

Letter I44

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

MAJOR CONCERNS:

- 1. Traffic over the bridge, on Circle R Drive, Hwy 395, & West Lilac Road.
In 2007 a motorcyclist was killed at Covey & West Lilac Road on a curve.
We already have too much traffic on these narrow, curved roads!
2. Noise pollution.
3. Water shortages. We are in a severe drought.
4. Sewer 5. Electrical 6. Light pollution.
If this monster development happens, we will have the cost of fencing around
our property (which hasn't happened in our 25 years here). This would be
necessary because of people pollution: coming on our property, dumping trash, etc.
There is a nearby development at Highways 15 & 76 where all the road improvements
and utilities are already in place and the land is flat and more useable than our
rural, hilly area.

(Attach additional pages as needed)

PHOTOS ENCLOSED

Signature: Ben E. Hare, Date: 7-24-14

Ben E. Hare
Print Name

9902 West Lilac Road
Address

Escondido, CA 92026
City State Zip Code

(760) 749-6253
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

144-1 The project will be required to improve West Lilac Road between Old Highway 395 and Main Street to meet the General Plan Mobility Element classification of 2.2C, subject to exceptions as approved by the County (M-TR-4). As detailed in the Traffic Study (Appendix E) and subchapter 2.3 of the FEIR, the impacts along this segment of West Lilac Road from Old Highway 395 to Main Street will be mitigated through implementation of M-TR-4. Regarding the West Lilac Bridge, improvements will be made at Old Highway 395 and West Lilac Road including a signalized intersection and a left-turn lane at the westbound West Lilac Road approach. As a result of these measures, and as demonstrated in the Traffic Study, impacts would be mitigated to less than significant.

As shown in Table 10.2 of the Traffic Impact Study, from a traffic operation perspective, the project does not cause any significant impacts to the intersection at West Lilac Road and Covey Lane and as a result no traffic mitigation was proposed in that regard. The FEIR also identified a small percent (9 percent) of the project's total traffic utilizing Covey Lane. A sight distance analysis was also completed for the intersection at Covey Lane and West Lilac Road (Appendix C-1 to the FEIR, Landmark Analysis). The analysis determined that a clear line of sight of 480 feet would be needed from a portion of APN 129-190-44 but that there was only an existing line of sight distance of 330 feet because of a small hill with vegetation that currently obstructs the line of sight at this location. This area was identified as the area in which a clear space easement over 0.25 acre with related grading rights was needed to remedy the existing condition. Implementation of the clear space easement would be a condition of the project. As such, safety should be improved at this intersection.

144-2 The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding any specific analysis; however, noise impacts are discussed in detail in FEIR subchapter 2.8. 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.

144-3 A Water Supply Assessment (WSA) was prepared for the project by the Valley Center Municipal Water District (VCMWD) (see Appendix Q of the FEIR). The WSA report found that water would be adequate to serve the project plus existing demands, and future water demands

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>I44-3 (cont.)</p> <p>served by the VCMWD during normal, single-dry year, and multiple dry water years. Refer to subchapter 3.1.7 of the FEIR. 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. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and, therefore, no more specific response can be provided or is required. Additionally, as shown in the June 9, 2015 memorandum from Dexter Wilson Engineering (FEIR Appendix T-1), the project is consistent with the temporary, emergency Executive Order (EO) B-29-15 issued by Governor Brown on April 1, 2015. The project is consistent with the emergency water conservation regulations mandated by the SWRCB and the VCMWD. The project intends to fully comply with all water conservation regulations required by the VCMWD and the State (emergency or otherwise). Please refer to FEIR subchapter 3.1.7 and Appendix T-1 for details. Also, the VCMWD issued another letter dated June 5, 2015, which is attached as Exhibit A to FEIR Appendix T-1. The June 2015 VCMWD letter concludes that “despite the impacts of short-term droughts and water supply shortages, in the long-term the District is confident that through the combined efforts of the state, MWD, the SDCWA and the VCMWD, sufficient supplies will be available for its service area, including the LHR development.” 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.</p> <p>I44-4</p> <p>The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the FEIR. Sewer/Wastewater facilities planned to serve the proposed project are detailed in the FEIR in the Project Description (Chapter 1), subchapter 3.1.7 (Utilities and Service Systems) and in Appendix S, Wastewater Management Alternatives. Light pollution is addressed in subchapter 2.1. All existing electrical utilities are within the project and would be distributed on-site and no off-site facilities would be needed. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and, therefore, no more specific response can be provided or is required. 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.</p>
--	--

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>I44-5 The comment and concern expressed by the commenter is noted; however, indirect impacts are addressed throughout the FEIR, including trespass (see Agricultural Resources, FEIR subchapter 2.4). Specific steps are being taken by the project to reduce and/or avoid the possibility of such impacts including implementation of a detailed landscape plan, and the placement of buffers and fencing along the project boundary. 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.</p> <p>I44-6 The County acknowledges the development referenced in the comment and these projects are included in the project's cumulative analysis. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that 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.</p>
--	---