

I-407 John Walsh

I -407-1 The commenter asks that the County consider his opposition to the 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 -407-2 The commenter explains that they live in in Hidden Meadows and moved there because it is a low density rural area. The comment states that the Project would dramatically impact the low density 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.

I -407-3 The comment states that extensive earth moving and rock grinding will create years of dangerous dust that will blow across the commenters property and into their house. The commenter urges the County to not impose a hazard to his family.

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 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 -407-4 The comment states that there is daily traffic congestion at the I-15 interchange due to endless backup traffic coming from Deer Springs Road and adding thousands of residences would make things worse. The comment states that thousands of new residences would add new commuters to the road and local employment centers do not need thousands of more residences.

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.

Comment Letter Responses

- I -407-5** The commenter explains that as a bicyclist, they already face difficulties with the County's poor execution to provide, maintain, and sweep road shoulders to allow for safe bicycle riding. The comment states that adding more commuters to the road would add risk to the safety of bicyclists in the area.

As addressed on page 2.13-82 in **Section 2.13, Transportation and Traffic**, the project's proposed improvements to Deer Springs Road and Twin Oaks Valley Road include a ten-foot-wide multi-use pathway and dedicated bicycle lanes that would connect directly to the project's internal network of pathways and trails, and the bicycle lanes on Sarver Lane and Mesa Rock Road as well as to the existing multi-use pathway and bicycle path along Twin Oaks Valley Road heading into the City of San Marcos. Compared to existing conditions where facilities do not exist or only partially exist, these pedestrian and bicycle improvements would create safer conditions for these two alternative forms of travel along the project's off-Site road improvements.

- I -407-6** The comment states that an earlier version of the Project was already rejected. The comment states that the Project is very similar to the previous project, which is also inconsistent with the General Plan. The comment states that giving in to the developers would imply corruption on the part of the County Board of Supervisors. The commenter urges the County not to forfeit the public's confidence in local government by giving in to a developer who would be gone as soon as their money making venture is complete.

Please refer to **Topical Response LU 1**. 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 -407-7** The commenter asks that the County consider that the Project appear on the upcoming election ballot, so the public can exercise their right to vote. The commenter urges that the County not let a few officials squeeze benefits from a developer at the expense of thousands of people who expect to continue living in low density housing.

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.