

I-338 Gennaro Savarese

I-338-1 The comment expresses opposition to the proposed Project and states the following comments are in addition to the Hidden Meadows Community Sponsor Group comments.

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-338-2 The comment expresses concerns over wildfires. The comment notes that “escape to the north and/or south are likely to be blocked in a rapidly advancing Santa Ana wind fed fire” and that the “Mountain Meadow/Center City/Champagne/Deer Springs intersection” “has to be considered and treated as our only emergency exit at least in terms of evaluating adequacy of capacity.” 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(Evacuation)**, which notes that, the Draft EIR notes that while prior evacuations within the project vicinity have experienced traffic congestion, the project includes improvements to Deer Springs Road, which would increase capacity of the main evacuation route compared to the existing condition. Further, when compared to the existing condition, improvements to North Twin Oaks Valley Road and Buena Creek Road would expand the traffic network capacity to assist evacuation efforts for the surrounding community.

The Evacuation Plan also provides that “fire and law enforcement official will identify evacuation points before evacuation routes are announced to the public. Evacuation routes are determined based on the location and extent of the incident and include as many pre-designated transportation routes as possible.” Accordingly, the Draft EIR, Appendix N-2 “defers to Law Enforcement and Office of Emergency Services” because, “among the most important factors for successful evacuations in urban settings is control of intersections downstream of the evacuation area.”

I-338-3 The comment provides background information on traffic on I-15 and the I-15/Deer Springs interchange during small brush fires. The comment states a north/south escape is not probable, which leaves Deer Springs Road. The comment states “If

Comment Letter Responses

expanded to four lanes as in option B, Deer Springs is likely to deliver little improvement over its current ratings in another ten years even without this development if traffic trends continue as experienced over the past decade.” The County does not concur with this comment. Please refer to the above Response to Comment I-338-2.

I-338-4 The comment states that if Deer Springs Road is only widened to three lanes, including a continuous center turn lane, the road would be “a planned bottleneck in what must be considered the default emergency evacuation route for the communities on the east side of I-15.” The County does not concur with this comment. Please refer to the above Response to Comment I-338-2.

I-338-5 The comment asks if there is any mitigation for wildland fire evacuation and requests the County provide its most recent evaluation. The County has provided Appendix N-2, the Newland Sierra Wildland Evacuation Plan, as part of the DEIR. Based on the analysis in Appendix N-2, the DEIR concluded in Section 2.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, that impacts due to evacuation are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

I-338-6 The comment states a second threat is to health and welfare as a result of construction. The comment states construction activities will be ongoing for approximately ten years and the communities on the east side of I-15 and south of the project site will be exposed to noise and air quality pollutants.

The County acknowledges the comment and refers the commenter to **Topical Responses AQ-1** through **AQ-3** and **NOI-1**. The comment addresses general subject areas which received extensive analysis in Sections 2.3 and 2.10 of the Draft EIR, as explained in those Topical Responses. 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-338-7 The comment states communities downwind of the project Site are within closed valleys which will “trap and contain the toxic particulate matter and the noise and the dust for extended periods.” The comment states these communities consist of a “higher than average number of senior citizens, many of whom already content with” health problems which will be “exacerbated by the effects of this project.”

The County acknowledges the comment and refers the commenter to **Topical Responses AQ-1** through **AQ-3**. The comment addresses general subject areas which received extensive analysis in Sections 2.3 and 2.10 of the Draft EIR, as explained in those Topical Responses. The County will include the comment as part of the Final

Comment Letter Responses

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

- I-338-8** The comment states these communities “dealt with the dust from about hour hundred houses” built around the Hidden Meadows golf course and asks if any health impact analysis has been conducted for “this project?”

The County is not certain if the comment is asking whether the comment is referring to a Health Risk Analysis done as a follow up project referenced in the comment (i.e., the 400 homes around the Hidden Meadows golf course), or the proposed Project. AS it related to the proposed Project, the County notes that a Health Risk Assessment was prepared (Appendix C to Appendix G, Air Quality Technical Report) and the findings from the Health Risk Assessment were evaluated in the DEIR. Please refer to Section 2.3.5.3, Impacts to Sensitive Receptors, as well as Appendix C to Appendix G.

The County further notes that no health impact analysis was prepared as a follow up item to the Hidden Meadows.

- I-338-9** The comment notes that during construction of the homes around the golf course in the Hidden Meads area, wildlife “became virtually unknown in the neighborhood.” The comment questions if any study has been done on the disruption to wildlife during project construction.

The County acknowledges the comment and directs the commenter to Appendix H, Biological Resources Evaluation. As explained in Section 2.1, Definition of Impacts:

Indirect impacts are reasonably foreseeable effects caused by project implementation on remaining or adjacent biological resources outside the proposed development, roads, and FMZ. Indirect impacts may affect areas within the defined project Site but outside the limits of grading, non-impacted areas, and areas outside the project Site, such as downstream effects. **Indirect impacts include short term effects immediately related to construction activities** and long term or chronic effects related to trail use and development of the project Site. In most cases, indirect effects are not quantified, but in some cases quantification might be included, such as using a noise contour to quantify indirect impacts to nesting birds. (*emphasis added*)

Accordingly, such impacts from construction are considered as part of Appendix H and the DEIR. Specifically, impacts CWA-3 (Existing Core Wildlife Area), SP-3, W-7, V-5, WM-3, and WM-5.

Comment Letter Responses

- I-338-10** The comment states the proposed Project is not “smart development” because it is “expanding out” and “the opposite of filling in.” The comment states the project Site is rugged land requiring excavation and fill.

The County acknowledges the comment and does 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.

Nonetheless, the County notes the proposed Project is within an existing Village designation and would create a mixed use community. The commenter is referred to Section 3.3, Land Use and Planning. No further response is required or necessary.

- I-338-11** The comment states, “there is and always will be inadequate infrastructure to support the development with severe impact on the surrounding community.” The County does not concur with the comment. Please refer to **Response to Comment O-1.7-4**.

- I-338-12** The comment notes that there are no public transportation facilities nor any expectation of any. The County acknowledges the comment and notes that 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.

Nonetheless, the County notes there is a park and ride at the I-15/Deer Springs Road interchange. The proposed Project and DEIR include a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program to reduce single-occupancy vehicle trips. The TDM Program is based on exiting, off-site transit facilities and proposed on-site improvements, and would be implemented and monitored by a TDM Coordination (PDF-20).

- I-338-13** The comment states the project is located in a high fire risk area with “questionable potential increase in fire potential.” The County acknowledges the comment and notes that it restates information in the DEIR regarding the project Site’s location within a high fire hazard zone. Regarding the comment about a “questionable potential increase in fire potential,” the commenter is referred to Appendix N-1, Fire Protection Plan, and DEIR Section 2.8.3.1. The comment addresses general subject areas, 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.

Comment Letter Responses

I-338-14 The comment states there are no shopping centers, stores, restaurants or entertainment facilities in the area, which will add to the number of external vehicle trips per dwelling unit.

The County notes the comment provides background information and 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 concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR.

Nonetheless, the County does not concur with the comment. The proposed Project would include a Town Center. As stated in Section 1.2.1.5, Land Use Plan, the Town Center

“would be compact and walkable, include commercial retail space, townhomes, and a school site, and provide employment opportunities for future residents and the surrounding area. The Town Center would include 95 residential dwelling units, 81,000 square feet of commercial space, a 6-acre school site, and 5.73 gross acres of parks.”

Further, the proposed Project includes a TDM Plan (see PDFs 1-20, Section 1.2.1.7) to reduce daily trips. Appendix R3, Newland Sierra TDM Program – VMT Reduction Evaluation, notes the TDM program would reduce VMT by approximately 11.1%.

I-338-15 The comment states there are no schools nearby and none being provided by the developer. The County does not concur with this comment. The proposed Project includes a site reserved for a school in the Town Center. Please refer to Section 1.2.1.5, Land Use Plan, under the Town Center heading, which states, “The Town Center would include 95 residential dwelling units, 81,000 square feet of commercial space, a 6-acre school site, and 5.73 gross acres of parks.”

The County notes further that Schools are further analyzed in Section 3.5.3 of the DEIR, and that impacts to school service were determined to be less than significant.

I-338-16 The comment states there are other locations in San Diego County to build dwelling units without the additional cost of multiple vehicles to get to work, school, and shopping needs. The comment questions why the County allows huge development proposals to go forward where they are not in compliance with the General Plan, especially after all the time and money spent creating and approving the General Plan.

The County acknowledges the comment and refers the commenter to **Topical Response LU-1**.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK