

LETTER

RESPONSE

Letter I11

From: Marina Boubion [mailto:planktonbou@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, June 27, 2014 12:57 PM
To: Slovick, Mark
Subject: Lilac Hills Ranch EIR comments

Mr. Slovick:

Please see attached comments from me regarding the Lilac Hills Ranch proposed development. I hope our county board of supervisors make the right choice to deny the proposal for the good of all (including wildlife).

Thank You for your consideration.

Marina Boubion
9746 Megan Ter
Escondido, CA 92026
760-749-7036

} I11-1

- I11-1 The County acknowledges your comment and opposition to the project. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project.
- I11-2 The County acknowledges Project impacts related to wildfires are identified in FEIR subchapter 2.7 and would be significant (Impact HZ-1). Project traffic impacts are identified in subchapter 2.3, and include significant impacts to West Lilac Road (Impacts TR-5, TR-7, TR-10, and TR-23), Circle R Drive (Impacts TR-8, and TR-26), and other local roadways. The comment does not raise any other specific issue regarding the environmental analysis and, therefore, no more specific response can be provided or is required. However, the comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project.
- I11-3 The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the FEIR. Environmental impacts to surrounding residences are addressed throughout the FEIR and local wildlife impacts are addressed in subchapter 2.5. During construction, local wildlife would typically move to the suitable habitat areas that exist in the local area. Impacts to agricultural resources are addressed in subchapter 2.4 and Appendix F of the FEIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and, therefore, no more specific response can be provided or is required.
- I11-4 The comment references the “struggle to get out” of the San Elijo Hills community during a recent wildfire. It appears that the comment is attempting to draw a comparison between the San Elijo Hills community and the proposed project, however it should be noted that it is difficult to compare fire and evacuation hazards across communities that have different topography and ingress/egress conditions. Large evacuations typically involve some level of congestion on area roadways, which is why emergency responders are conservative in making early evacuation orders to ensure safe evacuation. Wildfire hazard impacts are addressed in subchapter 2.7.2.4 and emergency response and evacuation plans are addressed in subchapter 2.7.2.3. As discussed in subchapter 2.7 of the FEIR, the Evacuation Plan provides evacuation routes, evacuation points, and specific measures to keep future residents and employees informed about what to do if a wildfire occurs and safe at a time of evacuation.

LETTER

RESPONSE

LILAC HILLS RANCH
3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3100 5571 (TM),
3100 5572 (TM), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-018
(STP), HLP XX-XXX, SCH 2012061100
ENVIRONMENTAL LOG NO.: 3910 12-02-003 (ER)
DRAFT REVISED EIR PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD
June 12, 2014 through July 28, 2014

DRAFT EIR COMMENT SHEET

Tuesday, June 17, 2014
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
Planning & Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123

WRITTEN COMMENT FORM

Please see attached sheets.

(Attach additional pages as needed)

Marina Boubion *6/26/2014*
Signature Date

MARINA BOUBION
Print Name

9746 Megan Ter
Address

Escondido, CA 92026
City State Zip Code

760-749-7036
Phone Number

MAIL, FAX or E-MAIL FORMS TO:

Mark Slovick
County of San Diego
Planning & Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123
FAX #: (858) 694-3373
e-mail: Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov

COMMENTS MUST BE RECEIVED BY 4:00 PM, JULY 28, 2014

111-5 The project includes on- and off-site roadway improvements (refer to FEIR subchapter 1.2.1.4, subchapter 2.3 and Appendix E for details). Road improvements are proposed along West Lilac Road as well as Covey Lane, Rodriguez Road, and Mountain Ridge Road. Intersection signalization is proposed at Gopher Canyon Road and I-15 ramps; Highway 395 and Circle R Drive; and Highway 395 and West Lilac Road. The comment states, "...West Lilac and the I-15 interchange need to be upgraded – provide off and on ramps...", it is assumed this comment is referring to the I-15 SB and NB ramps at Old Highway 395. As noted in subchapter 2.3 of the FEIR, project traffic generation does not warrant improvements to these ramps. However, a cumulative impact was identified for these ramps (Impact TR-24 and TR-25) that would be mitigated to less than significant by implementation of M-TR-8 which requires payment of TIF. Refer to Table 2.3-24 of subchapter 2.3.

The project does not include the widening of the West Lilac bridge; however, improvements will be made to accommodate projected traffic including paving, restriping, installing a traffic signal at Old Highway 395 and West Lilac Road including construction of a left-turn lane at the westbound West Lilac Road approach to Old Highway 395 and West Lilac Road. This portion of West Lilac Road would be improved to meet the General Plan Mobility Element classification 2.2C, subject to exceptions as approved by the County (M-TR-4).

Widening the bridge is not proposed because widening it would be infeasible under CEQA due to engineering issues, and due to costs. It would also require tremendous coordination efforts by multiple jurisdictions including with Caltrans. Therefore, it is not considered a feasible option for inclusion in the project.

In addition, widening Circle R Drive is not warranted. It is also noted that the project would be required to improve other roadways and intersections through mitigation measures M-TR-1 through M-TR-11. See FEIR subchapter 2.3 for additional details.

LETTER

RESPONSE

Marina Boubion
9746 Megan Ter
Escondido, CA 92026
760-749-7036
planktonbou@yahoo.com

Mark Slovick
County of San Diego
Planning and Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123

Subj: Lilac Hills Ranch Development

Dear Mr. Slovick:

Lilac Hills Ranch Project is a very large project that seems to be benefiting the developer and is not in the public's interest. A project like this would lower the quality of exiting communities, the impacts are many including large negative impacts on the environment, it exposes residents to greater danger of fire, it increases the traffic volume significantly on West Lilac Road, Circle R and all the neighboring roads.

I11-2

I am opposed to this development being approved (Lilac Hills Ranch Development Project) for the following reasons:

1. The proposed changes to the zoning would have a major impact to residents who already live here and to local wildlife. Where would the wildlife go?

I11-3

2. This project not only increases danger to all residents due to fire and traffic, it also increases the risk to our firefighters and first-responders. what happened at San Elijo Hills in San Marcos during the last fire is an excellent example of what can happen - it was difficult to get out and of course put residents and first responders at a higher risk. I am not sure we want to have similar situation here when the Santa Ana winds come. Do we?

I11-4

Will the Developer be forced to upgrade access roads? This project would need access road improvements needed for the increase in traffic. Big time health and safety concern, especially in the case of a wildfire. West Lilac and the I-15 interchanges need to be upgraded - provide off and on ramps and make the West Lilac/I-15 bridge into a four-lane. West Lilac and Circle R also need to be upgraded to 4 lane roads. A recent example would be what was done for Hidden Meadows.

I11-5

3. Wasn't the San Diego County General Plan approved just three years ago? August 2011? After all the resources spent by the Public (by the County), the county staff must have known what was best for rural areas. The current zoning is Rural SR-10, SR-4. It is zoned for about 110 homes and increases the density by 1700%. In my mind, this development definitely goes against the General Plan! Is the County going to ignore the General Plan or will they abide by it?

I11-6

5. Another huge for me is water; seems crazy that developments of this magnitude are even brought up for discussion when our water needs in CA are such an issue. Where would the water come from for this development anyway? Agriculture? I don't think that is a good choice - where will our food come from anyway? China?

I11-7

Again, I seriously oppose this development as it stands now. the SD County plan has it zoned for just 110 homes on 608 acres It should be drastically de-scoped to match the.

I11-8

Let's keep it rural, please.

Marina Boubion 6-26-2014

I11-6 Property owners may request a General Plan Amendment pursuant to Government Code Sections 65300 et seq. Prior to the sunset of Board of Supervisors Policy I-63, in order to amend the General Plan, an applicant was required to process a Planned Authorized Amendment (PAA). An amendment to the General Plan was allowed to proceed by the approval of a PAA by the Planning Commission on December 17, 2010. The project includes amendments to the County General Plan Regional Land Use Element Map to change the regional category from Semi-Rural to Village, which would result in an increase in density as noted by the commenter. The project has been evaluated for consistency with General Plan Guiding Principles, Goals and Policies, and the County's Community Development Model. The FEIR includes analysis demonstrating how the project would comply with the General Plan. A General Plan consistency analysis is provided in subchapter 3.1.4 and Appendix W of the FEIR.

I11-7 Water supply for the project would come from the Valley Center Municipal Water District (VCMWD). Pursuant to Senate Bill 610 and Senate Bill 221, a Water Supply Assessment (WSA) was prepared for the project by the VCMWD (see Appendix Q of the FEIR). The WSA report evaluates water supplies that are or will be available during normal, single-dry year, and multiple dry water years during a 20-year projection to meet existing demands, existing plus projected demands of the project, and future water demands served by the VCMWD. Based on the VCMWD's water supply reliability analysis contained in the 2010 Urban Water Management Plan, the WSA concludes that the VCMWD would have adequate water supply to meet and exceed expected demands for a 20-year planning horizon, including the project. In addition, the VCMWD issued an updated letter dated May 6, 2014 verifying that the conclusions of the WSA are still valid considering recent drought conditions and associated water use restrictions. This letter has been included as a cover letter to Appendix Q of the Draft Final EIR.

I11-8 The County acknowledges your comment and opposition to the project. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project.