

I-349 Zachary Seech

I-349-1 The comment provides background information from the commenters experience on Buena Creek Road. The comment states that adding 2,135 homes threatens the community's ability to exit during normal times and "would probably make an existing impossible in the event of a wildfire evacuation or any urgency." The comment questions the justification for adding traffic to an already failing intersection. The County acknowledges the comment and notes 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.

Nonetheless, with respect to the amount of traffic added to Buena Creek Road, Table 2.13-17 shows that Buena Creek Road would experience between 2,390 and 3,960 additional daily trips as a result of the proposed project and identifies direct impacts to two sections of Buena Creek Road (TR-14 and TR-15). Section 2.13.12 identified M-TR-5, M-TR-6 and M-TR-7 to mitigation these impacts to less than significant; however, because M-TR-5 is under the jurisdiction of the City of San Marcos, impact M-TR-14 remains significant and unavoidable.

With respect to the comment regarding emergency evacuation, please refer to **Topical Response HAZ-1**, which states that, relative to traffic gridlock concerns, 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.

I-349-2 The comment asks what the weight limit is for trucks on Buena Creek Road and if larger trucks would be prohibited from using the road during construction of the proposed Project. The County acknowledges the comments and notes it does not raise any issue concerning the adequacy 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.

Nonetheless, construction traffic is analyzed in Section 2.13.9.1. As stated on Page 2.13-60 of the DEIR:

Buena Creek Road/Monte Vista Drive and Buena Creek Road/S. Santa Fe Ave Intersection Improvements

Comment Letter Responses

The limits of construction related to these two intersections are approximately 300 to 400 feet on each leg of the intersection proposed for improvements by the project. Appropriate traffic controls measures (e.g., K-rails, etc.) will be placed where needed to implement the necessary improvements. Only minor grading for the widening, shoulder, and roadbed improvements is anticipated for these intersection improvements. Where possible, construction vehicles, contractors, and workers will be required to use the work area for movement throughout the construction zone to minimize impacts on those portions of the road that remain open to through traffic. These improvements are anticipated to take between six to nine months.

As concluded on Page 2.13-63, with implementation of PDF-39, which requires the preparation of a Traffic Control Plan for the project, impacts related to construction traffic were determined to be **less than significant**.

- I-349-3** The comment asks “what is the traffic load past which we will not build new projects?” 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 or 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 or necessary.
- I-349-4** The comment asks if environmental degradation of the creek due to overpopulation and trash from through traffic is addressed in the draft EIR. The comment states the creek is a vulnerable area resource. The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR, specifically in Section 3.2, Hydrology and Water Quality, and 2.4, Biological Resources. 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-349-5** The comment states the project is an abrogation of the General Plan that urbanizes a wildlife area with no major access to infrastructure such as mass transit. The County does not concur with this comment. Please refer to **Topical Responses LU-1 and LU-2**. The Draft EIR details that project development would require amendments to the General Plan, including a General Plan Amendment to amend the North County Metropolitan Subregional Plan Map from existing General Commercial, Office Professional, Semi-Rural 10, and Rural Land 20 designations to Village Core Mixed

Comment Letter Responses

Use, Semi-Rural 1, and Open Space Conservation. (Draft EIR Section 1.6, Project Inconsistencies with Applicable Regional and General Plans, p. 1-29 – 1-32.)

With these General Plan Amendments, the Draft EIR finds the project would be consistent with the General Plan. The Draft EIR evaluates the project's consistency with the General Plan in detail in Chapter 3.3, Land Use and Planning; and Draft EIR Appendix DD. (See, Section 3.3.3.2, Conflict with Plans, Policies, and Regulations, p. 3.3-21.) In undertaking this consistency evaluation, the Draft EIR analyzes whether the project was consistent with each of the "Guiding Principles" and policies of the County of San Diego General Plan (2011) and Subregional Plan. Based on this detailed review, the Draft EIR concluded impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 3.3-21 - 3.3-36, 3.3-38.)

In addition to evaluating the project's consistency with the Guiding Principles and policies of the General Plan, the Draft EIR directly compares the proposed project land uses to the Existing General Plan Land Uses in Section 4.5, Existing General Plan Alternative. (Draft EIR, p. 4- 16.) Compared with the project, Section 4.5.5 has determined that the Existing General Plan Alternative would actually result in greater significant impacts to Transportation and Traffic, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Aesthetics and Mineral Resources compared to the project. (Draft EIR, p. 4-24.)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK