I-271 Margaret McCown Liles (1)

I-271-1 The commenter explains that they object to the Project, because the County has more endangered species than any other County in the Country and to build 2,000 plus homes on natural habitat would be an act of irresponsibility.

Potential impacts to biological resources, including wildlife, received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR, specifically in Section 2.4 Biological Resources. 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-271-2 The commenter explains that they object to the Project, because it does not provide adequate improvement of roads and that during the 2007 fire evacuation, Mountain Meadow Road was a nightmare, and the Project would double the traffic attempting to evacuate.

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-271-3 The comment states that the Project violates the County's General Plan, of which millions of dollars and countless hours of volunteer time were spent.

Please refer to **Topical Response LU-1.** 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-271-4 The comment states that the Project would not pay for the infrastructure needed to support the Project. The commenter explains that they voted to form the Deer Springs Fire Protection District and the rate of property tax to maintain the District has increased since its formation.

The County does not agree with this comment. 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.

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-271-5 The commenter explains that as population has increased in the area, taxes have increased, and the services provided have decreased in quality. The commenter explains that San Diego can be built out to resemble Tokyo or Hong Kong, and the prices of housing will continue to rise, or growth can be managed and the prices of housing will continue to rise, because San Diego County is such a desirable place to live. The comment states that there should be no more sprawl development and approving the Project would be an unconscionable disregard for health of the County and planet.

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.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK