

I-157 Jennifer Wilson Glassel

- I -157-1** The comment states the commenter has a list of questions after reviewing the Draft EIR.

The comment is 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 -157-2** The comment states the County spent 10 years and millions of dollars on the General Plan Update, which downzoned the project Site to 99 units. The commenter urges the County to recommend against the proposed project

The County refers the commenter to **Topical Response LU-1** addressing this comment and the proposed project's consistency with the County General Plan. 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 -157-3** The comment states the proposed project is in a sensitive area that would impact wildlife corridors. The comment states the proposed project has also sought a carve-out of the draft North County MSCP.

The County refers the commenter to **Topical Response BIO-1** regarding the proposed projects consistency with the Draft North County MSCP, and **Topical Response BIO-2** regarding wildlife corridors and wildlife movement. The proposed project would not preclude implementation of the North County MSCP and would mitigate impacts to wildlife movement 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 -157-4** The comment states the proposed project would impact significant cultural resources, in particular by widening Deer Springs Road.

The comment restates information contained in the Draft EIR, specifically Section 2.5 Cultural Resources, 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 -157-5** The comment states the proposed project would add 28,000 ADT to local roads and would bring traffic on the I-15 to Level of Service "F" with no new freeway improvements or transit infrastructure proposed. The comment further states the proposed project would widen Deer Springs Road to six lanes and draw thousands of

Comment Letter Responses

cut through trips but would start construction prior to Caltrans analyzing a re-designed interchange at Deer Springs Road and I-15.

As stated on page 2.13-2 in Section 2.13, Transportation and Traffic, the project proposes two options for Deer Springs Road (Option A and Option B), neither of which propose full buildout of a six-lane roadway as identified in the County's General Plan (6.2 Prime Arterial). Option A would require the reclassification of Deer Springs Road in the County's General Plan Mobility Element (County of San Diego 2011a) from a 6.2 Prime Arterial classification (six-lane) to a 4.1A Major Road with Raised Median classification (i.e., a four-lane road) between the San Marcos City Limit (just north of the Twin Oaks Valley Road) and Sarver Lane; to a 2.1B Community Collector with Continuous Turn Lanes classification (i.e., a two-lane road) between Sarver Lane and Mesa Rock Road; and back to a 4.1A Major Road classification between Mesa Rock Road and the I-15 Southbound (SB) Ramps.

Option B would construct the entire length of the road from the I-15 SB Ramps to its intersection with Twin Oaks Valley Road as a four-lane road, with an approximately 7,600-foot-long section of the road between Sarver Lane and Mesa Rock Road as a 4.1B Major Road (four lanes of travel with intermittent center turn lanes), and the balance of the road, including its intersections with Sarver Lane and Mesa Rock Road, as a 4.1A Major Road. Option B would not require the reclassification of Deer Springs Road; the roadway would remain as a 6.2 Prime Arterial (six-lane) in the County's General Plan Mobility Element (County of San Diego 2011a) from I-15 to the San Marcos City Limit.

The refers the commenter to **Topical Response TR-1** regarding impacts to I-15 and SR-78, and **Topical Response TR-2** regarding the timing of improvements of the interchange at Deer Springs Road and I-15. 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 -157-6 The comment state VWD projects a water supply deficit for the next 20 years and that the District's WSA requires a 36% water supply cut to existing customers to serve the proposed project.

The County refers the reader to **Topical Response UTL-1** regarding water shortage and drought, and **Topical Response UTL-2** regarding the alleged reduction in water consumption for existing residents/ VWD customers. 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.

Comment Letter Responses

I-157-7 The comment states the proposed project is in a “Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone” and that the proposed project does not provide enough emergency access in the event of a fire which could cause gridlock and compromise public safety in an evacuation. The comment also restates comments from I-157-2, above, regarding the General Plan Update.

The County refers the reader to **Topical Response HAZ-1** regarding the proposed project’s location in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone and evacuation planning. Please refer to **Topical Response LU-1** regarding the proposed project’s consistency with the County General Plan. 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-157-8 The comment states that the County has not adopted its Climate Action Plan (“CAP”) and should not consider the proposed project until the CAP is complete. The comment also states that the County’s threshold for analyzing GHG impacts was invalidated by the courts.

The County refers the commenter to **Topical Response GHG-3** regarding the County’s 2018 CAP. The County adopted its CAP on February 14, 2018.

Regarding the invalidated GHG threshold, the County acknowledges the comment and notes the proposed project did not use the Efficiency Metric for analyzing the proposed project’s impacts. Refer to **Response to Comment O-1-186**. 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.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK