County of San Diego

DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

BRIAN ALBRIGHT
DIRECTOR

www.sdparks.org

Administrative Office: (858) 694-3030
Fax: (858) 495-5841
Reservations: (858) 565-3600

June 23, 2011

CEQA Initial Study - Environmental Checklist Form
(Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G Rev. March, 2010)

1. Project Title:

   Live Oak Park Amphitheater

2. Lead agency name and address:

   County of San Diego, Department of Parks and Recreation
   5500 Overland Avenue, Suite 410
   San Diego, CA 92123

3. a. Contact: Stephen Paul, Project Manager
   b. Phone number: (858) 966-1347
   c. E-mail: stephen.paul@sdcounty.ca.gov

4. Project location:

   The proposed project is located at Live Oak County Park, 2746 Reche Road, Fallbrook, CA 92028 (Assessor's Parcel Number 107-260-27).

   Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1028, Grid C/5

5. Project Sponsor name and address:

   County of San Diego, Department of Parks and Recreation
   5500 Overland Avenue, Suite 410
   San Diego, CA 92123

6. General Plan Designation

   Community Plan: Fallbrook
   Land Use Designation: (17) Estate Residential
   Density: 1 du/2, 4 acres

7. Zoning

Use Regulation:	A70, Limited Agriculture
Minimum Lot Size:	2 acres
Special Area Regulation:	N/A

8. Description of project:

The proposed Live Oak Amphitheater Project (project) consists of the construction of a 100-person capacity outdoor amphitheater and associated park improvements within a developed County park. The proposed multi-purpose amphitheater will be used for special events currently held within the Park, and will be located in an area of the Park currently used as an assembly area. The proposed amphitheater will replace existing park amenities including a wooden gazebo and five cement picnic tables. The amphitheater will include a 30-foot diameter concrete stage, concrete sound panels, 92 fixed metal chairs and 6 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) spaces for wheelchairs. In addition, the amphitheater will be landscaped with native shrub and groundcover vegetation. Underground permanent irrigation will be installed for the proposed landscaping.

The project also includes additional ADA park improvements including restroom improvements, installation of an ADA drinking fountain, and relocation of two ADA parking stalls next to a proposed ADA concrete switchback ramp and 5-foot decomposed granite (DG) pathway leading to the amphitheater. The pathway will extend from the west parking lot and run parallel to an existing walkway. The pathway will cross over an existing cobble and mortar-lined stormwater conveyance and continue across an existing foot bridge and follow along the existing access path to the project location. No alterations to the existing conveyance and bridge are proposed. The project is anticipated to take four to six months to complete and will require minor grading. Construction will be staged in the existing west parking lot.

9. **Surrounding land uses and setting:**

The project site is within an existing County park located in the unincorporated community of Fallbrook, immediately north of Reche Road and approximately 2 miles west of Interstate 15. Lands immediately surrounding the project site are used primarily for spaced rural residences, as well as limited arterial commercial and agricultural (orchard/vineyard) uses.

10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):**

Permit Type/Action	Agency
None	None

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project and involve at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or a "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☐ Aesthetics
☐ Biological Resources
☐ Hazards & Haz. Materials
☐ Mineral Resources
☐ Public Services
☐ Utilities & Service Systems
☐ Agricultural Resources
☐ Cultural Resources
☐ Hydrology & Water Quality
☐ Noise
☐ Recreation
☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance
☐ Air Quality
☐ Geology & Soils
☐ Land Use & Planning
☐ Population & Housing
☐ Transportation/Traffic

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☑ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Parks and Recreation finds that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Parks and Recreation finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Parks and Recreation finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Signature — Date: 6/23/11

Megan Hamilton — Printed Name

Group Program Manager, DPR — Title

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

A vista is a view from a particular location or composite views along a roadway or trail. Scenic vistas often refer to views of natural lands, but may also be compositions of natural and developed areas, or even entirely of developed and unnatural areas, such as a scenic vista of a rural town and surrounding agricultural lands. What is scenic to one person may not be scenic to another, so the assessment of what constitutes a scenic vista must consider the perceptions of a variety of viewer groups.

The items that can be seen within a vista are visual resources. Adverse impacts to individual visual resources or the addition of structures or developed areas may or may not adversely affect the vista. Determining the level of impact to a scenic vista requires analyzing the changes to the vista as a whole and also to individual visual resources.

No Impact: The project site is located within a developed County park in the community of Fallbrook and is completely surrounded by residential and commercial development. Based on site visits by County staff on March 3, 2009 and January 18, 2011, the proposed project is not located near or within, or visible from, a scenic vista and will not substantially change the composition of an existing scenic vista in a way that would adversely alter the visual quality or character of the view. Therefore, the proposed project will not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as scenic (Caltrans - California Scenic Highway Program). Generally, the area defined within a State scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. There are no scenic highways designated within the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers. The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surrounding area can be characterized as rural residential development interspersed with commercial and agricultural (orchard/vineyard) facilities on flat to moderately sloping topography.

The proposed project consists of the construction of an outdoor amphitheater and associated park improvements within a developed County Park. The amphitheater will replace existing park amenities including a wooden gazebo and five cement picnic tables. Other development within the Park currently includes playground equipment, baseball fields, a basketball court, a sand volleyball court, a soccer field, horseshoe pits, shade structures, picnic tables and grills, and a concrete dance area and stage. The project is compatible with the existing visual environment's visual character and quality for the following reasons: the project will not introduce any features that would detract from or contrast with the existing visual character and/or quality of the neighborhood; no lighting is proposed; no blockage of views would result from the project (sound panels will only be ten feet high); and the project will not require significant alteration of the existing landform (the project will utilize the existing slope of site and will only require minor grading).

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on visual character or quality because the entire existing viewshed and a list of past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XVII are located within the viewshed surrounding the project and will not contribute to a cumulative impact for the following reasons: the projects will not introduce any features that would contrast with the existing visual character and/or quality of the neighborhood; no blockage of views would result from the projects; and they will not require significant alteration of the existing landform. Therefore, the project will not result in any adverse project or cumulative level effect on visual character or quality on-site or in the surrounding area.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any use of outdoor lighting or building materials with highly reflective properties such as highly reflective glass or high-gloss surface colors. Therefore, the project will not create any new sources of light pollution that could contribute to skyglow, light trespass or glare and adversely affect day or nighttime views in area.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Important Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☑ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project site has land designated as Prime and Unique Farmland. However, the project site is within an existing County Park which was originally developed in 1920 and there has been no agricultural use within the Park since that time. Therefore, the project will not have significant adverse project or cumulative level impacts related to the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Farmland of Local Importance to a non-agricultural use.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☑ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project site is zoned A70, which is considered to be an agricultural zone. However, the project consists of the construction of an outdoor amphitheater within an existing developed County Park and the County's Zoning Ordinance does not apply to the development, use, or improvement of existing County Parks. Additionally, the project site is not under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore,

there will be no conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project site has land designated as Prime and Unique Farmland and the surrounding area within a radius of one-quarter mile has land designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, and agricultural operations including avocado groves. However, the project consists of the construction of an outdoor amphitheater within an existing developed County Park and will not result in the conversion of agricultural resources to non-agricultural uses as this area is dedicated to recreational uses. In addition, the surrounding active agricultural operations are already separated from the Park by residential uses and the project will not change the existing land uses in the area, resulting in change that could convert agricultural operations to a non-agricultural use. Therefore, no potentially significant project or cumulative level conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Farmland of Local Importance to a non-agricultural use will occur as a result of this project.

III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project consists of construction of an outdoor amphitheater and associated park improvements within an existing developed County Park. The operational emissions from the project are below specified screening levels, and subsequently will not violate ambient air quality standards. In addition, because the project is an improvement to an existing assembly area, it is not anticipated to generate any additional vehicle trips. Therefore, the project will not conflict or obstruct with the implementation of the RAQS nor the SIP on a project or cumulative level.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

In general, air quality impacts from land use projects are the result of emissions from motor vehicles, and from short-term construction activities associated with such projects. The San Diego County Land Use Environment Group (LUEG) has established guidelines for determining significance which incorporate the San Diego Air Pollution Control District's (APCD) established screening-level criteria for all new source review (NSR) in APCD Rule 20.2. These screening-level criteria can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project's total emissions (e.g., stationary and fugitive emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality. Since APCD does not have screening-level criteria for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the use of the screening level for reactive organic compounds (ROC) from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for the Coachella Valley (which are more appropriate for the San Diego Air Basin) are used.

Less than Significant Impact: The project consists of construction of an outdoor amphitheater and associated park improvements within an existing developed County Park. Construction of the amphitheater would entail minimal grading consisting of less than 200 cubic yards of cut/excavation and 45 cubic yards of fill. However, grading operations associated with the construction of the project would require the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal, temporary and localized, resulting in pollutant emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance. In addition, because the project is an improvement to an existing assembly area within a developed County Park, it is not anticipated to generate any additional vehicle trips. Therefore, the project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the 1-hour concentrations under the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) for Ozone (O_3). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM_{10}) under the CAAQS. O_3 is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM_{10} in both urban and rural areas include: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

Less than Significant Impact: Air quality emissions associated with the project include emissions of PM_{10}, NO_x and VOCs from construction/grading activities. However, grading on site would be minimal and grading operations associated with the construction of the project would require the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal, localized and temporary resulting in PM_{10} and VOC emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance. Because the project is an improvement to an existing assembly area within a developed County Park, it is not anticipated to generate any additional vehicle trips.

In addition, a list of past, present and future projects within the surrounding area were evaluated and none of these projects emit significant amounts of criteria pollutants. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. The proposed project as well as the past, present and future projects within the surrounding area, have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance, therefore, the construction and operational emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to create a cumulatively considerable impact nor a considerable net increase of PM10, or any O_3 precursors. Therefore, the project will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool-12th Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, or day-care centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes

in air quality. The County of San Diego also considers residences as sensitive receptors since they house children and the elderly.

Less than Significant Impact: The following sensitive receptors have been identified within a quarter-mile (the radius determined by the SCAQMD in which the dilution of pollutants is typically significant) of the proposed project: surrounding residences. However, the project does not propose uses or activities that would result in exposure of these identified sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations and will not place sensitive receptors near carbon monoxide hotspots. In addition, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations because the proposed project as well as the listed projects have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☑ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project could produce objectionable odors, which would result from volatile organic compounds, ammonia, carbon dioxide, hydrogen sulfide, methane, alcohols, aldehydes, amines, carbonyls, esters, disulfides dust and endotoxins from the construction phase. However, these substances, if present at all, would only be in trace amounts (less that 1 $\mu g/m^3$). Subsequently, no significant air quality odor impacts are expected to affect surrounding receptors. Moreover, the affects of objectionable odors are localized to the immediate surrounding area and will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable odor.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☑ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, and site visits by County staff on March 3, 2009 and January 18, 2011, it has been determined that the project site is located within a developed portion

of the Park that supports scattered coast live oak trees (*Quercus agrifolia*) with an understory consisting of areas of mowed grass and woodchips. This area previously had been significantly disturbed by minor grading during construction of the Park and is subject to a high degree of foot traffic disturbance from usage of the existing facilities. The project has been designed to avoid the majority of the existing oak trees on site, but will require the removal of four existing oak trees; however, two of the oak trees to be removed are showing signs of rot and are heavily leaning, and one is weakened at the crotch and is being held together with metal ties. The four oak trees that will be removed due to existing poor condition and/or construction will be replaced by planting six to eight 36- to 48-inch box coast live oak trees as well as native shrub and groundcover vegetation surrounding the perimeter of the amphitheater. Permanent underground irrigation will be provided to ensure plant establishment and health. The remaining oak trees on site will be carefully preserved with construction fencing placed outside the drip line to prevent root damage during construction. Therefore, the project will not have a substantial adverse effect on any candidate, sensitive, or special status species and would not contribute to cumulative impacts to these designated species.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: County staff conducted site visits on March 3, 2009 and January 18, 2011. As a result, staff has determined that the proposed project site does not contain any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities as defined by the County of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), Fish and Game Code, Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, or any other local or regional plans, policies or regulations. Therefore, the project will not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on site visits conducted by County staff on March 3, 2009 and January 18, 2011, it has been determined that the proposed project site where construction will occur does not contain any wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, stream, lake, river or water of the U.S., that could potentially be impacted through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, diversion or obstruction by the proposed development. An intermittent rock-lined jurisdictional creek channel does traverse Live Oak Park, but this area will not be impacted by the project. Therefore, no impacts will occur to wetlands defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, and site visits by County staff on March 3, 2009 and January 18, 2011, it was determined that the project site is located within a developed portion of the Park that has limited biological value. Impedance of the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, the use of an established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, and the use of native wildlife nursery sites would not be expected as a result of the proposed project for the following reasons: the project site is not located within an established wildlife corridor, the total impact area is very small (approximately 0.2 acre), the project site is already developed with a wooden gazebo and picnic tables, and the project will be conditioned to avoid grading and construction during the avian breeding season. Therefore, the project would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources. The proposed project site is located within the boundaries of the County of San Diego North County Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), a subarea plan under the County's MSCP that is not yet approved. While specific criteria requirements have not yet been established for the North County subarea plan, the proposed project site is located within a residential developed area outside of the proposed preserve or pre-approved mitigation area (PAMA) boundaries. Additionally, the project will not preclude or prevent the preparation of the North County MSCP nor will it preclude connectivity between areas of high habitat value. The project would not result in impacts to habitats subject to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance; therefore, a Habitat Loss Permit will not be necessary.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Based on an analysis of County of San Diego archaeology resource files, archaeological records, maps and aerial photographs, and a survey of the property by County of San Diego Historian, Dr. Lynne Newell Christenson, it has been determined that there are one or more historical resources within the project site. These resources include concrete picnic tables that date to the 1960s. These tables were evaluated in a report entitled, County of San Diego Department of Parks and Recreation Live Oak Park Tables, dated August 2003, and prepared by Fallbrook resident and local historian Margaret Ray and County Historian Dr. Lynne Newell Christenson. The report indicates that these tables are replicas of other earlier tables within the Park that date to the 1920s, and that these more modern tables are eroding, chipping, and falling apart, while the original tables (from the 1920s) show much less wear. The 1960s picnic tables have little historical value and are not considered significant pursuant to the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15064.5. Moreover, if the resources are not considered significant historic resources pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5 loss of these resources cannot contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☑ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Based on an analysis of records and an archaeological survey on foot conducted during a site visit by County of San Diego Historian, Dr. Lynne Newell Christenson, on March 3, 2009, it was determined that while the general area was known to be used by Native Americans in the past, there are no potentially significant cultural resources within the project site. The project site was significantly disturbed during construction of the Park itself and currently there is significant foot traffic disturbance due to the high degree of usage of the Park facilities. In addition, there is extensive bioturbation from rodent disturbance found throughout the Park. The current project proposes only minimal grading within the project site and the project will be conditioned so that an archaeological monitor and a Native American monitor will be on site for any ground disturbance activities. Therefore, the project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

San Diego County has a variety of geologic environments and geologic processes which generally occur in other parts of the state, country, and the world. However, some features stand out as being unique in one way or another within the boundaries of the County.

No Impact: The site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been listed in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Unique Geology Resources nor does the site support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features.

d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: A review of the County's Paleontological Resources Maps indicates that the project is located entirely on plutonic igneous rock and has no potential for producing fossil remains.

e) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of records and an archaeological survey on foot conducted during a site visit by County of San Diego Historian, Dr. Lynne Newell Christenson, on March 3, 2009, it has been determined that the project will not disturb any human remains because the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains. In addition, the project will not disturb any human remains since prior grading of the project site has eliminated any potential for the presence of interred human remains, the project site is currently disturbed from foot traffic and bioturbation, the project proposes only minimal grading within the project site, and the project will be conditioned so that an archaeological monitor and a Native American monitor will be on site for any ground disturbance activities. Therefore, the project will not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Interim Revision 2007, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California, or located within any other area with substantial evidence of a known fault. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known fault-rupture hazard zone as a result of this project.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The *Uniform Building Code* (UBC) and the *California Building Code* (CBC) classifies all San Diego County with the highest seismic zone criteria, Zone 4. However, the proposed project is not located within five kilometers of the centerline of a known active-fault zone as defined within the *Uniform Building Code's Maps of Known Active Fault Near-Source Zones in California*. Additionally, to ensure the structural integrity of all structures, the project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. Therefore, the project will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is not within a "Potential Liquefaction Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. This indicates that the geologic environment of the project site is not susceptible to ground failure from seismic activity. In addition, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill or located within a floodplain. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure, including liquefaction.

iv. Landslides?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is not within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. Landslide Susceptibility Areas were developed based on landslide risk profiles included in the *Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, San Diego, CA* (URS 2004). Landslide risk

areas from this plan were based on data including steep slopes (greater than 25%); soil series data (SANDAG based on USGS 1970s series); soil-slip susceptibility from USGS; and Landslide Hazard Zone Maps (limited to western portion of the County) developed by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. Also included within Landslide Susceptibility Areas are gabbroic soils on slopes steeper than 15% in grade because these soils are slide prone. Since the project is not located within an identified Landslide Susceptibility Area and the geologic environment has a low probability to become unstable, the project would have no impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from landslides.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Visalia sandy loam, which has a soil erodibility rating of “slight” as indicated by the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service, dated December 1973. Moreover, the project will not result in unprotected erodible soils; will not alter existing drainage patterns; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature; will not develop steep slopes; and will include Best Management Practices (BMPs) to ensure sediment does not erode from the proposed project site during construction. Therefore, the project will not result in soil erosion or loss of topsoil.

c) Will the project produce unstable geological conditions that will result in adverse impacts resulting from landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located on or near geological formations that are unstable or would potentially become unstable as a result of the project. For further information refer to Section VI. Geology and Soils, Question a., i-iv listed above.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not contain expansive soils as defined by Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). The soils on-site are Visalia sandy loam. These soils have a shrink-swell behavior of low and represent no substantial risks to life or property. Therefore, the project will not create a substantial risk to life or property. This was confirmed by staff review of the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is for construction of an outdoor amphitheater within an existing developed County Park. The project does not propose any septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems since no wastewater will be generated.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity.

b) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Therefore, the project will not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

c) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or is otherwise known to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on a site visit and records search, the project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances. The project site is not included in any of the following lists or databases: the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, the San Diego County Hazardous Materials Establishment database, the San Diego County DEH Site Assessment and Mitigation (SAM) Case Listing, the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program Database ("CalSites" Envirostor Database), the Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRIS) listing, the EPA's Superfund CERCLIS database or the EPA's National Priorities List (NPL). Additionally, the project does not propose structures for human occupancy or significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill, is not located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash), is not on or within 1,000 feet of a Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS), does not contain a leaking Underground Storage Tank**,** and is not located on a site with the potential for contamination from historic uses such as intensive agriculture, industrial uses, a gas station or vehicle repair shop. Therefore, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment.

d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☑ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project is located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for MCAS Camp Pendleton. However, the proposed project will not result in hazards to airport safety or surrounding land uses for the following reasons:

- The project will comply with Airport Land Use Compatibility Policies for MCAS Camp Pendleton including: Noise, Safety, Airspace Protection, and Overflight Compatibility Policies.
- The project does not propose any distracting visual hazards including but not limited to distracting lights, glare, sources of smoke or other obstacles or an electronic hazard that would interfere with aircraft instruments or radio communications. Therefore, the project complies with the Federal Aviation Administration Runway Approach Protection Standards (Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 77 – Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace).
- The project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport.
- The project does not propose any artificial bird attractor, including but not limited to reservoirs, golf courses with water hazards, large detention and retention basins, wetlands, landscaping with water features, wildlife refuges, or agriculture (especially cereal grains).

Therefore, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip. As a result, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

The following sections summarize the project's consistency with applicable emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN:

Less than Significant Impact: The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a comprehensive emergency plan that defines responsibilities, establishes an emergency organization, defines lines of communications, and is designed to be part of the statewide Standardized Emergency Management System. The Operational Area Emergency Plan provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan includes an overview of the risk assessment process, identifies hazards present in the jurisdiction, hazard profiles, and vulnerability assessments. The plan also identifies goals, objectives and actions for each jurisdiction in the County of San Diego, including all cities and the County unincorporated areas. The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan will not be interfered with by the project due to the location of the project, plant and the specific requirements of the plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius. All land area within 10 miles of the plant is not within the jurisdiction of the unincorporated County and as such a project in the unincorporated area is not expected to interfere with any response or evacuation.

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

No Impact: The Oil Spill Contingency Element will not be interfered with because the project is not located along the coastal zone or coastline.

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan will not be interfered with because the project does not propose altering major water or energy supply infrastructure, such as the California Aqueduct.

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

Less than Significant Impact: The Dam Evacuation Plan for Red Mountain Reservoir will not be interfered with because even though the project is located along the outer boundary of a dam inundation zone, the project would not be difficult to safely evacuate in the event of a dam failure. Although an "amphitheater" is listed as a unique institution, the proposed Live Oak Park amphitheater does not meet the definition of a unique institution provided by the Office of Emergency Services (OES). Unique institutions are loosely defined by OES as "land uses that would typically be difficult to evacuate safely and expeditiously, thus impeding successful implementation of a Dam Evacuation Plan" and "those uses which, given the size and nature of the use, have inherent risks and pose additional concerns in the event of an evacuation." The proposed Live Oak Park amphitheater is an outdoor multi-purpose gathering area with a relatively small capacity (less than 100 people) and does not include any walls or barriers that would impede evacuation. In addition, the proposed amphitheater is located in an area that is currently used as an assembly area and a Site Emergency Response Plan has been developed for the Park. Therefore, the project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with the implementation of an emergency response plan.

g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is completely surrounded by residential and commercial development, and/or irrigated lands and no wildlands are adjacent to the project. Also, the project consists of the construction of an outdoor amphitheater with no walls within a developed County Park that is serviced by the North County Fire Protection District. Therefore, the project is not expected to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving hazardous wildland fires.

h) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve or support uses that allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours (3 days) or more (e.g., artificial lakes, agricultural irrigation ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses. Moreover, based on a site visits conducted by County staff on March 3, 2009 and January 18, 2011, there are none of these uses on adjacent properties. Therefore, the project will not substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose waste discharges that require waste discharge requirement permits, NPDES permits, or water quality certification from the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). In addition, the project does not propose any known sources of polluted runoff or land use activities that would require special site design considerations, source control BMPs or treatment control BMPs, under the San Diego Municipal Storm Water Permit (RWQCB Order No. R9-2007-0001).

b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☑ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project lies in the 903.12 Bonsall hydrologic subarea within the San Luis Rey River hydrologic unit. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, March 2007, the mouth of the San Luis Rey River is impaired for bacteria, Guajome Lake is impaired for nutrients, and the 19-mile downstream reach of the San Luis Rey River is impaired for total dissolved solids and chloride. Constituents

of concern in the San Luis Rey River watershed include enterococci, fecal coliform, dissolved minerals, chemical oxygen demand, and turbidity.

The project proposes the following activities that are associated with these pollutants: minimal amounts of ground disturbance including less than 200 cubic yards of excavation, and 100 cubic yards of fill associated with construction of the outdoor amphitheater. However, a Water Pollution Control Plan (WPCP) will be prepared and implemented prior to construction and will include site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs to be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced in any runoff to the maximum extent practicable so as not to increase the level of these pollutants in receiving waters. BMPs may include, but are not limited to, perimeter controls (fiber rolls), sediment control (filters and sandbags), and stabilized construction entrance/exit areas.

All proposed BMPs will be consistent with the regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result, the project will not contribute to a cumulative impact to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d). Regional surface water and storm water permitting regulation for County of San Diego, Incorporated Cities of San Diego County, and San Diego Unified Port District includes the following: California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), San Diego Region Order No. R9-2007-0001, NPDES No. CAS0108758, issued January 24, 2007; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ordinance No. 9926, revised March 2008); County Storm Water Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended August 5, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9589). The stated purposes of these ordinances are to protect the health, safety and general welfare of the County of San Diego residents; to protect water resources and to improve water quality; to cause the use of management practices by the County and its citizens that will reduce the adverse effects of polluted runoff discharges on waters of the state; to secure benefits from the use of storm water as a resource; and to ensure the County is compliant with applicable state and federal laws. Ordinance No. 9926 (WPO) has discharge prohibitions, and requirements that vary depending on type of land use activity and location in the County. Ordinance No. 9589 is Appendix A of Ordinance No. 9926 (WPO) and sets out in more detail, by project category, what dischargers must do to comply with the Ordinance and to receive permits for projects and activities that are subject to the Ordinance. Collectively, these regulations establish standards for projects to follow which intend to improve water quality from headwaters to the deltas of each watershed in the County. Each project subject to WPO is required to propose BMPs or design measures to mitigate any impacts that may occur in the watershed.

c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation
- ☑ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Incorporated

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The RWQCB has designated water quality objectives for waters of the San Diego Region as outlined in Chapter 3 of the Water Quality Control Plan (Plan). The water quality objectives are necessary to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit as described in Chapter 2 of the Plan.

The project lies in the 903.12 Bonsall hydrologic subarea, within the San Luis Rey River hydrologic unit that has the following existing and potential beneficial uses for inland surface waters, coastal waters, reservoirs and lakes, and ground water: municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply; industrial process supply; industrial service supply; freshwater replenishment; hydropower generation; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; cold freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; marine habitat; migration of aquatic organisms; and, rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat.

The project proposes construction of an outdoor amphitheater in an existing developed County Park. A WPCP will be prepared and implemented prior to construction and will include site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs to be employed such that the proposed project will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses. BMPs may include, but are not limited to, perimeter controls (fiber rolls), drainage system inlet protection and sediment control (filters and sandbags), and stabilized construction entrance/exit areas.

In addition, the proposed BMPs are consistent with the regional surface water, storm water and groundwater planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses. Refer to Section VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality, Question b, for more information on regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process.

d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The existing Live Oak Park obtains its water supply from the Rainbow Municipal Water District which obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported water source. The proposed project is for the construction of an outdoor amphitheater and will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation, domestic or commercial demands. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge including, but not limited to the following: the project does not involve regional diversion of water to another groundwater basin; or diversion or channelization of a stream course or waterway with impervious layers, such as concrete lining or culverts, for substantial distances (e.g., one-quarter mile). These activities and operations can substantially affect rates of groundwater recharge. Therefore, no impact to groundwater resources is anticipated.

e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project proposes construction of an outdoor amphitheater and associated park improvements within a developed County Park. The proposed project will implement site design measures, source control, and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable. The project design provides for minimal ground disturbance and will maintain the existing drainage flow on site. A WPCP will be prepared and implemented prior to construction and will include site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs. BMPs may include, but are not limited to, perimeter controls (fiber rolls), drainage system inlet protection and sediment control (filters and sandbags) and stabilized construction entrance/exit areas. These measures will control erosion and sedimentation and satisfy waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (RWQCB Order No. R9-2007-0001), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in significantly increased erosion or sedimentation potential and will not alter any drainage patterns of the site or area on- or off-site. In addition, because erosion and sedimentation will be controlled within the boundaries of the project, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. For further information on soil erosion refer to Section VI. Geology and Soils, Question b.

f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☑ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The proposed project will not significantly alter established drainage patterns or significantly increase the amount of runoff for the following reasons:

- The project design will maintain the existing drainage flow on site, which is conveyed to either natural drainage channels or approved drainage facilities.
- The project will not increase water surface elevation in a watercourse with a watershed equal to or greater one square mile by 2/10 of a foot or more in height.
- The project will not increase surface runoff exiting the project site equal to or greater than one cubic foot/second.

Therefore, the project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. Moreover, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable alteration or a drainage pattern or increase in the rate or amount of runoff, because the project will substantially increase water surface elevation or runoff exiting the site, as detailed above.

g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☑ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project will result in the conversion of approximately 2,597 square feet (less than 6.5 percent of the total project site area) of previously pervious land to impervious surfaces. Run-off would be directed to pervious surfaces. This amount of conversion to impervious surfaces will not contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing storm water drainage systems. Therefore, the project will not create or contribute significant runoff water which would exceed the capacity of the existing storm water drainage system.

h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Potential sources of polluted runoff from the proposed project include the following: construction activities. However, a WPCP will be prepared and implemented prior to construction and will include site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs to be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced in runoff to the maximum extent practicable. BMPs may include, but are not limited to, perimeter controls (fiber rolls), drainage system inlet protection and sediment control (filters and sandbags), and stabilized construction entrance/exit areas. Refer to Section VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality, Questions a, b, c, for further information.

i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve the placement of housing. Therefore, no impact will occur.

j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant: A seasonal creek, which is identified as being a 100-year flood hazard area, runs through the project site. However, the creek bed is contained by 4-foot-tall stone masonry retaining walls and the project is not proposing to place structures, access roads or other improvements which will impede or redirect flood flows in this area.

k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant: A portion of the project site along Live Oak Creek lies within a special flood hazard area as identified on the County Flood Plain Map. However, the creek bed is contained by stone masonry retaining walls and the proposed amphitheater will be located outside the floodplain at an elevation that would prevent exposure of people or property to flooding.

l) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant: The project site lies on the outer boundary of a mapped dam inundation area for the Red Mountain Reservoir within San Diego County. However, the proposed project will not result in exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss injury, or death because the proposed amphitheater is an outdoor multi-purpose gathering area with a relatively small capacity (less than 100 people) and does not include any wall or barriers that would impede evacuation outside of the inundation zone (approximately 50 feet away). In addition, the San Diego County Office of Emergency Services has an established emergency evacuation plan for the area and Live Oak Park has an established Site Emergency Response Plan, and the project will not interfere with either of these plans.

m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

i. SEICHE

No Impact: The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir; therefore, could not be inundated by a seiche.

ii. TSUNAMI

No Impact: The project site is located more than a mile from the coast; therefore, in the event of a tsunami, would not be inundated.

iii. MUDFLOW

No Impact: Mudflow is type of landslide. The site is not located within a landslide susceptibility zone. Also, the geologic environment of the project area has a low probability to be located within an area of potential or pre-existing conditions that could become unstable in the event of seismic activity. In addition, though the project does propose minimal grading (minor contouring) that will temporarily expose unprotected soils, the project is not located downstream from unprotected, exposed soils within a landslide susceptibility zone. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the project will expose people or property to inundation due to a mudflow.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose the introduction of new infrastructure such as major roadways or water supply systems, or utilities to the area. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

b) 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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☑ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The proposed project is subject to the Regional Land Use Element Policy Estate Development Area (EDA) and General Plan Land Use Designation (22) Public/Semi-Public Lands. This designation indicates lands generally owned by public agencies. This designation is consistent with all categories of the Regional Land Use Element. The project is also subject to the policies of the Fallbrook Community Plan. The proposed project is consistent with the Parks & Recreational Goals and Policies of the Fallbrook Community Plan. The current zone is A70, Limited

Agriculture; however, the Zoning Ordinance does not apply to the development, use, or improvement of new or existing County parks.

The project falls within the MCAS Camp Pendleton Airport Influence Area - Review Area 2 and thus is subject to the MCAS Camp Pendleton Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) (adopted 2008). Limits on the heights of structures, particularly in areas of high terrain, are the only restrictions on land uses within Review Area 2. The project does not propose any structure greater than 30 feet in height and is therefore consistent with the MCAS Camp Pendleton ALUCP Compatibility Policies.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997) as an area of "Potential Mineral Resource Significance" (MRZ-3). However, the project site is located within an existing developed County Park surrounded by residential and commercial land uses, which are incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. Therefore, implementation of the project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value since the mineral resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is not considered to be an Extractive Use Zone (S-82) nor does it have an Impact Sensitive Land Use Designation (24) with an Extractive Land Use Overlay (25) (County Land Use Element, 2000). Therefore, no potentially significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource of locally important mineral resource recovery (extraction) site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan will occur as a result of this project.

XI. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The proposed project consists of the construction of an outdoor amphitheater in an area currently used as an assembly area within a developed County Park and does not support any noise-generating equipment. Based on a site visits completed by County staff on March 3, 2009 and January 18, 2011, the surrounding area supports spaced rural residential and limited commercial development. The project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable standards for the following reasons:

General Plan – Noise Element

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Policy 4b addresses noise sensitive areas and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise sensitive areas to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels [dB(A)]. Moreover, if the project is in excess of CNEL 60 dB(A), modifications must be made to the project to reduce noise levels. Noise sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries, or similar facilities, where quiet is an important attribute.

Project implementation is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to road, airport, heliport, railroad, industrial or other noise in excess of the CNEL 60 dB(A). This is based on staff's review of projected County noise contour maps [CNEL 60 dB(A) contours]. In addition, the forecast for amphitheater noise is estimated to be 47 dBA at 50 feet based on the Handbook of Noise Control (Harris 1979), which states the noise level for a loud voice is 50 dBA at 50 feet and for a shout is approximately 58 dBA at 50 feet. For the proposed amphitheater, it was assumed that an orator would speak in a loud voice approximately 45 percent of an hour, and that spectators would cheer approximately 5 percent of the time, and that no amplification would be allowed. An amphitheater in which sound amplification was not allowed would produce sound level below the threshold of significance for noise sensitive areas. Therefore, the project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.404

Section 36.404 of the Noise Ordinance prohibits one-hour average sound levels (decibels) at the property line on which the sound is produced to exceed the applicable limits set forth for each zone. The project site and adjacent properties are zoned A70

that has a one-hour average sound limit of 50 dB(A) between the hours of 7 AM and 10 PM, and 45 dB(A) between the hours of 10 PM and 7 AM.

Non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404) at or beyond the project's property line. The proposed amphitheater would not be located within 200 feet from an adjacent multi-family residential use or other noise sensitive use and noise levels are not anticipated to impact adjoining properties or exceed County Noise Standards, which is 55 dB(A), because the project does not involve any noise producing equipment that would exceed applicable noise levels at the adjoining property line.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.410

The project will not generate construction noise that may exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.410). Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.410. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75dB between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM.

Finally, the project's conformance to the County of San Diego General Plan (Noise Element, Policy 4b) and County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-404 and 36.410) ensures the project will not create cumulatively considerable noise impacts, because the project will not exceed the local noise standards for noise sensitive areas; and the project will not exceed the applicable noise level limits at the property line or construction noise limits, derived from State regulation to address human health and quality of life concerns. Therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of persons or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, and applicable standards of other agencies.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any of the following land uses that can be impacted by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

1. Buildings where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation, including research and manufacturing facilities with special vibration constraints.
2. Residences and buildings where people normally sleep including hotels, hospitals, residences and where low ambient vibration is preferred.
3. Civic and institutional land uses including schools, churches, libraries, other institutions, and quiet offices where low ambient vibration is preferred.

4. Concert halls for symphonies or other special use facilities where low ambient vibration is preferred.

Also, the project does not propose any major, new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on-site or in the surrounding area.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Studies completed by the Organization of Industry Standards (ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747) state an increase of 10 dB is perceived twice as loud and is perceived as a significant increase in the ambient noise level. The proposed project is for an outdoor amphitheater that does not support any noise-generating equipment and would not result in an increase in noise levels by 10 dB. However, the project involves the following noise sources that may increase the ambient noise level: construction activities that may last 4 to 6 months. As indicated in the response listed under Section XI. Noise, Question a., the project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas in the vicinity to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State and Federal noise control. Also, the project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels.

The project will not result in cumulative noise impacts because a list of past, present, and future projects within the vicinity were evaluated. It was determined that the project in combination with a list of past, present and future projects would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project does not involve any uses that may create substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity including, but not limited to, extractive industry; outdoor commercial or industrial uses that involve crushing, cutting, drilling, grinding, or blasting of raw materials; truck depots, transfer stations or delivery areas; or outdoor sound systems. The forecast for amphitheater noise is estimated to be 47 dBA at 50 feet based on the Handbook of Noise Control (Harris 1979), which states the noise level for a loud voice is 50 dBA at 50 feet and for a shout is approximately 58 dBA at 50 feet. For the proposed amphitheater, it was assumed that an orator would speak in a loud voice approximately 45 percent of an hour, and that spectators would cheer approximately 5 percent of the time, and that no amplification would be allowed. An amphitheater in which sound amplification was not allowed would produce sound level below the threshold of significance for off-site sensitive receptors including residences.

Also, general construction noise is not expected to exceed the construction noise limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.410), which are derived from State regulations to address human health and quality of life concerns. Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.410. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of 75 dB for more than an 8 hours during a 24-hour period. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The proposed project is located within the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for MCAS Camp Pendleton. However, project implementation is not expected to expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels in excess of the CNEL 60 dB(A). This is based on staff's review of projected County noise contour maps (CNEL 60 dB(A) contours). The location of the project is outside of the CNEL 60 dB(A) contours for the airport.

In addition, based on the list of past, present and future projects there are no new or expanded public airports projects in the vicinity that may extend the boundaries of the CNEL 60 dB noise contour or ALUCP. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not induce substantial population growth in an area because the project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in an area including, but limited to the following: new or extended infrastructure or public facilities; new commercial or industrial facilities; large-scale residential development; accelerated conversion of homes to commercial or multi-family use; or regulatory changes including General Plan amendments, specific plan amendments, zone reclassifications, sewer or water annexations; or LAFCO annexation actions.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not displace any existing housing since the project site is currently vacant and is within the boundaries of an existing County park.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not displace a substantial number of people since the project site is currently vacant and is within the boundaries of an existing County park.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

i. Fire protection?
ii. Police protection?
iii. Schools?
iv. Parks?
v. Other public facilities?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities including, but not limited to, fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Therefore, the project will not have an adverse physical effect on the environment because the project does not require new or significantly altered services or facilities to be constructed.

XIV. RECREATION

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any residential use including, but not limited to, a residential subdivision, mobile home park, or construction for a single-family residence that may increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities in the vicinity. The project itself is an improvement to an existing County park.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any residential use including, but not limited to, a residential subdivision, mobile home park, or construction for a single-family residence that may increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities in the vicinity. The project itself is an improvement to an existing County park.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Because the project is an improvement to an existing assembly area within a developed County Park, it is not anticipated to generate any additional ADTs. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system.

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency and/or as identified by the County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Program for designated roads or highways?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Because the project is an improvement to an existing assembly area within a developed County Park, it is not anticipated to generate any additional ADTs. Therefore, the proposed project will have no direct or cumulative impact on the level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☑ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant: The main compatibility concerns for the protection of airport airspace are related to airspace obstructions (building height, antennas, etc.) and hazards to flight (wildlife attractants, distracting lighting or glare, etc.). The proposed project is located within the MCAS Camp Pendleton Influence Area. The project consists of construction of an outdoor amphitheater and associated park improvements within a developed County Park, and is located within Review Area 2, but falls outside of the designated safety zones for MCAS Camp Pendleton. Limits on the heights of structures, particularly in areas of high terrain, are the only restrictions on land uses within Review Area 2. The proposed amphitheater and other Park improvements are consistent with the height restrictions identified for Review Area 2 within Policy 2.6.2(a)(2) of the ALUCP for MCAS Camp Pendleton, therefore the project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns. Furthermore, the project would not exceed the FAR Part 77 criteria related to airspace obstructions. Refer also to section VII.e Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Therefore, the proposed project will not have a significant impact on air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways, or create or place curves, slopes or walls which impede adequate sight distance on a road.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not result in inadequate emergency access. The proposed project consists of construction of an outdoor amphitheater and associated park improvements within an existing County park that already has adequate emergency access. The proposed project will not change the current adequate emergency access in any way; therefore, there will be no impact.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
☑ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Parking for the project will be provided at the existing Live Oak Park parking areas. There are two existing paved parking lots with a total of 140 parking spaces (including 8 accessible spaces), and one unpaved parking area with approximately 20 spaces. Therefore, the existing Park parking areas provide sufficient on-site parking capacity for the project when considering the type of use and capacity of the amphitheater.

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project consists of the installation and conversion of accessory structures within an existing County park. Project implementation will not result in any new development or new road design features. Therefore, the project will not conflict with policies regarding alternative transportation.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve any uses that will discharge any wastewater to sanitary sewer or on-site wastewater systems (septic). Therefore, the project will not exceed any wastewater treatment requirements.

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not include new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. In addition, the project does not require the construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, the project will not require any construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not include new or expanded storm water drainage facilities. Therefore, the project will not cause any significant environmental effects.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project does not involve or require water services from a water district. The project is the construction of an outdoor amphitheater that does not rely on water service for any purpose.

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is the construction of an outdoor amphitheater within a developed County Park and will not produce any wastewater. Therefore, the project will not interfere with any wastewater treatment providers' service capacity.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☑ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: It is unlikely that implementation of the project will generate solid waste. However, all solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and

California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). There are five, permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity. Therefore, in the event removal of trash and/or debris is required to implement the project, there is sufficient existing permitted solid waste capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Implementation of the project may generate small quantities of solid waste associated with the removal of trash (e.g., water bottles, food wrappers) brought onsite from patrons utilizing the facility. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440 et seq.). The project will deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility and, therefore, will comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or

prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for significant cumulative effects. There is no substantial evidence that there are biological or cultural resources that are affected or associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

The following list of past, present and future projects were considered and evaluated as a part of this Initial Study:

PROJECT NAME	PERMIT NUMBER	PERMIT STATUS
SD-948 Ihde Property/Cingular – Minor Use	3400 03-006	Approved
Live Oak 7434c/Nextel – Minor Use	3400 01-113	Approved
SPRINT Carriage Lane – Minor Use	3400 00-110	Approved
NS304 Gird Rd. Ihde Property – Major Use	3300 11-002	Approved
Hollingsworth – Administrative Permit	3000 06-012	Approved
Schilling – Tentative Parcel Map	3200 20467	Approved
Sherman – Tentative Parcel Map	3200 20096	Approved
American Lotus Buddhist Assn – Tentative Parcel Map	3200 21047	Approved
Johnson – Tentative Parcel Map	3200 20980	Approved
Godfrey – Tentative Parcel Map	3200 20244	Approved

No Impact: Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in sections I through XVI of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that there are cumulative effects associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☑ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections: I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VI. Geology and Soils, VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality, XI. Noise, XII. Population and Housing, and XV. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that there are adverse effects on human beings associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

XVIII. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

All references to Federal, State and local regulation are available on the Internet. For Federal regulations refer to http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/. For State regulations refer to www.leginfo.ca.gov. For County regulations refer to www.amlegal.com. All other references are available upon request.

Christenson, L. and M. Ray. 2003. County of San Diego Department of Parks and Recreation Live Oak Park Tables. Report on file at County of San Diego Department of Parks and Recreation History Center.

Harris, C. 1979. Handbook of Noise Control. Second Edition. McGraw-Hill Publishing Company.

Mead & Hunt. 2008. MCAS Camp Pendleton Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. Adopted by the San Diego County Airport Land Use Commission June 5, 2008.

AESTHETICS

California Street and Highways Code [California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/)

California Scenic Highway Program, California Streets and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/scpr.htm)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Sections 5200-5299; 5700-5799; 5900-5910, 6322-6326. ((www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-73: Hillside Development Policy. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-104: Policy and Procedures for Preparation of Community Design Guidelines, Section 396.10 of the County Administrative Code and Section 5750 et seq. of the County Zoning Ordinance. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, General Plan, Scenic Highway Element VI and Scenic Highway Program. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Light Pollution Code, Title 5, Division 9 (Sections 59.101-59.115 of the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances) as added by Ordinance No 6900, effective January 18, 1985, and amended July 17, 1986 by Ordinance No. 7155. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Wireless Communications Ordinance [San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances. (www.amlegal.com)

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County. (Alpine, Bonsall, Fallbrook, Julian, Lakeside, Ramona, Spring Valley, Sweetwater, Valley Center).

Federal Communications Commission, Telecommunications Act of 1996 [Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. LA. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996). (http://www.fcc.gov/Reports/tcom1996.txt)

Institution of Lighting Engineers, Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution, Warwickshire, UK, 2000 (http://www.dark-skies.org/ile-gd-e.htm)

International Light Inc., Light Measurement Handbook, 1997. (www.intl-light.com)

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center, National Lighting Product Information Program (NLPIP), Lighting Answers, Volume 7, Issue 2, March 2003. (www.lrc.rpi.edu)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000, Urbanized Area Outline Map, San Diego, CA. (http://www.census.gov/geo/www/maps/ua2kmaps.htm)

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System. (www.blm.gov)

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.

US Department of Transportation, National Highway System Act of 1995 [Title III, Section 304. Design Criteria for the

National Highway System. (http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legsregs/nhsdatoc.html)

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "A Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program," November 1994. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conversion, "California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model Instruction Manual," 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965. (www.ceres.ca.gov, www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996. (www.qp.gov.bc.ca)

County of San Diego Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer Information Ordinance, 1994, Title 6, Division 3, Ch. 4. Sections 63.401-63.408. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures, "2002 Crop Statistics and Annual Report," 2002. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System. (www.nrcs.usda.gov, www.swcs.org).

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

AIR QUALITY

CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Revised November 1993. (www.aqmd.gov)

County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District's Rules and Regulations, updated August 2003. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Federal Clean Air Act US Code; Title 42; Chapter 85 Subchapter 1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

BIOLOGY

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Natural Community Conservation Planning Process Guidelines. CDFG and California Resources Agency, Sacramento, California. 1993. (www.dfg.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, An Ordinance Amending the San Diego County Code to Establish a Process for Issuance of the Coastal Sage Scrub Habitat Loss Permits and Declaring the Urgency Thereof to Take Effect Immediately, Ordinance No. 8365. 1994, Title 8, Div 6, Ch. 1. Sections 86.101-86.105, 87.202.2. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Ord. Nos. 8845, 9246, 1998 (new series). (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Implementing Agreement by and between United States Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game and County of San Diego. County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, 1998.

County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Subarea Plan, 1997.

Holland, R.R. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. State of California, Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California, 1986.

Memorandum of Understanding [Agreement Between United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), San Diego County Fire Chief's Association and the Fire District's Association of San Diego County.

Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v County of Stanislaus (5th Dist. 1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 155-159 [39 Cal. Rptr.2d 54]. (www.ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Laboratory. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Research Program Technical Report Y-87-1. 1987. (http://www.wes.army.mil/)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. America's wetlands: our vital link between land and water. Office of Water, Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds. EPA843-K-95-001. 1995b. (www.epa.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1996. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Consultation Handbook: Procedures for Conducting Consultation and Conference Activities Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1998. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Environmental Assessment and Land Protection Plan for the Vernal Pools Stewardship Project. Portland, Oregon. 1997.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Vernal Pools of Southern California Recovery Plan. U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Region One, Portland, Oregon, 1998. (ecos.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory. 2002. (migratorybirds.fws.gov)

CULTURAL RESOURCES

California Health & Safety Code. §18950-18961, State Historic Building Code. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029, Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5, Human Remains. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code §5024.1, Register of Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5031-5033, State Landmarks. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097-5097.6, Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historic Sites. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097.9-5097.991, Native American Heritage. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

City of San Diego. Paleontological Guidelines. (revised) August 1998.

County of San Diego, Local Register of Historical Resources (Ordinance 9493), 2002. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Demere, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh. Paleontological Resources San Diego County. Department of Paleontology, San Diego Natural History Museum. 1994.

Moore, Ellen J. Fossil Mollusks of San Diego County. San Diego Society of Natural history. Occasional; Paper 15. 1968.

U.S. Code including: American Antiquities Act (16 USC §431-433) 1906. Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act (16 USC §461-467), 1935. Reservoir Salvage Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1960. Department of Transportation Act (49 USC §303) 1966. National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC §470 et seq.) 1966. National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC §4321) 1969. Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC §1451) 1972. National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431) 1972. Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1974. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC §35) 1976. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 USC §1996 and 1996a) 1978. Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC §470aa-mm) 1979. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991. American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

GEOLOGY & SOILS

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Publication 42, Interim Revision 2007. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Title 6, Division 8, Chapter 3, Septic Ranks and Seepage Pits. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Land and Water Quality Division, February 2002. On-site Wastewater Systems (Septic Systems): Permitting Process and Design Criteria. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Natural Resource Inventory, Section 3, Geology.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

American Planning Association, Zoning News, "Saving Homes from Wildfires: Regulating the Home Ignition Zone," May 2001.

California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements, Chapter 16 Section 162. (www.buildersbook.com)

California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Government Code. § 8585-8589, Emergency Services Act. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998. (www.dtsc.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25117 and §25316. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code § 2000-2067. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2. Hazardous Buildings. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Resources Agency, "OES Dam Failure Inundation Mapping and Emergency Procedures Program", 1996. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Consolidated Fire Code Health and Safety Code §13869.7, including Ordinances of the 17 Fire Protection Districts as Ratified by the San Diego County Board of Supervisors, First Edition, October 17, 2001 and Amendments to the Fire Code portion of the State Building Standards Code, 1998 Edition.

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health Community Health Division Vector Surveillance and Control. Annual Report for Calendar Year 2002. March 2003. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARP) Guidelines. (http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/, www.oes.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 5, CH. 3, Section 35.39100.030, Wildland/Urban Interface Ordinance, Ord. No.9111, 2000. (www.amlegal.com)

Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act as amended October 30, 2000, US Code, Title 42, Chapter 68, 5121, et seq. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Emergency Plan, March 2000.

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Energy Shortage Response Plan, June 1995.

Uniform Building Code. (www.buildersbook.com)

Uniform Fire Code 1997 edition published by the Western Fire Chiefs Association and the International Conference of Building Officials, and the National Fire Protection Association Standards 13 &13-D, 1996 Edition, and 13-R, 1996 Edition. (www.buildersbook.com)

HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report Number 476 Non-point Source Pollution: A Handbook for Local Government

California Department of Water Resources, California Water Plan Update. Sacramento: Dept. of Water Resources State of California. 1998. (rubicon.water.ca.gov)

California Department of Water Resources, California's Groundwater Update 2003 Bulletin 118, April 2003. (www.groundwater.water.ca.gov)

California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No. 8, August 2000. (www.dpla2.water.ca.gov)

California Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, § 8680-8692. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES General Permit Nos. CAS000001 INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES (97-03-DWQ) and CAS000002 Construction Activities (No. 99-08-DWQ) (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

California Storm Water Quality Association, California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbooks, 2003.

California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 7, Water Quality Control Plan. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Regulatory Ordinance, Title 8, Division 7, Grading Ordinance. Grading, Clearing and Watercourses. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Groundwater Ordinance. #7994. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov, http://www.amlegal.com/,)

County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan, 2002. (www.projectcleanwater.org)

County of San Diego, Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance, Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426. Chapter 8, Division 7, Title 6 of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances and amendments. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego. Board of Supervisors Policy I-68. Diego Proposed Projects in Flood Plains with Defined Floodways. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), 1972, Title 33, Ch.26, Sub-Ch.1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Freeze, Allan and Cherry, John A., Groundwater, Prentice-Hall, Inc. New Jersey, 1979.

Heath, Ralph C., Basic Ground-Water Hydrology, United States Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper; 2220, 1991.

National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. (www.fema.gov)

National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994. (www.fema.gov)

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water Code Division 7. Water Quality. (ceres.ca.gov)

San Diego Association of Governments, Water Quality Element, Regional Growth Management Strategy, 1997. (www.sandag.org

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES Permit No. CAS0108758. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

LAND USE & PLANNING

California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, Open File Report 96-04, Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production Consumption Region, 1996. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)

California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code 21000-21178; California Code of Regulations, Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, Appendix G, Title 14, Chapter 3, §15000-15387. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California General Plan Glossary of Terms, 2001. (ceres.ca.gov)

California State Mining and Geology Board, SP 51, California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and Procedures, January 2000. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-84: Project Facility. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted and amended from September 29, 1971 to April 5, 2000. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego. Resource Protection Ordinance, compilation of Ord.Nos. 7968, 7739, 7685 and 7631. 1991.

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.

Guide to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by Michael H. Remy, Tina A. Thomas, James G. Moore, and Whitman F. Manley, Point Arena, CA: Solano Press Books, 1999. (ceres.ca.gov)

MINERAL RESOURCES

National Environmental Policy Act, Title 42, 36.401 et. seq. 1969. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Subdivision Map Act, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Geologic Survey, Causey, J. Douglas, 1998, MAS/MILS Mineral Location Database.

U.S. Geologic Survey, Frank, David G., 1999, (MRDS) Mineral Resource Data System.

NOISE

California State Building Code, Part 2, Title 24, CCR, Appendix Chapter 3, Sound Transmission Control, 1988. . (www.buildersbook.com)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 6, Chapter 4, Noise Abatement and Control, effective February 4, 1982. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego General Plan, Part VIII, Noise Element, effective December 17, 1980. (ceres.ca.gov)

Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Planning (revised January 18, 1985). (http://www.access.gpo.gov/)

Harris Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, April 1995. (http://ntl.bts.gov/data/rail05/rail05.html)

International Standard Organization (ISO), ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747. (www.iso.ch)

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Environment and Planning, Noise and Air Quality Branch. "Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Guidance," Washington, D.C., June 1995. (http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/)

POPULATION & HOUSING

Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, 42 USC 5309, Title 42--The Public Health And Welfare, Chapter 69--Community Development, United States Congress, August 22, 1974. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

National Housing Act (Cranston-Gonzales), Title 12, Ch. 13. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

San Diego Association of Governments Population and Housing Estimates, November 2000. (www.sandag.org)

U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000. (http://www.census.gov/)

RECREATION

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Division 10, Chapter PLDO, §810.101 et seq. Park Lands Dedication Ordinance. (www.amlegal.com)

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

California Aeronautics Act, Public Utilities Code, Section 21001 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, January 2002.

California Department of Transportation, Environmental Program Environmental Engineering – Noise, Air Quality, and Hazardous Waste Management Office. "Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol for New Highway Construction and Reconstruction Projects," October 1998. (www.dot.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Street and Highways Code. California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Alternative Fee Schedules with Pass-By Trips Addendum to Transportation Impact Fee Reports, March 2005. (http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/land/pdf/TransImpactFee/attacha.pdf)

County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Report. January 2005. (http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html)

Fallbrook & Ramona Transportation Impact Fee Report, County of San Diego, January 2005. (http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html)

Office of Planning, Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Final Report, April 1995.

San Diego Association of Governments, 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments. (www.sandag.org)

U.S. Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77. (www.gpoaccess.gov)

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14. Natural Resources Division, CIWMB Division 7; and Title 27, Environmental Protection Division 2, Solid Waste. (ccr.oal.ca.gov)

California Integrated Waste Management Act. Public Resources Code, Division 30, Waste Management, Sections 40000-41956. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-78: Small Wastewater. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Annex T Emergency Water Contingencies, October 1992. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000.

U.S. Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System.

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.