

### I-301 Carolyn Richardson Owens (2)

**I-301-1** The commenter explains that they are a resident of Hidden Meadows and have many concerns about the project. The comment states that the County spent approximately \$18 million to develop the General Plan 10 years ago and determined that project site was not appropriate for development. The comment states that the General Plan discourages urban sprawl; therefore, the project contradicts the Plan. The commenter explains that they do not see the difference between the project and the Merriam Mountains project, which was voted down.

Please refer to **Topical Responses LU-1 and LU-2** for responsive information. Additionally, please see **Response to Comment O-1-377** for responsive information regarding the Merriam Mountains project. The comment is general in nature and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR. Given that the comment is general, a general response is all that is required. (*Paulek v. California Dept. Water Resources* (2014) 231 Cal.App.4th 35, 47-52.) Therefore, no further response is required or needed.

**I-301-2** The comment states that during construction of the project, neighbors would be subject to 244 weeks of grading and 5,650 tons of rock crushed per day. The comment explains that Hidden Meadows residents, who often partake in outdoor activities would be exposed to pollutants and noise associated with grading and rock crushing.

The Draft EIR's Air Quality chapter, and particularly **Section 2.3.5, Impact Analysis** therein, comprehensively evaluate the project's construction-related air quality impacts, including those attributable to rock crushing. Please also refer to **Topical Responses AQ-1, AQ-2, and AQ-3**.

Noise and vibration impacts associated with Project construction, were analyzed in Section 2.10, Noise of the Draft EIR. Please refer to **Topical Response NOI-1** for further responsive information.

As the comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, 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-301-3** The comment states that traffic on the I-15 is always moderate to heavy and that during morning and evening rush hours traffic on Deer Springs Road and Mountain Meadows Road to the I-15 is gridlocked. The comment states that the project would result in an addition of 10 million car trips a year in the surrounding community. The

## Comment Letter Responses

---

comment states that the Deer Springs/Mountain Meadows freeway interchange cannot handle these additional vehicles and while it is proposed to reconfigure this interchange, the EIR not significantly address the design of this interchange.

Traffic impacts and proposed improvements are disclosed in the Draft EIR, **Section 2.13 Traffic and Transportation**. Additionally, please see **Topical Responses TR-1 through TR-3** for further responsive information. There are a number of roadway, interchange, and signal improvements that are included as part of the proposed project, which will improve traffic conditions in the vicinity. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that EIR 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-301-4** The comment states that the project site is in a very high fire hazard severity zone. The comment states that there is one way out of Hidden Meadows during a fire evacuation, which is Mountain Meadows Road. The comment states that adding more residents to the area could result in gridlock during an evacuation.

An evacuation plan was prepared as part of the Draft EIR, Appendix N-2. Refer also to **Topical Response HAZ-1**. The comment also is general in nature and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR. Given that the comment is general, a general response is all that is required. (*Paulek v. California Dept. Water Resources* (2014) 231 Cal.App.4th 35, 47-52.) 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-301-5** The comment states that construction and operation of the project would result in the displacement of existing wildlife. The comment states that the EIR does not address all wildlife species in the area or the project's impacts on them.

The County does not concur with this comment. Relative to the comment that impact to wildlife are not acknowledged, **Section 2.4, Biological Resources**, of the Draft EIR analyzes impacts to biological resources. Please refer to Section 2.4.14, which identifies 37 potentially significant impacts, including impacts WM-3 (impacts to movement of large mammals from loss of wildlife corridors), WM-4 (impacts to habitat connectivity for larger wildlife species), and several indirect (edge) effects. The comment also is general in nature and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR. Given that the comment is general, a general response is all that is required. (*Paulek v. California Dept. Water Resources* (2014) 231 Cal.App.4th 35, 47-52.) Please also see **Topical Responses BIO-1 and BIO-2**. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for

## Comment Letter Responses

---

review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.

- I-301-6** The comment states that in addition to the above concerns, the project would impact local schools, the area's water supply, and infrastructure. The comment states that these issues areas need to be fully addressed before the project can be considered.

As stated in the Draft EIR, **Section 3.5 Public Services**, 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 Draft EIR addresses utilities and service systems, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR, specifically in Section 2.14 Utilities and Service Systems (which includes water supply impacts and mitigation). The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and, therefore, no more specific response can be provided or is required.

As stated in EIR, Section 1.0 Project Description on page 1-20, build out of the project is anticipated to occur in two phases over approximately 10 years in response to market demands and in accordance with a logical and orderly expansion of roadways, public utilities, and infrastructure. Figure 1-32, Phasing Plan, illustrates the anticipated sequence of planning area development, although sub-areas may not develop in that order. Backbone infrastructure and roadway improvements would be constructed in phases, as needed, to ensure that improvements are in place at the time of need.

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.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK