

### I-168 Larry Grano

- I-168-1** The comment states general opposition to the project and states that Newland will use 200 million gallons per year of water at a minimum. The comment asks where this water is going to come from and at what cost to existing residences.

Based on the estimates of water usage per year, the project is expected to require approximately 530 million gallons of water per year without water conservation measures, and approximately 390 million gallons per year with water conservation measures. The Draft EIR Section 2.14 Utilities and Service Systems includes an analysis on the sufficiency of water supplies, which begins on page 2.14-37. The purpose of that analysis is to determine if sufficient regional and local water supplies are available to serve the project and the existing and other planned development within the Vallecitos Water District's service area. As stated, the analysis is based on the regional UWMPs completed by the MWD and the Water Authority, the local 2015 UWMP completed by the Vallecitos Water District, HDR's SB 610 Water Supply Assessment, GSI's Water Conservation Demand Study, the County General Plan water supply policies, and other adopted regional reports from MWD and the Water Authority (EIR, Appendices S, T, U, V). As concluded on page 2.14-48, the project's operational water supply impacts would be less than significant. See also **Topical Response UTL-1**.

Please refer to **Topical Response UTL-2** responding to the portion of the comment about reduction in water consumption for existing residences. 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-168-2** The comment states that daily traffic trips would be 25,000 in/out on Deer Springs Road. To clarify, as stated in Section 2.13 Transportation and Traffic on page 2.13-48, the proposed project is expected to generate 28,862 new trips per day. The comment does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of the EIR or its analysis. 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-168-3** The comment states that the project brings I-15 and the Deer Springs Road interchange to a level of failing. To clarify, the traffic generated by the Newland Sierra project does not cause the level of service on I-15 to change to LOS F—where the I-15 would operate at LOS F, the identified significantly impacted freeway segments operate at LOS F under existing conditions. (See Table 2.13-3, Existing Freeway Mainline Operations.) Please refer to **Responses to Comments O-1-237 and O-1-253**, as well as **Topical Response TR-1** addressing impacts and mitigation concerning the I-15 mainline.

## Comment Letter Responses

---

Concerning the Deer Springs Road interchange, as discussed in Section 2.12 Transportation and Traffic of the EIR, the project has identified feasible mitigation in the form of building a new interchange, identified as mitigation measure M-TR-1. However, these improvements are partially under the jurisdiction and control of Caltrans and, thereby, subject to their concurrence and approval. Thus, for the purposes of the EIR, impacts to the I-15/ Deer Springs Road interchange are considered significant and unavoidable. Please see **Topical Response TR-2** discussing interchange phasing. 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-168-4** The comment states, “A rock crushing operation generating dust, noise, and vibration for the 3-6 years of building.” The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR. Regarding the blasting and rock crushing schedule, as stated on page 2.3-32 in Section 2.3 Air Quality, all grading activities, blasting, and rock crushing operations are anticipated to be completed by the end of 2022 when major earthwork activity would be completed for both phases. For impacts resulting from fugitive dust, see Section 2.3 Air Quality, and for noise and vibration impacts, see Section 2.10, Noise. Also see **Topical Response AQ-1 and AQ-3** concerning construction and blasting air quality impacts, and **Topical Response NOI-1** addressing construction and blasting noise. 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-168-5** The comment states “No evacuation during emergencies due to traffic congestion.” The County does not concur. Appendix N-2 is the Evacuation Plan for the Newland Sierra project, which was prepared in coordination with the Deer Springs Fire Protection District and County of San Diego, and does not conflict with existing evacuation plans. From Page 2.8-20 of the DEIR, “the intent of the evacuation plan is to guide implementation of an evacuation procedure such that the process of evacuating people from the Site is facilitated in an efficient manner and according to a pre-defined, practiced evacuation protocol.” Appendix N-2 identifies the proposed project’s evacuation road network, including internal roads which connect to three primary ingress/egress roads, and ultimately connect to major evacuation routes, including, Deer Springs Road, Sarver Lane, North Twin Oaks Valley Road, Buena Creek Road and Interstate 15. In addition, the proposed project includes improvements to Deer Springs Road which would increase capacity of the main evacuation route compared to the existing condition. Further, improvements to North Twin Oaks Valley Road and Buena Creek Road would expand capacity of the network to assist evacuation efforts for the surrounding community. Please see **Topical Response HAZ-1** for a more detailed explanation of evacuation.

## Comment Letter Responses

---

- I-168-6** The comment states that the surrounding rural area isn't ready to handle the influx of residences as a result of the project and that the necessary infrastructure isn't in place, nor does there seem to be a plan to put them in place. The comment expresses the opinions of the commenter. The County does not concur. As discussed in the Draft EIR at Section 1.0 Project Description, Sections 2.13 Transportation and Traffic, 2.14 Utilities and Service Systems, and 3.2 Hydrology and Water Quality, backbone infrastructure and roadway improvements would be constructed in phases, as needed, to ensure that improvements are in place at the time of need. See also, **Topical Response LU-1**. As the comment does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR, no further response can be provided. 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-168-7** The comment states that this project has been denied in the past and that millions was spent on a study with taxpayer money. The comment also states that this area is currently zoned for 99 homes. The comment does not challenge the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Refer to **Topical Response LU-1** addressing this comment and discussing 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-168-8** The comment states that the project is far outside the scope of the General Plan and asks how it can even be considered. The comment also asks how many times unrealistic and ridiculous plans have to be entertained. The County acknowledges the comment letter, 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