

### I-70 Cathy

- I-70-1** The comment states that during the Witchcreek fire 10 years ago they were forced to stay inside their homes and the I-15 was closed in both directions at 395 and Gopher Canyon. The comment says the only way out was through Gopher Canyon's one lane road to Oceanside. The County notes the comment provides background information and expresses the opinion of the comment. This comment does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA or dispute the adequacy of the DEIR. 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-70-2** The County acknowledges the comment as an introduction to comments that follow. The Comment also expresses concern regarding the lack of fire and police protection for the proposed homes. Fire and police protection have been adequately analyzed in Section 3.5 Public Services. Please see **Topical Response PS-1**.
- I-70-3** The comment states that the anticipated traffic flow was not considered and that this area is already impacted with lack of planning for existing homes in the area. The increase in traffic due to the proposed project has been adequately analyzed in **Section 2.13 Traffic and Transportation** and mitigation measures have been provide to reduce or substantially lessen potentially significant impacts. 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-70-4** The comment states that the impact to their safety, comfort, lack of public transportation, natural resources, and water cannot be overlooked. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the comment, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR. However, these issues were addressed in the DEIR: safety and law enforcement impacts were analyzed in Section 3.5 Public Services; public transportation was addressed in Section 2.13 Traffic and Transportation; natural resources were addressed in Section 2.4 Biological Resources; and water supply was analyzed in Section 2.14 Utilities and Service Systems. Please also see **Topical Responses BIO-1, BIO-2, UTL-1, UTL-2, TR-1, TR-2, and 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-70-5** The comment states that schools and other means of education for families has not been considered or paid for. Impacts to schools have been adequately analyzed in

## Comment Letter Responses

---

Section 3.5 Public Services. As stated on page 3.5-18, In recognition of the impact on school facilities created by new development, the school districts and the development may enter into various mitigation agreements to ensure the timely construction of school facilities to house students from new residential development. The primary financing mechanism authorized in these mitigation agreements is the formation of a community facilities district, pursuant to the Mello-Roos Community Facilities District Act of 1982.

In lieu of a mitigation agreement, the proposed project would be required to pay state-mandated school facilities fees to each school district to contribute a fair-share amount to help maintain adequate school facilities and levels of service. Regulatory compliance ensures that there would be sufficient facilities to serve the proposed project's additional students. Ultimately, the provision of schools is the responsibility of the school districts. SB 50 provides that the statutory fees found in the Government and Education Codes are the exclusive means of considering and mitigating for school impacts. Imposition of the statutory fees constitutes full and complete mitigation (Government Code Section 65995(b)).

The proposed project would either pay the state-mandated school fees or enter into a School Mitigation Agreement(s) to ensure that schools are built as population increases during the phased development. Therefore, impacts related to school facilities would be less than significant. 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-70-6** The comment states that previous research encourages new housing to be focused on infrastructure close to employment. The comment asks where this is. As stated in Section 1.0 Project Description on page 1-25,

“the project Site is connected via freeways, arterials, and local roads to several neighboring cities, making it less than 3 miles to the cities of Escondido, San Marcos, and Vista, and approximately 10 miles to the cities of Carlsbad and Oceanside, all North County cities serving as major centers of employment and regional shopping for North San Diego County. A jobs/housing market analysis prepared for the project by MarketPointe Realty Advisors<sup>214</sup> shows that 124,251 jobs exist within the State Route (SR) 78 Corridor Submarket, ...[and] that 63 percent of these jobs are commuting ... from outside the SR-78 Corridor Submarket. Of these jobs commuting into the Submarket, 58

---

<sup>214</sup> The Market Analysis is incorporated by reference and is available for public inspection and review upon request to the County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Development Services.

## Comment Letter Responses

---

percent are coming from other parts of San Diego County and the balance (42 percent) are coming primarily from the Riverside, Orange, and Los Angeles counties. Riverside County, the closest neighboring county and where more than 8 percent of the workers in the SR-78 Corridor Submarket live, is at least 25 miles to the north of the project Site, more than 30 miles from the center of the SR-78 Corridor Submarket, and accessible via I-15. By comparison, the project would offer a range of housing options much closer to these North County regional employment and shopping centers within the SR-78 Corridor Submarket.”

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-70-7** The comment states that the lack of emergency evacuation routes cannot be overlooked and that San Diego County has a recent history of needing this type of planning. The comment states that this has been denied by the County Supervisors in the past and that a recent \$18 million study was done in the area with tax payer money. With respect to emergency evacuation, Appendix N-2 is the Evacuation Plan for Newland Sierra, which was prepared in coordination with the Deer Springs Fire Protection District and County of San Diego, and does not conflict with existing evacuation and pre-plans. From Page 2.8-20 of the DEIR, “the intent of the evacuation plan is to guide implementation of an evacuation procedure such that the process of evacuating people from the Site is facilitated in an efficient manner and according to a pre-defined, practiced evacuation protocol.” Appendix N-2 identifies the proposed project’s evacuation road network, including internal roads which connect to three primary ingress/egress roads, and ultimately connect to major evacuation routes, including, Deer Springs Road, Sarver Lane, North Twin Oaks Valley Road, Buena Creek Road and Interstate 15. In addition, the proposed project includes improvements to Deer Springs Road which would increase capacity of the main evacuation route compared to the existing condition. Further, improvements to North Twin Oaks Valley Road and Buena Creek Road would expand capacity of the network to assist evacuation efforts for the surrounding community. Please see **Topical Responses HAZ-1** for a more detailed explanation of evacuation.

Regarding the comments reference to a recent study done in the area using tax payer money, it is unknown what the comment is referring to. 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.

## Comment Letter Responses

---

**I-70-8** The comment states that the site is currently zoned for 99 houses and the 2,135 proposed is an increase of more than 210%. With respect to the existing General Plan Land Uses and Zoning designations, the comment does not challenge the adequacy of the DEIR, rather, the comment restates information contained within the DEIR. As described in Section 1.6.1, General Plan and Zoning Amendment, the General Plan Land Uses for the project site are:

- General Commercial (4.6 acres), Office Professional (53.6 acres), Semi-Rural 10 (19.6 acres), and Rural Land 20 (1,907.8 acres)

The Existing Zoning for the project site includes:

- General Commercial (C36), Office Professional (C30), Rural Residential (RR), Limited Agricultural (A70), Extractive (S82), and General Rural (S92)

As shown in DEIR, Table 1-11, the existing General Plan land use designations would allow approximately 99 residential dwelling units and 2,008,116 square feet of commercial space. For additional detail please refer to **Topical Response LU-1**.

Furthermore, the Existing General Plan Land Uses are compared to the proposed project in Section 4.5, Existing General Plan Alternative. Section 4.5.5 concludes 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 proposed project (DEIR, p. 4-24).