

### I-340 Stefanie Schubert

- I-340-1** The comment introduces the commenter as the Assistant Spiritual Director of the Hidden Valley Zen Center (HVZC) and states that the HVZC will be directly impacted from the use of Sarver Lane as an access to the proposed Project.

The County acknowledges the comment as an introduction to comments that follow. The County notes that the comment does not raise any specific issue regarding the analysis in the Draft EIR 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-340-2** The comment states the HVZC has a 50-year history as a place of silent retreats, outdoor work practice, exercise, and meditation where people come for the rural, silent, natural environment. The comment states that any development beyond the General Plan would destroy the environment and the business of the HVZC.

The County notes the comment provides background information about the HVZC and does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. The County also refers the commenter to Section 4.5, Existing General Plan Alternative, which compares the proposed Project's impacts to impacts that would be expected as a result of development under the General Plan, which the comment suggests would be an acceptable level of impacts. As stated in Section 4.5.5, several impacts would be greater under the Existing General Plan Alternative than the propose Project.

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.

- I-340-3** The comment states that it is “unthinkable” that over the 10 years of preparation and construction that the blasting, rock crushing, and traffic would not exceed allowance for noise.

The County acknowledges the comment and refers the commenter to Section 2.10, Noise, specifically Section 2.10.5, Significance of Impacts Prior to Mitigation, which identifies several potentially significant noise impacts (i.e., instances where the proposed project may exceed the “allowances”), including Impacts N-7 and N-9 related to blasting. The Draft EIR identifies applicable mitigation measure in Section 2.10.6, including M-N-5, which requires the preparation of a blast drilling and monitoring plan, and M-N-8, which requires a vibration monitoring plan, as well as M-N-6 which requires implementation of Project Design Features (PDF's 33-38),

## Comment Letter Responses

---

including PDF-37 which requires taking those “steps necessary to ensure that on-site rock crusher facilities are located a minimum of 600 feet from the property line of existing residences and future on-site residences.”

With implementation of the applicable mitigation measures, noise impacts would be reduced to less than significant (Section 2.10.7), with the exception of CUM-N-1, off-site traffic noise. Relative to off-site traffic noise at the HVZC, the County determined that impacts would be less than significant because they would be less than a 10 dBA increase and would not exceed the noise level standards in the County General Plan.

- I-340-4** The comment states that the proposed project would result in constant traffic on Sarver Lane compared to existing levels, and that the main facilities are 85’ from the existing Sarver Lane, and that the HVZC keeps windows open for ventilation. The comment states the Draft EIR labels impacts as insignificant without providing analysis and that no on-site measures have been taken.

The County acknowledges the comment and refers the commenter to **Response to Comments O-1.15** and Response to Comment **I-340-3**. The Draft EIR also evaluated traffic and noise impacts from traffic; please refer to the Draft EIR traffic and noise sections for responsive information.

- I-340-5** The comment states there was an oversight by the DEIR to study impacts on HVZC, Sarver Lane and the immediate community using Sarver Lane, which the comment states is a private road north of St. Marks Catholic Church.

The County acknowledges the comment as an introduction to comments that follow. The County notes that the comment does not raise any specific issue regarding the analysis in the Draft EIR 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-340-6** The comment states that HVZC is a religious organization and protected by law, and that the proposed project would make the HVZC’s practices effectively impracticable. The comment provides repeats background information on the practices at HVZC which are summarized in comment I-340-2, above. The comment concludes by stating the proposed project and construction would cause traffic, noise levels, vibration, light pollution, air pollution, visual impacts and would destroy the natural flavor of the area.

## Comment Letter Responses

---

The County acknowledges the comment and notes it raises economic, social (practice of religious beliefs), or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment.

With respect to the practices at the HVZC, the County notes the comment provides factual background information and does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA.

With respect to the potential impacts listed, the comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in Section 2.1, Aesthetics, 2.3, Air Quality, 2.4, Biological Resources, 2.10, Noise and 2.13, Transportation and Traffic, 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-340-7** The comment states that under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act and the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Person Active, HVZC will be impacted beyond repair and will likely not be able to be mitigated, which amounts to a “taking.” The comment concludes by restating **Comment I-340-5**.

The County acknowledges the comment and notes it raises economic, social (practice of religious beliefs), or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. Please also refer to **Response to Comment I-340-5**. 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-340-8** The comment states HVZC is extremely noise, smell, and light and air pollution sensitive and requests a detailed study specific to all impacts to the HVZC. The County acknowledges the comment and refers the comment to the Draft EIR. The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in Section 2.1, Aesthetics, 2.3, Air Quality, and 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-340-9** The comment requests the precise alignment of Sarver Lane. The comment states that using the grading plan, it appears Sarver Lane will come 50’ on to HVZC property and that there are no easements supporting this. The comment requests clarification on how far Sarver Lane would be from the Meditation Hall.

## Comment Letter Responses

---

**I-340-10** The comment states the commenter objects to using a private road to serve the proposed project. The comment states that developer should use their own land for access and that the intention of the previous owners to protect the local environmental.

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-340-11** The comment requests the DEIR consider access options other than “taking” land from the HVZC. The comment requests clarification on how the necessary land for Sarver Lane will be acquired and where the new driveway for HVZC will be, what the parking lot would look like, where lost parking spaces will be provided, and how many native oaks will be removed.

The County acknowledges the comment and notes it raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. 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.

**I-340-12** The comment requests information on what type of sound proofing, greenery, visual screening and other mitigation will be provided. The comment states the commenter did not see any mitigation in the Draft EIR. The comment states that HVZC will need sound walls and visual screening along Sarver Lane and around the properties northern and southern boundaries, and suggests that paving be minimized. The comment states all impacts buildings will also be required to be sound-proofed.

The County does not concur with the comment and refers the commenter to Response to Comments to **Response to Comments O-1.15-6** and **I-340-3**, above regarding potential noise impacts. Because no impacts would occur at HVZC, no mitigation in the form of sound walls, sound proofing, or screening 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. No further response is required or necessary.

**I-340-13** The comment states that the P-14 park is proposed to have stormwater basins which may attract mosquitos and expose the HVZC to odors. The comment states that uses such as composting, community gardens and the clubhouse should be located within

## Comment Letter Responses

---

the project Site, and not in the existing neighborhood. The comment requests the County impose restrictions on uses that could affect the existing neighborhood.

The County acknowledges the comment. With respect to the stormwater basins, the County refers the commenter to Section 2.3.5.4, Odor Impacts. As concluded on page 2.3-59, the proposed project “would be required to comply with the odor policies enforced by SDAPCD, including Rule 51 in the event a nuisance complaint occurs, and County Code Sections 63.401 and 63.402, which prohibit nuisance odors and identify enforcement measures to reduce odor impacts to nearby receptors” and that impacts would be less than significant.

The County also refers the reader to Section 2.8.3.4, Vectors, which concludes that “

“basins would be designed to either exclude vectors from enclosed sources of standing water; or for rapid discharge, completely draining within 72 hours to prevent basins from becoming sources for vectors.” Further, “a third option is to make the breeding habitat less suitable” and “[m]osquito larvicides may be applied within the basins to deter mosquito breeding. The EPA reports that, when used properly, mosquito larvicides are of no concern for human health threats and do not pose risks to wildlife or the environment.” As a result of these measures, “impacts resulting from vectors associated with Saddleback Park would be less than significant.” (DEIR, p. 2.3-31)

With respect to the comment that the park should be located within the project Site, 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.

Regarding the comment that the County impact use restrictions on the park, the County agrees the park would have to comply with all applicable County requirements for park uses. The comment 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.

- I-340-14** The comment requests a detailed study of the impacts of all uses at all times of the day and night of the P14 park, including stormwater basins, visual, smell, vectors, noise, traffic, and nuisance from potential future park uses. The comment concludes by suggesting the park be relocated into the project Site.

## Comment Letter Responses

---

The County refers the commenter to **Response to Comment I-340-13**, above. The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in Sections 2.1, Aesthetics (visual), 2.3 Air Quality (odors), 2.8, Hazards (Vectors), 2.10, Noise, 2.13, Transportation and Traffic, 2.14, Utilities (storm drain), and 3.2, Hydrology and Water Quality, 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.

**I-340-15** The comment suggests the P14 park be relocated into the project Site.

With respect to the comment that the park should be located within the project Site, 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.

**I-340-16** The comment states that problems from putting the clubhouse in an existing neighborhood should not be outsourced to the sheriff. The comment states the DEIR puts one sheriff in charge of the whole development and that it currently takes on average 45 minutes for the sheriff to arrive. The comment requests more detailed information on how a single county sheriff would monitor the noise and other emissions from Parks and asks about the funding for a new station, officers and equipment.

The County does not concur with the comment. Law enforcement services are analyzed in Section 3.5, Public Services of the Draft EIR. As discussed therein, “[t]he project would result in the need for *five* additional sworn personnel.” The DEIR further finds that, consistent with General Plan Policy LU-12.2, which requires development to mitigate significant impacts to existing service levels. “future property owners would support the County’s Sheriff Department through property tax payments, similar to all other County residents.” As a result, the Draft EIR concludes “[w]ith incorporation of the project design features and the requirement for the proposed project to pay its fair share for increased law enforcement services via property taxes, the potential impact to law enforcement services would be less than significant.”

With respect the comment regarding funding, the County acknowledges the comment and notes it raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. 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.

## Comment Letter Responses

---

- I-340-17** The comment requests a noise study which analyzes rock crushing, blasting, building activities and traffic, including actual and expected cumulative effects under exiting, construction, and operational scenarios.

The comment addresses general subject areas, Noise, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR. The County refers the commenter to Appendix Q, Noise Impact Report, as well as Section 2.10 of the Draft EIR, which provide the Exiting noise levels, and analyze both construction and operational noise levels as requested by the commenter. The County further refers the commenter to **Topical Response NOI-1**. 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-340-18** The comment asks “how much noise from the I-15 will the valley be exposed to after the “mountain top is blasted away?”

The comment addresses general subject areas, Noise, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR. The County refers the commenter to Appendix Q, Noise Impact Report, as well as Section 2.10 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-340-19** The comment states that, based on the “megaphone shape of the valley and regular occurrence of inversion layers” (Comment I-340-63 through I-340-67) that the commenter expects unpredictable impacts in unexpected areas related to light, sound and air pollution. The comment requests a detailed study of those impacts in general, as well as on HVZC.

The comment addresses general subject areas, Light Pollution, Air Quality, and Noise, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR. The County refers the commenter to Appendices E, Visual Resources Technical Report, G, Air Quality Technical Report, and Q, Noise Impact Report, as well as Sections 2.1, Aesthetics, 2.3, Air Quality, and 2.10 of the Draft EIR. The comment notes that such analysis may be unpredictable but does not raise any specific issue regarding the analysis provided in the DEIR 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-340-20** The comment states that in her personal experience, one gun shot resounds for several seconds, and one truck driving up the hill appears to be driving by as close as 30 feet.

The comment addresses general subject areas, Noise, which received extensive analysis in Section 2.10 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 acknowledges the comment expresses the experiences 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-340-21** The comment states that in her experience, the noise from Deer Springs Road depends on air pressure, wind direction, and the presence of the inversion layer.

The comment addresses general subject areas, Noise, which received extensive analysis in Section 2.10 of the Draft EIR an Appendix Q, Noise Report. 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 acknowledges the comment expresses the experiences 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-340-22** The comment states that in her experience, the smell from a woodstove settles in the valley and makes it difficult to breath depending on weather conditions.

The County acknowledges the comment expresses the experiences 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-340-23** The comment requests a detailed study of the cumulative emissions and noise during construction and operation of the proposed project.

The comment addresses general subject areas, Noise, which received extensive analysis in Sections 2.3, Air Quality and 2.10, Noise of the Draft EIR an Appendix G, Air Quality Technical Report and Appendix Q, Noise Report. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and, therefore, no more specific

## Comment Letter Responses

---

response can be provided or is required. The County acknowledges the comment expresses the experiences 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-340-24** The comment requests the study of effects of the inversion layer and wind direction on noise, air quality, light pollution under existing, construction, and operational scenarios.

The comment addresses general subject areas, Light Pollution, Air Quality, and Noise, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR. The County refers the commenter to Appendices E, Visual Resources Technical Report, G, Air Quality Technical Report, and Q, Noise Impact Report, as well as Sections 2.1, Aesthetics, 2.3, Air Quality, and 2.10 of the Draft EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding the analysis provided in the DEIR 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-340-25** The comment states that several members of HVZC have asthma and that they should be able to continue with their religious practice without have to resort to the use of expensive epi-pens or hospitalization to counteract potentially life-threatening exposure to silicate dust and other emissions.

The County acknowledges the comment and refers the commenter to Topical Response AQ-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.

- I-340-26** The comment states the natural beauty would be irreversibly destroyed and become as ugly as Los Angeles. The comment states “we do NOT need more developments....that cause more and more open space to be sealed with concrete and asphalt...and crease unstoppable domino effects around the area.” The comment states “we need to stop this NOW right at the outset” and that instead “we need high density, affordable housing near public transportation in town.”

The comment addresses general subject areas, Aesthetics, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR. The County refers the commenter to Sections 2.1, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR. As concluded in Section 2.1, impacts to existing visual character and quality of the Site and surroundings would be significant and avoidable,

## Comment Letter Responses

---

as the comment states. Further, Section 2.1.4 concludes, “Physical changes associated with vegetation removal, grading, and the addition of residential development would adversely affect the viewshed and impacts would be considered **cumulatively considerable**” as the comment implies. The comment does not raise any new issue regarding the analysis provided in the DEIR and, therefore, no additional 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-340-27** The comment states that the proposed project will lead to the loss of additional rarified agricultural areas.

The County acknowledges the comment and refers the reader to Response to Comment O-1-42. 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-340-28** The comment restates similar information contained in Comment I-340-19 and I-340-22 regarding the shape of “the valley” and her neighbors’ wood stove. The comment then states that if the proposed project is allowed, “the situation could easily get out of hand” and that heating/cooling, wood burning and vehicle emissions will lead to high levels of pollution. The comment concludes that inversion layers are occurring on a regular basis.

The County acknowledges the comment regarding increased levels of air pollutants and notes that the comment addresses general subject areas, Air Quality, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR. The County refers the commenter to Appendix G, Air Quality Technical Report, and Q Sections 2.3, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding the analysis provided in the DEIR and, therefore, no more specific response can be provided or is required. No further response is required or necessary.

The County further refers the commenter to Response to Comment I-340-19 and I-340-22. Regarding the frequency of inversion layers, the County notes the notes the comment provides factual 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.

## Comment Letter Responses

---

**I-340-29** The comment states that up-zoning would invite a domino effect and the destruction of habitat than the study area alone. The comment states the commenter has seen netcatchers [sic] in the valley area of the project Site. The comment states that the Mirriam [sic] and adjunct mountains are wildlife corridors and many large species require large open spaces. The comment states is it important to keep the areas as one big piece rather than cutting it up.

Relative to the growth inducing effect of the proposed Project, the County refers the commenter to Section 1.8 of the Draft EIR which discusses potential growth inducing impacts and concludes, “the project has potential for growth inducement, which may result in subsequent adverse environmental effects as a result of such growth. Such adverse environmental effects could include impacts to visual resources, air quality, biological resources, transportation and traffic, noise, and cultural resources.”

Relative to the commenters observance of gnatcatcher, the County acknowledges the comment and refers the reader to Impact W-1 and W-2, impacts to California gnatcatcher, as well as mitigation measures M-BIO-1, M-BIO-2, M-BIO-3, M-BIO-4, M-BIO-5, M-BIO-6, M-BIO-7, and M-BIO-8a through 8E, which would reduce impacts to less than significant.

Regarding wildlife corridors, the County refers the comment to **Response to Comment BIO-2**, as well as **O-1.5**.

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.

**I-340-30** The comment states the commenter has found summer holly on the project Site.

The County acknowledges the comment and refers the commenter to Impact SP-1 through SP-4 (Section 2.4.14.11), short term impact to summer holly (and Ramona Horkelia). Impacts SP-1 through SP-4 are mitigated with mitigation measures **M-BIO-1, M-BIO-2, M-BIO-3, M-BIO-8A-E, M-BIO-9, M-BIO-10, and M-BIO-11** to less than significant. 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.

**I-340-31** The comment states “there are ancient indian [sic] sites and less than 100 [year] old graves in the area” but that some grinding holes/stones have been illegally removed in the last year. The comment requests the County contact the Larson family.

## Comment Letter Responses

---

The comment addresses general subject areas, Cultural Resources, which received extensive analysis in Section 2.5 of the Draft EIR. As states on pg. 2.5-58 of the Draft EIR, “In summary, all potentially significant impacts on cultural resources can be mitigated to **less than significant**. Refer to Table 2.5-1 for a summary of resources sites and impact significance.” This includes Impact CR-10, potential to discover human remains. 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-340-32** The comment states the Mirriam [sic] Mountains are solid granite and decomposing granite, and that any building activity will require blasting and grinding that will affect wildlife irreversibly. The comments asks if it is expected that netcatchers [sic] would stay her during years of blasting and grinding?

The comment addresses general subject areas, indirect/temporary impacts to wildlife, which received extensive analysis in Section 2.4 of the Draft EIR. This includes Impacts W-1, W-3, W-5, W-7 and W-9. These impacts would be mitigated to less than significant and concluded in Section 2.4.16.1.2. 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-340-33** The comment states that “inviting traffic away from existing development will increase air pollution.” The commenter states it is possible to provide more housing and cause less pollution by clustering affordable housing near existing high density development and infrastructure.

The comment addresses general subject areas, air quality and traffic/VMT, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR, Section 2.3, Air Quality, specifically in Section 2.3.4.3. Operational Emissions Estimates and Methodology. 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-340-34** The comment states the wildland fire hazard is not mitigable and that all planned exists lead in the same direction – South. The comment states that exit roads will be blocked and evacuees will try to escape on foot.

## Comment Letter Responses

---

The County does not concur with this comment and refers the commenter to **Topical Response HAZ-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.

- I-340-35** The comment states that existing sensitive habitats will be destroyed due to changes in water and groundwater levels as a result of the proposed project and expressed concern about a dry creek on the HVZC property.

The County acknowledges the comment. As stated on pg. 3.2-18 of the Draft EIR, “although the project’s introduction of new impervious surfaces would result in an increase in runoff flows, the incorporation of basins for detention and water quality, as well as compliance with County requirements for drainage design, would ensure that flooding does not occur downstream of the project Site *and that watercourses are not substantially altered from existing conditions*. Impacts would be less than significant.” (*emphasis added*)

With respect to the comment regarding groundwater levels, the County refers the commenter to Draft EIR Section 3.2.3.3, Groundwater Resources. As stated on page 3.2-24, “The project would not rely on any source of groundwater and not result in the depletion of any existing groundwater within the Site.” In addition, although the proposed project would introduce impervious surfaces to the project Site, “primary bedrock unit onsite is Cretaceous-aged Granitic rocks (monzogranite) which is very hard, moderately weathered, slightly fractured and exhibits steep topographic relief.” Accordingly the DEIR states “much of the project Site is not likely support significant groundwater resources and the potential recharge rates within the Site are very low.” Overall impacts to groundwater were determined to be less than significant.

- I-340-36** The comment restates background information on the HVZC previously stated in Comment I-340-2 and I-340-6, as well as information regarding protections afforded to religious institutions.

The County notes the comment provides factual 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.

## Comment Letter Responses

---

**I-340-37** The comment states the commenter finds it short-sighted to break up the last, large untouched area between San Marcos and Bonsall. The comment states it will lead to a domino effect, look like Los Angeles, and create enormous traffic.

The County acknowledges the comment and notes the first part 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.

Relative to the “domino effect” and traffic, the County refers the reader to Section 1.8, Growth-Inducing Impacts, and Section 2.13, Transportation and Traffic. 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.

**I-340-38** The comment states that where the commenter is from, development like the proposed project is not allowed, and only farmers get permits to upgrade their farm. The comment states the commenter is not against smart development and requests studying cities that do not limit future development by using up space in an unwise manner and no implement wise long term strategies

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-340-39** The comment states San Diego County needs more affordable housing near existing infrastructure and public transportation and existing high-density areas and note more un-affordable homes far away from all resources.

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-340-40** The comment states that any public services to serve the proposed project will increase traffic beyond the development and is not sustainable via existing infrastructure. The comment states that funding is not provided by any public agency and asks who will fund new schools, police stations and officers.

## Comment Letter Responses

---

The comment addresses general subject areas, Traffic and Public Services, which received extensive analysis in section 2.13, Transportation and Traffic, and 3.5, Public Services 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 comment also raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. 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-340-41** The comment requests not to destroy one of the last resorts for recreational nature and for preserving the project Site for future generations.

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-340-42** The comment states the City of San Marcos is suffering from poor air quality. The County notes the project Site is in the County of San Diego, not the City of San Marcos.

The comment addresses general subject areas, Air Quality, which received extensive analysis in Section 2.3, Air Quality, 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-340-43** The comment states the proposed project is not sustainable via existing infrastructure and that expanding local infrastructure is not a solution. The comment states the I-15 is “already jammed” and that “we need less, not more traffic. We need affordable housing near public transportation.”

The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR. The County refers the commenter to Section 2.13.11.3, which identifies impacts to existing, local infrastructure as a result of the proposed project and cumulative projects. Section 2.13.12 provides for recommended mitigation measures, which would reduce traffic impacts on several roadways and intersections under both direct and cumulative traffic scenarios. 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

## Comment Letter Responses

---

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

Regarding the comment about needed less traffic, not more and the provision of affordable housing, 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-340-44** The comment requests a study of Summer Holly.

The County refers the commenter to **Response to Comment I-340-30**, above.

**I-340-45** The comment requests a study of the Copper Butterfly. The comment states the commenter has observed the indicator plant, redberry, on the project Site.

The County does not concur with the comment. As stated on pg. 2.4- ,

“No Hermes copper butterflies (*Lycaena hermes*) have been detected on the project Site. Although the butterfly’s preferred adult nectaring plant, California buckwheat (*Eriogonum fasciculatum* var. *foliolosum*), occurs throughout the project Site, the requisite larval host plant (i.e., true limiting factor), spiny redberry (*Rhamnus crocea*), has not been detected during plant surveys. In addition, the project Site is north of most recent records for this species, and the closest occurrence is located 25 miles south of the project Site near Mission Trails (CDFW 2014c).”

The comment does not provide any additional support for the commenters claim regarding redberry; 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-340-46** The comment requests a study for how greenhouse gas emissions and particulate matter will have a direct bearing on the religious practice of the members of HVZC, including in the presence of the inversion layer.

The County refers the commenter to **Topical Response AQ-1**.

The comment addresses general subject areas, greenhouse gas emissions and particulate matter, which received extensive analysis in Sections 2.3, Air Quality and 2.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, in the Draft EIR. The comment does not raise any

## Comment Letter Responses

---

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-340-47** The comment requests a study of the light pollution from the proposed project and project-related traffic would create, with and without the proposed project.

The comment addresses general subject areas, light and glare, which received extensive analysis in Sections 2.1.3.3, Light and Glare, 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.

- I-340-48** The comment requests study of the growth inducement the proposed project would create. The comment speculates that if the proposed project is approved, the Zen Center, 23 acres, the Golden Door Spa, and other large agricultural uses will come into play for future development.

The County acknowledges the comment and refers the reader to Section 1.8, Growth-Inducing Impacts. As stated on page 1-38:

“the project has potential for growth inducement, which may result in subsequent adverse environmental effects as a result of such growth. Such adverse environmental effects could include impacts to visual resources, air quality, biological resources, transportation and traffic, noise, and cultural resources. There are no known intensity-increasing development applications pending at the County in the immediate project vicinity at this time.”

The comment addresses general subject areas, growth inducement, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR, in Section 1.8 (stated above), as well as Section 2.12, Population and Housing. 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-340-49** The comment states that the Draft EIR did not study or model the impacts on how taking a whole section of the county which has been set aside to be rural, will have on going and long-lasting effects on north county from all impact disciplines.

## Comment Letter Responses

---

The County does not concur with the comment. The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in Section 3.3, Land Use and Planning, 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-340-50** The comment states that the Draft EIR did not study the cost impacts to county tax payers and the residual costs effects if the General Plan is modified to accommodate the proposed project.

The County acknowledges the comment and notes it raises economic (tax payers and “residual cost”), social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. 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.

- I-340-51** The comment states that the Draft EIR “ignores the projects fundamental conflicts with the County’s General Plan by wrongly dismissing all planning and land use issues as “not a significant impact’.”

The County does not concur with this comment. Please refer to Topical Response LU-1, as well as Section 3.3, Land Use and Planning, and Appendix DD, Land Use Consistency Analysis, of the Draft EIR. The County the comment 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-340-52** The comment states that the Draft EIR did not study or mention that Caltrans does not have money for I-15 freeway improvements to accommodate the proposed project. The comment states that Caltrans is working off the current General Plan and that modifying the General Plan will not create additional dollars to improve I-15 which is now operating at LOS F. The County does not concur with the comment. The Draft EIR analyzes the proposed project’s impacts to I-15 in Section 2.13, Transportation and Traffic, and identifies that the proposed project would have a significant and unavoidable impact to I-15. Please see also Topical Response TR-1.

Regarding Caltrans funding for freeway improvements, the County acknowledges the comment and notes it raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to

## Comment Letter Responses

---

relate to any physical effect on the environment. 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.

- I-340-53** The comment states that the Draft EIR did not study the proposed project’s impacts on Sarver Lane and the immediate community using Sarver Lane. The comment states that Sarver Lane is a private road just to the north of HVZC.

The County does not concur with this comment. Please refer to **Response to Comment O-1.16-20** through **O-1.16-23**. 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.

- I-340-54** The comment states that the TDM measures in the Draft EIR are “urban” measures and not applicable, and that as a result there are more trips which will be leaving the sight than forecasted which needs to be remodeled.

The County does not concur with this comment. Please refer to the Draft EIR GHG emissions analysis. 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.

- I-340-55** The comment states that the proposed project will cause I-15 to be gridlocked but that the proposed project “won’t contribute any money to mitigate impacts to the mainline freeway.” The comment states that the costs of these impacts need to be studied and address through monetary mitigation and modeled in the County Fiscal Model.

With respect to the proposed project’s impact to I-15, the County refers the comment to **Response to Comment I-340-52**, above. The County also refers the commenter to **O-1.10**, prepared by DELANE Engineering, Inc. 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-340-56** The comment restates comments raised in Comments I-340-1 through I-340-56 above.

The comment does not raise any new environmental issue. The County refers the reader to Response to Comment sI-340-1 through I-340-56, above. The County will

## Comment Letter Responses

---

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-340-57** The comment states that it appears the proposed project is contemplating modifying the flood plain on land owned by HVZC and states that the proposed project needs to study an alternative because the HVZC will now allow the proposed project to modify any land owned by the HVZC.

The commenter is misunderstanding the proposed improvements. As stated in the Introduction to Appendix CC, Sarver Lane and Deer Springs Road, off-site of the project Site, “impact the FEMA-capped floodplain and floodway for both Stevenson Creek and the Twin Oaks Valley Creek.”

The project proposed to “construct an open channel for Stevenson Creek along the easterly side of Deer Springs Road and several culvert crossings.” (Appendix CC, Introduction) As explained in Section 3.2.3.1 of the DEIR

“...portions of the project’s off-site improvements to Sarver Lane and Deer Springs Road fall within the existing 100-year Flood Zone. The existing drainage facilities within these off-site areas are not sufficiently sized to accommodate the 100-year storm event from Stevenson Creek and Twin Oaks Valley Creek. As a result, storm flows overtop both roads creating a flooding condition during major storms.”

Accordingly, the proposed project would “eliminate this flooding condition with the improvements to both roads by installing a new drainage channel and system of culverts...”

- I-340-58** The comment states that Sarver Lane was not analyzed and the Draft EIR did not show the street alignment and noise impacts along Sarver lane. The comment states that 6,000 trips will have significant impacts. The County acknowledges the comment and refers the commenter to **Response to Comment O-1.15-12** (confirm). 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-340-59** The comment states that under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act and the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Person Active, HVZC will be impacted beyond repair and will likely not be able to be mitigated, which amounts to a “taking.”

The County refers the commenter to **Response to Comment I-340-7**, above.

- I-340-60** The comment states that the Draft EIR does not adequately study and disclose major important impacts, in particular impacts along Sarver Lane.

## Comment Letter Responses

---

The County refers the commenter to **Response to Comments I-340-4, 5, 9, 11, 12, 53 and 58**, above.

- I-340-61** The comment states the Draft EIR does not properly inform the public or decision makers and should not be used as a basis for making a decision. The comment suggest an overhaul of the EIR.

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-340-62** The comment states that given the innumerable issues with the project, the commenter strongly advises against it. The comment states the commenter would not wish to live in any section of the proposed project and would advise anyone against settling there.

The County acknowledges the comment and notes it provides concluding remarks that do not raise new or additional environmental issues concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR. The County acknowledges the comment, and notes it expresses general opposition for the project, but does not raise any issue concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR. For that reason, the County provides no further response to this comment.

- I-340-63** The comment is a picture of the inversion layer.

The comment 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-340-64** The comment is a picture of the inversion layer.

The comment 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-340-65** The comment is a picture of the inversion layer.

The comment 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-340-66** The comment is a picture of the inversion layer.

The comment 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-340-67** The comment is a picture of the inversion layer.

The comment 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-340-68** The comment a picture of Summer Holly.

The comment 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-340-69** The comment a picture of Redberry.

The comment 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 fur