noise and Vibration* Section 4.17, *Transportation and Circulation* Section 4.20, *Wildfire* Section 4.19, *Utilities and Service Systems* Chapter 6, *Alternatives*
Joyce Nygaard, April 7, 2021	The commenter expressed concerns regarding noise, greenhouse gas emissions, traffic, wildfire as it relates to open fire, and utilities as it relates to wastewater disposal.	Section 4.8, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change* Section 4.13, *Noise and Vibration* Section 4.17, *Transportation and Circulation* Section 4.19, *Utilities and Service Systems* Section 4.20, *Wildfire*
Jonah Gula, April 6, 2021	The commenter expresse~~s~~d concern regarding impacts on California Species of Special Concern, native species, and impacts on biological resources. The commentor stated that impacts associated with proposed uses on Wright's Field should be analyzed in the Draft EIR and identified the loss of grasslands as fragmentation.	Section 4.4, *Biological Resources*
Anne Falasco Norton, April 2, 2021	The commenter expressed concern regarding impacts on aesthetics related to character, ambiance, and views. The commenter also expressed concern regarding views being impacted by the proposed berm.	Section 4.1, *Aesthetics and Visual Resources*
	The commenter also expressed concern regarding noise associated with activities in the park. The commenter requests noise associated with all activities including the dog park, ~~skate~~all-wheel park, bike ~~park~~skills area, and traffic be analyzed in the EIR.	Section 4.13, *Noise and Vibration*

Commenter	Environmental Topic(s)	Location Where Addressed in this ~~Draft~~Final EIR
	The commenter expressed concern regarding the proposed dog park related to disease and odor. The commenter requested that odor be analyzed in the Draft EIR.	Section 4.3, *Air Quality and Health Risk*
	As the project site is located in a dark sky zone, the commenter is concerned lighting associated with the proposed park would result in impacts and requests that the issue be analyzed in the Draft EIR.	Section 4.1, *Aesthetics and Visual Resources*
	The commenter raise~~s~~d concerns regarding water availability and ground water contamination from pollutants associated with the project and requests that this be analyzed in the Draft EIR.	Section 4.10, *Hydrology and Water Quality*
	The commenter expressed concern regarding potential crime and demand for police services and requests that this issue be analyzed in the Draft EIR.	Section 4.15, *Public Services*
	The commenter expressed concern regarding traffic and air quality associated with increased traffic and requests that impacts be analyzed in the Draft EIR.	Section 4.17, *Transportation and Circulation*
	The commenter stated that the project would limit access to recreational opportunities within Wright's Field.	Chapter 3, *Project Description*
	The commenter expressed concern regarding wildlife habitat impacts, specifically on grasslands, and requested that they be analyzed in the Draft EIR.	Section 4.4, *Biological Resources*
	The commenter requested a thorough analysis of alternative park sites.	Chapter 6, *Alternatives*

1.5 Organization of the ~~Draft~~Final EIR

The content and format of ~~this~~the Draft EIR and Recirculated Draft EIR ~~a~~were designed to meet the requirements of CEQA and ~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines Article 9. Table 1-3 summarizes the organization and content of the Final~~Draft EIR and Recirculated Draft~~ EIR, which follows the same format.

Table 1-3. Document Organization and CEQA Requirements

~~Draft~~ EIR Chapter	Contents
Executive Summary	Includes a brief summary of the project; identifies each significant effect, including proposed mitigation measures and alternatives to reduce or avoid the effect; identifies the areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public; and summarizes the issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and

~~Draft~~ EIR Chapter	Contents
	whether or how to mitigate the significant effects (~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines Section 15123).
Chapter 1, Introduction	Discusses the purpose of CEQA and this ~~Draft~~ EIR, the scope and content of this ~~Draft~~ EIR, the organization of this ~~Draft~~ EIR, and the intended uses for this ~~Draft~~ EIR (~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines Section 15124(d)).
Chapter 2, Environmental Setting	Describes the overall existing physical conditions in the vicinity of the project when the analysis was initiated. In addition, the specific existing conditions for each resource area are described in the applicable resource section~~s~~ in Chapter 4, *Environmental Analysis* (~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines Section 15125).
Chapter 3, Project Description	Contains both a map of the precise location and boundaries of the project and its location relative to the region, lists the project's central objectives and underlying purpose, and provides a detailed description of the project's characteristics (~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines Section 15124(a), (b), and (c)).
Chapter 4, Environmental Analysis	Describes the existing physical conditions for each resource area, lists the applicable laws and regulations germane to the specific resource, describes the impact assessment methodology, lists the criteria for determining whether an impact is significant, identifies the direct and indirect significant impacts that would result from implementation of the project, and lists feasible mitigation measures that would eliminate or reduce the identified significant impacts (~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines Sections 15125–15126.4).
Chapter 5, Cumulative Impacts	Defines the cumulative study area for each resource; identifies past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects with related impacts within each study area; and evaluates the contribution of the project to a cumulatively significant impact. This chapter also lists feasible mitigation measures that would eliminate or reduce the identified significant cumulative impacts (~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines Section 15130).
Chapter 6, Alternatives	Describes a reasonable range of alternatives to the project, including the No-Project Alternative; compares and contrasts the significant environmental impacts of alternatives to the project; and identifies the environmentally superior alternative (~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6).
Chapter 7, Additional Consequences of Project Implementation	Discusses the way the project could foster economic or population growth, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment; describes the significant irreversible changes associated with the project's implementation; and provides a brief discussion of the environmental resource impacts that were found to be not significant during preparation of th~~is~~e Draft and Final EIR (~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines Sections 15126.2(c) and (d), 15127, and 15128).
Chapter 8, List of Preparers and Agencies Consulted	Lists the individuals and agencies involved in preparing this Draft and Final EIR (~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines Section 15129).
Chapter 9, References	Provides a comprehensive listing by chapter of all references cited in ~~this Draft~~the Final EIR (~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines Section 15148).

~~Draft~~ EIR Chapter	Contents
Acronyms and Abbreviations	A list of acronyms and abbreviations is provided for the reader's reference immediately following the list of tables and figures in the Table of Contents.
Appendices	Presents additional background information and technical detail for several of the resource areas.