

LETTER

RESPONSE

Letter I69

From: Hoann Samirpali
To: Slowick, Mark
Cc: Hoann Samirpali
Subject: Llan Hills Ranch REIR : 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
Date: Friday, July 25, 2014 5:14:46 PM

To: County of San Diego
Planning and Development Services

Water. Roads. Fire.

WATER
Our natural resources for water are not in huge supply these days. No news there! They haven't been for years. What makes anyone think water is all of a sudden going to be available in great quantities anytime soon?

As a rural home owner who has in the past been asked to conserve, and who currently is watching the surrounding countryside become a virtual wasteland of tree skeletons from un-watered groves I marvel at the County even considering a development of this size in such a dry brush area which is already straining from lack of resources (water).

How is this possible? Can one County entity actually ask farmers and homeowners to conserve on water while another branch in the County is considering approval of density housing in that same area? In some cases even on the same parcel numbers! Please answer this in a way that makes sense!

ROADS
We already know the WEST TRIANGLE (West Lilac Rd., Castle Creek and Old 395) have some of the County's oldest and underdeveloped roads in existence. They are curvy, narrow, with out bike lanes, often edging up to sliced granite bedrock on one side and sheer 60 plus foot drops on the other, without room for width expansion. How on earth does the County intend to deal with the increase of road traffic under these conditions?

And then there is the Lilac Bridge, a two lane wonder which functions beautifully at the current capacity. Add 3,000 (or even HALF THAT!) more cars....and now we have bottleneck, backed up traffic on narrow, curvy roads...a recipe no doubt for one accident after another. How does the County intend to ensure the safety of every driver (not to mention bicyclists of which we have hundreds!) under these conditions?

FIRE!
This last May I was caught on the I-15 going North to home during one of the many fires in North County. Because of freeway closer (Fallbrook Fire) I was stuck on the I-15 between Deer Springs Rd. and Gopher Canyon Rd. for over 2 hours. This was the "normal" traffic flow of that time of day, but because of road closure we were given detour through ONE LANE!!! Fortunately the fire never hit the freeway in this particular fire (the next day proved otherwise), and people eventually got to where they were going. Mind you, this section of road should normally take a few minutes

169-1

169-2

169-3

169-4

169-1 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.

Regarding water use restrictions, such restrictions are imposed by the VCMWD in response to Statewide requirements for water conservation. Water districts have a mandate to require water conservation, in addition to providing water to serve future growth. As a result, providing water to the serve the proposed project does not conflict with current water conservation requirements.

In addition, Article 230 of the District's Administrative Code details the District's Water Supply Shortage Response Program which anticipates the juxtaposition of requesting water conservation from its existing customers while allowing new customers (such as LHR) to receive service. Based on the District declared stage of appropriate drought response, conservation measures for existing customers are either voluntary or mandatory. Similarly the processing of new developments is either allowed or prohibited.

169-2 The comment addresses the general subject area of traffic which was analyzed in the FEIR. The adequacy of roads to serve the proposed project was analyzed in subchapter 2.3 and Appendix E of the FEIR.. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding 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.

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>169-3 The road deck on the West Lilac Road bridge would be improved to 2.2C standards with implementation of the project. The project does not include the widening of the West Lilac bridge (except for the installation of sidewalk on the south side); however other improvements will be made to area roads to accommodate projected traffic including paving, restriping, installation of a traffic signal at Old Highway 395 and West Lilac Road, and 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. As discussed in FEIR subchapter 2.3.3.2, in the Build-out Under the General Plan With Road 3 Scenario, West Lilac Road would be added to the list of Mobility Element roads (General Plan Mobility Element Table M-4) for which operation of the road at LOS E or F is acceptable. In addition, as detailed in section 1.2 of the Traffic Study (Appendix E of the FEIR), none of the exception requests for West Lilac Road would affect roadway capacity. The exception requests in this location affect shoulder and parkway widths, not the actual drivable portion of the road</p> <p>169-4 The comment provides background information about the commenter's experience in the May 2014 wildfires. Refer to subchapter 2.3 and Appendix E of the FEIR for details related to traffic impacts and required improvements. Refer also to response to comment C11-23/24 for additional details on safe evacuation of 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.</p>
--	---

LETTER

RESPONSE

<p>of travel time, yet I was there for over 2 hours. Had there been more traffic (1,500 -3,000 more due to this proposed development) trying to get off, I suppose that number would have escalated to 3 hours.</p> <p>My point is that with all the Temecula and further northern cities traveling the I-15 corridor everyday, all day, we cannot add in one large leapfrog development 3,000 more cars without adding lanes to the freeway, without adding more exits and unramps, without adding an ulterior exit route from THEIR SITE of Lilac Hills Ranch! And this cannot be done WITHOUT taking away private property, i.e. imminent domain.</p> <p>So what is the County's intention on this?</p> <p>My three concerns:</p> <p>WATER (where is it coming from and at whose expense? And don't say at the developer's expense...when water gets used, we are all affected!)</p> <p>ROADS (three and four lane Lilac Hills Ranch roads emptying onto West Lilac and Castle Creek...at whose expense? Again, when cars travel on the road it affects us all!)</p> <p>FIRE! (The last BIG fire in this area was in 1970 - Gopher Canyon Fire. That spells 44 years of unburned DRY brush. Given the road situation, it spells disaster and death.) Is the County willing to place all of those living in this area at risk? For what? \$\$\$? I want an answer!</p> <p>As a reminder I would like to share a photo of a fire on the I-15 a few years back and how things went awry because people could not get through...Please see attachment...</p> <p><i>floann sannipoli</i> <i>9542 COVEY LANE ESCONDIDO, CA 92026</i> <i>760-731-2116</i></p>	<p>169-4 cont.</p> <p>169-5</p> <p>169-6</p> <p>169-7</p> <p>169-8</p> <p>169-9</p> <p>169-5 The County acknowledges this comment about impacts to the I-15. The FEIR identified significant, unmitigated cumulative impacts to I-15 segments from SR-78 to the Riverside County line. For additional details, refer to the Global Response: Significant and Unavoidable Impacts to I-15, included in the introduction to these responses to comments.</p> <p>169-6 The Draft FEIR evaluated the adequacy of the roadway network to serve the proposed project in subchapter 2.3 and Appendix E. The analysis did not identify the need for a new access road to serve the project from I-15. The adequacy of the project access for purposes of emergency evacuation was evaluated in subchapter 2.7.2.4 of the FEIR and Appendix K (Evacuation Plan). As discussed in subchapter 2.7, the primary evacuation routes are through a series of internal roadways within the development, which in turn permit direct emergency evacuation to the north, south, east, and west to accommodate pending wildfire conditions. As shown on Figure 2.7-3, evacuation routes include Main Street, Street "Z," Lilac Hills Ranch Road, Covey Lane, and Mountain Ridge Road. The project site would also be served by secondary emergency evacuation routes using Street "F" and Birdsong Drive on the north and Rodriguez Road in the southern Senior Neighborhood (refer to subchapter 2.7, Figure 2.7-3).</p> <p>The comment does not raise a specific issue regarding the content or adequacy of the FEIR.. With respect to the use of Eminent Domain, the applicant would be required to obtain additional right-of-way for road improvements. If right-of-way could not be obtained, then they could request the Board of Supervisors to assist in obtaining the right-of-way (Eminent Domain) pursuant to Board Policy. It is in the discretion of the Board of Supervisors whether to require improvements that would necessitate initiation of proceedings to acquire additional easements. See Global Response: Off-site Improvements – Environmental Analysis and Easement Summary Table, which provides a detailed breakdown of all necessary improvements within County right-of-way and private easements and the affect of construction of each.</p>
---	---

LETTER

RESPONSE



- I69-7 This comment addresses general subject areas of roads and water that were evaluated in the FEIR. The adequacy of water resources is evaluated in subchapter 3.1.7 of the FEIR and in Appendix Q. Transportation and traffic is evaluated in subchapter 2.3 and Appendix E of the FEIR. Refer to response to comment I69-1 for details related to water availability and response to comments I69-2, I69-3, I69-5, and I69-6 for more specific traffic and transportation-related details. Regarding who would fund the infrastructure needed for this project, any road improvements proposed as project design measures or as mitigation would be fully funded by the applicant.. The Specific Plan includes a Public Facilities Finance Plan in section IV.E.8 that describes various funding options. All of the funding options would be funded by the project applicant and/or future residents of the project and would apply only to future residents of the project and would not affect surrounding properties. Actual water used by future residents would be paid by future residents, consistent with the existing payment structures in place for water supply in the VCMWD service area.
- I69-8 With respect to the adequacy of fire and emergency response service, see Global Response: Fire and Medical Services.
- I69-9 The comment references an attached photograph. The comment and photograph will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project.