

I-388 Lindsay Townley

- I -388-1** The commenter explains that they are opposed to the project and that the project does not belong in such an incompatible location.

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 -388-2** The commenter explains that their concerns about the project include freeway and surface road traffic, fire protection, water shortages, strain on existing sewage systems, and direct impacts to the native environment.

The comment addresses traffic, wildfire hazards, utilities and service systems, and biological resources, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR, specifically in Sections 2.13 Transportation and Traffic, 2.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials, 2.14 Utilities and Service Systems, 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-388-3** The commenter explains that the EIR cannot address environment-specific concerns without addressing the impacts of the project on neighboring communities.

The Draft EIR analyzed impacts associated with aesthetics; agricultural resources; air quality; biological resources; cultural resources, geology, soils, and seismicity; greenhouse gas emissions; hazards and hazardous materials; mineral resources; noise; paleontological resources; population and housing; transportation and traffic; and utilities and service systems, which considered impacts to neighboring communities.

This comment is general in nature and does not raise any specific issue regarding any particular analysis in the DEIR. Therefore, no specific response can be provided or is required. (*Paulek v. California Dept. Water Resources* (2014) 231 Cal.App.4th 35, 47 [a general response is all that is required to a general comment]). This comment is included in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.

- I-388-4** The comment states that the impact to rural Twin Oaks and Buena Creek Valley residents would be life-changing. The commenter explains that they bought their property in 1987 because it was in a low density housing area. The commenter asks

Comment Letter Responses

why a project of such density is being considered, when it conflicts with the General Plan. The commenter asks why tax-payer money is being wasted on such plans if the results are going to be ignored by developers.

Please refer to **Topical ResponseLU-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-388-5** The commenter explains that for over 30 years they have watched and have been impacted by urban sprawl in the County. The comment states that the Quintessa development has overburdened Buena Creek Road. The comment states that Buena Creek Road does not have shoulders for bicyclists or pedestrians to access the NCTD Sprinter.

The comment addresses traffic, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR, specifically in Section 2.13 Transportation and Traffic. 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-388-6** The comment states that Buena Creek Road has been designated as a future four lane road, which has been used to justify additional development in the area. The comment states that the community has requested that this be reclassified as a two-lane road. The comment states that the County has stated in meetings that the widening of Buena Creek Road is unlikely to occur, because of the lack of funds.

The comment addresses traffic, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR, specifically in Section 2.13 Transportation and Traffic. 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-388-7** The commenter urges the County to reject the project for the reasons listed below.

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.

Comment Letter Responses

- I-388-8** The comment states that the project would add 21,350 daily trips to the already congested roads and freeways.

The comment addresses traffic, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR, specifically in Section 2.13 Transportation and Traffic. 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-388-9** The comment states that there is no guarantee that taxpayer money would not be used to fund mitigation to area roadways including Mesa Rock Road and the I-15 freeway intersection.

Traffic impacts and proposed improvements are disclosed in Section 2.13 Traffic and Transportation. There are a number of roadway, interchange, and signal improvements that are included as part of the proposed project, including improvements to Mesa Rock Road. 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-388-10** The comment states that the number of homes planned for the project exceeds the General Plan Update, which was funded by taxpayer money.

Please refer to **Topical Response LU 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-388-11** The comment states that massive construction would clog local streets and would result in significant noise and air quality impacts for 10 years. The comment explains that the surrounding area is home to many senior citizens with health problems which would be exacerbated by the project. The comment states that the Golden Door resort would also be destroyed.

The Draft EIR's Air Quality chapter, and particularly **Section 2.3.5, Impact Analysis** therein, comprehensively evaluates the project's construction-related air quality impacts, including those attributable to blasting. Please refer to **Topical Response Air Quality – Blasting Impacts**. As the comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, no more specific response can be provided or is required. The

Comment Letter Responses

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-388-12** The comment states that the project is located in a severe fire hazardous zone with poor road access and does not have an adequate evacuation plan. The commenter explains that they are concerned about the existing fire danger, especially because a new I-15 interchange is not in the plans. The comment states that residents and commercial tenants of the project would not attempt to evacuate the project area via I-15, rather, they would likely travel west onto Twin Oaks Valley and Buena Creek Road. The commenter asks how the County plans to deal with the residents of the project evacuating on onto Twin Oaks Valley and Buena Creek Roads.

For information regarding evacuation during a wildfire, refer to Draft EIR Appendix N-2, which includes the Evacuation Plan for Newland Sierra. Also refer 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. No further response is required or necessary.

- I-388-13** The commenter explains that they are asked to conserve and pay more for water, but yet a new 2,135 home development is proposed next to their doorstep. The comment states that the project is many miles from public transportation, which conflicts with the smart growth initiative through the County.

Please refer to GR-UTL-1 (Water Shortage/Drought). The comment addresses utilities and service systems, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR, specifically in Section 2.14 Utilities and Service Systems. 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-388-14** The comment states that Southern California is in the midst of a drought and the project would consume more than 1 million gallons of water per day. The commenter explains that water shortages and future water demand have been ignored by the Vallecitos Water District, and these issues should be addressed for the project. The comment states that sewer overburdening must also be addressed.

Please refer to GR-UTL-1 (Water Shortage/Drought). The comment addresses utilities and service systems, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR, specifically in Section 2.14 Utilities and Service Systems. 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

Comment Letter Responses

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

- I-388-15** The commenter asks how the County can justify building over 2,000 homes east of Buena Creek Road, without a concrete plan of how the road will be modified to accommodate the project's ADT. The commenter states that they expect a specific answer from the County regarding the Buena Creek Road improvements.

Traffic impacts and proposed improvements are disclosed in Section 2.13 Traffic and Transportation. There are a number of roadway, interchange, and signal improvements that are included as part of the proposed project, including improvements to Buena Creek Road. 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-388-16** The commenter asks how the County plans to manage the additional traffic associated with the project during an evacuation event on Twin Oaks Valley and Buena Creek Road.

Potential impacts associated with fire hazards and evacuations have been adequately analyzed in the Draft EIR, **Section 2.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials** as well as, **Appendix N, Fire Protection Plan and Evacuation Plan**. Mitigation has been provided when necessary to avoid or lessen potentially significant impacts. Refer to **Topical Response HAZ-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-388-17** The commenter asks how the County can justify adding the water and sewage demands associated with the project and how the future water and sewage shortages would be apportioned to the existing parcels within the Vallecitos Water District.

Please refer to GR-UTL-1 (Water Shortage/Drought). As stated on page 1-11 of the Draft EIR Project Description, "Off-site sewer and water improvements would be completed in accordance with the approved water and sewer master plans prepared for the Project. These improvements would be made in conjunction with surface improvements to Sarver Lane, Deer Springs Road, and Twin Oaks Valley Road. Additional segments of sewer would be improved in Twin Oaks Valley Road to Del Roy Avenue and East of Twin Oaks Valley Road within an existing Vallecitos Water District easement. Additionally, an 800-foot-long pipeline segment would require upsizing from the existing 18-inch-diameter line to a 21-inch-diameter line. This

Comment Letter Responses

segment is located north of East Mission Road between Twin Oaks Valley Road and Vineyard Road within the City of San Marcos. The existing sewer is located behind a commercial/retail development. For the purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that the entire 30-foot-wide easement would be impacted to upsize the existing sewer line.”

The County notes 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-388-18** The commenter explains that they are concerned about the impact to native birds and wildlife.

The comment raises a general subject area, biological resources, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR, specifically Section 2.4. The County notes the comment does not specifically state which impacts to wildlife would occur. As the comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, 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-388-19** The commenter explains that they live in riparian habitat off of Buena Creek Road and want to understand the impact to wildlife on the project site and within the Buena Creek Road neighborhood and riparian habitat.

The comment raises a general subject area, biological resources, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR, specifically Section 2.4. As the comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, 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-388-20** The commenter explains that the Merriam Mountain project was not approved by the County Board of Supervisors previously, and the Newland Sierra project does not overcome the practical and environmental issues of the Merriam Mountain project. The comment states that the County’s new transportation plan discourages urban sprawl, and asks why the project is not being held to those guidelines. The commenter asks that the County consider the concerns and opposition to the project.

Comment Letter Responses

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.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK