

I-275 Jim McPheters

I -275-1 The commenter explains that they are in opposition to the project.

The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commentator, 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 -275-2 The comment states that the 8,000 page EIR is an attempt to justify a project with 2,135 homes and 81,000 square feet of commercial space. The comment states that the County's General Plan is only 5 years old and cost taxpayers \$18 million. The comment states that the Merriam Mountains project was already voted down by the County Board of Supervisors.

The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commentator, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR. Please see **Response to Comment O-1-377** and **Topical Response LU-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. No further response is required or necessary.

I -275-3 The commenter asks why new homes would be constructed when the State and local water districts continue to impose water restrictions and rationing along with price increases to customers. The comment explains that they have heard there would be a 36% cutback of water for existing Vallecitos Water District customers in order to accommodate new residents, and asks if this is true.

The Twin Oaks Valley Property Owner's Association made the same or similar comment in a newspaper ad, noting that "36% cuts to resident's water supply" would be required so as to serve the proposed project. The Vallecitos Water District responded by posting on its website a "Correction of Misinformation." According to the District, it is not mandating the rationing of its water supplies to existing District customers (by 36% or any percentage), so as to be able to serve any proposed new development, including the Newland Sierra project. For that reason, the District considered the Twin Oaks' statement "false," requiring correction. See **Topical Response UTL-2**. 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 -275-4 The comment states that traffic on the I-15 between Temecula and San Diego is deplorable and asks how the project would ease traffic flow when there would be an additional 30,000 ADT associated with the project. The commenter asks if the Palomar College satellite campus and the new residential projects near the I-15 and SR-76 have been considered in the Draft EIR.

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. Please refer to Chapter 1, Project Description, Table 1-10 Cumulative Projects. The Palomar College North Education Center District Master Plan as well as several residential projects are included in table.

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 -275-5 The comment states that the Draft EIR indicates that construction would last for 10 years in response to market demands. The commenter asks if the Country were to go into another recession, if the construction period would last for 15 years. The commenter asks what the financial capacity of the developer is to ensure the project gets completed in a timely manner.

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 -275-6 The commenter asks what the impact is for getting Caltrans involved and how the project fits into their timeline for easing traffic congestions on the I-15 and SR-78. The commenter asks if this timeline is consistent with what is stated in the Draft EIR.

The project has identified feasible mitigation in the form of building a new interchange and that mitigation measure is identified herein as M-TR-1. The process of implementing the mitigation for the interchange is subject to a three-phase process under the jurisdiction of Caltrans. The first phase involves the preparation of a Project Initiation Document (PID) consisting of a Project Study Report-Project Development Support (PSR-PDS) document. The purpose of the PSR-PDS document is to define the purpose and need for any proposed improvements, identify a reasonable range of alternatives (i.e., interchange configurations), and develop an action plan for

Comment Letter Responses

implementation of the improvements. In 2014, in response to the project's traffic impact analysis, which identified significant direct and cumulative impacts to the Interchange, the project applicant initiated the PID process with Caltrans to begin evaluating different configurations for mitigating impacts to the Interchange.

After completion of the PID phase and approval of the PSR-PDS document, the process advances to the second phase known as the Project Approval and Environmental Document (PA&ED) process. The PA&ED process includes an appropriate CEQA/NEPA environmental document for the proposed improvements, including consideration of alternative configurations and a Project Report (PR), which constitutes an engineering technical document that serves as the basis for detailed construction plans.

At the conclusion of the PA&ED process, Caltrans will select an Interchange configuration and the process enters the third phase, which involves the Plans Specification and Engineering Phase (PS&E), where detailed engineering documents and construction plans are prepared for the Interchange. Finally, the PS&E phase is followed by the acquisition, if any, of any required right-of-way and construction of the new Interchange.

All aspects included in the process of implementing the mitigation for the Interchange improvements are subject to Caltrans' review, oversight, and approval. As of this writing, Caltrans is within the first PID phase. Caltrans has not completed this phase nor initiated the PA&ED phase. To date, the PSR-PDS document includes preliminary interchange alternatives consisting of an expanded diamond interchange, a diverging diamond interchange, and a roundabout interchange.

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 -275-7 The commenter asks how the County supports the statement that the project would result in the irretrievable commitment of limited, slowly renewable and non-renewable resources, however, would not be highly accelerated when compared to existing conditions and growth projections for the County, and therefore would not be a significant impact.

An analysis of the project's significant irreversible environmental changes is provided in Section 2.15. 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

Comment Letter Responses

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 -275-8** The commenter asks how accurate the Vallecitos Water District and the County growth projections have been in the past 5 to 10 years.

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 -275-9** The comment states that fire safety must be a huge consideration as a result of the fires experienced in the County. The commenter asks what would happen if one or more of the major ingress and egress roads is closed because of a fire. The commenter asks how many times the I-15, SR-78, and SR-76 have been closed in the past few years due to a fire and asks if that information has been taken into consideration.

The County acknowledges the comments and notes that it addresses general subject areas, wildland fire evacuation, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR. 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.

Nonetheless, please refer to **Topical Response HAZ-1**.

- I -275-10** The comment states that the years of noise, dust and air pollution, and congestion from heavy equipment would be unhealthy, especially to the residents of the nearby Lawrence Welk and Champagne Village who are older and may be more vulnerable to these impacts. The commenter asks if the impact from years of construction are taken into consideration as a special factor or grouped in a general population. The comment states that the dust and air pollution from additional vehicles on the road would have another negative impact on this group.

The Draft EIR's Air Quality chapter, and particularly Section 2.3.5, Impact Analysis therein, comprehensively evaluates the project's construction-related air quality impacts. Please refer to **Topical Response AQ-1 through AQ-3**.

The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR, specifically in Section 2.3, Air Quality. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and, therefore, no more specific response

Comment Letter Responses

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 -275-11** The comment states that the noise and vibration impacts from blasting activities would be significant to nearby residents. The commenter explains that the nearby residents are already exposed to these impacts from Camp Pendleton. The commenter asks if damage would occur to existing foundations and how these impacts would be mitigated.

Please refer to **Topical Response NOI-1**. Noise and vibration impacts associated with Project construction, including blasting were analyzed in Section 2.10, Noise of the Draft EIR. 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 -275-12** The comment states that the housing crisis would not be mitigated by the project, unless the costs of the homes are less than \$400,000 in 2022.

The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commentator, 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 -275-13** The commenter explains that they read some reports a year prior which suggested that the education community, fire, police, and health services and possibly the water district were opposed to the project. The commenter asks how their concerns were mitigated.

This comment is general in nature and does not raise any specific issue regarding any particular analysis in the Draft EIR. Therefore, no specific response can be provided or is required. (*Paulek v. California Dept. Water Resources* (2014) 231 Cal.App.4th 35, 47 [a general response is all that is required to a general comment]). This comment is included in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.

- I -275-14** The commenter explains that the Executive Summary of the Draft EIR lists impact areas that are significant and cannot be mitigated. The comment states that some mitigation require taxpayer dollars to be spent to update assessments. The commenter asks why taxpayers should bear these costs. The commenter notes that there were

Comment Letter Responses

impacts that were determined to be less than significant and asks if this was based on personal opinions and assumptions.

This comment is general in nature and does not raise any specific issue regarding any particular analysis in the Draft EIR. Therefore, no specific response can be provided or is required. (*Paulek v. California Dept. Water Resources* (2014) 231 Cal.App.4th 35, 47 [a general response is all that is required to a general comment]). This comment is included in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.

I -275-15 The commenter asks who would provide oversight to ensure mitigation efforts reduce dust and noise and are being adhered to.

There are several agencies who would be responsible for enforcement of mitigation (e.g., County of San Diego, San Diego Air Pollution Control District), as detailed in the MMRP.

I -275-16 The commenter explains that they are against the project.

The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commentator, 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.