

LETTER

RESPONSE

Letter I43

**From:** Hans Haas [mailto:terijk@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 28, 2014 12:53 AM  
**To:** Slovick, Mark  
**Subject:** Lilac Hills Ranch DEIR Comment

Mark Slovick,

This letter is submitted as part of the public response to Lilac Hills Ranch DEIR.

My name is Hans Haas and I live off West Lilac Road with my wife and two children. Both my wife and I grew up in Valley Center, so when it came time to buy a home together, we knew that rural Valley Center was the place for us. Giving our children the chance to grow up in a safe, quiet, country environment like we did, is extremely important to us. That's one of the many reasons we oppose the Lilac Hills Ranch project.

I43-1

First, let me thank you for your time and consideration at the recent EIR meeting. I attended the meeting and was impressed at how you and your staff handled the hostility and strong emotions that this project has inspired in our community. Everyone I spoke to was in opposition to the project, excluding the Accretive representative, naturally. In fact the project seemed to generate so much frustration and questioning that the one hour meeting seemed far to short. The increase in fire danger and the congestion of our roads seemed to dominate the discussion, which is completely understandable. Lilac Hills Ranch could mean disaster for our area when the next firestorm comes. But there are other major concerns that this massive project brings to mind.

I43-2

Since Valley Center is an agricultural town, water has always been an issue worth attention. As I'm sure you know, state wide water restrictions were recently announced in response to the record drought we are experiencing. Even if you look beyond the current conditions, water costs have risen continuously in Valley Center over the years. The burden of these costs have cause many avocado and orange groves to be let go, as the farmers can't afford the water. Some have gone to well water, but the water table in Valley Center is dropping due to both over pumping and the drought. I read that Accretive plans to use well water and rain water to supply a major portion of the usable water for LHR. That is both naive and unrealistic to think that well water would be reliable enough to supply a community of 1,700+ homes and additional commercial properties. Has any study been done to verify that the ground water could supply such a community in the long term? Should the wells run dry, what is the contingency plan for supplying the community with water? How much money would it cost the rate payers in order to expand existing infrastructure to accommodate that many homes? I think this is a glaring example of how inappropriate and unsustainable this project is.

I43-3

I43-4

Opposition to this project is wide spread, and growing. If Accretive is allowed to move ahead with their plans, it will irreparably damage the quality of living for the residents of our community. It is a gross disregard of the intent of the GP2020 plan. One of the most appealing things about living out here is having a 2 acre minimum parcel neighborhood. To modify the GP2020 and allow for this massive development, would signal a green light for

I43-5

I43-1 The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the project. This introductory 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.

I43-2 With respect to the adequacy of fire and emergency response service, please see Global Response: Fire and Medical Services. The Evacuation Plan (Appendix K) of the FEIR, includes multiple components intended to create an orderly and safe evacuation of the project site in time of emergency such details of evacuation routes, evacuation points, and specific measures to keep future residents and employees informed and safe if wildfire occurs. See response to comment I26-1 for details related to the Evacuation Plan. The comment does not raise a specific issue with regard to the content or adequacy of the FEIR.

I43-3 Water supply for the project would come from the Valley Center Municipal Water District (VCMWD) which is imported from San Diego County Water Authority. A Water Supply Assessment (WSA) was prepared for the project by the VCMWD (see Appendix Q of the FEIR) that demonstrates water supplies 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 demand. 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 FEIR.

Regarding the use of groundwater to serve a portion of the project's water needs, the Preliminary Hydrogeologic Assessment (Appendix P of the FEIR) establishes the baseline for groundwater use within the project site. Only wells that have been active for a period of at least five years were included (6 of the 10 wells). The analysis suggests that the water wells with at least a five-year history of activity may have produced, on average, approximately 191 ac-ft per year. The project's anticipated groundwater use would not exceed this 191 ac-ft per year baseline.

As stated in Appendix P, all potable water supply for the proposed project will be provided by the VCMWD. It is anticipated that groundwater could be used to meet the irrigation needs of Lilac Hills Ranch, subject to the discretion of the VCMWD.

LETTER

RESPONSE

other developers to disregard the GP2020 and join Accretive in developing our countryside, at the cost of the community. I would ask that your recommend against Lilac Hills Ranch, for the reasons listed above and the many other ones that I'm sure you are receiving.

Regards,

Hans Haas  
30695 Lilac Hills Ln.  
Valley Center, CA



I43-5  
cont.

I43-4 Regarding funding for water infrastructure, the Specific Plan, Section IV Implementation includes a Public Facilities Finance Plan on page IV-10. Table 10 identifies Facility and Improvement Financing which includes various financing options including Developer funding (including fees, land dedication and construction of facilities), Formation of Assessment District (AD), Community Facilities District (CFD), Infrastructure Financing District (IFD) and/or Reimbursement Agreements. The Board of Supervisors would have the discretion as to who would be responsible for financing various facilities and improvements.

I43-5 The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the project. Refer to response to comment I5-3 for the discussion on community character and I5-2 for the discussion on General Plan Amendments. 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.