

### I-71 Dennis Cavallari

- I-71-1** The comment states that the following comments are provided by the President of the Board for the Hidden Valley Zen Center, which the comment notes will be directly impacts from the use of Sarver Land as an entry and exit to the proposed 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-71-2** The comment states that the following comments are provided by the President of the Board for the Hidden Valley Zen Center, which the comment notes will be directly impacts from the use of Sarver Land as an entry and exit to the proposed 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-71-3** The comment states that the commenter was unable to find any reference or study of greenhouse gas emissions and how GHG emissions would have a direct bearing on the outdoor and indoor religious practices of the members of the HVZC. The County acknowledges the comment and refers the reader to Appendix K, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report of the Draft EIR, as well as Section 2.7. The County notes that the comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR in Section 2.7 and Appendix K. 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-71-4** The comment states that under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act and Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Person Act, the HVZC will be impacts beyond repair and the impacts will not be mitigated. The comments states the proposed project will be “nothing short of a land taking” to the unmitigated impacts. 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-71-5** The comment states that the Draft EIR did not account for the potential growth inducement the proposed project will create. The comment states once the proposed project is approved, the Zen Center, 23 acres, the Golden Door Spa and various other

## Comment Letter Responses

---

large agriculturally used parcels will come into play for future urban developments that was not studied or modeled.

The County acknowledges the comment and refers the reader to Section 1.8, Growth-Inducing Impacts. As stated on page 1-38:

“the project has potential for growth inducement, which may result in subsequent adverse environmental effects as a result of such growth. Such adverse environmental effects could include impacts to visual resources, air quality, biological resources, transportation and traffic, noise, and cultural resources. There are no known intensity-increasing development applications pending at the County in the immediate project vicinity at this time.”

The comment addresses general subject areas, growth inducement, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR, in Section 1.8 (stated above), as well as Section 2.12, Population and Housing. 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-71-6** The comment states that the Draft EIR did not study or model the impacts on how taking a whole section of the county which has been set aside to be rural, will have on going and long-lasting effects on north county from all impact disciplines. The County does not concur with the comment. The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in Section 3.3, Land Use and Planning, of the Draft 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.

**I-71-7** The comment states that the Draft EIR did not study the cost impacts to county tax payers and the residual costs effects if the General Plan is modified to accommodate the proposed project. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it raises economic (tax payers and “residual cost”), social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. 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-71-8** The comment states that the Draft EIR “ignores the projects fundamental conflicts with the County’s General Plan by wrongly dismissing all planning and land use issues as “not a significant impact””. The County does not concur with this comment. Please refer to **Topical Response LU-1**, as well as Section 3.3, Land Use and

## Comment Letter Responses

---

Planning, and Appendix DD, Land Use Consistency Analysis, of the Draft EIR. The County the comment 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. No further response is required or necessary.

- I-71-9** The comment states that the Draft EIR did not study or mention that Caltrans does not have money for I-15 freeway improvements to accommodate the proposed project. The comment states that Caltrans is working off the current General Plan and that modifying the General Plan will not create additional dollars to improve I-15 which is now operating at LOS F. The County does not concur with the comment. The Draft EIR analyzes the proposed project's impacts to I-15 in Section 2.13, Transportation and Traffic, and identifies that the proposed project would have a significant and unavoidable impact to I-15. Please see also **Topical Responses TR-1 and TR-2**.

Regarding Caltrans funding for freeway improvements, the County acknowledges the comment and notes it raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. 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-71-10** The comment states that the Draft EIR did not study the proposed project's impacts on Sarver Lane and the immediate community using Sarver Lane. The comment states that Sarver Lane is a private road just to the north of HVZC. The County does not concur with this comment. Please refer to **Response to Comment O-1.16-20** through **O-1.16-23**. 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-71-11** The comment states that the TDM measures in the Draft EIR are "urban" measures and note applicable, and that as a result there are more trips which will be leaving the sight than forecasted which needs to be remodeled. The County does not concur with this comment. Please refer to **Responses to Comments O-1.16-8, O-1.16-22** through **O-1.16-25**. 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.

## Comment Letter Responses

---

**I-71-12** The comment states that the commenter was unable to find the Sarver Lane alignment in the DEIR. The County acknowledges the comment and refers the reader to the Tentative Map and Preliminary Grading Plan, which were listed as Additional Items provided during public review on the County’s website. 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-71-13** The comment states that the proposed project will cause I-15 to be gridlocked but that the proposed project “won’t contribute any money to mitigate impacts to the mainline freeway.” The comment states that the costs of these impacts need to be studied and address through monetary mitigation and modeled in the County Fiscal Model.

With respect to the proposed project’s impact to I-15, the County refers the comment to **Response to Comment I-71-9**, above. The County also refers the commenter to **O-1.10**, prepared by DELANE Engineering, Inc. 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-71-14** The comment states that Draft EIR did not model or how air quality emissions would impact the HVZC. The County refers the reader to Appendix F, Air Quality Technical Report of the Draft EIR, as well as Section 2.3, Air Quality. The County notes that the comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR in Section 2.3 and Appendix F. The County also refers the reader to **Topical Response AQ-1**. 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-71-15** The comment states that it appears the proposed project is contemplating modifying the flood plain on land owned by HVZC and states that the proposed project needs to study an alternative because the HVZC will now allow the proposed project to modify any land owned by the HVZC.

The commenter is misunderstanding the proposed improvements. As stated in the Introduction to Appendix CC, Sarver Lane and Deer Springs Road, off-site of the project Site, “impact the FEMA-capped floodplain and floodway for both Stevenson Creek and the Twin Oaks Valley Creek.”

The project proposed to “construct an open channel for Stevenson Creek along the easterly side of Deer Springs Road and several culvert crossings.” (Appendix CC, Introduction) As explained in Section 3.2.3.1 of the DEIR

## Comment Letter Responses

---

“...portions of the project’s off-site improvements to Sarver Lane and Deer Springs Road fall within the existing 100-year Flood Zone. The existing drainage facilities within these off-site areas are not sufficiently sized to accommodate the 100-year storm event from Stevenson Creek and Twin Oaks Valley Creek. As a result, storm flows overtop both roads creating a flooding condition during major storms.”

Accordingly, the proposed project would “eliminate this flooding condition with the improvements to both roads by installing a new drainage channel and system of culverts...”

- I-71-16** The comment states that Sarver Lane was not analyzed and the Draft EIR did not show the street alignment and noise impacts along Sarver lane. The comment states that 6,000 trips will have significant impacts. The County acknowledges the comment and refers the commenter to **Response to Comment O-1.15-12** (confirm). 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.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK