

### I-402 Katherine Wagner

- I -402-1** The commenter provides their address and explains that they are writing because they are against the Project. The commenter explains that the Project was voted down in the past and asks why it is being considered again.

The previous project denial has no bearing on the current project or its environmental analysis because: (a) the prior project was considered and rejected more than seven years ago under different factual and legal circumstances, (b) the prior project was subject to different environmental analyses, and (c) the prior project involved different features, plans, and amenities. The Draft EIR for the proposed project has been prepared in compliance with CEQA, and represents a substantial size reduction when compared to the prior project, as it would develop approximately 20% fewer homes, preserve an additional 17 acres of open space onsite plus an additional 218 acres off-site, and generate approximately 7,000 fewer daily trips overall. Nonetheless, 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 requiring any further response under CEQA.

- I -402-2** The commenter explains that the thought of blasting in an area that has not burned in years scares her.

Potential impacts associated with fire hazards and evacuations have been adequately analyzed in 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. As stated on page vii of Appendix N-1, a Construction Fire Prevention Plan would be prepared as part of the project, “detailing the important construction phase restrictions and fire safety requirements that will be implemented to reduce risk of ignitions and pre-plans for responding to an unlikely ignition.”

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 -402-3** The commenter explains that they live in an area surrounded by horse ranches and nurseries and hopes that the land uses remain the same. The commenter asks if the County needs to have a home on every hill. The comment states that the County will eventually look like Los Angeles.

## Comment Letter Responses

---

The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commenter, 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 -402-4** The comment states that traffic is already bad on Twin Oaks and the commenter explains that they cannot imagine what it would look like if thousands of more cars came into San Marcos. The comment states that several homes are being developed in San Marcos, which would add a toll to the local streets.

The comment addresses traffic issues, 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 -402-5** The commenter requests that the Project does not go through and asks to keep the Valley out of the hands of developers who want to make money and do not live in the area.

The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commenter, 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.