

I-27 Barbara Benson (2)

I-27-1 The comment expressed the commenter’s appreciation for the opportunity to respond to the Draft EIR and states the following comments address concerns about water supply and safety. 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-27-2 The comment states that even without the proposed project, the region faced periods of draught, and that VWD has projected a water supply deficit over the next 20 years, and requires a 36% water supply cut to existing customers to serve the proposed project. The comment asks how this would affect safety in case of a fire hazard, and whether there will be enough water pressure

The County acknowledges the comment and refers the commenter to **Topical Response UTL-1** and **Topical Response UTL-2**. The proposed project would have sufficient water supply. Further, the proposed project has been reviewed by the San Diego County Fire Marshal and Deer Springs Fire Protection District, and the project has been designed and would be constructed to meet fire flow requirements.

I-27-3 The comment states that I-15 and SR-78 are “jammed” and asks how citizens and commuters can be evacuated safely during construction of and following completion of the proposed project.

The County acknowledges the comment and refers the commenter to **Topical Response HAZ-1**. As noted in that response, the proposed project includes a Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan (Appendix N-2 of the Draft EIR), which describes how an evacuation scenario from the project Site. Further, the proposed project would include improvements to roadways and intersections which would provide additional capacity in the event of an emergency evacuation.

I-27-4 The comment states the County spent 10 years and millions of dollars to prepare an update to the General Plan. The comment states when that plan was approved, the Supervisors “agreed to protect this area” and downzoned the property from 200 units to 99-units. The comment concludes by urging the County to recommend against the proposed project.

The County acknowledges the comment and refers the commenter to **Topical Response LU-1** regarding the proposed project’s compliance with the General Plan. The County also refers the commenter to Section 4.5, Existing General Plan Alternative. The County acknowledges the comment, and notes it expresses general opposition for the project, but does not raise any issue concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR. For that reason, the County provides no further response to this comment.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK