

I-65 Shirley Cail

I-65-1 The County notes the comment states opposition to the project and provides 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-65-2 This comment states that the project is not near public transportation and the number of cars on the road is now at full capacity. The comment also says that rush hour traffic is stopped from Gopher Canyon south and it's impossible to get over the I-15 on Twin Oaks Valley Road in the mornings. As stated in Section 2.13 Transportation and Traffic on page 2.13-56, the project would consist of a substantial TDM program, including an electric bike-share program, coordination of a ride share/shuttle system, a park-and-ride lot, subsidized transit passes for residents and employees, mobility hubs as a means of resident outreach and education, and continued coordination with SANDAG and NCTD for the siting of future transit infrastructure. The applicant is actively working with Caltrans to expand the existing park-and-ride facility and to incorporate the design of the facility into the Town Center concept plan. Furthermore, the applicant is working with NCTD to design the facility to accommodate future transit use. The design of the expanded park-and-ride would include bicycle lockers. In addition, as stated on page 2.13-53, the shuttle service throughout the Project would also provide rides to the Escondido Transit Center.

Regarding the commenter's concern about peak hour traffic, this issue was thoroughly and adequately analyzed in the DEIR in Section 2.13 Transportation and Traffic. Please see **Topical Responses TR-1 through TR-3**. 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-65-3 The comment states that water has not been addressed and asks where the water will come from to supply 2,135 homes. A full analysis of water demand and water supply has been provided in Section 2.14.1.4 Water Supply Analysis of Project Effects and Significance Determination on pages 2.14-37 through 2.14-48. As determined therein, impacts regarding water supply would be less than significant. Please also 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.

I-65-4 The comment expresses concern regarding the lack of fire and police protection. The comment states that Hidden Meadows voted to pay a special tax to build a fire station in the community, but says that the developer is planning to use Deer Springs Fire District instead of building their own. The County notes that Deer Springs Fire

Comment Letter Responses

Protection District provides service to the Hidden Meadows Community. Please see **Topical Response PS-1**.

- I-65-5** The comment states that there is a lack of schools and parents will have to drive out of the area to drop off students, putting more cars on the road. A school site is proposed as part of the Project. As stated in Section 2.13 Transportation and Traffic on page 2.13-51, “the proposed school site would accommodate 555 students, which is less than the estimated K-8 student generation of the Project. Therefore, the majority of the students attending the school would be expected live within the Project site.” 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-65-6** The comment states that infrastructure has not been addressed and asks who will pay for it and what will it cost. The Specific Plan ensures that necessary infrastructure and public facilities, such as, circulation improvements, drainage and stormwater facilities, water and wastewater facilities, fire protection, and schools would be provided prior to development, or phased to coincide with other construction. Please see Specific Plan, Section 4.5, Public Facilities/Infrastructure (Appendix C). 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-65-7** The comment states the County Board of Supervisors have voted against this project before and says that it’s time to follow the General Plan or it was a waste of tax payer money. Please see **Responses to Comment O-1-377 through O-1-495**. The County Board of Supervisors has not voted against the Newland Sierra Project. Compared with the Project, Section 4.5.5 has determined that the Existing General Plan Alternative would result in greater significant impacts to Transportation and Traffic, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Aesthetics and Mineral Resources compared to the project (Draft EIR, p. 4-24.). 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.