

I-135 Barbara Flinn (2)

I -135-1 The comment states the commenter understood the project was denied years ago. The comment states the commenter was born in San Diego and has seen growth. The comment states the commenter commuted for 32 years and sat in traffic for hours, and was glad when I-15 was built and when Highway 163 was widened from two lanes. The comment states the commenter is retired in Hidden Meadows and loves it because it is quiet and peaceful. The comment then states the commenter does not leave before 9:00AM because of traffic, especially on the roads around the freeway.

The County acknowledges the comment and notes it 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.

Nonetheless, the County acknowledges the comment and notes it 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 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 -135-2 The comment asks who thinks more housing is a smart choice. The comment asks why not solve existing problems. The comment then describes efforts to contact the County about speeding on Mountain Meadows Road and states that speed limit signs are overgrown by trees.

The County acknowledges the comment and notes it 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.

Nonetheless, the County acknowledges the comment and notes it addresses general subject areas, traffic safety, which received extensive analysis in Section 2.13, Transportation and Traffic 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.

Comment Letter Responses

I -135-3 The comment states the project was to be smaller and was denied, and asks about affordable housing and where the residents will work after being stuck in traffic all day.

The County acknowledges the comment and notes it 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.

Nonetheless, the County notes, relative to the previous project, Merriam Mountain, the County notes that project was larger than the proposed project. Further, the County notes that previous decision does not affect the proposed project, nor the analysis contained in the Draft EIR.

Relative to affordable housing, the County notes it does not have a requirement for projects to provide affordable housing. The County refers the commenter to the MarketPoint Advisors analysis, which was available on the County's website during public review for additional information on the proposed projects housing types and market trends in the region.

Relative to traffic, the comment addresses general subject areas which received extensive analysis in Section 2.13, Transportation and Traffic 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.

I -135-4 The comment asks to save some land in north county or anywhere. The comment states that subdivisions by developers who leave town are not needed in San Diego. The comment recalls Mira Mesa in the 1907's and houses being built before roads were developed.

The County acknowledges the comment and notes it 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.

Nonetheless, the County notes that 1,209 acres of the project Site are proposed as open space in a permanently managed, funded preserve.

Regarding the timing of traffic improvements, the County refers the commenter to Section 2.13.12, which provides a comprehensive list of mitigation measures with dwelling unit thresholds by which the improvements are required to be completed to

Comment Letter Responses

avoid triggering impacts. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and, therefore, no more specific response can be provided or is required.

- I -135-5** The comment states that more development will is more water runoff and that “we need water to sin into the ground, not run off back to the ocean.” The comment states the commenter does not understand how our representatives could let us down and that common sense says the area cannot handle the development, let alone blasting a few of the last remaining north county hillsides and wildlife.

The County acknowledges the comment and notes it 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.

Nonetheless, the comment addresses general subject areas, hydrology, blasting, and wildlife, which received extensive analysis in Sections 2.3, Air Quality, 2.4, Biological Resources, 2.10, Noise, and 3.2, Hydrology and Water Quality of the Draft EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding the analysis and, therefore, no more specific response can be provided or is required.

- I -135-6** The comment states that putting the cart before the horse makes everything worse.

The County acknowledges the comment and notes it provides concluding remarks that do not raise new or additional environmental issues concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR. For that reason, the County provides no further response to this comment.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK