

I-203 Michael Hunsaker

- I-203- 1** The comment expresses general concern over the project and Draft EIR. 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-203- 2** The commenter is concerned with the length of the Draft EIR and is concerned not enough time was given for the public to review such a large document. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commenter, and 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.
- I-203- 3** The commenter expresses concern that the Draft EIR is too lengthy and refers to outside documents, which adds to the time required to review. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commenter, and 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.
- I-203- 4** The comment expresses concern that the Draft EIR frequently draws conclusions where evidence is missing or incorrect. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commenter, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR. These comments are 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-203- 5** The comment states that both sides of the project must be carefully weighed and that the project proponent should carry the burden of proof. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commenter, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR. These comments are 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-203- 6** The comment states that CEQA requires that an EIR addresses the future of the project and its impacts on the community and the environment. The commenter believes the developer was given a leeway that allows them to increase impacts on the

Comment Letter Responses

environment. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commentator, and 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.

I-203- 7 The comment lists important environmental issues such as growth inducement impacts, limits of environmentally sound policies, and the evolving changes that will reasonably impact a different future, making previous projections and policies obsolete. The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in 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-203- 8 The comment expresses concern of the impacts the project would place on the North County Twin Oaks region, the Vallecitos Water District, the San Marcos Unified School District and the I-15 corridor. In particular, the comment expresses concern about exceeding the environmental limitations of the Vallecitos Master Plan. The following statement was published by VWD:

“The Vallecitos Water District is not in a drought emergency and therefore is not imposing any mandatory water-use cuts (reductions). In addition, the District would never impose water-use reductions to any customers to allow for any proposed development, including the Newland Sierra project.”

To continue to provide reliable water service to our customers, Vallecitos is guided by its Master Plan, which analyzes existing and future land uses, as well as current water demands and trends, to evaluate the existing and future water needs for District customers well into the future. Even with the 1,624 acre-feet* of annual water demand projected for the proposed Newland Sierra development, the District has already anticipated greater water use (1,825 acre-feet per year) identified for this property during the 2017 Master Plan process without the development. In other words, even if this development moves forward, the District will have sufficient water supplies for all new and existing customers.

During the recent drought, the cutbacks to our customers were not due to a supply shortage, as Vallecitos had sufficient water supplies. The cutbacks were mandated by an Executive Order from Governor Brown. Even during the depth of the drought, Vallecitos’ water provider - the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA), projected 85,196 acre-feet of water in storage after assuming an additional three

Comment Letter Responses

consecutive years of drought. Since the drought has ended, SDCWA now has 171,000 acre-feet of water in storage, and no restrictions on deliveries to the Vallecitos Water District, or any agency. This is in addition to the drought-resilient water available from the Pacific Ocean from the District's direct connection to the Claude "Bud" Lewis - Carlsbad Desalination Plant."²²¹

Regarding the proposed project's impacts to the San Marcos Unified School District, As stated in Section 3.5 Public Services on page 3.5-17, the project has reserved a 6-acre site for a school. After the on-site school is built, K-8 students generated by the proposed project would have the opportunity to attend this new school, which would have adequate capacity and would provide relief to overcrowding in the San Marcos Unified School District. Even with the addition of a school on-site, the project would be subject to assessment of applicable school fees in all three districts at the appropriate rate.

Regarding the proposed project's impacts to the I-5 corridor, Section 2.13, Transportation and Traffic of the Draft EIR, determined that the Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to the I-15 Mainline from Old Highway 395 to Pomerado Road and SR 78 Mainline from Mar Vista Road to Sycamore Avenue. 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-203-9 The comment states that although the Draft EIR disclosed cumulative projects, the magnitude of cumulative effects were not addressed. In particular, the comment expresses that cumulative impacts to schools, and population growth resulting from increased home density. Further, the commenter adds that Figure 2.3 is not supported by evidence.

The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR. For instance, cumulative impacts were analyzed within each chapter of the Draft EIR. Cumulative impacts to schools were discussed in Section 3.5.5 of the Draft EIR. As discussed in this section, cumulative impacts to public schools would be less than significant with implementation of the project. Further, cumulative impacts on population and housing are discussed in Section 2.12.4. As described in this section, impacts to population and housing would be significant and unavoidable.

²²¹ <http://www.vwd.org/Home/Components/News/News/2358/18?backlist=>

Comment Letter Responses

In regards to the comment regarding Figure 2.3, Figure 2.3-1, Cancer Risk: 30-Year Exposure on Residential Receptor Locations, is supported by evidence found in Appendix G, Air Quality Technical Report.

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-203- 10** The comment states that, due to paused infrastructure development as a result of the Great Recession, current utilities and service systems do not have the capacity to handle new development. The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR. More specifically, the project's impacts on Utilities were analyzed in Section 2.14, and Public Services were analyzed in Section 3.5. 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-203- 11** The commenter expresses concern about a lack of transparency when it comes to tax shortfalls. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. 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 because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.
- I-203- 12** The comment expresses concern that developer fees collected for mitigation are not used for mitigation, leaving communities to bear the cost of impacts. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commentator, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. 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 because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.
- I-203- 13** The comment states that the North County government is expressing broken promises to its citizens, while residents are reluctant to support new taxes. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commentator, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect

Comment Letter Responses

- on the environment. 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 because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.
- I-203- 14** The commenter is concerned that a handful of large cities have a disproportionate authority for controlling the distribution of funds. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. 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 because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.
- I-203- 15** The commenter offers a list of precautions to reduce environmental impacts. 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-203- 16** The comment states that all developer fees must be adequate to meet the needs for new infrastructure. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commentator, and 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.
- I-203- 17** The comment requests that all mitigation is built before any development begins. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding the analysis in the Draft EIR 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-203- 18** The comment requests that no changes should be made in the final project plans. 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 for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I-203- 19** The comment requests that all ambiguities and inadequately supported assertions and conclusions in the Drat EIR are eliminated in the Final EIR. The commenter believes

Comment Letter Responses

that because this is such a large tasks, the Draft EIR should be completely redone and recirculated and the public should be given more time to review the document.

The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and, therefore, no more specific response can be provided or is required. Revisions have been made to the Draft EIR to correct minor errors and add clarification. Revisions were made in ~~strikeout~~/underline of the Final EIR. These minor revisions do not constitute new information requiring recirculation 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.

- I-203- 20** The commenter is concerned that “Red Tape Reduction” measures passed by the County are difficult to construct and implement. More particularly, the commenter believes that the developer can pressure government project managers to meet their schedule. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. 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 because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.
- I-203- 21** The commenter is concerned that San Marcos Unified School District is overcrowded. The project’s impacts to schools are discussed in detail in Section 3.5.3 of the Draft EIR. Further, as stated in Section 1.0 Project Description on page 1-23, the project has reserved a 6-acre site for a school, which could serve students from the San Marcos Unified School District and Escondido Union School District. If students do not attend a school within the project Site, the project’s future students who live in the San Marcos Unified School District boundary are expected to attend Twin Oaks Elementary School, San Marcos Middle School, or Woodland Park Middle School. The project’s future students living within Escondido Union School District are expected to attend North Broadway School, Rock Springs Elementary School, or Rincon Middle School. The project’s future high school students are expected to attend Mission Hills High School, San Marcos High School, or Escondido High School. The school districts ultimately decide student attendance at the various schools. 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-203- 22** The commenter believes that cumulative impacts would occur to Twin Oaks Elementary Schools and that the project should be required to build at least one new high school and two middle schools. The commenter believes that not enough land is

Comment Letter Responses

available to also build a high school. As stated in Section 1.0 Project Description on page 1-23, the project has reserved a 6-acre site for a school, which could serve students from the San Marcos Unified School District and Escondido Union School District. If students do not attend a school within the project Site, the project's future students who live in the San Marcos Unified School District boundary are expected to attend Twin Oaks Elementary School, San Marcos Middle School, or Woodland Park Middle School. The project's future students living within Escondido Union School District are expected to attend North Broadway School, Rock Springs Elementary School, or Rincon Middle School. The project's future high school students are expected to attend Mission Hills High School, San Marcos High School, or Escondido High School. The school districts ultimately decide student attendance at the various schools. 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-203- 23** The commenter believes that the method in which the State determines development fees to schools is inadequate. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. 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 because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.
- I-203- 24** The commenter believes that the method in which the State determines development fees to schools is inadequate. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. 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 because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.
- I-203- 25** The commenter believes that the issue of school overcrowding does not receive enough attention. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. 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 because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.
- I-203- 26** The commenter believes that developers seek to maximize profits while politicians help them inflate their profits. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it

Comment Letter Responses

- raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. 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 because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.
- I-203- 27** The commenter believes that in order to address cumulative impacts to schools, a new high school would be required. However, the commenter believes that no money or space exists for a new high school nearby. Impacts to schools were addressed in Section 3.5.3 of the Draft EIR. As stated in Section 1.0 Project Description on page 1-23, the project has reserved a 6-acre site for a school, which could serve students from the San Marcos Unified School District and Escondido Union School District. If students do not attend a school within the project Site, the project's future students who live in the San Marcos Unified School District boundary are expected to attend Twin Oaks Elementary School, San Marcos Middle School, or Woodland Park Middle School. The project's future students living within Escondido Union School District are expected to attend North Broadway School, Rock Springs Elementary School, or Rincon Middle School. The project's future high school students are expected to attend Mission Hills High School, San Marcos High School, or Escondido High School. The school districts ultimately decide student attendance at the various schools. 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-203- 28** The commenter believes that the Draft EIR did not analyze road and greenhouse gas problems that result from school access problems. Impacts to roads and greenhouse gases from schools is not an impact from the project on the environment and thus is not an environmental issue analyzed under CEQA. Impacts from the project on greenhouse gases were extensively analyzed in Section 2.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, while impacts from the project on traffic were extensively analyzed in Section 2.13, Transportation and Traffic. 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-203- 29** The commenter believes that the project should not be approved because there is not enough adequate schools with safe transportation. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commentator, and 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

Comment Letter Responses

consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

I-203- 30 The commenter believes that the General Plan must be update when existing conditions are significantly changed, even though problems are still ignored. The project's compliance with the General Plan is addressed throughout the EIR, including in Section 3.3, Land Use, specifically Section 3.3.3.2, Conflicts with Plans, Policies and Regulations. Further, Appendix DD, Land Use Consistency Table, analyzes the project's compliance with the General Plan Guiding Principles, Goals, Objectives and Policies. The Draft EIR concludes the proposed project would have a less than significant impact to Land Use. 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-203- 31 The commenter believes that the project requires further analysis of roads. The comment addresses issues to transportation and traffic, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR (see Section 2.13, Transportation and Traffic). 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-203- 32 The commenter believes that both methods of traffic analysis, level of service (LOS) and vehicle miles traveled (VMT), fail to consider the effects of gridlock.

The project's traffic volume and/or LOS traffic impacts are addressed in Section 2.13.9. As discussed in this section, the proposed project would have potential significant direct impacts to various intersections, street segments, and freeway segments under the Existing + Project Scenario. Further, the proposed could result in significant cumulative impacts to various intersections, street segments, and freeway mainline segments. Impacts to various intersections, street segments, and freeway segments were found to be significant and unavoidable. The project's potential impacts associated with home-based VMT are addressed in Section 2.13.10. As discussed in this section, VMT impacts would be significant and unavoidable. As such, the effects of gridlock received extensive analysis 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-203- 33 The comment describes the methodology used to analyze Level of Service (LOS) traffic impacts. The commenter is concerned that both the LOS and VMT methods of analysis are flawed. The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR (see Section 2.13, Transportation and Traffic).

Comment Letter Responses

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-203- 34 The comment expresses concern that VMT does not address the issue of speed and gridlock and that LOS does not truly addresses GHGs. The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR (see Section 2.13, Transportation and Traffic in 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. No further response is required or necessary.

I-203- 35 The comment expresses concern that the GHG analysis fails to consider the consequences of traffic calming. As discussed in Section 2.7.3.1, Generate Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Either Directly or Indirectly, that May Have a Significant Impact on the Environment, of the Draft EIR, operational greenhouse gas emissions resulting from vehicular traffic from the project was extensively analyzed. 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-203- 36 The comment expresses concern that roundabouts are dangerous to pedestrians and bicyclists and increase GHGs by over 50%. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commentator, and 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.

I-203- 37 The comment expresses concern that the studies included in the Draft EIR does not address cap and trade fees. The commenter believes that cap and trade fees promote GHG emissions and is a way for government to increase taxes. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commentator, and 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.

I-203- 38 The comment describes that the biggest contributor to GHGs is congestion and gridlock. The commenter believes roundabouts, reduced number or lanes, and

Comment Letter Responses

intermixing pedestrians and bicyclists is unsafe and not environmentally friendly. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commentator, and 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.

I-203- 39 The comment believes that LOS and VMT should always be analyzed although they don't address and quantify the major road issues of heavily impacted roads such as Deer Springs and the I-15 intersections. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commentator, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR. The project's traffic volume and/or LOS traffic impacts are addressed in Section 2.13.9, while the project's potential impacts associated with VMT are addressed in Section 2.13.10. Impacts to Deer Springs Road/I-15 interchanges were analyzed throughout Section 2.13, Transportation and Traffic and impacts were determined to be significant and unavoidable. 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-203- 40 The comment expresses concern that the proposed project would result in GHG and traffic impacts that are more significant than other developments, particularly traffic impacts at Deer Springs Road/Interstate 15. The commenter is concerned that mitigation measures related to improvements to Deer Springs Road would be inadequate and actually increase congestion. Further, the commenter believes that the mitigation measures proposed along Deer Springs Road and Twin Oaks are not speculative due to restraints in the California budget and political fallout. The commenter believes these improvements must be completed before the project goes forward.

The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR, specifically in Section 2.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Section 2.13, Transportation and Traffic. In response to the commenter's concern regarding improvements along Deer Springs Road, as described in Section 2.13.2.1 of the Draft EIR, even with implementation of mitigation measures M-TR-1 through M-TR-4, related to improvements along Deer Springs Road, impacts would be considered significant and unavoidable. Further, as discussed on page 2.13-106 of Section 2.13.12.1 of the Draft EIR, with implementation of M-TR-1 through M-TR-4, direct impacts to traffic would be mitigated to less than significant levels. However, as the timing and implementation of these improvements are under the jurisdiction and control of the City of San Marcos and, thereby, subject to their concurrence and

Comment Letter Responses

- approval, for the purposes of this EIR, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable. 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-203- 41** The commenter believes that the Draft EIR should have evaluated gridlock and congestion based on experience while GHG emissions can be calculated using a graph like the one referenced by the commenter in **Response to Comment I-203-34**. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commentator, and 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.
- I-203- 42** The commenter believes that the existing Deer Spring Road/I-15 interchange has design restraints. As discussed in M-TR-1, on page 2.13-105 in Section 2.13.12.1 of the Draft EIR, improvements to the Interstate 15/Deer Springs Road interchange includes coordination by the project applicant with Caltrans. The lane configuration ultimately selected by Caltrans is subject to their PID, PA&ED, and PS&E processes required for the planning, environmental review, design, and construction of the new interchange. 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-203- 43** The commenter explains that conventional clover leaf design at the Deer Spring Road/I-15 interchange would require removal of the Mobile Home Park and the ARCO station and possibly the Fire station to the south and cell towers to the north. As discussed in M-TR-1, on page 2.13-105 in Section 2.13.12.1 of the Draft EIR, improvements to the Interstate 15/Deer Springs Road interchange includes coordination by the project applicant with Caltrans. The lane configuration ultimately selected by Caltrans is subject to their PID, PA&ED, and PS&E processes required for the planning, environmental review, design, and construction of the new interchange. 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-203- 44** The commenter believes that the design of the Deer Spring Road/I-15 interchange should have been completed by the time the Draft EIR was released and needs to be incorporated in the Final EIR. The commenter believes the Draft EIR should be redone and include the final intersection design. The Counter refers the commenter to **Topical Response TR-2**. The County will include the comment as part of the Final

Comment Letter Responses

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-203- 45 The comment introduces seven issues to be discussed below. 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-203- 46 The comment describes a personal experience with fire. The comment addresses fire issues, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR (see Section 2.8.3.1, Wildfire Hazards, in 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-203- 47 The comment expresses concern that the project could result in attraction of arsonists to the site, and that the terrain of the project site could lead to unintentional man-made fires.

As discussed on page 2.8-17 in Section 2.8.3.1, Wildland Fires, of the Draft EIR, proposed project is situated in an area that, due to its steep terrain, heavy fuels, adjacent ignition sources, and fire history, is subject to periodic wildfire. The project Site and the nearby communities of Castle Creek, Hidden Meadows, and Lawrence Welk Resort are all located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, as designated by CAL FIRE. However, the project's FPP (included as Appendix N of the Draft EIR), which already has been incorporated into project design, demonstrates that the proposed project would be in compliance with applicable portions of the County of San Diego 2017 Consolidated Fire Code and the Deer Springs Fire Protection District's Ordinance Number 2013-01. The project's FPP was approved by the County of San Diego on May 15, 2015 and DSFPD on May 18, 2015. The proposed project would also be consistent with the 2013 California Building Code, Chapter 7A, 2013 California Fire Code, Chapter 49, as adopted by San Diego County. Chapter 7A of the California Building Code focuses primarily on preventing ember penetration into homes, a leading cause of structure loss from wildfires. As described in Section 2.8.3.1 and the project's FPP, the project would meet or exceed all applicable Code requirements, with the exception of three lots. These lots will provide non-standard fuel modification zones. However, with implementation of mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant. 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.

Comment Letter Responses

I-203- 48 The comment expresses concern that the project's fire access is inadequate. Required project features for new development in wildland urban interface areas are described on page 2.8-18 in Section 2.8.3.1, Wildfire Hazards, of the Draft EIR. As discussed in this section, the project's FPP (Appendix N of the Draft EIR), which already has been incorporated into project design, demonstrates that the proposed project would be in compliance with applicable portions of the County of San Diego 2017 Consolidated Fire Code and the Deer Springs Fire Protection District's Ordinance Number 2013-01. Further, as discussed on page 2.8-20 in Section 2.8.3.1, Wildfire Hazards, of the Draft EIR, an evacuation plan has been prepared for the project (Appendix N of the Draft EIR), as required by the project's FPP, that indicates how the project would evacuate during a wildfire emergency. The evacuation plan has been prepared in coordination with DSFPD and San Diego County such that it does not conflict with existing evacuation and pre-plans. The evacuation plan does not interfere with the countywide Operational Area Emergency Plan, as it was reviewed by County staff to ensure consistency with other applicable/overlapping emergency plans. The available evacuation routes for the project are: (1) egress to the south via Mesa Rock Road, (2) egress to the south on Sarver Lane, and (3) egress to the west via Camino Mayor. The evacuation plan requires adjustment and continued coordination by the Newland Sierra HOA and/or developer and DSFPD/Law enforcement agencies during each of the construction phases. With each phase, the evacuation routes may be subject to changes with the addition of both primary and secondary evacuation routes. 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-203- 49 The comment states that fire extinguisher systems inside homes are of little use in brush fires because homes are set on fire under eaves. As described on page 2.8-18 in Section 2.8.3.1, Wildfire Hazards, of the Draft EIR, interior fire sprinklers, which would be provided in all structures (now required by code), have a track record of extinguishing up to 95 percent of interior fires and significantly reducing fire damage. Although not designed for wildland fire defense, should embers succeed in entering a structure, sprinklers provide an additional layer of life safety and structure protection. 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-203- 50 The comment expresses concern that smoke from a fire at the project site would create smoke that would affect the housing for seniors, which is expected to be located in the vicinity of the project site. Cumulative impacts to wildfire hazards were analyzed in Section 2.8.4 of the Draft EIR. As discussed in this section, cumulative projects similar to the the proposed project, along with cumulative projects, would result in an increased population in wildland interface and urbanized areas, thereby potentially increasing the risk of wildland fires through factors such as human

Comment Letter Responses

carelessness, arson, and vehicle fires. However, the best available technologies for fire protection have been included in project design, and its FPP further demonstrates that the fire spread rate would be sufficiently reduced for adequate response by the fire authority having jurisdiction. Through the proposed project's and cumulative projects' compliance with the numerous fire-related regulations, and incorporation of fire protection features, the potential cumulative impacts from wildland fires would be less than significant. 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-203- 51 The comment expresses concern that evacuation will be impossible unless the interchange and the Deer Springs Road are expanded first. As described on page 15 of Appendix N2 of the Draft EIR, Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan for the Newland Sierra Community, road improvements for Deer Springs Road, portions of Sarver Lane, and Camino Mayor or the Camino Mayor alternative will provide significantly higher vehicle capacity due primarily to the additional widths and lane provisions. Further, page 19 of Appendix N2 of the Draft EIR outlines the Newland Sierra post mitigation estimated roadway capacity for evacuation at different roadway segments. For the Deer Springs Road segment, the Evacuation Plan analyzed project road options A and B for Deer Springs Road to show comparison between potential plans of these improvements. As described on page 2.8-27, in Section 2.8.3.3 of the Draft EIR, impacts to emergency response plans would be less than significant. 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-203- 52 The comment expresses concern that implementation of the proposed project would result in the same level of fuel area, and gridlock along the main streets during evacuation. More specifically, the commenter believes the Draft EIR only analyzed the ability for residents to get the exit of the development and does not analyze the ability of the exits to be clear for evacuation to safer areas away from the fires. The commenter believes the roads should be expanded before the start of development.

There are number of roadway, interchange, and signal improvements that are included as part of the proposed project. These improvements are disclosed in Section 2.13 Traffic and Transportation. Potential impacts associated with fire hazards and evacuations have been adequately analyzed in Section 2.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials as well as, Appendix N, Fire Protection Plan and Evacuation Plan. Mitigation has been provided when necessary to avoid or lessen potentially significant impacts. 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.

Comment Letter Responses

I-203- 53 The comment expresses concern that fire code is not well enforced and recommends inspections of the proposed project fire breaks as well as regular pressure and flow inspections.

The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commentator, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR. Potential impacts associated with fire hazards and water supply related to wildfires, been adequately analyzed in Section 2.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Mitigation has been provided when necessary to avoid or lessen potentially significant impacts. 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-203- 54 The commenter suggests that the Draft EIR analyzed impacts to fire breaks and trails on animal migration patterns. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commentator, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR. Further, Section 2.4.10, Habitat Connectivity and Wildlife Corridors, of the Draft EIR describes existing conditions on the project site with respect to wildlife corridors, and Section 2.4.12.4, Wildlife Movement and Nursery Site, of the Draft EIR analyzes the proposed projects impacts. The Draft EIR further identifies impacts WM-1 (short-term direct impacts to potential foraging and nesting habitat), WM-2 (permanent, direct impacts to the loss of potential foraging and nesting habitat), WM-3 (impact to movement of large mammals from loss of wildlife corridors), WM-4 (impacts to habitat connectivity for larger wildlife species) and WM-5 (impacts to wildlife behavior resulting from noise and/or nighttime lighting in a wildlife corridor) as significant impacts and recommends mitigation measures, including M-BIO-1, M-BIO-2, M-BIO-3, M-BIO-6, M-BIO-7 and M-BIO-8A through M-BIO-8E, which reduce the anticipated impacts to less than significant levels. 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-203- 55 The commenter is concerned about noise impacts resulting from the project. The comment restates information contained in the Draft EIR and does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. Noise impacts received extensive analysis in Section 2.10, Noise, of the Draft EIR. As described in this section, mitigation measures M-N-1, M-N-2, M-N-3, M-N-4, M-N-5, M-N-6, M-N-7 and M-N-8 would reduce impacts to noise to less than significant levels. Nonetheless, even with implementation of mitigation measures, cumulative impacts to noise would be significant and unavoidable. The County will include the comment as part of the Final

Comment Letter Responses

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-203- 56** The commenter is concerned about noise impacts resulting from increased traffic along Twin Oaks. The commenter is concerned that the noise section of the Draft EIR only concentrated on peak traffic and recommends that a time graph of noise is included in the Draft EIR.

Increased noise due to additional traffic has been adequately analyzed in the Draft EIR in Section 2.10.4. As stated therein, off-site traffic noise impacts were evaluated based on the calculated change in noise levels due to the increase or decrease in traffic volumes. As shown in Table 2.10-19, project traffic would not result in a substantial noise increase under future with implementation of the project conditions at any of the modeled receiver locations. 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-203- 57** The commenter is concerned about noise impacts from traffic speeding. Speeding is not an impact to the physical environment under CEQA. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. 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 because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.

- I-203- 58** The commenter believes that due to noise echoing topography of the site, noise screens will be impractical mitigation. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commentator, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR. As discussed on page 2.10-30 through 2.10-31 in Section 2.10.6 of the Draft EIR, M-N-1, which requires noise barriers and/or setbacks to be incorporated into project design, would reduce potentially significant exterior noise impacts to below a level of significance. 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-203- 59** The comment expresses concern that once Twin Oaks is expanded, speeding, noise, and safety would be encouraged. The comment suggests more studies on noise, speeding, and safety issues be included in the Draft EIR. The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR. Speeding is not an impact to the physical environment under CEQA, and thus the County acknowledges the comment and notes it raises economic, social, or political issues

Comment Letter Responses

that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. Noise impacts were extensively analyzed in Section 2.10, Noise, of the Draft EIR. Traffic hazards were extensively analyzed in Section 2.13.9.6, Traffic Hazards 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.

I-203- 60 The comment discusses general water limitations in the West. The project's impacts to water supply were analyzed in Section 2.14.1, Water Supply and Service, 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-203- 61 The comment expresses general concerns about California's drought. Further, the commenter believes that the Draft EIR's statement that the project's needs will be met by the Vallecitos Water District (VWD) is unsupported and that the VWD does not have sufficient supplies to provide water to the site.

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

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-203- 62 The comment expresses concern that water would be denied to existing residents and transferred to new developments. The commenter believes that the predicted water shortages outlined in the VWD Urban Master Water Plan (UMWP) would be worse than expected and that the release of a new Master Water Plan (MWP) is behind schedule and that the analysis in the Draft EIR must be revised once the UMWP is updated.

The Twin Oaks Valley Property Owner's Association made the same or similar comment in a newspaper ad, noting that "36% cuts to resident's water supply" would be required so as to serve the proposed project. The VWD responded by posting on its website a "Correction of Misinformation." According to VWD, the District is not mandating the rationing of its water supplies to existing District customers (by 36%

Comment Letter Responses

or any percentage), so as to be able to serve any proposed new development, including the Newland Sierra project. For that reason, VWD considered the Twin Oaks' statement "false," requiring correction.

The above comment makes the same statement. Based on the information provided by VWD, the County concurs that the statement is inaccurate should be corrected.

The VWD's correction is quoted below in full:

"Recently, the Twin Oaks Valley Property Owner's Association published a newspaper ad noting "36% cuts to resident's water supply" in relation to a proposed Newland Sierra housing project. This statement is false. The Vallecitos Water District is not in a drought emergency and therefore is not imposing any mandatory water-use cuts (reductions). In addition, the District would never impose water-use reductions to any customers to allow for any proposed development, including the Newland Sierra project.

To continue to provide reliable water service to our customers, Vallecitos is guided by its Master Plan, which analyzes existing and future land uses, as well as current water demands and trends, to evaluate the existing and future water needs for District customers well into the future. Even with the 1,624 acre-feet [asterisk omitted] of annual water demand projected for the proposed Newland Sierra development, *the District has already anticipated greater water use (1,825 acre-feet per year) identified for this property during the 2017 Master Plan process without the development. In other words, even if this development moves forward, the District will have sufficient water supplies for all new and existing customers.*

During the recent drought, the cutbacks to our customers were not due to a supply shortage, as Vallecitos had sufficient water supplies. The cutbacks were mandated by an Executive Order from Governor Brown. Even during the depth of the drought, Vallecitos' water provider - the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA), projected 85,196 acre-feet of water in storage after assuming an additional three consecutive years of drought. Since the drought has ended, SDCWA now has 171,000 acre-feet of water in storage, and no restrictions on deliveries to the Vallecitos Water District, or any agency. This is in addition to the drought-resilient water available from the Pacific Ocean from the District's direct connection to the Claude "Bud" Lewis - Carlsbad Desalination Plant.

Comment Letter Responses

Regardless of development in our community, we encourage all residents to continue to make water conservation a permanent way of life. Click on the links for more information about conservation or the District's Master Plan or contact us at (760) 744-0460.²²² (Italics added.)

In addition, at the November 16, 2016 public meeting in which the VWD Board of Directors considered and approved the project's WSA, Director Hernandez specifically rejected this "mandatory rationing" requirement:

"And I, too, wanted to make it perfectly clear - we've mentioned this a number of times. I know there are some out there that still come up and tell us that they're concerned about that the existing rate payers are going to pay for some portion of the new water. That's absolutely false. That's absolutely wrong. Every new home that is going to be built is going to pay its own way. There is [no] burden on any of the existing rate payers, whether it's one home or 600 homes. It makes no difference. The developers have to pay for all of the new development and the capacity that is required." (See VWD Board of Directors' meeting transcript, Nov. 16, 2016, p. 31, italics added.)

The County has determined that there are sufficient, available, and reliable water supplies to meet the water demand of the Project in addition to the planned and other future land uses in VWD's service area during normal/average years, a single dry-year, and multiple-dry years over a 20-year planning horizon. (See also Draft EIR, Section 2.14.1, Water Supply and Service.)

In regards to the commenter's concerns regarding a new MWP, notes it expresses the opinions of the commentator, and 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.

I-203- 63 The commenter expresses concern that his two verbal requests to the Board have been ignored. The commenter states that he will file a formal written request to review and copy the data in the UMWP and suggests the County reviews this data as well and incorporate it into a recirculated Draft EIR. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commentator, and does not raise an issue

²²² The VWD's "Correction of Misinformation" is incorporated by reference and available for public review upon request to the County. It is also available for review at VWD's website: <http://www.vwd.org/Home/Components/News/News/2358/18> (last accessed November 8, 2017.)

Comment Letter Responses

related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR, but rather, it raises concerns regarding the already adopted UWMP. 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-203- 64 The comment introduces a list of issues related to the UMWP. 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-203- 65 The comment expresses concern that the VWD UMWP did not address more water inefficient and wasteful developments already in the pipeline. The commenter believes that there are not enough water supplies available to serve the project.

The comment regarding the UMWP does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR. 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 on the proposed project land uses and water conservation measures and concludes the impacts to water supplies would be less than signification. For additional detail refer to **Topical Response UTL-1**.

I-203- 66 The comment expresses concern about the project's impact on water quality and water supply. The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR. Section 3.2, Hydrology and Water Quality, addresses water quality issues, while Section 2.14.1, Water Supply and Service, of the Draft EIR, analyzes water supply. 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-203- 67 The comment expresses concern that the UMWP and the Draft EIR did not cover the ability of new developments to gain capacity apparently below cost and more than they need. The Draft EIR analyzes water supply and capacity of water facilities in Section 2.14.1, Water Supply and Service. As discussed in this section, with implementation of mitigation measures, impacts to water supply and service would be less than significant. Further, the November 16, 2016 public meeting in which the VWD Board of Directors considered and approved the project's WSA, Director Hernandez specifically rejected this "mandatory rationing" requirement:

Comment Letter Responses

“And I, too, wanted to make it perfectly clear - we’ve mentioned this a number of times. *I know there are some out there that still come up and tell us that they’re concerned about that the existing rate payers are going to pay for some portion of the new water. That’s absolutely false. That’s absolutely wrong.* Every new home that is going to be built is going to pay its own way. *There is [no] burden on any of the existing rate payers,* whether it’s one home or 600 homes. It makes no difference. *The developers have to pay for all of the new development and the capacity that is required.*” (See VWD Board of Directors’ meeting transcript, Nov. 16, 2016, p. 31, italics added.)

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-203- 68 The comment expresses concern that the VWD places burdens on home owners in regards to water conservation. The following statement was published by VWD:

“The Vallecitos Water District is not in a drought emergency and therefore is not imposing any mandatory water-use cuts (reductions). In addition, the District would never impose water-use reductions to any customers to allow for any proposed development, including the Newland Sierra project.

To continue to provide reliable water service to our customers, Vallecitos is guided by its Master Plan, which analyzes existing and future land uses, as well as current water demands and trends, to evaluate the existing and future water needs for District customers well into the future. Even with the 1,624 acre-feet* of annual water demand projected for the proposed Newland Sierra development, the District has already anticipated greater water use (1,825 acre-feet per year) identified for this property during the 2017 Master Plan process without the development. In other words, even if this development moves forward, the District will have sufficient water supplies for all new and existing customers.

During the recent drought, the cutbacks to our customers were not due to a supply shortage, as Vallecitos had sufficient water supplies. The cutbacks were mandated by an Executive Order from Governor Brown. Even during the depth of the drought, Vallecitos’ water provider - the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA), projected 85,196 acre-feet of water in storage after assuming an additional three consecutive years of drought. Since the drought has ended, SDCWA now has 171,000 acre-feet of water in storage, and no restrictions on deliveries to the Vallecitos Water District, or any

Comment Letter Responses

agency. This is in addition to the drought-resilient water available from the Pacific Ocean from the District's direct connection to the Claude "Bud" Lewis - Carlsbad Desalination Plant."²²³

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-203- 69 The comment expresses concern that existing water supplies are not drought resistant and will be cut back severely as the drought returns.

To continue to provide reliable water service to our customers, Vallecitos is guided by its Master Plan, which analyzes existing and future land uses, as well as current water demands and trends, to evaluate the existing and future water needs for District customers well into the future. Even with the 1,624 acre-feet* of annual water demand projected for the proposed Newland Sierra development, the District has already anticipated greater water use (1,825 acre-feet per year) identified for this property during the 2017 Master Plan process without the development. In other words, even if this development moves forward, the District will have sufficient water supplies for all new and existing customers.

During the recent drought, the cutbacks to our customers were not due to a supply shortage, as Vallecitos had sufficient water supplies. The cutbacks were mandated by an Executive Order from Governor Brown. Even during the depth of the drought, Vallecitos' water provider - the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA), projected 85,196 acre-feet of water in storage after assuming an additional three consecutive years of drought. Since the drought has ended, SDCWA now has 171,000 acre-feet of water in storage, and no restrictions on deliveries to the Vallecitos Water District, or any agency. This is in addition to the drought-resilient water available from the Pacific Ocean from the District's direct connection to the Claude "Bud" Lewis - Carlsbad Desalination Plant."²²⁴ 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-203- 70 The comment expresses concern that the proposed project would reduce the sustainability of a community's needed water drought reserve. 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

²²³ <http://www.vwd.org/Home/Components/News/News/2358/18?backlist=/>

²²⁴ <http://www.vwd.org/Home/Components/News/News/2358/18?backlist=/>

Comment Letter Responses

- 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. 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-203- 71** The comment discusses general water source issues resulting from the drought, water quality issues, agricultural irrigation efficiency, water scarcity for farmers, the issue of dry reservoirs, and water salinity. The comment addresses general subject areas and does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and, therefore, no more specific response can be provided or is required. Further, Section 3.2, Hydrology and Water Quality, extensively analyzed water quality issues, while Section 2.14.1, Water Supply and Service, of the Draft EIR, extensively analyzed water supply. 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.
- I-203- 72** The comment states that although it agrees with the Draft EIR's analysis and conclusions on agricultural resources, the Draft EIR should have analyzed future possibilities of marijuana cultivation at the project site. The commenter believes marijuana cultivation would change the economics of agriculture and has led to environmental and water disasters in the state and particularly in San Diego. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commentator. Agricultural resources were extensively analyzed in Section 2.2 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.
- I-203- 73** The comment discusses issues with water hungry plants, draft marijuana regulations, properties of the marijuana plant, water consumption properties for various plants, and water needs associated with marijuana production. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it raises general issues with marijuana cultivation that does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA or any issues 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

Comment Letter Responses

decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.

I-203- 74 The comment raises concern that, if the project site is used to grow marijuana, it would lead to significant impacts in water consumption and fire fuel modification zones. The proposed project would not involve marijuana production. 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-203- 75 The comment discusses economic, light pollution, water, and pesticide issues from marijuana cultivation. The comment discusses that the project cannot be allowed to allow cultivation of marijuana. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment, as well as environmental issues from marijuana cultivation that do not related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR. The proposed project would not involve marijuana production. 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 because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.

I-203- 76 The commenter requests that there will be no marijuana grown at the project site and if it is, security fences shall be installed. The proposed project would not involve marijuana production. 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.

I-203- 77 The commenter is concerned about VWD's new water capacity issues and believes there is a lack of a formal plan check and public analysis in the water purchase approval system. The commenter adds economic concerns about growing deficits for water and waste treatment capacity accounts, water and sewer demands, and blasting, grading, and excavation schedules. The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR as well as economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. 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 because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.

I-203- 78 The commenter is concerned that the public was not given enough time to review the Draft EIR. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commenter, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any

Comment Letter Responses

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.

I-203- 79 The commenter is concerned that the Draft EIR has major gaps and unsupported conclusions. The commenter believes that the Draft EIR should be redone, corrected and recirculated. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and, therefore, no more specific response can be provided or is required. Revisions have been made to the Draft EIR to correct minor errors and add clarification. Revisions were made in ~~strikeout~~/underline of the Final EIR. These minor revisions do not constitute new information requiring recirculation 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.

I-203- 80 The commenter is concerned that the location, topography, and rural setting make the location of the project unsuitable. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commentator, and 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.