

I-274 Randy McKinney

I-274-1 The commenter thanks the County for the opportunity to provide comment and that after discussing the Project with other members of the Hidden Valley Center, the commenter has a few concerns.

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-274-2 The commenter explains that they do not understand why the Project has been given the green light when the County spent 10 years developing the General Plan which determined that Merriam Mountains were not appropriate for development. The commenter explains that similar projects have been proposed in the past but have been rejected.

Please refer to **Topical Response LU-1 and Response to Comment O-1-377**.

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-274-3 The comment states that the Vallecitos Water District projects a water deficit for the area for the next 20 years and the District's water supply assessment requires a 36% water supply cut to existing customers in order to serve the Newland Sierra development project.

Refer to **Topical Response UTL-2**. As stated on page 43 in Appendix S, Water Supply Assessment Report, the water conservation requirement of 36% to meet 2020 demands during multi-dry year conditions is part of VWD's water supply plan to meet future demands. The water conservation requirement is reduced to 26% to meet the 2025 and 2035 demand requirements during multi-dry year conditions. The 36% and 26% water conservation requirements are not being imposed due to the proposed project. However, with the implementation of water conservation measures, the proposed project will sufficiently contribute towards VWD's intent to use water conservation to meet 36% and 26% of its future demand projections under multi-dry year conditions through 2035.

I-274-4 The comment states that Hidden Valley Zen Center is a contemplative community and that their traditional religious practices include indoor and outdoor meditation

Comment Letter Responses

and the Project would impact these practices. The comment states that no noise study has been prepared for the Hidden Valley Zen Center.

The Draft EIR does include Sarver Lane in the off-site noise analysis. A receiver location (O9) is located at a church on Sarver Lane. From Section 2.10.3.1, of the Draft EIR:

“At the church on Sarver Lane (Receiver O9), the traffic noise level is predicted to increase by 3 dBA from 54 dBA CNEL to 57 dBA CNEL with the proposed project. However, as noted above, an increase of 3 dBA or greater is considered a significant impact only if the site is a “documented noisy site.” In this case, both the existing and existing with project noise levels (54 and 57 dBA CNEL, respectively) would not exceed the County noise standard for churches of 65 dBA CNEL.”

In recognition of the potential influence of traffic from Deer Springs Road on uses at the southern end of Sarver Lane (such as the church at Receiver O9) compared to residential uses further north on Sarver Lane, a supplemental analysis has been prepared to represent additional off-site NSLU on Sarver Lane. The following table shows the noise levels at receivers without the influence of traffic from Deer Springs Road.

Receiver	Modeled Noise Level Sarver Lane Only (dB CNEL)			
	Existing	Future without Project	Future with Project – Opt B	Noise Level Increase - Future with Project vs. Future w/o Project
Hidden Valley Zen Center	42	49	58	9
Resi Sarver Ln 1	42	46	54	8
Resi Sarver Ln 2	44	50	59	9
Resi Sarver Ln 3	43	49	58	9
Resi Sarver Ln 4	41	43	49	6
Resi Sarver Ln 5	41	44	52	8

As shown in this table, the predicted noise level increases are below the County’s threshold of 10 dBA. While these noise level increases are greater than 3 dBA, they would not equal or exceed the County’s Noise Compatibility Guidelines and Standards for the underlying land uses; thus, the impact remains less than significant as concluded in the Draft EIR. No further revisions are required or necessary.

I-274-5 The commenter asks the County to consider these comments before allowing the Project to proceed.

Comment Letter Responses

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