

### I-42 Karen and Kevin Birch

- I-42-1** 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. For that reason, the County provides no further response to this comment.
- I-42-2** The comment states that 60 days is not enough time to review the entire EIR and that one public comment session is not enough. 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.
- I-42-3** 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.
- I-42-4** The comment states that population will more than double and asks if we need this many homes so far away from any city and if we did then why did the County spend millions of dollars on the 2020 General Plan EIR. Population impacts were addressed in Section 2.12 Population and Housing. This comment is unrelated to the environmental analysis provided in the Draft EIR. 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-42-5** The comment states that the project should not be considered until Caltrans has prepared their EIR for the I-15 interchange improvements and asks if the SR-78 will be addressed in the Caltrans EIR. 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. Please also see **Topical Responses TR-1 and TR-2**.
- I-42-6** The comment asks when the various options will be reviewed and/or decided and how will they be paid for. The comment also states that none of the options in the EIR provided relief to existing traffic issues on Deer Springs Road, I-15, or Center City Parkway and Mountain Meadows Road. The comment addresses general subject areas, 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-42-7** The comment states that Caltrans (California tax payers) and the citizens of San Diego County will have to pay for the major redesign of the area and asks why the developer isn't required to pay a large share of the expense in these improvements. The commenter is incorrect. The project applicant will be required to contribute fair share contribution to the TIF program. TIF funds are only used to pay for improvements to roadway facilities identified for inclusion in the TIF program, which includes both County roads and Caltrans highway facilities. TIF funds collected for a specific local or regional area must be spent in the same area. By ensuring TIF funds are spent for the specific roadway improvements identified in the TIF program, the CEQA mitigation requirement is satisfied, and the Mitigation Fee Act nexus is met. 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-42-8** The comment states that impacts to the Sheriff's Department and the Deer Springs Fire Marshall need to be addressed. The comment also expresses concern regarding wildfires and evacuation. Potential impacts to law enforcement and fire department have been adequately analyzed and disclosed in Section 3.5 Public Services of the Draft EIR. Regarding evacuation, the Draft EIR notes that while prior evacuations within the project vicinity have experienced traffic congestion, the project includes improvements to Deer Springs Road, which would increase capacity of the main evacuation route compared to the existing condition. 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.
- I-42-9** The comment expresses concern regarding electricity and asks why the San Onofre power plant is listed as a source of electricity when it's in the process of being decommissioned. The San Onofre plant is still operational and SDG&E has sufficient capacity to supply the region's energy needs. The project would require solar on all residential units.
- I-42-10** The comment expresses concern regarding water supply and a requirement to reduce consumption by 36%. The Twin Oaks Valley Property Owner's Association made the same or similar comment in a newspaper ad, noting that "36% cuts to resident's water supply" would be required so as to serve the proposed project. The Vallecitos Water District responded by posting on its website a "Correction of Misinformation." According to the District, it is not mandating the rationing of its water supplies to existing District customers (by 36% or any percentage), so as to be able to serve any proposed new development, including the Newland Sierra project. For that reason, the District considered the Twin Oaks' statement "false," requiring correction. See **Topical Responses UTL-1 and UTL-2**. 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-42-11** The comment asks where sewer will be routed, if the project will have its own treatment facility, and who will pay for the extensions and upgrades to capacity. The comment also says that VWD is out of sewer capacity and asks how they could handle the added volume. The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR; specifically, in Section 2.14.2, Wastewater. 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-42-12** The comment asks where the pipes will be coming from that will supply natural gases to the houses. The County acknowledges the comment and notes that it does not appear to relate to any physical change to the environment. For that reason, no more detailed response is required or necessary. 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-42-13** The comment asks if the County actually needs this development or not. The comment also states that the County is being asked to set aside all of the millions of dollars spent on the General Plan to satisfy the developers greed. 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. Please see **Topical Responses LU-1 and LU-2**. 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-42-14** The comment asks if anyone has considered impacts to habitat and if they will see more dead coyotes killed on the freeway because their habitat is lost. The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR; specifically, in Section 2.4, Biological Resources. Please see **Topical Responses BIO-1 and BIO-2**. 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-42-15** The comment asks when blasting will occur as they know it will occur for approximately 10 years. The comment is incorrect. The Draft EIR's Project Description details the anticipated construction schedule in Section 1.2.1.12, Construction. As to the overall duration of construction, the Draft EIR states that "[b]uild out of the Community is anticipated to occur in two phases over approximately 10 years" (2018 through 2027) due to market demands and in order to

## Comment Letter Responses

---

- achieve a “logical and orderly expansion of roadways, public utilities, and infrastructure... to ensure that improvements are in place at the time of need.” However, all heavy construction activities (which include the blasting referenced in the comment) “are anticipated to be completed by the end of 2022.” Thus, all heavy construction activities, including blasting, are anticipated to be completed within the first five years (2018 through 2022). (Draft EIR, p. 1-20.) Further, “[i]ndividual blasting or rock-crushing activities during Phases 1 and 2 would occur sequentially and would not overlap.” (*Ibid.*) Refer to **Topical Response AQ-2**. 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-42-16** The comment asks how the public will be protected from silica dust and resulting cancer risk. The Draft EIR determined, on the basis of the evidence, that “deposited crystalline silica is not considered to be a source of significant health risk and impacts would be less than significant.” (Draft EIR, p. 2.3-50.) Even though impacts would be less than significant, the Draft EIR, nonetheless, provides mitigation measures M-AQ-11 and M-AQ-12 to further control fugitive dust emissions generated during blasting activities and thereby further minimize crystalline silica exposure. Refer to **Topical Response AQ-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.
- I-42-17** The comment asks how the communities will be protected from accidental fire caused by the construction. The proposed project is located within the jurisdictions of the DSFPD and the SMFPD. The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR; specifically, in 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-42-18** The comment asks about traffic congestion during construction and if they should anticipate 10 years of traffic congestion, worse than they have now. The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR.; specifically in Section 2.13, Transportation and Traffic. Specific to the issue of construction traffic, the EIR found traffic impacts related to construction trips to be less than significant. Refer to Section 2.13.9.1, Construction Traffic Impact Analysis, of the 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.

## Comment Letter Responses

---

**I-42-19** The comment asks where high school students will go and if they will be driving through Jesmond Dene to get to Escondido High School. The comment asks if there is capacity in the Escondido School District and if they would be in portable classrooms. The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR; specifically, in Section 3.5, Public Services (page 3.5-17). 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-42-20** The comment asks how residents will be routed/affected if there was a fire during the construction/widen of Twin Oaks Valley Road. As stated in Section 2.13 Transportation and Traffic on page 2.13-58, “The California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) states that the TCP “provides for the reasonably safe and efficient movement of road users through or around temporary traffic control zones while reasonably protecting workers, responders to traffic incidents, and equipment.” TCPs define the locations of all roads that would need to be temporarily closed or subject to traffic control due to construction activities, including hauling of oversized loads by truck or delivery vehicle, truck routes, and permitted hours for construction vehicles to be operating. The TCPs define the use of warning signs, lights, barricades, cones, direction of travel, posted speed limit, location of temporary barricades, no parking restrictions, etc., according to standard guidelines outlined in the Caltrans Traffic Manual for Construction and Maintenance Work Zones (1996 edition, Revision 2), the Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction, the MUTCD, and the Work Area Traffic Control Handbook (WATCH).

The project would be required to prepare, for County approval prior to issuance of the first grading permit and as required for individual grading and construction permits associated with off-Site improvements, Construction Traffic Control Plans (TCPs) to manage construction-related traffic. The TCP has been incorporated into project design as PDF-39 (refer to the specific measures outlined in Project-Specific Traffic Control Measures below).”

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-42-21** The comment asks when the EIR will be released and what impact will the changes have on existing traffic congestion. The comment also asks if this should not be approved first. As it relates to the project’s effect on existing traffic conditions, please see **Response to Comment I-91-51**. 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-42-22** The comment explains why they and many others who live in the area bought their homes there over the city. The County notes the comment provides background information and 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.
- I-42-23** The comment states that they cannot support the development. 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. For that reason, the County provides no further response to this comment.