

Draft Responses to Comment Letter B

Individual  
 Louis F. Russo  
 February 17, 2013

	Comment	Response to Comment
<b>B -1</b>	I am a 10 year resident of Alpine, an 8 year member of the Alpine Community Planning Group (ACPG) and a 6 year member of the San Diego Rural Fire District (SDRF) Board of Directors, currently serving as the Chairman of the SDRF board.	This comment is introductory in nature and does not raise a significant environmental issue for which a response is required.
<b>B -2</b>	Over the years I have seen numerous factions, with divergent views, give input and opinions regarding density and development within the Alpine Community Planning Area. In particular, as both a parcel owner, resident and ACPG member, I watched closely the recent "community input" regarding the former FCI lands. After having participated in, and reviewed, the entire process, my recommendation is that you adopt the Modified Project Alternative (Environmentally Superior Alternative) for those lands within the ACPG boundaries, as well as for the entire East County Area.	The commenter's preference for the Modified Project Alternative (Environmentally Superior Alternative) is acknowledged.
<b>B -3</b>	My reasons for recommending this adoption are: (1) First, and foremost, it most closely aligns with both the wishes of the majority of residents as well as the provisions of the Alpine General Plan guiding principles and provisions. Although heavy influence was exerted by developers, contractors, realtors, etc. to obtain the most heavily dense designations possible (as one would expect), the overriding desires of the majority was to retain the rural nature of the former FCI lands, to protect these lands environmentally and to live within the infrastructure, present and proposed, within	The County understands and acknowledges the commenter's reasons for supporting the Modified Project Alternative. Reasons such as those cited here may factor into the alternative that is chosen by the decision makers, along with additional findings. This information will be included in the Final SEIR for their consideration.

**Draft Responses to Comments**

	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response to Comment</b>
	this area.	
<b>B -4</b>	(2) This alternative provides a reasoned, reasonable, plausible plan for limited growth within the former FCI lands while at the same time accommodating, to a reasonable degree, those parcel owners who wish to increase density, within reason, on their parcels. In fact, except for two parcel owners (both of whom were nonresidents who simply owned land within the boundaries), the majority of the owners within the ACPG former FCI area were more than willing to be reasonable with their neighbors during the workshops conducted to provide you with the community recommendations. This is not to say there weren't shenanigans at play, but in general, the residents were able to compromise, save two, to come up with a workable plan. The Environmentally Superior Alternative I recommend adoption of most closely aligns with the majority opinion of the residents.	The County acknowledges and appreciates this comment. The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will consider this information and will ultimately make the final decision regarding which alternatives (i.e., which land use designations to apply).
<b>B -5</b>	(3) As you are aware, there are severe infrastructure and environmental challenges in the ACPG boundary former FCI lands. In addition to lack of Padre Dam water/ sewer, the existing water table limitations are known by all of the current residents. The new Viejas Resort will further strain this asset. In addition, there are very limited roads, little to no secondary access (as required by fire regulations), and those that do exist will need extensive widening, turnarounds, etc. in the event of any development. The Environmentally Superior Alternative appears to best address these issues.	The County agrees that to achieve many of the land use densities and intensities in the Proposed Project for Alpine, extension of water and sewer services would be required. Also, based on the traffic study (SEIR, Appendix D) buildout at these intensities is forecast to result in significant traffic impacts unless certain roadways in Alpine are widened. This comment is not inconsistent with the analysis in the SEIR.
<b>B -6</b>	(4) The area of the former FCI lands within the ACPG boundary are, quite frankly, probably the greatest fire hazard area in the County. Although I have been here for the Viejas	The County agrees that the former FCI lands within Alpine generally qualify as high and very high fire hazard severity areas. This determination is not inconsistent with the

**Draft Responses to Comments**

	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response to Comment</b>
	<p>Fire, Cedar Fire and all subsequent fires, the current fire fuel maps show that the greatest concentration of fire fuel are almost directly aligned with the former FCI lands within the ACPG boundary. Most areas here are marked in bright red, the highest danger level, and in addition to no Padre Dam hydrants, etc., there are barely enough current roads to enable the protection of the existing structures. ANY development will require extensive County expenditures of funds to upgrade/increase infrastructure.</p>	<p>analysis in the SEIR.</p>
<b>B -7</b>	<p>(5) Finally, the Environmentally Superior Alternative is aptly named as most of the former FCI lands in the ACPG boundary abut directly with Cleveland National Forest. Although the slim, one vote, majority on the ACPG voted to go forward with greatly increased densities, to SR-1 and SR-2, in these parcels, it was never a viable recommendation. The Environmentally Superior Alternative recognizes this and provides greatly reduced densities as one approaches the National Forest. This not only evidences a high level of common sense, but is fully in alignment with the Alpine Community General Plan Guiding Principles, which was just updated by the community prior to contractor/developer/ realtor rush to ignore during the former FCI lands workshops and public input. This Alternative "rights the ship" in this regard. Thank you for your consideration.</p>	<p>See response to comment B-3 above.</p>

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK