

## Valley Center Community Planning Group

**Approved Minutes** for a regular meeting held on **April 2, 2018** at 8:00 p.m. in the Valley Center Community Hall, 28246 Lilac Road, Valley Center, California 92082.

Oliver Smith, **Chair**; Ashly Mellor, **Vice-Chair**; James Garritson, **Secretary**

**A**=Absent; **Ab**=Abstention; **BOS**=Board of Supervisors; **PDS**=Department of Planning & Development Services; **DPW**=Department of Public Works; **DRB**=Valley Center Design Review Board; **GP**= County General Plan; **N**=Nay; **P**=Present; **PC**=County Planning Commission; **R**=Recused; **SC**=Subcommittee; **TBD**=To Be Determined; **VCCPG**=Valley Center Community Planning Group; **VC**= Valley Center; **VCPRD**=Valley Center Parks & Recreation District; **Y**=Yea

### A. Roll Call

- Meeting was called to order at **8:03 p.m.** and a Quorum was established with **11 members present.**
- ~~Jeana Boulos~~ - **A**
- William Del Pilar - **P**
- Susan Fajardo - **P**
- James Garritson - **P**
- ~~Dina Charmakar~~ - **A**
- Steve Hutchison - **P**
- Susan Janisch - **P**
- Jennifer Lindley - **P**
- ~~Kathy MacKenzie~~ - **A**
- Ashly Mellor - **P**
- LaVonne Norwood - **P**
- ~~Claire Plotner~~ - **A**
- Ann Quinley - **P**
- Oliver Smith - **P**
- Jon Vick - **P**

### B. Pledge of Allegiance - Mr. Del Pilar

### C. Public Communication/Open Forum

- None

### D. Action items (VCCPG advisory vote may be taken on the following items).

**1) Draft Recirculated Environmental Impact Report [DREIR] for the Lilac Hills Ranch project, PDS20 12-3800-12-001 (GPA). Discussion and recommendation vote on a comment letter to the County. Specific issues include addressing Traffic Impact, Global Climate Change, Air Quality & Noise. The documents are available on the county website at: [https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/pds/ceqa/LHR\\_Recirculation\\_2.html](https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/pds/ceqa/LHR_Recirculation_2.html) (Hutchinson)**

- Mr. Hutchinson shares background about this project from **A Recommendation From the Lilac Hills Ranch Subcommittee to the VCCPG**. This letter was approved by the Lilac Hills Ranch Subcommittee in a 5-0-0 vote.
- Mr. Fox (audience) made a few comments about possible traffic impacts in this region. He stated that the Bonsall School District does not have the capacity to take additional students. Mr. Garritson asked for further information about the Bonsall School District. Mr. Del Pilar asked about where the additional students would go from other projects that are currently being built in Valley Center. Mr. O'Connor asked for further clarification about traffic concerns. Jon Rilling, the project manager said that traffic would be diverted and they are working with the County to create solutions.
- Mr. Hutchison spoke about road studies and there was a discussion on the width of the roads. Additional lanes will not be built, but the roads will be widened. There was a road study done back in October 2017. The study probably used strips to record traffic for over three regular school days. The studies have peak and off-peak hours.
- Matt Kuhn (audience) wanted to know if this road would have an impact on his property. Mr. Hutchinson said that eminent domain is a possibility on portions of the road for the purpose of fire protection.

- There was a discussion about the four options to add a fire station. After 73 homes are built, the developer must have a solution for the fire department to reach homes within the five minutes.
- There was a discussion between Mr. Rilling and Mr. Hutchinson about the different phases of the project. Mr. Rilling stated that it did not matter how the phases were built. That once a certain threshold was met then the mitigation for that threshold must be done regardless of phasing.
- Mara Davis (audience) is very concerned about wildfires because all of the exits lead to West Lilac Road. Mr. Fox shared information about the impact of the 2003 wildfire that went through Valley Center. He said that a woman named Allison lost family members and was severely burned when the wildfires went through Lake Wohlford Road.
- Mr. O'Connor stated that leapfrog developments need to put in the necessary roads whenever a new development is built. Mr. Rilling said that 75% of San Diego County is in a fire risk zone.
- A community member shared her experience using Cole Grade Road when the wildfires came through her region. She would like all of us to really think about the lack of lanes and roads when an evacuation is necessary. Mr. Hutchinson said we all need to be vigilant in addressing fire concerns.
- Karla Berkey (audience) would like the County to follow the General Plan. Mr. Fox said that the developers often try to override the General Plan. Hans (audience) said that this project would cause problems for anyone trying to use Old Castle Road.
- Mr. Vick supports the motion because of numerous concerns about the lack of roads.
- Ms. Norwood stated how she thought that these issues are not just a LHR issue. A developer will only do what the County makes them do and it has given this project more attention then it has in an unincorporated area for years. She asks what the county has made the project contribute to the community as a whole.
- Mr. Del Pilar would also like the County to address road concerns. He would like a reason to support the project, but believes this is not the time to build it. Ms. Mellor also shares her concerns about the lack of roads in this region. Ms. Janisch is against the project.
- Mr. Vick states how he was trying to find a reason to support the project but could not. He spoke about how the project is not going to have to put in a public park until after Phase 3, but even then how it will more than likely be a LHR Park and that the families that live there will be playing in the VC Parks but not have to pay any PLDO Funds toward the project.
- **Motion: To approve a recommendation Letter from the Lilac Hills Ranch Subcommittee to the Valley Center Community Planning Group be sent to the County prior to the deadline of 4:00 p.m. on Monday, April 9.**
- **Maker/Second: Hutchinson/Quinley**
- **Motion Carries (Y-N-Ab). 10-1-0.**

#### Roll Call Vote:

- |                         |                        |                    |
|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| ● William Del Pilar - Y | ● Susan Janisch - Y    | ● Ann Quinley - Y  |
| ● Susan Fajardo - Y     | ● Jennifer Lindley - Y | ● Oliver Smith - Y |
| ● James Garritson - N   | ● Ashly Mellor - Y     | ● Jon Vick - Y     |
| ● Steve Hutchison - Y   | ● LaVonne Norwood - Y  |                    |

#### ● E. Group Business

1) Meeting Updates: Next Regular Monthly VCCPG meeting: **April 9, 2018**

## **F. Adjournment**

- **The meeting adjourned at 9:23 p.m.**
- **Minutes were approved on April 9, 2018.**

**James Garritson, Secretary**

---

## **Appendix VCCPG April 2, 2018 Special Meeting Minutes**

**28 March 2018**

### **A RECOMMENDATION FROM THE LILAC HILLS RANCH SUBCOMMITTEE TO THE VALLEY CENTER COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP [VCCPG]:**

The Lilac Hills Ranch Subcommittee [SC], after careful consideration, moves that the following comments relating to the Lilac Hills Ranch Project [Project], GPA12001-Draft Recirculated Environmental Impact Report [DREIR] be adopted and be forwarded to Mark Slovick, Project Manager for the County, prior to the April 9, 2018 deadline:

-----

**1.** The VCCPG, after careful and thoughtful consideration of the information contained in the DREIR, reiterates the considerable and substantial previously submitted objections and concerns about the Project, and now offers further comments on the new information presented in the DREIR.

Given the overwhelming disapproval of the Project by the voters of San Diego County in November 2016 [64%, or about 735,000 voters, voted No on Measure B in opposition to the Project], it is surprising to see this Project being reconsidered at all.

Unfortunately, our earlier comments and the intervening electoral result have not caused any meaningfully significant changes to the Project. Previously, we expressed opposition to the Project on several bases:

**1-A.** Perhaps the most fundamental basis is the erroneous interpretation of the goals and policies of the County's General Plan, and particularly land use policies, including LU-1.1 and LU-1.2. The general plan adopted by the County in August 2011 has many elements that are crafted to integrate each with the whole. This misrepresentation of those elements with contentious interpretations that will benefit the Project remains a central concern for this Project and several others moving through the review process.

On land use, the Project is proposed on rural, agricultural land containing some of the best soils in the County and state. The microclimate of the Project site is well suited, and is currently used, for the cultivation of horticultural plants and floral materials as well as subtropical fruits. The General Plan discourages the use of agricultural land for developments like the one proposed and

prohibits such “leapfrog” developments away from existing infrastructure. Acquiescence to the National Green Building Standard rather than adhering to the LEED-ND standard called for in the General Plan eviscerates the intended prohibition of leapfrog development by not enforcing the prerequisite for selecting a proper site for development before considering construction techniques.

**1-B.** Geologically, the Project is planned to cut and fill 4 million cubic yards of earth in order to accommodate building sites, roads and other facilities. Cuts will be up to 70-feet deep. This process will require blasting and rock crushing on-site. Although not planned, as a practical matter, the Project will likely require import of fill to complete the anticipated elevations.

**1-C.** Visually, the 1746 houses plus 90,000 square feet of commercial development of the project will stand in stark contrast to the present rural, agricultural surroundings in the Lilac Triangle. The Project also will likely impact the viewscape of the scenic I-15 corridor that passes just to the west.

**1-D.** Traffic congestion and the lack of transportation alternatives for the Project were serious concerns in 2014/15 and they have only been amplified in the more recent traffic studies. The Project is expected to substantially increase vehicle miles traveled and average daily trips on rural roads built for much smaller volumes. The Project will do this rather than fulfilling the often-cited County requirement that development build and/or improve the supporting roads. In addition, the Project asked for 10 County road standard exceptions to largely avoid that responsibility. In the years since the previous traffic study for the Project, traffic volumes have increased markedly on nearly all the affected road and intersection segments. Many segments rise to a level just below the threshold for failure. There is no planned public transportation for the Project except a bus stop 3-miles away.

**1-E.** As a result of the increased traffic volumes and vehicle miles traveled associated with the Project, not surprisingly, air quality will deteriorate well beyond what it would be without the Project. Various nitrogen oxides, carbon dioxide and other elements of smog will be added to the local atmosphere beyond current levels.

**1-F.** Again, not surprisingly, along with the increasing traffic volumes already present, the addition of more than 19,000 average daily trips by the Project will greatly increase the noise both from local roads and the adjacent I-15 freeway.

**1-G.** We also commented on substantial impacts to the cultural and biological resources of the Project site. There are many species of animals and plants present on the Project site that are identified by the County with various degrees of threatened existence within the County. The feeble justification for their loss is that populations of these species may exist elsewhere, although no evidence to demonstrate that suggestion was offered. Additionally, the Project is adjacent to a large Native American cultural site that extends into the Project. Cultural items, most likely, will be disturbed or destroyed during the Project’s excavation and grading.

**1-H.** Wild fires figure prominently in the Project area. However, there is no agreed or committed plan for fire protection in the 2015 DEIR and none offered in the DREIR. The Project includes a 200-bed assisted living facility accompanied by a gated senior community. These features will pose considerable difficulty for fire evacuation given the simplified “Ready, Set, Go” plan being

offered. Exacerbating that plan is the limited egress from the entire Project. All the exits are onto the narrow two-lane West Lilac Road, or possibly onto the connecting, narrow two-lane Circle R Road, leading to gridlock even before the rest of Valley Center's residents attempt to use those roads for evacuation.

**1-I.** With all that is previously mentioned, there will be significant irreversible impacts on the Lilac Triangle, and consequently, Valley Center. The developer points to a previous project, San Elijo Hills, as an example of what this Project could be. The commercial center of San Elijo Hills has not materialized as forecast and much of it will likely revert to additional housing. The evacuation of San Elijo Hills during the 2014 Cocos fire was plagued by gridlock at a crucial time for exiting residents and entering firefighting equipment and personnel. The prospect of such impacts in the Lilac Triangle is daunting. Further, in terms of community character, the substitution of an urban density for the current rural, agricultural density in the Project area will have a permanent damaging impact on properties surrounding the project.

**2.** The DREIR presents newer information on impacts that would be caused by the Project that must be addressed before a decision is made for approval.

## **2-A. Transportation/Traffic**

**2-A.1** – The traffic counts for evaluated road intersections/segments in Table 2.3-a appear to be anomalous in a few cases with no acceptable explanation of why there are disparate counts between the 2015 report and the 2017 report. Specifically,

West Lilac Road segments:

- Old Highway 395 to Main St.,
- Main St. to Street F,
- Street F to Covey Lane and
- Circle R Drive to Lilac Road

The counts on these segments are not consistent with counts on adjoining road segments. The listed segments all *decreased* in volume from 23% to 37%, while West Lilac Road from Covey Lane to Circle R Drive *increased* by 108% and Circle R Drive from West Lilac to Mountain Ridge Road *increased* by 25%. And yet, the volume on Circle R Drive from Mountain Ridge Road to Old Highway 395 [a logical outlet for points to the east] is inexplicably *decreased* by 45%. What is the explanation for the disappearing volume on these segments? By comparison, the volume for all the other road segments studied increased by an average of 30%. Were the counts on the low volume segments affected by traffic control for construction work in the segment of Circle R Drive from Mountain Ridge Road to Old Highway 395? Is there another plausible explanation? In the County's August 2016 Impact Report West Lilac Road from Old Highway 395 to Main Street is designated for improvement to 2.2C. Is that in conflict with the re-circulated DEIR chapter 2.3? What is the timing of the mitigation if it is to be made? How are we to react to the conflicting information?

Curiously, four of the five anomalous segments either front on the Project boundary or are important for Project access. It seems surprising that the consultant conducting the studies didn't conduct variance analysis to the prior count information and, at some top level, address the root cause of the variance. It is especially curious considering that one segment [West Lilac Road between Old Highway 395 and Main St.] is freed from mitigation as a result of the lowered volume count [ref. 2.3.S.1 Significant Direct Impacts, ¶ 1]. We wonder if a new count would reflect

increases similar to 87% of the other segments studied [increases averaged 30%]. If it did, this segment would be increased above the LOS D capacity of the road segment [13,500] in connection with cumulative impacts and therefore be LOS E. Likely a similar increase for the other atypical road segments would have similar results. A recount using the more traditional and accurate traffic count instrumentation stretched across the road segments for multiple days rather than manually counted at an intersection would provide required statistically valid information for Decision Makers.

VCCPG reviews many traffic impact studies, perhaps ten in the past four years. This is the first instance of a manual count being employed. The use of a questionable count methodology combined with a limited sample size that yields a significantly different direct impact result requires more extensive explanation and supporting information than what the RDEIR provides.

**2-A.2** In Table 2.3-2, Peak Hour Intersection LOS Results, delays are expressed in terms of the single worst-case delay rather than average delay? Why is that? Further, a 32-minute delay at the I-15 northbound ramps at Gopher Canyon Rd. in the PM seems more than a stretch to those of us who use that ramp. More realistic and useful data are needed.

**2-A.3** Table 2.3-1a, Existing Plus Project Cumulative Segment Operations, reports no cumulative impact on West Lilac Road from Old Highway 395 to Main Street, claiming that there is no significant impact on the segment as it goes from LOS A to LOS D. Citing comment 2-A.1, the failure to reach significance is likely due to the anomalously low volume count [890] for the segment. A more reasonable count would likely exceed the threshold of 13,500 trips [presently calculated at 13,140] and show the segment at an unacceptable LOS E or F. This segment must be addressed to ensure that all measures needed to accommodate the dramatic increases in traffic volume are employed.

2-A.4 Table 2.3-1 is appears to be out-of-date and should be removed or lined-out.

**2-A.5** Table 2.3-23, Direct Traffic Impacts and Mitigation Summary, presents disturbing new timing delays for impact mitigations.

- M-TR-1 is being moved from phase A to phase B [although this mitigation is already constructed]. It seems more reasonable for the developer to contribute to this mitigation at the start of phase A rather than later, since the first 352 houses will be contributing to the congestion along Gopher Canyon and E. Vista Way.
- M-TR-2 is being moved from phase B to phase D. The I-15 SB ramps at Gopher Canyon will be impacted by the Project from the first phase onward. There is a lack of justification to delay the mitigation until phase D, since the subject intersection is presently impacted and additional project volume will exacerbate the situation from the start of the Project.
- M-TR-4 [West Lilac Road from Old Highway 395 to Main Street] has been removed either because of the low 2017 report traffic count lowering significance or because of the directive listed in the County's August 2016 Impact Report by the Planning Commission. It is unclear which is being implemented.
- M-TR-5 [E. Vista Way from Gopher Canyon to Osborne] is being moved from phase B to phase C. Like M-TR-1, this mitigation is already constructed. However, the Project will have an impact from the start and the developer should be conditioned to contribute to this mitigation at the start of phase A.

- M-TR-6 [a signal at West Lilac Road and Old Highway 395] is not conditioned until the 585<sup>th</sup> house in phase C. This intersection is the key one for the Project and the Project should be conditioned to implement the improvement at the start of phase A, particularly since it is part of an LOS E or F set of segments along Old Highway 395.
- Neither M-TR-2017-1 [Old River Road at Camino Del Rey] nor M-TR-2017-2 are conditioned to be installed at any particular phase. Whether it is to be a signal or a roundabout, the Specific Plan and DREIR should be more specific about timing so the public can assess the potential impacts as the Project rolls out over at least 10-years. There is no certainty here. A specific plan should be defined and communicated.

**2-A.6** The DREIR is unclear about how the mitigations for traffic impacts will be implemented if the phasing proceeds in some order other than phases 1,4,2,5,3. Of course doubly confusing is the use of phases A-E in chapter 2.3 rather than phases 1-5 used elsewhere. Are there alternative plans for different phasing sequences and how will each different sequence affect the traffic impacts and mitigation.

**2-A.7** Chapter 2.3 on page 16 states that the southbound ramps from I-15 will operate at LOS D in the AM and LOS A in the PM peak hours. This is inconceivable in the context of the TIS. Clearly there is a mistake here. More likely, this intersection will operate at LOS F in the PM. There is a chronic existing problem making a left turn onto the SB I-15 ramp or making a left turn onto eastbound Gopher Canyon Road from the SB I-15 ramp.

**2-A.8** The off-site impact cited at the intersection of Lilac Road and Old Castle Road indicates that a traffic signal or a roundabout is required for mitigation. A signal at this location would pose a serious traffic hazard since the eastern approach of Old Castle Road to that intersection has a significant down-hill curved grade that will be a challenge for large, heavy vehicles attempting to stop for a signal. The sight lines from this approach are also limited. A roundabout with adequate intersection warning signage may be the only solution.

**2-A.9** The Mountain Ridge Road exceptions should be denied until after the resolution of ROW and overburdening issues are resolved. The developer is predicating phase 5 [D] on access to this private road and has not made any progress on resolution in the past several years. Until resolved, it should be assumed that access would not be granted.

**2-A.10** The developer cites the General Plan Mobility Element need for park and ride facilities to be provided by large projects such as this one. Observing that there is a park and ride facility at Gopher Canyon and Old Highway 395 does not and should not satisfy that requirement. The cited facility is routinely oversubscribed presently, causing many users to park outside of the bounds of the facility on the road edge. The developer should be conditioned to either expand the cited facility or create a new one nearer the Project that can serve the Project's residents.

**2-A.11** Given the conclusion in chapter 2.3 that no mitigation of added congestion or impacts on the I-15 by the Project could be conditioned by the County because of jurisdictional issues, should not Caltrans be included in the review? To ignore the impacts to the principal roadway through North San Diego County along with its on-and off-ramps is short sighted. Further, the timing of any mitigation Caltrans might make in response to this Project, as well as the many others proposed or approved for the I-15 corridor between Riverside and Highway 78, should be coordinated with the County as the impacts occur.

## **2-B Green House Gas**

**2-B.1** The evaluation of green house gas [GHG] emissions for this Project is an important measure of why General Plan policy LU-1.2 is so crucial along with the conservation policies cited in Chapter 2.9 of the DREIR. Most of the cited CO<sub>2</sub>e is generated by mobile sources. The Project expects mobile sources to generate about 85.5 million vehicle miles traveled [VMT] each year. If policy LU-1.2 were properly applied to this Project, the Project location would be much closer to jobs, meaningful shopping, schools, and other required services including public transit. This policy is about more than “green” buildings and solar electric systems. It requires projects to be located near existing infrastructure, jobs and other social services. The failure to do so is requiring the purchase of carbon-offset credits for 2/3 of the CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions potentially generated by the Project. Many of those credits would not be needed if the Project met the first prerequisite of the LEED-ND standard. Instead, the Project shopped for a standard that could conform to its needs rather than the community’s.

Further, by resorting to carbon credits, the County is allowing the Project to add GHG to the atmosphere rather than remove them. Many of the carbon credit projects are forests that existed before the Project and would exist without the Project. Rather than reducing GHG, the Project is simply buying its way out of its responsibility.

**2-B.2** The Transportation Demand Management Program [TDM] includes several elements, e.g. school pool, school bus, and walking school bus programs that may not ever apply to this Project. If the proposed school is not built on site, trips to school will not be nearly as efficient as anticipated and may actually add to the ADT and VMT out of the Project. The same could be said for the Hotel guest private transit service since most guests will likely arrive in private vehicles and use them for local travel. So, far from making a significant contribution to reducing CO<sub>2</sub>e, it may be a nice gesture that is ineffective and adds emissions.

**2-B.3** Adding the EV charging stations off-site after the 1000<sup>th</sup> house is built [M-GHG-1] is disappointing and frustrates the intention of reducing CO<sub>2</sub>e. The charging stations should be a feature that is realized much earlier in the development considering the huge deficit the Project will rack up for both construction and operations.

**2-B.4** The carbon offset credit programs cited have only one project in San Diego County among them [Cuyamaca State Park Reforestation]. So, the Project will generate more than 23,000 MTons of CO<sub>2</sub>e a year for at least 30 years, but somewhere else in the world will benefit from reduced pollutants and Valley Center/Bonsall will be subjected to those pollutants locally. The entire concept of carbon credits has been re-evaluated by world governments and found to be suspect to the point that carbon credits will not be endorsed beyond 2020. It seems incredible that the County of San Diego would allow this Project to advance based on a flawed concept that will likely do nothing to mitigate the tremendous quantities of GHG to be generated by this Project.

## **2-C Air Quality**

**2-C.1** It seems clear that given the 30% increase in traffic trips between the 2015 traffic report and the 2017 TIS, the mobile sources projected for the Project will be adding considerably more pollutants to the local atmosphere. Regardless of the carbon credits to be purchased to offset these

pollutants, the degraded air quality created locally will be offset somewhere else in the world. Further, the concept of carbon offsets has been called into question by the European Union. It is not certain that all credits are “additional” sequestered units of carbon or units that would have been sequestered even without the credit program. To have the Project purchase carbon credits for 30 years may not be the solution the County needs to “reduce” CO<sub>2</sub>e either locally or globally.

## **2-D Specific Plan**

**2-D.1** There is no way of knowing when the final map for phase 3 will be submitted or implemented. What happens if phase 3 [which is the presumed final phase] is never built? The families that reside in the LHR Project will be using the Valley Center Parks and Recreation District fields and parks and the greater community of Valley Center will have to pay for it. The Project developer would not put its fair share into PLDO Funds and there would not be a public park. The assumption that people who live in the LHR Project will work in the community is illogical. The commercial development that will be in phase 2 will be retail stores. No one with a job in retail can afford a home in the \$300,000 - \$600,000 range.

**2-D.2** The Transportation Demand Management plan sounds great. But can anyone say that this will work? Participation is at the discretion of each resident or employee and they must be responsible for themselves. An applicant making a case for reducing VMT with a voluntary program can't say for sure it will be used.

Phase 3 is the last phase to be built in the project if the phasing expressed in chapter 2.3 is to be believed. Why is it that the major facilities for the public [the K-8 school and the public park] from this Project are being saved for phase 3? If Phase 3 is not built or built 8-10 years after phase 1, then where will the children that will live in the LHR Project go to school? They will go to the Valley Center Pauma Unified School District or The Bonsall Unified School District for at least 8-10 years if not longer.

**2-D.3** When deciding on the location of the proposed Project, did a thought of teen drivers enter anyone's mind? One teenaged driver on the minimally improved roads in the area of the Project is horrible to think of, but a hundred?

If there is no K-8 school built *in* the community, did the Traffic Impact Study consider the hundreds of added daily trips that those parents will take twice a day? This is not a wise location.

**2-D.4** This project is proposing to take away over 178,000 square feet of property from neighboring property owners. This is called Eminent Domain. Why is the County going to be complicit in taking from private property owners to benefit a developer who should have already secured the off-site rights he needs?

## **2-E Noise**

**2-E.1** Although LHR could be characterized as a suburban area, it is being placed in the middle of a rural area that also contains farming. The noise from traffic (let alone construction, likely continuous over the next 10 years) will severely degrade the character and quality of life of the surrounding area. This is particularly true because of the proposed commercial activity that will necessitate considerable and regular truck traffic.

**2-E.2** While this recirculation of the DEIR only looked at noise levels for the increases in traffic, it is important to remember that the examination of construction noise is included in the 2015 DEIR and is claimed to not change since the Project has not changed since then. Not only will it include heavy equipment noise, also, during the phase 3 construction, there will be considerable blasting and crushing of rock to create buildable spaces. That construction noise will continue for at least ten years during the anticipated period of construction. It could be longer if the economy slows down as it is expected to during the construction period because the rate of new home purchases will slow concurrently. The Project's progress to completion will depend on several market forces that are subject to the state of the economy, making it impossible to predict how long existing residents will have to tolerate the elevated noise levels.

**2-E.3** While the report suggests all noise increases related to the Project are within acceptable limits, it should be noted that several sample sites that have ambient levels in the upper 50 Community Noise Equivalent Level [CNEL] range will experience Project-related increases above 3 CNEL putting them over the 60 CNEL threshold for unacceptability. The fact that the increase doesn't amount to more than 10 CNEL makes these sample sites still acceptable. And yet, a sample site at 60 CNEL that increases by only 3 CNEL is unacceptable even though it is at a lower level than those sites that increased to higher levels.

**2-E.4** There are several-to-many instances where a current location is in the above 60 CNEL range, unacceptable to the County for current noise levels. For the County to consider the Project's anticipated increase in noise to be unacceptable, the increase would have to be 3 or more CNELs. Even though there are more instances of these current "unacceptable" ratings, there are no LHR project increases in the 3 or more range at these sample sites. This is both curious and unexpected considering the average 30% increase in traffic volumes on the road segments impacted by the Project. It suggests that the criteria for sample site selection need to be corrected or at least re-examined.

**2-E.5** The County focused much of its analysis on safeguarding buyers of Project homes from the Noise Impacts and has not adequately addressed the Noise Impacts to existing residential structures in the Project Area and implemented effective mitigation.

The County's proposed Implementing Resolution that imposes rigorous analysis of Road Noise and requires construction methods to attenuate road-generated noise. Great care is taken to ensure that new homebuyers will not be impacted by Noise.

Why isn't the same level of protection provided to existing homeowners in the project area? The noise modeling required by this resolution has not been performed for every existing residence offsite the Project area. The analysis has been less rigorous than this proposed implementing resolution requires, and many of the most impacted structures have not been analyzed for impacts. When impacts have been identified, the County blithely states "significant and unavoidable" and moves to approve the Project.

Don't existing homeowners have the same rights to a Noise environment that humans can reasonably sleep in that new owners do? What measures have been taken to accurately model road noise for each existing structure and perform meaningful mitigation for each and every offsite existing residential structure?