

LETTER

RESPONSE

Letter I59

From: Ruth Mattes [<mailto:ruthmattes48@gmail.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, June 25, 2014 5:39 PM
To: Slovic, Mark
Subject: Comment on Proposed Lilac Hills Ranch Project

June 25, 2014
 Draft EIR Comment Sheet

Dear Mark Slovic,

I was in attendance at your informative June 17th, 2014 meeting in the Valley Center Library.
 I am **STRONGLY OPPOSED** to the proposed Lilac Hills Ranch Project for the following reasons:

I59-1

- **FIRE DANGER** INCREASED CRITICALLY, as the recent unexpected 2014 Spring fires proved. This area was hostage to fires to the north and south on I-15 making escape deadly.

I59-2

- **TRAFFIC** INCREASED, as studies have shown which impacts on FIRE SATEY, PUBLIC SAFETY and POLLUTION. **INSUFFICIENT ROADS!!**

I59-3

- **WATER** TAXED beyond our already strained resources.

I59-4

- **CRIME** INDEX INCREASED from increased traffic to the area.

I59-5

- **ENVIRONMENT** impacted negatively, excessive blasting and earth movement.

I59-6

- **SENIOR COMPLEX** ??? NOT near any hospital or senior services!

I59-7

Have we learned nothing from LA (where developers have run out of lucrative spaces to build) or even closer, Temecula??? Their roads are choked daily killing the "ideal San Diego" experience.

I59-8

This project creates a deadly fire trap to all surrounding residents. **We DO NOT need it.**

I59-9

Sincerely,
 Ruth Mattes
 29667 Circle R Greens Drive
 Escondido, CA 92026
 760-421-9564
ruthmattes48@gmail.com

- I59-1 This comment is introductory in nature. 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.
- I59-2 Refer to response to comment I26-1, for details related to fire protection and emergency evacuation. The comment does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of the environmental document. 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.
- I59-3 The comment addresses general subject areas of traffic, fire safety, public safety, and pollution which were analyzed in the FEIR. Refer to subchapter 2.3 and Appendix E, response to comment I26-1, subchapter 3.1.5, and subchapter 2.2 for details related to traffic, fire protection, public safety, and air quality, respectively. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding the adequacy of the environmental analysis. 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.
- I59-4 Water supply for the project would come from the Valley Center Municipal Water District (VCMWD) which is imported from San Diego County Water Authority. 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 FEIR.

LETTER

RESPONSE

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>I59-4 (cont.) 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.”</p> <p>I59-5 The comment raises social issues that do not relate to any physical effect on the environment. 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. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue with respect to the FEIR, no further response is required.</p> <p>I59-6 The FEIR includes conceptual blasting locations in Figure 1-19. Subchapter 2.8 and Appendix M evaluate the potential impacts that would be associated with proposed blasting. As discussed in this analysis, two blasting impacts are identified, impacts N-14 and N-16. Mitigation measures M-N-11 and M-N-12 would reduce potential blasting impacts to less than significant. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding the adequacy of the environmental analysis. 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>I59-7 Regarding the proposed senior center area, this area would include group care (assisted living). An assisted living type facility would provide on-site routine medical care to support the medical needs of the elderly. Emergency medical care that requires specialized care or hospitalization would require travel to regional hospitals or medical facilities. This use would require future approval of a Major Use Permit.</p> |
|--|---|

LETTER

RESPONSE

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>159-8 The comment expresses the opinions of the commenter. 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>159-9 With respect to the adequacy of fire and emergency response service, see Global Response: Fire and Medical Services. The project's 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 as 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 Fire Protection Plan and Evacuation Plan.</p> |
|--|--|