

### I-11 Louise E. Anderson

- I-11-1** The County acknowledges the comment as an introduction to comments that follow. The Comment also expresses concern regarding the lack of fire and police protection for the proposed homes. The County acknowledges the comment and notes that it addresses general subject areas, fire and police services, which received extensive analysis in Section 3.5 Public Services, of the Draft EIR. The comment does not raise a specific issue with the analysis; therefore, no more specific response can be provided or is required. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I-11-2** The comment states that the anticipated traffic flow was not considered and that this area is already impacted with lack of planning for existing homes in the area. The increase in traffic due to the proposed project has been adequately analyzed in Section 2.13 Traffic and Transportation and mitigation measures have been provided to reduce or substantially lessen potentially significant impacts. Please see **Topical Responses TR-1, TR-2, and TR-3**.
- I-11-3** The comment states that the impact to their safety, comfort, lack of public transportation, natural resources, and water cannot be overlooked. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the comment, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR. However, these issues were addressed in the DEIR: safety and law enforcement impacts were analyzed in Section 3.5 Public Services; public transportation was addressed in Section 2.13 Traffic and Transportation; natural resources were addressed in Section 2.4 Biological Resources; and water supply was analyzed in Section 2.14 Utilities and Service Systems. Please also refer to **Topical Responses BIO-1, BIO-2, UTL-1, UTL-2, TR-1, TR-2, and TR-3**. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I-11-4** The comment states that schools and other means of education for families has not been considered or paid for. Impacts to schools have been adequately analyzed in Section 3.5 Public Services. As stated on page 3.5-18, in recognition of the impact on school facilities created by new development, the school districts and the development may enter into various mitigation agreements to ensure the timely construction of school facilities to house students from new residential development. The primary financing mechanism authorized in these mitigation agreements is the formation of a community facilities district, pursuant to the Mello-Roos Community Facilities District Act of 1982.

## Comment Letter Responses

---

In lieu of a mitigation agreement, the proposed project would be required to pay state-mandated school facilities fees to each school district to contribute a fair-share amount to help maintain adequate school facilities and levels of service. Regulatory compliance ensures that there would be sufficient facilities to serve the proposed project's additional students. Ultimately, the provision of schools is the responsibility of the school districts. SB 50 provides that the statutory fees found in the Government and Education Codes are the exclusive means of considering and mitigating for school impacts. Imposition of the statutory fees constitutes full and complete mitigation (Government Code Section 65995(b)).

The proposed project would either pay the state-mandated school fees or enter into a School Mitigation Agreement(s) to ensure that schools are built as population increases during the phased development. Therefore, impacts related to school facilities would be less than significant. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

**I-11-5** The comment states that previous research encourages new housing to be focused on infrastructure close to employment. The County acknowledges the comment and notes that it does not raise an issue with the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

**I-11-6** The comment states that the lack of emergency evacuation routes cannot be overlooked and that San Diego County has a recent history of needing this type of planning. Please see **Topical Response HAZ-1**. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

**I-11-7** The comment states that this has been denied by the County Supervisors in the past and that a recent \$18 million study was done in the area with tax payer money. The comment also states that the site is currently zoned for 99 houses and the 2,135 proposed is an increase of more than 210%. Regarding the comment referencing a recent study done on the area using tax payer money, it is unknown what the comment is referring to. With respect to the existing General Plan Land Uses and Zoning designations, the comment does not challenge the adequacy of the DEIR,

## Comment Letter Responses

---

rather, the comment restates information contained within the DEIR. As described in Section 1.6.1, General Plan and Zoning Amendment, the General Plan Land Uses for the project site are:

- General Commercial (4.6 acres), Office Professional (53.6 acres), Semi-Rural 10 (19.6 acres), and Rural Land 20 (1,907.8 acres)

The Existing Zoning for the project site includes:

- General Commercial (C36), Office Professional (C30), Rural Residential (RR), Limited Agricultural (A70), Extractive (S82), and General Rural (S92)

As shown in DEIR, Table 1-11, the existing General Plan land use designations would allow approximately 99 residential dwelling units and 2,008,116 square feet of commercial space. Furthermore, the Existing General Plan Land Uses are compared to the proposed project in Section 4.5, Existing General Plan Alternative. Section 4.5.5 concludes the Existing General Plan Alternative would result in greater significant impacts to Transportation and Traffic (due to higher peak hour volumes), Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Aesthetics and Mineral Resources compared to the proposed project (DEIR, p. 4-24). For additional detail please refer to **Topical Response LU-1**.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK