

I-333 Jim Rosvall

- I -333-1** The commenter thanks the County for the opportunity to comment and has a list of questions and 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 -333-2** The commenter asks why the community has to continually fight developers that try to change the General Plan. The comment states that the General Plan took millions of dollars of tax payer money and years of work and too often it is overruled. The comment states that the Project is a modified version of the Merriam Mountain Development that was turned down by the Board of Supervisors a few years ago. The comment states that the same problems exist but they are worse today.

Please refer to **Topical Response LU-1**.

The previous project denial has no bearing on the current project or its environmental analysis because: (a) the prior project was considered and rejected more than seven years ago under different factual and legal circumstances, (b) the prior project was subject to different environmental analyses, and (c) the prior project involved different features, plans, and amenities. The Draft EIR for the proposed project has been prepared in compliance with CEQA, and represents a substantial size reduction when compared to the prior Merriam Mountain project, as it would develop approximately 20% fewer homes, preserve an additional 17 acres of open space onsite plus an additional 218 acres off-site, and generate approximately 7,000 fewer daily trips overall. 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 requiring any further response under CEQA.

- I -333-3** The comment states that there is a lack of infrastructure and that traffic in the area is already horrendous.

As stated in Section 1.0 Project Description on page 1-20, build out of the Community 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

Comment Letter Responses

constructed in phases, as needed, to ensure that improvements are in place at the time of need.

- I -333-4** The comment states that the Project area is an extremely high wild fire area and that escape routes are minimal. The comment states that many people own horses in the area, which would slow evacuation. The comment states that the Fire Department claims they can handle the situation, but the commenter urges the Fire Department to recall the fires in Rancho Bernardo and Scripps Ranch where there is much better infrastructure to handle the situation.

The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR, specifically Section 2.13 Transportation and Traffic, and in Appendix N-2 Emergency Evacuation Plan. 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 -333-5** The comment states that the Project site is a biologically sensitive area with major ecological corridors. The comment raises a general subject area, biological resources, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR, specifically Section 2.4. The County notes the comment expresses the opinions of the commenter, and does not specifically state which impacts to wildlife would occur. 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 -333-6** The comment states that ten years of blasting and rock crushing with prevailing winds would carry dust and pollutants directly into the Lawrence Welk Retirement Community.

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, including those attributable to blasting. Please refer to **Topical Response Air Quality – Blasting Impacts**. 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 -333-7** The commenter asks where the water supplied for the Project would come from. The comment states that existing residents would be required to reduce water consumption by 36% to accommodate the Project.

Comment Letter Responses

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 VWD responded by posting on its website a "Correction of Misinformation." Please refer to **Topical Response UTL-2**.

- I -333-8** The comment states that the Project does not include an affordable housing component, and rather the Project is proposing "attainable housing." The comment states that homes that cost \$800,000 or more would not be attainable for very many people.

As stated in Table 1 of **Appendix DD, Land Use Consistency Table**:

"The County does not presently have or enforce a requirement that projects include an affordable housing component when proposing a General Plan Amendment, however, the project's various neighborhoods have been planned to accommodate the housing needs of a wide range of consumer life stages and income levels. For example, the project would include 325 age-qualified housing units, 15% of the total housing proposed in the project, in its Sierra Mesa neighborhood. In addition to these age-qualified units, the project would include 762 multi-family townhome and row townhome-style units in its Town Center, Terraces, and Valley neighborhoods and 173 units in family clusters in its Valley, Knolls, and Summit neighborhoods. Finally, the project's Hillside neighborhood will include age-targeted housing units, including single-story units and units with the master living space on the ground floor. In combination, these housing types constitute over 60% of the project's proposed units, providing an important housing type for young professionals, first-time homebuyers, growing families, empty-nesters, retirees, and seniors. The balance of the project's housing would be in the form of more traditional single-family homes and accommodate many of these same demographic groups. Collectively, the project's mix of housing types includes sufficient housing options for a wide range of consumer life stages and income levels.

Accordingly, the DEIR concluded the proposed project is consistent with Policy H-1.9 of the Housing Element. It should be noted that the proposed project does not preclude the future development of affordable housing units. The 762 multi-family townhome and row townhomes style units and 173 cluster units and 325 age-qualified units could be considered viable affordable housing types.

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

Comment Letter Responses

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 -333-9 The comment states that there is no public transportation within six miles of the Project.

The County does not agree with this comment. As stated in Section 1.0 Project Description on page 1-24, three Sprinter stations are within 6 miles of the project Site: the San Marcos Civic Center Sprinter Station, the Buena Creek Station, and the Palomar College Station. 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 -333-10 The comment states that survey after survey demonstrates that millennials want housing near work and close to public transportation.

As stated in Section 1.0 Project Description on page 1-24, the project is located at the Deer Springs Road interchange with direct access to I-15, providing regional access to existing job centers in San Marcos, Vista, Rancho Bernardo, Escondido, and Poway. The Site is also located near Cal State San Marcos and Palomar College, and three Sprinter stations are within 6 miles of the project Site: the San Marcos Civic Center Sprinter Station, the Buena Creek Station, and the Palomar College Station, as shown in Figure 1-34, Proximity to Major Employment Centers. 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 -333-11 The comment states that the Project is an insane leapfrog development that endangers the health and well-being of the surrounding existing communities.

The County General Plan discourages leapfrog development, as is outlined in Guiding Principle LU-1.2.

LU-1.2 Leapfrog Development. Prohibit leapfrog development which is inconsistent with the Community Development Model. Leapfrog Development restrictions do not apply to new villages that are designed to be consistent with the Community Development Model, that provide necessary services and facilities, and that are designed to meet the LEED-Neighborhood Development Certification or an equivalent. For purposes of this policy, leapfrog development is defined as Village densities located away from established Villages or outside established water and sewer service boundaries. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]

Comment Letter Responses

However, as described in Appendix DD of the Draft EIR, Land Use Consistency Analysis:

“The Community Development Model is implemented by three Regional Categories: Village, Semi-Rural, and Rural lands. The project as proposed is consistent with the Community Development Model, because the Community Development Model has already applied an established Village Regional Category designation to a portion of the project Site. The project does not propose to create a new Village, or expand or reconfigure the existing Village area. The project is also within the established boundaries of the Vallecitos Water District.”

Therefore, the Project is not considered leapfrog development, and would be consistent with the County General Plan, in that regard.

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.

I -333-12 The comment states that the Project would impact three different school districts and will build no new schools. The comment states that the largest of the three school districts is already at capacity and that the six acre site for the elementary school is inadequate.

As stated in Section 3.5 Public Services on 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 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 -333-13 The commenter explains that they are not against development, but the Project is not fiscally responsible and it will cost the County more in tax money than it will generate.

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

Comment Letter Responses

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 concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR.