

### I-233 Lynn Knowles

- I -233-1** The comment states that there is much environmental concern and lack of planning associated with 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.

- I -233-2** The comment states that there is a lack of fire and police protection for the proposed 2,135 homes.

As stated on page 3.5-15, Section 3.5 Public Services, the proposed project would increase demand on fire and emergency medical services. The County Fire Mitigation Fee Program (see County Code of Regulatory Ordinances section 810.309 and Ord. No. 10429 (N.S.), June 21, 2016) ensures that development fees are paid at the time of issuance of building permits, and those fees are intended to closely reflect the actual or anticipated costs of additional fire protection facilities and equipment required to adequately serve new development. The DSFPD is a participant in the County's Fire Mitigation Fee Program.

The proposed project will pre-pay the County Fire Mitigation Fee pursuant to a Fire Fee Payment Agreement with the DSFPD which would also provide funding beyond the required County Fire Mitigation Fee to augment the DSFPD's capabilities for continued provision of timely service to its primary jurisdictional area, including the project Site. By pre-paying the County Fire Mitigation Fee, the proposed project ensures Fire Station 12 would continue to have the capacity and facilities to serve the project Site and satisfy the General Plan's 5-minute threshold (Appendix N). The final funding amount will be determined in the Fire Fee Payment Agreement, to be completed prior to map recordation per County conditions of approval.

As stated on page 3.5-16, Section 3.5 Public Services, the project and its increase in population will necessitate an increase in law enforcement to meet the additional demands for services that invariably accompany population growth. The project would result in the need for five additional sworn personnel. For purposes of this analysis, the estimated residential population for the proposed project is approximately 6,063 individuals, resulting in the need for five new sworn officers to meet desirable law enforcement service levels (See EIR, Appendix EE, Project Facility Availability Forms). The project would not require the expansion of existing police protection facilities or the construction of new facilities. As such, the project would not result in impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered facilities.

## Comment Letter Responses

---

The proposed project would be subject to payment of public facilities development impact fees at the rate in effect at the time building permits are issued. The amount is determined through evaluation of the need for new law enforcement facilities as it relates to the level of service demanded by new development, which varies in proportion to the equivalent dwelling unit generated by a specific land use. The development impact fees address the proposed project's proportional impact on capital facilities, such as structures and equipment, associated with police protection. It does not address the impact associated with operations and maintenance for those facilities. Public funds such as property taxes, sales taxes, and fees generated by the project would be used to cover the incremental costs associated with providing police services. Net revenues are used to finance costs associated with operations and maintenance associated with the public services required to serve the project. The project would be required to pay the development impacts fees, which would be used exclusively for future facility improvements necessary to ensure that the development contributes its fair share of the cost of law enforcement facilities and equipment determined to be necessary to adequately accommodate new development in the County.

- I -233-3** The comment states that the anticipated traffic flow is not even considered and the area is already impacted with the lack of planning for the existing homes in the area and from Riverside County.

The County disagrees with this comment. Traffic impacts and proposed improvements are disclosed in Section 2.13 Traffic and Transportation. There are a number of roadway, interchange, and signal improvements that are included as part of the proposed project. 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 -233-4** The comment states that the impact to safety, comfort, lack of public transportation, natural resources, including water cannot be overlooked. The comment 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. However, these issues received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR: safety and law enforcement impacts were analyzed in Section 3.5 Public Services; public transportation was addressed in Section 2.13 Traffic and Transportation; natural resources were addressed in Section 2.4 Biological Resources; and water supply was analyzed in Section 2.14 Utilities and Service Systems. Please also see **Topical Responses BIO-1, BIO-2, UTL-1, UTL-2, TR-1, TR-2, and TR-3**. 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 -233-5** The comment states that schools and other means of education for the families has not been considered or paid for.

The County disagrees with this comment. 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. 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 -233-6** The comment states that previous research encourages a focus on new housing on infrastructure close to employment, and the commenter asks where this is.

As stated in Section 1.0 Project Description on page 1-24, the project is located at the Deer Springs Road interchange with direct access to I-15, providing regional access to existing job centers in San Marcos, Vista, Rancho Bernardo, Escondido, and Poway. The Site is also located near Cal State San Marcos and Palomar College, and three Sprinter stations are within 6 miles of the project Site: the San Marcos Civic Center Sprinter Station, the Buena Creek Station, and the Palomar College Station, as shown in Figure 1-34, Proximity to Major Employment Centers. 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 -233-7** The comment states that the lack of evacuation routes cannot be overlooked. The County agrees with this comment. An evacuation plan was prepared as part of the Draft EIR, Appendix N-2. Refer to **Topical Response HAZ-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 -233-8** The comment states that the County has a recent history of needing this type of planning. The comment says in the past, this has been denied by the County Board of Supervisors. The comment states that there has been an \$18 million study done on the area with tax payer money, which addresses many of these concerns. The County notes the comment, however, it does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. 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.

## Comment Letter Responses

---

- I-233-9** The comment states that the proposed project has 210% more homes than the current General Plan allows. The County notes the comment, however, it does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. 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-233-10** The comment states that the commenter is opposed to the Project. The County notes the comment, however, it does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. 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.