

I-158 Kevin Glassel

- I-158-1** 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-158-2** The comment states that when the General Plan was approved Supervisors agreed to protect this area from over-development and downsize the property to 99 units from 200. Please refer to **Topical Response LU-1** addressing General Plan consistency. 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-158-3** The comment states that if developed, the project would sever critical north/south and east/west wildlife corridors. Please refer to **Topical Response BIO-2** concerning wildlife corridors. 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 comment states that Newland Sierra has sought special treatment or a “carve out” of the regional biological mitigation plan before it has been adopted by wildlife agencies. See **Topical Response BIO-1** concerning the North County MSCP. 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-158-4** The comment states that the project would impact Native American human remains by expanding Deer Springs Road. The comment restates information contained in the Draft EIR, specifically Section 2.5 Cultural Resources. Potential impacts to Native American human remains have been extensively evaluated, disclosed and mitigated for 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-158-5** The comment states that the project would add 28,000 new trips per day to the local roads and would bring I-15 traffic to level “F”. The comment restates information contained in the Draft EIR. Specifically, Section 2.13.6 estimates the anticipated project trips. Section 2.13.9 analyzes the project’s impacts to the transportation network, including impacts to freeway segments. The Draft EIR identified impacts TR-18 (I-15 from Deer Springs Road to Pomerado Road) and TR-41 (I-15 from Old Highway 395 to Pomerado Avenue) as a significant and unavoidable direct and cumulative impacts, respectively. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no more specific response can be provided or is required. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR

Comment Letter Responses

for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.

I-158-6 The comment states that the project proposes to widen Deer Springs Road to six lanes and build a new I-15 interchange, drawing thousands of cut-through commuters. 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.

Regarding the comment that Newland plans to start building before Caltrans finishes its analysis and approval of a re-design interchange at Deer Springs Road and I-15, refer to **Topical Response TR-2** for discussion of interchange phasing.

I-158-7 The comment states that Vallecitos Water District projects a water supply deficit for the next 20 years and that the District's Water Supply Assessment requires a 36% water supply cut to existing customers in order to serve the Newland Sierra development. The County does not concur with the comment. Refer to **Topical Response UTL-2** addressing the reduction in water consumption for existing residents.

Regarding the proposed projects impacts to water supply, the Draft EIR analyzes water supply in Section 2.14.1, Water Supply and Service. The proposed project would increase overall demand for potable water; however, the Draft EIR compares the planned water usage for the project Site with the estimated water demand based

Comment Letter Responses

on the proposed project land uses and water conservation measures, and concludes the impacts to water supplies would be less than significant. For additional detail refer to **Topical Response UTL-1**.

- I-158-8** The comment states that the project is in a “Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone” and that the project does not provide enough emergency access routes in the event of a fire which would cause gridlock during an evacuation. 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. 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-158-9** The comment states that the County Board of Supervisors spent millions of dollars and 10 years developing a General Plan that protected and downzoned this area, and that a few years ago the Board of Supervisors voted to approve the plan and protect this area from development. Please refer 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-158-10** The comment states that the County should not approve the project until the Climate Action Plan (CAP) has been completed. The comment also states that the Golden Door and Sierra Club recently won a trial court decision invalidating the County’s threshold for measuring greenhouse gas impacts.

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