

### I-370 Duane and Diane Sorlie

- I-370-1** The comment states there is “much environmental concern and lack of planning about the Newland Sierra Project.

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-370-2** The comment states a major concern is the “lack of fire and police protection.”

The comment addresses general subject areas, fire and police service, which received extensive analysis in Section 3.5, Public Services, 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.

Nonetheless, as concluded in Section 3.5, impacts to fire and law enforcement services were determined to be less than significant. Please refer to Section 3.5 for additional information.

- I-370-3** The comment states traffic flow is not considered and the project area is already impacted by existing homes in the area and traffic from Riverside County.

The County concurs with the comment that existing traffic in the project area is operating at failing levels of service. The DEIR analyzes Existing Conditions in Section 2.13.2.3 and Tables 2.12-1, 2.13-2, 2.13-3 and 2.13-4. On pages 2.13-26 and 27:

#### Intersections

Peak hour turning movement counts were conducted at the study area intersections during April 2015. Existing AM/PM peak-hour intersection volumes are shown in Table 2.13-1, Existing Intersection Peak-Hour Operations. Signal timing plans from the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) for the I-15 and SR 78 ramp intersections and City of San Marcos signalized intersections also are included in Appendix R.

As shown in Table 2.13-1, the following intersections currently operate at LOS E or worse:

- Deer Springs Road/I-15 SB Ramps (LOS E during the PM peak hour)

## Comment Letter Responses

---

- Robelini Drive/S. Santa Fe Avenue (LOS E during the AM peak hour)
- Buena Creek Road/S. Santa Fe Avenue (LOS F during the AM peak hour and LOS E during the PM peak hour)
- Buena Creek Road/Monte Vista Drive (LOS F during the PM peak hour)

### Road Segments

Table 2.13-2, Existing Street Segment Operations, provides a summary of the average daily traffic (ADT) volumes derived from traffic counts conducted by LLG during April 2015. As shown in Table 2.13-2, the following segments currently operate at LOS E or worse:

- Deer Springs Road: Twin Oaks Valley Road to Sarver Lane (LOS F)
- Deer Springs Road: Sarver Lane to Mesa Rock Road (LOS F)
- Deer Springs Road: Mesa Rock Road to I-15 SB Ramps (LOS F)
- Twin Oaks Valley Road: Deer Springs Road to Buena Creek Road (LOS F)
- Twin Oaks Valley Road: Buena Creek Road to Cassou Road (LOS F)
- Gopher Canyon Road: Little Gopher Canyon Road to I-15 Ramps (LOS E)
- Robelini Drive: Sycamore Avenue to S. Santa Fe Avenue (LOS F)
- S. Santa Fe Avenue: Robelini Drive to Buena Creek Road (LOS E)

### Freeway Segments

Table 2.13-3, Existing Freeway Segment Operations, summarizes the existing freeway mainline levels of service along the subject segments within the project study area. As shown in Table 2.13-3, the following freeway segments are currently calculated to operate at LOS E or worse:

- I-15: Riverside County Boundary to Old Highway 395
- I-15: Gopher Canyon Road to Pomerado Road
- SR 78: Mar Vista Road to Rancho Santa Fe Avenue
- SR 78: Las Posas Road to Twin Oaks Valley Road

(emphasis added)

## Comment Letter Responses

---

The comment addresses general subject areas, traffic, which received extensive analysis in Section 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-370-4** The comment states the “impact to our safety, comfort, lack of public transportation and an impact on our natural resources, most importantly water cannot be overlooked.”

The comment addresses general subject areas, public safety, traffic, and water, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR, including **Sections 2.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials** (wildland fires), **Section 2.13, Transportation and Traffic**, **Section 2.14, Utilities and Service Systems**, and **Section 3.5, Public Services**. 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-370-5** The comment states that “schools and other means of education for families has not been considered, and certainly not paid for.” The County does not concur with this comment. School services are addressed in Draft EIR Section 3.5.3. As stated on page 3.5-19 of the Draft EIR, “[t]he proposed project would either pay the state-mandated school fees or enter into a School Mitigation Agreement(s) to ensure that schools are built as population increases during the phased development. Therefore, impacts related to school facilities would be **less than significant**.”

Impacts to school have been evaluated in Draft EIR Section 3.5. Further, a K-8 school site is identified with the proposed project to accommodate project-generated students. Impact associated with the on-site school have been analyzed through the DEIR. No further response is required or necessary.

- I-370-6** The comment states that “previous research encourages to focus new housing on infrastructure close to employment” and asks “where is this?”

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.

## Comment Letter Responses

---

Nonetheless, the County notes that existing and planned infrastructure is located within and adjacent to the project Site, including a major roadway (Deer Springs Road) and existing and planned water and sewer systems. Please see **Response to Comment O-1.7-4**.

**I-370-7** The comment states that “the lack of emergency evacuation routes cannot be overlooked” and notes that San Diego County has “a recent history of needing this type of planning.”

The County acknowledges the comment and directs the commenter to Section 2.8.3.1, Wildfire Hazard, and 2.8.3.3 (Emergency Response Plans), as well as **Topical Response HAZ-1** and **Response to Comment O-1.13**.

As stated in Section 2.8.3.1 of the Draft EIR, “The available evacuation routes for the project are: (1) egress to the south via Mesa Rock Road, (2) egress to the south on Sarver Lane, and (3) egress to the west via Camino Mayor,” and that “it is estimated that the minimum amount of time needed to move the Newland Sierra population to urbanized and/or designated evacuation areas may require up to 4 hours after notification to evacuate is given.” The Draft EIR concludes that impacts to Wildfire Hazards and Emergency Response Plans would be **less than significant**.

**I-370-8** The County notes the comment provides background information and does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. The County acknowledges the comment letter, and notes it expresses general opposition for the project, but 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 because the comment does not raise an environmental issue concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR.