

### I-212 Robert Jakubowski

- I-212-1** The comment states that the commenter is a former Hidden Meadows Home Association board member and is appalled that the project is coming up again, especially after being rejected and in violation of the San Diego County General Plan. The comment states that behind the scenes scheming is alive and well. The comment states that the Merriam Mountains Project was rejected in 2010 because the slim majority of County Supervisors recognized that the location is unsuitable for dense development. The commenter states that they heard a Newland representatives compare the project to Hidden Meadows. The commenter compares the Project and Hidden Meadows and explains that the Project is denser.

With respect to the Merriam Mountains project, the County notes that this previous project has no bearing on the proposed Project or its environmental analysis. Please see **Response to Comment I-345-2** and **Response to Comment O-1-377**.

Please refer to **Topical Response LU-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-212-2** The comment states that the Project would create “over-the-top” traffic. 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-212-3** The comment states that the Project would result in a dangerous fire evacuation problem.

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 Newland Sierra Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan (Appendix N-2 to the Draft EIR) anticipates the potential for bottlenecks, accidents, and other issues on roadways. On page 20, the plan indicates that the estimated evacuation times may be up to 2 hours, double that (4 hours), or more, if the wildfire scenario did not “enable pre-planned traffic management measures”. Should this situation be realized, the Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan offers descriptions of contingency options that would enable evacuations to cease or be partially implemented, while residents are directed to remain in their ignition resistant, defensible homes for the short duration that wildfire would burn in the fuels at the outer edges of the Project’s code exceeding, wide fuel modification zones.

## Comment Letter Responses

---

As indicated in Sections 1.0, 2.0, and 6.0, of the Newland Sierra Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan, wildfires are fluid events that require situational awareness, scenario pre-planning, and contingencies. It is anticipated that the worst-case Newland Sierra evacuation would occur in a similar manner to many other San Diego County planning areas. In the event of a wildland fire in the area, evacuation and contingency plans are an early part of a wildfire's tactical planning process by an Incident Command team. A contingency plan is one of the immediate priorities for development by Incident Command when a wildfire event occurs in a wildland-urban interface area. Community evacuation plans, like the Newland Sierra plan, will be integrated into the contingency planning process to assist and coordinate evacuation planning for all residents requiring evacuation. It must be recognized that wildfire and other emergencies are often fluid events and that the need for evacuations are typically determined by on-scene first responders or by a collaboration between first responders and designated emergency response teams, including Office of Emergency Services and the Incident Command established for larger emergency events. As such, and consistent with all emergency evacuation plans, this Emergency Evacuation plan is to be considered a tool that supports existing pre-plans and provides for citizens who are familiar with the evacuation protocol, but is subservient to emergency event-specific directives provided by agencies managing the event.

Please refer to Appendix N-1, Newland Sierra Fire Protection Plan (Dudek 2017) for details on the Proposed Project's redundant, layered fire protection system, that is consistent with designated shelter in place communities.

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-212-4** The comment states that the Mountain Meadow and I-15 interchange is already congested to and from Temecula and destinations north and south.

Please refer to **Response to Comment I-239-3**.

**I-212-5** The comment states that the Merriam Mountain project rejected in 2010 attempted to get around fire evacuation by a burn in place plan. The comment states that the Project would result in a burn in place scenario as thousands of people would be gridlocked trying to exit the freeway.

With respect to the Merriam Mountains project, the County notes that this previous project has no bearing on the proposed Project or its environmental analysis. Please refer to **Response to Comment I-239-3** and **Response to Comment O-1-377**.

## Comment Letter Responses

---

**I-212-6** The comment states that since 1913 there have been over 23 major wildfires in San Diego County killing dozens of people and resulting in extensive property loss. The comment states that the 2003 Cedar and 2007 Witch Creek fires resulted in 22 deaths. The comment states that the project would propose further expansion into know fire zones.

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. Refer to **Topical Response HAZ-1**. Mitigation has been provided when necessary to avoid or lessen potentially significant impacts.

**I-212-7** The comment states that there is easier land to develop closer to San Diego and that it is unnecessary to blow up and flatten a beautiful mountain.

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-212-8** The comment states that fine particles would be inhaled for years by children with asthma, seniors with COPD, and otherwise healthy people would eventually get sick. The comment states that Hidden Meadows would be downwind for the 10 years of project construction with no benefit to the County's plan of locating housing closer to places of work in San Diego.

Refer to **Topical Response AQ-1 through AQ-3**. An operational health risk assessment was prepared as part of the Draft EIR to analyze the health risks associated with the operation of the I-15 Freeway, Deer Springs Road, and the ARCO gas station, to new residents and schools introduced to the project site as part of the project (Appendix C, Health Risk Assessment) of the air quality technical report (Appendix G of the Draft EIR)).

As stated in the Air Quality Technical Report, Appendix G of the Draft EIR (page 138-139):

Regarding operational health risk, students attending the school on Site would be exposed to a maximum cancer risk of approximately 4.2 in 1 million. Project residents located in the north-east corner of the Town Center residential area would be exposed to a maximum cancer risk of approximately 9.1 in 1 million following implementation of mitigation measures M-HR-1, M-HR-2, M-HR-3, M-HR-4, and M-HR-5. The cancer risks on the project Site would not exceed the SDAPCD threshold of 10 in 1 million for cancer

## Comment Letter Responses

---

impacts after mitigation. The project residents would be exposed to a maximum chronic hazard index of approximately 0.02. The project residents would be exposed to a maximum acute hazard index of approximately 0.1. Therefore, the resulting maximum chronic and acute hazard indices are less than the SDAPCD threshold of 1.0 for chronic and acute noncancer health impacts. With implementation of mitigation measures, the health impacts to residents and students attending the school on Site would be **less than significant**.

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-212-9** The commenter recommends that the County of Supervisors and Planners reject the Project.

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.