

### I-210 Mark Jackson (1)

- I-210-1** The comment states that there were three major issues with the Draft EIR's disclosure of impacts of offsite improvements to Sarver Lane.

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-210-2** The comment states that the Draft EIR was unclear whether Sarver Lane from the Project boundary south to the Deer Springs Road intersection would become a County Public Road along its entire length, or have sections that would remain a Private Road.

The commenter is directed to Appendix R, Traffic Impact Analysis of the Draft EIR. Figure 2-3, Internal Roadway Classification Map, shows that Sarver Lane would continue to operate as a public road.

- I-210-3** The comment states that the Draft EIR and its supporting documents do not provide adequate impact disclosure information for Sarver Lane private and public road right of way (ROW), impacts to existing driveways, drainage and brush management easement rights, and temporary construction easements required off site of the Project.

The County does not agree with this comment. The commenter is directed to the Preliminary Grading Plan, Sheets 12 and 13.

- I-210-4** The comment states that Design Exception Requests #3 and #4 to decrease the width of travel lanes and lower design speed are inappropriate given the Emergency Access significance of Sarver Lane to existing residents and future Project population.

Existing pavement widths on Sarver Lane vary from 28 feet along the Catholic Church frontage (2557 Sarver Lane at the southern portion of Sarver Lane) to 16 feet north of the church.

It is proposed that the first segment, Section B1, of Sarver Lane would not include a median, but would include two 11-foot wide lanes and shoulders/bike routes in each direction that are 8 feet wide. It is proposed that the second segment, Section B2, of Sarver Lane would include a reduced shoulder, but would include two 11-foot wide lanes and a 5-foot-wide bike lane in each direction. There will be an extended parkway on one side of the road that is 29 feet wide and includes a 10-foot-wide pathway and a swale, and a 5-foot-wide landscape parkway on the other side of the road.

## Comment Letter Responses

---

Therefore, the Project would reduce pavement width of Sarver Lane when compared to the existing condition for a portion of the roadway; however, in some cases, the Project would increase the width of the roadway. The Project would therefore make Sarver Lane a more consistent width throughout.

The commenter does not explain why a decrease in the width of Sarver Lane (for some portions) is inappropriate with regards to emergency access. However, the addition of bike lanes as part of the Project would allow bikes and vehicles to travel in separate lanes, creating safer access for vehicles and bikes when compared to the existing condition.

Appendix N-2, Evacuation Plan for Newland Sierra, was prepared to analyze potential impacts related to evacuations, including the proposed improvements to Sarver Lane. As concluding in Section 2.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, impacts related to evacuation would be considered less than significant.

**I-210-5** The commenter asks if Sarver Lane from the Project southern boundary to Deer Springs Road is going to become a public road. The comment states that currently the first 1,500 feet of Sarver Lane north of Deer Springs Road is a County Public Road. The commenter asks if the intent of the General Plan Amendment is to annex the entire length of Sarver Lane as a public road from Deer Springs Road to the project boundary.

The commenter is directed to Appendix R, Traffic Impact Analysis of the Draft EIR. Figure 2-3, Internal Roadway Classification Map, shows that Sarver Lane would continue to operate as a public road. However, the road would be extended to serve as an entrance to the project site. Because Sarver Lane currently operates as a public road, no annexation would be required; rather the road would be extended to reach the project site.

**I-210-6** The comment states that the preliminary grading plan does not have adequate resolution to determine impacts. The comment states that impacts to existing driveways along Sarver Lane offsite of the Project, drainage, construction easements, brush management easements, and drainage easements are not indicated in enough resolution to determine impacts to existing property owners. The comment requests that a Right of Way analysis be prepared for Sarver Lane, similar to what was prepared for Deer Springs Road. The comment requests that the Right of Way analysis be prepared with “Design Exceptions 3 and 4” and without “Design Exceptions.”

The commenter is directed to the Preliminary Grading Plan, Sheets 12 and 13, which shows the right of way required for Sarver Lane improvements.

**I-210-7** The comment states that the Design Exception Requests #3 and #4 to decrease the width of travel lanes and lower design speed for Sarver Lane is inappropriate. The

## Comment Letter Responses

---

commenter requests that the County state their position on Design Exception Requests #3 and #4 and the rationale for the County's proposed position to except or deny the requests.

It is not clear what the commenter is referring to as "Design Exception Requests #3 and #4"; however, it is assumed that the commenter is referring Section 3.2.2.2 Light Collector Roadway Standards of the Specific Plan (pages 108 and 109 of Appendix C of the Draft EIR).

Please refer to **Response to Comment O-237-4**. The commenter does not explain why a decrease in the width of Sarver Lane (for some portions) is inappropriate with regards to emergency access. However, the addition of bike lanes as part of the Project would allow bikes and vehicles to travel in separate lanes, creating safer access for vehicles and bikes when compared to the existing condition.

The comment is general in nature and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR. Given that the comment is general, a general response is all that is required. (*Paulek v. California Dept. Water Resources* (2014) 231 Cal.App.4th 35, 47-52.) Therefore, no further response is required or needed.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK