

I-112 Mike Dummer

I-112-1 The comment states that the commenter has reviewed the DEIR and has a list of questions and concerns. The comment requests additional information in response to the questions. The comment concludes the following comments are offered as a homeowner, community member and taxpaying resident of San Diego County.

The County acknowledges the comment as an introduction to comments that follow. This comment is included in 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 notes that under CEQA, if an issue has been adequately addressed in the Draft EIR, no new or additional information is necessarily required to be provided.

I-112-2 The comment states that a check of Zillow® will inform any homebuyer there are plenty of homes for sale in the area and there is no housing crises. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. 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 because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.

I-112-3 The comment states that San Diego County “used to be a great place to live” but that the County has since approved impressive amounts of sprawl and overdevelopment and that quality of life has “cratered in just a few generations.” The comment states that the commenter and his wife moved to the Twin Oaks Valley area to enjoy rural life and the proposed project would “destroy the remnants of our dream.” The comment concludes that the County is “failing at it’s job” (sic) and that “many in and outside of the county recognize” not providing for an acceptable quality of life.”

The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commentator, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of 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.

I-112-4 The comment states that “traffic on Buena Creek Road, the 78, and the I-15 in the areas surrounding the project Site is deplorable, services (including parks and outdoor recreation) are marginal, public safety resources are delayed and unresponsive, the air quality is failing, water is scarce, waste water systems are over spilling and the County has no plan to remediate these issues.” The comment continues that the quality of life for San Diego County residents has diminished due to developments

Comment Letter Responses

such as the proposed project and “the County’s inability to fix the roads, fix the traffic, protect the public safety, increase quality of life and control the growth.” The comment concludes by stating “the County must fix these issues before focusing on new developments and the additional infrastructure that new developments will require.”

The comment addresses general subject areas, traffic, public services, air quality, water and wastewater, and population growth, which received extensive analysis in Sections 2.3, Air Quality, 2.12, Population and Housing, 2.13, Transportation and Traffic, 2.14, Utilities and Service Systems, and 3.5, Public Services in the Draft EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and, 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.

I-112-5 The comment states that between 10% and 30% of the proposed project’s ADT will use the transit stop at Buena Creek Road and South Santa Fe Avenue. The comment states that Buena Creek Road is a narrow, dangerous two-lane county road that has a failing level of service. The comment states the County had publicly stated that it has no plans to enhance Buena Creek Road due to many challenges. The comment concludes that the proposed project will exacerbate challenges on Buena Creek Road and worsen the failing wait times at several intersections. The County acknowledges the comment and notes that it provides background information and restates information contained in the Draft EIR and does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. 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-112-6 The comment states that the commenter found the Draft EIR very difficult to read because it was over 8,000 pages and included many inaccuracies and information referenced across many sections. The comment states some references were improperly referenced or the data was not available. The comment states the public review period was too short to read the DEIR in its entirety. The comment concludes with a series of questions requesting the County extend the comment period to 1 day for every 20 pages, if the County will fix the inaccuracies and references that make the DEIR easier to read and either the county will re-issue the DEIR and reopen the comment period.

The County does not concur with the comment. The public review period was 60-days, which exceeded the standard 45-day public review period in order to accommodate the extinguishment of mineral resources, and in full compliance with CEQA. While the comment notes several inaccuracies and illogical references, it does

Comment Letter Responses

not raise any specific instance of where these occur and, 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.

- I-112-7** The comment states that the County approved the General Plan Update after 10 years of meetings. The comment states that the Board of Supervisors downzoned the project Site to 99 units. The comment concludes by urging recommending against the proposed project to safeguard this sensitive rural corridor. The comment then asks three questions asking about compliance with the General Plan, how the County will pay for each of the non-mitigated impacts and how the County will pay for the lawsuit without using public funds if the Board approved the proposed project.

The County does not concur with the comment and refers the commenter to **Topical Response LU-1** regarding the proposed project's compliance with the General Plan. With respect to the questions regarding how the County will pay for each of the non-mitigated impacts and how the County will pay for the lawsuit without using public funds if the Board approved the proposed project, the County acknowledges the comment and notes it raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. 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 because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.

- I-112-8** The comment states that the proposed project will add additional housing that is not in the character of the rural community and which will ruin the atmosphere of the neighborhood, which is zoned for 1 home on every 20 acres. The comment asks questions about why the County is considering violating the General Plan, how the project will comply with the dark skies ordinance, what measures would mitigate light pollution and how the project will preserve the community's rural culture.

With respect to community character and rural character, the Draft EIR analyzes the proposed project's consistency with applicable General Plan policies related to community character in Appendix DD, Land Use Consistency Analysis, and finds that the proposed project would be consistent with policies including COS-1.8, COS-11.3, COS-14.1, COS-14.4, COS-21.3, H-2.1, LU-6.3, LU-9.2, LU-9.12, LU-11.2, LU-12.4, M-2, and M-4.3.

With respect to the comment about violating the General Plan, the County refers the commenter to Topical Response LU-1 and Draft EIR, Section 3.3, Land Use and Planning.

Comment Letter Responses

In addition, Section 2.1.3.2, Visual Character or Quality, analyzed the proposed project's impacts and concludes that:

“the introduction of project elements would result in an adverse change to the primarily undisturbed chaparral-covered hill and valley terrain of the project Site, resulting in changes in the visual character of the project Site from undeveloped to open space/developed. As such, the proposed project would significantly alter the current visual character of the site, and impacts would be **potentially significant (Impact AES-1)**.”

Thus, the DEIR analyzed the proposed projects consistency with community and rural character.

With respect to the question regarding compliance with the County dark skies ordinance and mitigation, Section 2.1, Aesthetics of the Draft EIR was prepared in accordance with the County's *Guidelines for Determining Significance, Report Format and Content Requirements: Dark Skies and Glare* (County of San Diego 2007b), and Section 2.1.3, analyzes the proposed project consistency with “applicable Federal, State or local statute or regulation related to dark skies or glare, including but not limited to the San Diego County Light Pollution Code.” As concluded on page 2.1-56, “potential impacts associated with ... conflicts with federal, state, or local statutes or regulations related to dark skies or glare (including the County Light Pollution Code) (Guideline e) would be **less than significant** and no mitigation is required.”

I-112-9 The comment states that the commenter is concerned about the impact the project will have on air quality, including sensitive populations such as children, seniors, and people with respiratory issues. The comment states the commenter does not believe the proposed mitigation measures are sufficient and believes the monitoring should be more frequent. The comment also states concern for particulate matter requiring more frequent cleanings and requiring the commenter to keep his windows closed and run the air conditioning more often, increasing his electric bill. The comment concludes with two questions about how the air quality monitoring is not continuous or more frequent, and how the project will address house cleaning, additional car washes and an increased electricity bill.

The County acknowledges the concern regarding air quality impacts and refers the reader to Topical Response AQ-1. With respect the comment about mitigation, the County notes the comment expresses the opinions of the commentator, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR. Nonetheless, the County refers the reader to Response to Comment I-1.4-98 for

Comment Letter Responses

addition explanation regarding why other mitigation measures are not required for the proposed project.

Regarding the concern about more frequent house cleanings, car washes, and higher electrical bills, the County acknowledges the comment and notes it raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. 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-112-10** The comment states that there are very few open spaces left in the county west of I-15 and that the rural community preserve open space for flora and fauna to thrive, including large predators, a diverse range of birds and reptile. The County acknowledges the comment as an introduction to comments that follow. This comment is included in 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-112-11** The comment asks how the project will mitigate loss of habitat connectivity west of the I-15 freeway. The County acknowledges the comment and refers the comment to **Topical Response BIO-2**, as well as Section 2.4.10 and 2.4.12.4 of the Draft EIR. The proposed project analyzes impacts to wildlife corridors and provides mitigation to reduce impacts to less than significant. This comment is included in 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-112-12** The comment states that the Draft EIR mentions the North County MSCP. The commenter notes the MSCP is not publically available and requests a detailed description of the MSCP for the project Site before re-submitting the EIR for public comment. The County acknowledges the comment and refers the reader to **Topical Response BIO-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.
- I-112-13** The comment states that there are no details in the Draft EIR on how the proposed project will comply with the County's CAP. The comment states that GHGs may be causing climate change and that the proposed project should comply with the County's CAP. The comment concludes with a request to explain how the project complies with the CAP, a question about why the County is utilizing tax dollars to consider projects that do not conform to the General Plan and CAP when such funds could be used to improve Buena Creek Road, and questions how the project confirms to the CAP estimates for public transit use and why this wasn't address in the DEIR.

Comment Letter Responses

The County acknowledges the comment and refers the commenter to **Topical Response GHG-3** regarding the proposed project's consistency with the CAP. The County notes that the CAP was not drafted at the time the proposed project's NOP was issued, nor when the project was circulated for public review. Further, the County refers the reader to Section 4.5.2 of the Draft EIR, which evaluates the proposed project's impacts to GHG emissions compared to the Existing General Plan Alternative. Because of the required mitigation measures (M-GHG-1 through M-GHG-3), the County notes the proposed project would result in net zero carbon emissions which would be less than required under a CAP-compliant General Plan Alternative.

With respect to the question about conformance to the CAP and General Plan and use of tax payers dollars, the County notes the comment raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. 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 because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.

Regarding the proposed project use of public transit, the comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in Section 2.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Section 2.13, Transportation and Traffic, of the Draft EIR. Further, the County refers the reader to Appendix R3. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and, 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.

- I-112-14** The comment states that the project will have a significant impact on the noise level in the surrounding community and will greatly increase the construction noise and ongoing traffic noise. The comment states that many of the impacts can be mitigated with traditional techniques but that the DEIR notes impacts as unmitigable or insignificant. The comment requests the DEIR add sound walls and sound attenuating construction techniques and materials to all road ways impacted by the project and surrounding areas.

The County notes the comment restates information from Section 2.10, Noise of the Draft EIR regarding potential impacts related to construction and operational (traffic) noise. The County does not concur that the DEIR dismisses impacts as insignificant. The DEIR complies with the County's requirements for evaluating noise impacts and identifies all potentially significant impacts as required throughout Section 2.10. A summary of these impacts is provided in Section 2.10.5, which identifies nine project

Comment Letter Responses

impacts and one cumulative noise impact. Where feasible, a total of eight mitigation measures are recommended to reduce impacts to less than significant in Section 2.10.6. The County notes that all impacts would be reduced to less than significant, with the exception of cumulative noise impact CUM-N- 1, Noise level increases along Deer Springs Road at Receivers O5, O11 and O12 with the Deer Springs Road Option B configuration.

I-112-15 The comment asks where construction lay down areas will be located. The County refers the reader to PDF 35, on page 2.10-16, which states the following:

PDF 35 The project applicant, or its designee, shall take those steps necessary to require that equipment staging areas are located as far as feasible from occupied residences or schools.

The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding the analysis and, 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.

I-112-16 The comment asks where the blasting will occur, on what schedule, and how much explosive material will be used in each blast. The County acknowledges the comment and refers the reader to **Topical Responses AQ-2, AQ-3 and NOI-1**. With respect to the amount of explosive material, the County refers the commenter to Page 2.3-31, which states, “An estimated 17 to 19 tons of explosive would be used per day.” The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding the analysis and, 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.

I-112-17 The comment states that the Board of Supervisors spent millions of dollars and 10 years developing the General Plan that downzoned the project area. The comment states the proposed project is the same population as the City of Del Mar and will degrade the rural character of the community and the County. The comment states the surrounding infrastructure cannot handle such an increase in capacity and that the County’s project growth is socially, environmentally, and economically unsustainable.

The County does not concur with the comments. In response to the project’s consistency with the General Plan, please refer to Topical Response LU-1, as well as Section 3.3, Land Use and Planning, and Appendix DD, Land Use Consistency Analysis.

Comment Letter Responses

Regarding the rural character of the community, please refer to **Response to Comment I-112-8**, above. Regarding the provision of infrastructure, the County refers the commenter to **Response to Comment O-1.7-4**.

Regarding the County's growth being "socially, environmentally and economically unsustainable" these issues are outside the scope of the Draft EIR, and raise economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. 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 because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.

- I-112-18** The comment states that there is not mention of how the proposed project will affect the Twin Oaks Valley Community and requests the EIR be revised and resubmitted for comment with a detailed analysis of the project's impacts to the Twin Oaks Valley Community in the same detail as the North County Metro Impacts.

The County does not concur with this comment. The proposed project is not within the Twin Oaks Valley Community and is not required to perform a consistency analysis for a community in which it is not located. The Draft EIR discusses potential growth inducing impacts, as well as cumulative impacts, which may relate to Twin Oaks Valley; however, the requested analysis is not required or necessary.

- I-112-19** The comment states that the proposed project would generate 28,000 new trips on local roads. The comment states that I-15, SR-78, Buena Creek Road, and other roads already have failing levels of services (LOS) and the proposed project would exacerbate the problems and leave taxpayers responsible for traffic improvements. The comment states that Caltrans has also revealed that it will not be improving on and off ramps as mentioned in the DEIR.

The County comment restates information contained in the Draft EIR and does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. The comment addresses general subject areas (traffic), which received extensive analysis in Section 2.13, Transportation and Traffic, of the Draft EIR. The comment does not raise any new or specific issue regarding that analysis and, 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.

The County specifically refers the commenter to Section 2.13.12, Mitigation Measures, which identifies those improvements which will be required of the project applicant should the proposed project be approved.

Comment Letter Responses

With respect to Caltrans, please see **Topical Response TR-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.

- I-112-20** The comment asks how the proposed project will mitigate impacts to the 78 and I-15 freeway which are already failing and provides a photo of traffic on southbound I-15.

The County acknowledges the comment and refers the reader to **Topical Response TR-2**. The comment does not raise an issue concerning 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.

- I-112-21** The comment asks how the County plans to upgrade Buena Creek Road for the additional traffic and utilization of the Sprinter Station, which the comment states will add 1,500 ADT.

The County acknowledges the comment and refers the reader to Impacts TR-15 which is identified on pg. 2.3-65 of the DEIR.

- **Buena Creek Road: S. Santa Fe Ave. to Monte Vista Dr. (Impact TR-15)**

Section 2.13.12.1 of the Draft EIR identifies “Mitigation measures M-TR-6 and M-TR-7 would mitigate the identified significant impacts to this segment of Buena Creek Road to **less than significant**.” (DEIR, pg. 2.13-111)

For clarification, M-TR-6 and M-TR-7 is as follows (See DEIR, pg. 2.13-107, 108):

M-TR-6 Prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for the 165th equivalent dwelling unit, the project applicant, or its designee, shall implement of the following mitigation options:

1. provide a traffic signal and the following lane configuration improvements at the intersection of Buena Creek Road/Monte Vista Drive:
 - Southbound – One shared left/right turn lane
 - Westbound – One through lane, and one right-turn lane with right-turn-overlap
 - Eastbound – One left-turn lane, and one through lane
2. Build a roundabout at this intersection.

M-TR-7 Prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for the 273th equivalent dwelling unit, the project applicant, or its

Comment Letter Responses

designee, shall improve the Buena Creek Road/ S. Santa Fe Avenue intersection to provide dedicated right and left turn lanes on southbound Buena Creek Road. As the S. Santa Fe Avenue intersections with Buena Creek Road and Robelini Drive operate under a single traffic controller, as additional mitigation, the signal timing plan would be modified and the intersection signal equipment would be upgraded.

A cumulative impact (Impact TR-36) is also identified for this segment of Buena Creek Road. As stated in the Draft EIR at pg. 2.13-116, “Mitigation Measures M-TR-6 and M-TR-7 also would mitigate the identified significant cumulative impact to this segment of Buena Creek Road to less than significant.”

Accordingly, through implementation of M-TR-6 and M-TR-7, the segment impact raised by the commenter is mitigated to less than significant.

I-112-22 The comment asks how the proposed project would resolve the impacts at Buena Creek Sprinter Station crossing and depicts a picture of traffic backing up.

The County acknowledge the comment and refers the commenter to Impact TR-7, Buena Creek Road/S. Santa Fe Avenue (p. 2.13-101). This impact is proposed to be mitigated by M-TR-7, which is repeated above under Response to Comment I-112-22. With implementation of M-TR-7, Impact TR-7 would be reduced to less than significant. (pg. 2.13-120)

The Draft EIR also identifies a cumulative impact at this intersection Impact TR-27, which would similarly be mitigated through implementation of M-TR-7 (pg. 2.13-123).

The Draft EIR also identifies Impact TR-8, Robelini Drive/S. Santa Fe Avenue Intersection. as to this direct project impact, the Draft EIR explains:

The impact to this intersection would be mitigated by adding receiving lanes on each side of S. Santa Fe Avenue. A detailed review of the constraints to provide additional lanes at the intersection was conducted. These improvements would require widening S. Santa Fe Avenue where right-of-way does not exist and significant impacts to private property would result to acquire the necessary right-of-way. The increase in volume at this intersection due to the project is approximately eight percent (8%). Therefore, the required improvements would not be proportional to the level of impact the project has at this intersection, which is located over 5 miles from the Project site. Based on these factors, improvements at the Robelini Drive/S. Santa Fe Avenue intersection are considered infeasible.

Comment Letter Responses

It should be noted that the S. Santa Fe Avenue intersections with Buena Creek Road and Robelini Drive operate under a single traffic controller. The improvements at the Buena Creek Road/S. Santa Fe Avenue intersection identified above in Mitigation Measure M-TR-7 would partially mitigate the project's impacts to the Robelini Drive/S. Santa Fe Avenue intersection, however, M-TR-7 would not fully mitigate the impact identified herein. Therefore, this impact to the Robelini Drive/S. Santa Fe Avenue intersection is considered significant and unavoidable. (*emphasis added*)

Similarly, a cumulative impact (Impact TR-28) would occur at this location. As explained in the DEIR:

“...there are no feasible improvements that fully mitigate the project's direct impact to this intersection. However, with the implementation of the S. Santa Fe Avenue CIP Project, this impact will be eliminated with the realignment of Sycamore Avenue to connect directly to Buena Creek Road, thereby rerouting traffic off of Robelini Drive and through this new intersection connecting Buena Creek Road and S. Santa Fe Avenue traffic directly to Sycamore Avenue. S. Santa Fe Avenue and the new intersection connecting Sycamore Avenue directly to Buena Creek Road are County TIF Program Eligible Facilities and part of the Regional Arterial System (RAS). Therefore, the following mitigation measure would mitigate this cumulative impact to less than significant:

M-TR-14 The Project applicant, or its designee, shall participate in the County TIF Program.”

Accordingly, the DEIR concludes that "M-TR-14 would mitigate the project's cumulative impact to the intersection of Robelini Drive/S. Santa Fe Avenue (Impact TR-28) to less than significant”

- I-112-23** The comment asks how the County will mitigate impacts on the 78 freeway onramp at Sycamore. The County does not concur with the comment because the Traffic Impact Analysis and DEIR did not identify an impact to this facility and no mitigation is required. The County refers the commenter to Tables 2.13-19, Existing + Project + Cumulative Projects Ramp Meter Operations. 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-112-24** The comment asks how the proposed project would provide sustainable transportation methods including bike paths and curb and sidewalks to public transportation consistent with the County's CAP and the SANDAG Complete Streets Policy.

Comment Letter Responses

The County acknowledges the comment and refers the commenter to Sections 2.13.9.6, Traffic Hazards and 2.13.9.7, Alternative Transportation Policies of the County's General Plan, of the Draft EIR. As analyzed therein, the proposed project would result in **less than significant** impacts through compliance with (1) "the applicable *Public Road Standards*, the County's Mobility Element safety-related policies, and other applicable engineering requirements, and incorporation of the project's TDM measures and transportation-related project design features" and (2) "the applicable alternative transportation policies in the County's Mobility Element as addressed above and in more detail in Appendix DD of this EIR."

- I-112-25** The comment states that water and sewer infrastructure in the area is beyond capacity and no improvement plans have been outlined to modernize current facilities even before the additional demand from 6,000 new residents. The comment states that VWD projects a water supply deficit for the next 20 years and that the Water Supply Assessment requires a 36% cut to existing customers to serve the proposed project. The comment concludes that current taxpayers will be "left with the bill to improve the infrastructure." The County does not concur with this comment.

With respect to existing water and sewer infrastructure, the comment expresses the opinion of the commenter without providing any evidentiary support. Further, these are existing conditions and not a physical change to the environment caused by the proposed project, and are therefore out of the scope of the DEIR. 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.

With respect to VWD, the County refers the commenter to **Topical Response UTL-1 and UTL-2**. 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.

With respect existing taxpayers funding infrastructure improvements, the comment raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. 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 because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.

- I-112-26** The comment asks how utility costs will be paid. The comment raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. 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 because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.

Comment Letter Responses

I-112-27 The comment asks that if an HOA or Mello-Roos will pay the utility costs, what those fees would be. The comment raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. 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 because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.

I-112-28 The comment asks how the proposed project will meet the water demands without compromising current resident usage.

The County acknowledges the comments and refers the reader to **Topical Response UTL-2**. 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 because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.

I-112-29 The comment asks what impact the proposed project will have on sewer overflows. The County refers the reader to Section 2.14.2, Wastewater of the DEIR regarding sewer service. 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 because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.

I-112-30 The comment states that the proposed project has set aside 6 acres and recommends the planned site be increased to 10 acres, and that another 10 or more continues acres within the San Marcos Unified School District (SMUSD) boundaries. The comment states the 6-acre site abuts the I-15 freeway which needs to be evaluated to confirm it meets requirements for public schools, including for noise, air quality, and acreage. The comment concludes by asking how the County will ensure that schools are not impacted by the additional students resulting from the proposed project and request information on student to teacher ratio and any additional resources and funding require to meet accepted ratios.

The County does not concur with the recommendation to increase the size of the school site from 6-acres to 10-acres, nor the recommendation to add another 10-acre school site. To clarify, the proposed project would generate 672 students in K-8, of which 168 would be in grades six through 8. Please see **Response to Comment A-5-2** regarding the school size of 6-acres. The County notes the comment expresses the opinions of the commentator, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR.

Regarding the location of the school, the Draft EIR has evaluated the school site. The comment addresses general subject areas, including air quality and noise, which

Comment Letter Responses

received extensive analysis in Section 2.3 and 2.10 of the Draft EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and, 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.

Lastly, regarding the question about how the County will ensure schools are not impacted by the proposed project, the County refers the reader to Section 3.5, Public Services, of the Draft EIR which states that “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.**”

- I-112-31** The comment states that the proposed project is located in a “Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone” and does not provide enough emergency access routes. The comment states that gridlock during an evacuation would compromise public safety, which should be the County’s number one priority.

The County acknowledges the comment and refers the commenter to **Topical Response HAZ-1**, as well as **O-1.13**.

- I-112-32** The comment requests a comprehensive plan for evacuation with input and approval from relevant EMS agencies and the public.

The County refers the reader to Appendix N-2 of the Draft EIR, Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan, for the requested information, which has been reviewed and accepted by the County of San Diego and San Diego County Fire Marshal. The County notes the comment does not raise an issue within the meaning of CEQA or address the adequacy of 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.

- I-112-33** The comment ask what routes will the proposed project use to evacuate the project residents and notes that surrounding residents in the Twin Oaks community will also be evacuating on the same roads.

The County acknowledges the comment and refers the commenter to **Response to Comments I-112-32** and **33**, above. 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-112-34** The comment questions that if roads are currently failing, how will the same roads handle an emergency evacuation.

Comment Letter Responses

The County acknowledges the comment and refers the commenter to **Response to Comments I-112-32 and 33**, above. With respect the question regarding the current level of service on roadways, the proposed project would include improvements that will expand current roadway capacity, particularly at peak hour; however, the County notes that evacuations may occur at any time of day, including non-peak hour.

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-112-35 The comment asks how the County will preserve the public safety in times of disaster. The County refers the commenter to **Response to Comments I-112-32, 33, and 34**, above. Please also see **Topical Responses HAZ-1 and PS-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.

I-112-36 The comment states that the DEIR is incomprehensive, incomplete and inadequate and that the County would be “negligent” not to revise and recirculate. The comment implores the County “to deny the DEIR until proper mitigations can be made.” The comment concludes by urging the County to recommend against the proposed project and respect the General Plan.

The County does not concur with the comment. The County notes the comment expresses the opinions of the commentator, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR has been prepared in accordance with the County’s EIR Content and Format Requirements. Impacts have been identified and appropriate, feasible mitigation has been provided throughout Chapter 2.0, including Sections 2.2, Agricultural Resources, 2.3, Air Quality, 2.4, Biological Resources, 2.5, Cultural Resources, 2.6, Geology and Soils, 2.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, 2.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, 2.10, Noise, 2.11, Paleontological Resources, 2.13, Transportation and Traffic, and 2.14, Utilities and Service Systems, to mitigate impacts to less than significant. The remaining significant, unavoidable impacts to Aesthetics, Air Quality, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, and Transportation and Traffic, have been identified and Statements of Overriding Considerations and Findings of Fact have been prepared as part of the FEIR.

The County acknowledges the comment, and notes it expresses general opposition for the project, but does not raise any issue concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR. For that reason, the County provides no further response to this comment.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK