

### **I-188 Jennifer Hill**

- I-188-1** 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-188-2** The comment asks if a cumulative impact study has been done for the surrounding communities for evacuation and how it will affect them. Appendix N-2 the Newland Sierra Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan, was included as part of the Draft EIR. As stated in the Draft EIR, Section 2.8 Hazards on page 2.8-33, the evacuation plan has been prepared in coordination with DSFPD and San Diego County such that it does not conflict with existing evacuation and operational pre-plans. The evacuation plan would not interfere with the countywide Operational Area Emergency Plan or the County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, as it has been reviewed by County staff to ensure consistency with other applicable/overlapping emergency plans. Other cumulative projects in the area, and specifically large residential projects similar to the proposed project (such as Lilac Hills Ranch, Campus Park West, and Meadowood), that require the preparation of evacuation plans would be coordinated with the Office of Emergency Services and applicable emergency service districts to ensure that conflicts do not occur. Please Refer to **Topical Response HAZ-1**. 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-188-3** The comment asks what the improvements are for the I-15 overpass to address traffic/congestion/emergency etc. As stated in mitigation measure M-TR-1, the project applicant, or its designee, shall coordinate with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to improve the Interstate 15/Deer Springs Road interchange to implement the lane configuration ultimately selected by Caltrans. See **Topical Response TR-2**. 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-188-4** The comment asks if an impact study has been done for air quality and noise that addresses rock crushing and blasting. Rock crushing and blasting activities have been analyzed in the Draft EIR in Section 2.3 Air Quality and Section 2.10 Noise. Also see **Topical Response AQ-1 through AQ-3** and **Topical Response NOI-1**. 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-188-5** The comment expresses concern over air born particles that will result from blasting and rock crushing. With respect to air contamination due to dust, Appendix F to Draft EIR Appendix G is a letter report summarizing, “the potential health effects associated with expected respirable crystalline silica emissions from blasting.” Long term exposure to ambient respirable crystalline silica concentrations greater than 3 µg/m<sup>3</sup> causes silicosis and other adverse health effects. However, the Draft EIR concludes that “[m]aterials that would be blasted at the proposed project are granitic and similar to those blasted at hard rock quarries. The SCAQMD monitored respirable crystalline silica concentrations near the Azusa Rock Quarry and found that average concentrations were 0.5 µg/m<sup>3</sup> or six times less than the REL. This concentration included emissions from blasting and other construction emission sources on-site. Accordingly, concentrations that nearby receptors would be exposed to would be considered acceptable.” (Draft EIR, p 2.3-50) As a result, “Dust that is deposited near sensitive receptors is unlikely to result in exposure to respirable crystalline silica because the vast majority of deposited material is too large to be respirable.” (Draft EIR, p. 2.3-49) In addition, “there are no existing processes taking place or future processes that would take place as part of the proposed project at nearby receptor locations that would reduce the size of particles deposited making them smaller, respirable particles.” (Draft EIR, p. 2.3-49) Finally, “the small amount of respirable dust that may be deposited would need to be re-entrained into the air in order to be hazardous.” (Draft EIR, p. 2.3-49). Please also refer to **Topical Response AQ-1 and AQ-3**. 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-188-6** The comment asks if a Health Risk Assessment has been conducted. A Health Risk Assessment was conducted, and is included as Appendix C to Draft EIR Appendix G, Air Quality Technical Report. 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-188-7** The comment expresses concern over evacuation during a fire event. Please refer to **Topical Response HAZ-1**, as well as Appendix N-2, Wildland Fire Evacuation 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-188-8** 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.