I-365 Lois Sklar (1)

I-365-1 The comment expresses opposition to the project. The comment also states the project will contribute 28,862 new trips and expresses concern about traffic and access during a wildfire.

With respect to the project trip generation, Section 2.13, Transportation and Traffic, analyzes the proposed projects new trips. As described in Section 2.13.7, the mix of land uses in the project would limit the number of external trips leaving the project site by approximately 23%, reducing the ADT from 28,862 to 22,209.

Regarding access, the proposed project includes three access points. These include two primary access points on Deer Springs Road (Sarver Lane and Mesa Rock Road) and an additional access point off North Twin Oaks Valley Road at Camino Mayor. The proposed project includes mitigation measures to widen Deer Springs Road to four lanes, which would improve existing access in the event of an evacuation. Appendix N-2, Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan for Newland Sierra, analyzes the evacuation of the project Site in the event of a wildfire and Section 2.8.3.3 of the DEIR analyzes the proposed project’s impacts to Emergency Response Plans and concludes the impacts are less than significant.

I-365-2 The comment addresses a general subject area (impacts to wildlife), which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR, specifically in Section 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-365-3 The comment raises concerns regarding construction impacts related to noise and air quality. Please see Topical Responses AQ-1 and NOI-1. No further response is required.

I-365-4 The comment states the proposed Project is located within an area designated as Pre-Approved Mitigation Area and that the project would sever wildlife corridors and is preceding implementation of the North County MSCP. Please see Topical Response BIO-1 and BIO-2. No further response is required.

I-365-5 The comment states the project upends the General Plan. The County does not concur. Please see Topical Response LU-1.

I-365-6 The comment states the project will require condemnation. The DEIR addresses the potential displacement of homes and people in Section 2.12.3.2. The DEIR states that the off-site improvements to Sarver Lane, “would require the demolition of existing
houses located on four parcels,” but that “The applicant currently owns two of these parcels, one of which is vacant and uninhabitable. The applicant also has a recorded option to purchase the other two parcels.” As a result, “[t]his displacement of existing housing and residents on four parcels would not be considered substantial as it would not necessitate the construction of additional housing elsewhere.” Impacts would be considered less than significant.

I-365-7 The comment states the VWD projects a water supply deficit and will require existing customers to reduce water usage by 36% if the proposed project is approved. The County does not concur. Please see Topical Response UTL-1 and UTL-2. No further response is required.

I-365-8 The comment questions the commercial zoning in a rural area. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it raises an economic issue that does 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-365-9 This comment discusses the provision and supply of housing in the project vicinity and the proximity of the project site to employment centers and transportation options for low-income housing. 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-365-10 The County acknowledges the commenter’s opposition to the project and notes it provides concluding remarks that do not raise new or additional environmental issues concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR. For that reason, the County provides no further response to this comment.