

I-236 Harris Korn (2)

Comment Letter I236

August 12, 2017

Ashley Smith, Planning Manager
County of San Diego Planning and Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123

Subject: DEIR Public Comments regarding feasibility of proposed Direct and Cumulative Traffic mitigation claims for Newland Sierra General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan PDS2015-GPA-15-001 (GPA), PDS2015-SP-15-001 (SP).

Dear Ashley,

In this letter I want to specifically address Camino Mayor (CM) and North Twin Oaks Valley Rd (TOVR). Since it is a remote area that may be unfamiliar to many I've attached pictures to give a better understanding of the environment and points of concern.

1. Pix #1 is a sign past Twin Oaks Crest Dr. showing 2 miles of hairpin turns when traveling on TOVR descending into the valley
2. Pix #2 is just past the sign showing one of the TOVR descending curves
3. Pix #3 is CM as it is today, a private unpaved road intersecting with TOVR which is .2 miles from the sign in Pix #1
4. Pix #4 is a typical rock quarry truck driving south, ascending the TOVR curve section about .2 miles the other side of CM & TOVR intersection
5. Pix #5 is quarry truck ascending, wheels over the line
6. Pix #6 is quarry truck ascending, needing to swing wide in hairpin curve with wheels over the line
7. Pix #7 is quarry truck back end ascending, wheels over the line for next curve
8. Pix #8 is quarry trucks side by side, zoom in to view front end of quarry truck ascending while 2nd quarry truck back end (yellow body) is descending
9. Pix #9 is bicyclist in middle of road, quite typical to see.

I236-1

I read through the Traffic Section 2.13 of the DEIR and found lacking information about CM, references were scattered all over the report, and some I read as conflicting. Being a 3rd access route for the Project I think there is need for much clarification of what is exactly planned for both CM, the CM/TOVR intersection and the hairpin portions of TOVR that connect.

I236-2

In section 2.13.11 it is mentioned as an Unsignalized intersection, yet Table 2.13-1 Existing Intersection Operations (page 127), I believe lists it as Signalized, while another Table lists it as MSSC. As pic 3 shows it is currently a private road with no traffic control signage/signal. Section 2.13-82 states improvements will fall under Applicable Road Standards yet I find this a vague reference given it is unclear...is this road is to be used as a 3rd public access road to the Project, a utility road, or gated and locked road, or a road used for evacuation purposes only? And, what happens with the hairpin curve section of TOVR from CM to Twin Oaks Crest? What happens with the curved road sections of TOVR continuing to the rock quarry? Will you please provide specific details addressing this access?

I236-3

I regularly witness quarry trucks coming to a complete stop in the road to allow another truck to pass in this hairpin section. I've also witnessed quarry truck tires off the pavement next to the side ditches where no curbs exist and of course crossing the lines.

I236-4

Bicyclists use TOVR for training. My picture shows only 1 riding in the middle of the lane but often groups of bicyclists ride 2 and 3 abreast.

I236-5

Comment Letters

North TOVR dead ends at a private road past the quarry. Since the road doesn't go through traffic is limited and most people who use this section are those aware of the safety hazards as we share the road with cyclists and quarry trucks. With the Project adding more traffic the current safety concerns that already exist will be amplified. How will the County address this or are they prepared to take on the liability? Who will make the road improvements? Will TOVR be realigned and if so, how and when?

1236-6

I invite anyone from the County Offices or any Supervisor to meet and have a first-hand visit of this area. Or, if desired, I do have more photos.

1236-7

As to other areas of traffic, Deer Springs and Buena Creek are roads I travel regularly, already are overburdened during commute times of the day. Widening the roads will be a detriment to many residences and businesses, and in the end most likely will not accommodate the new Project growth anyway. These roads were designed and meant to be rural roads. I-15 will be another disaster like Temecula if not improved adequately FIRST. How is the State, County, many Cities and Communities going to work together to have resources and necessary infrastructure in place to accommodate the influx of population this Project brings to all the surrounding areas? And do this before the fact, not after?

1236-8

As stated in a previous letter, I was born and raised in Oceanside and currently reside in San Marcos. In my 60+ years I've witnessed good and bad planning. This Project is definitely an infringement. It is not the right development to fit in with our rural area. Our area does not have the proper infrastructure to accommodate and be burdened with the tremendous spillover this urban leapfrog development will create. Furthermore, it is important to keep some areas of the County pristine, Twin Oaks Valley being one, exactly how the General Plan now provides.

1236-9

Sincerely,

Harris Korn
27721 N Twin Oaks Valley Rd
San Marcos, CA 92069



I236-10

Comment Letters



1236-10
Cont.



1236-10
Cont.



I236-10
Cont.

Comment Letters



1236-10
Cont.

Comment Letters



1236-10
Cont.



1236-10
Cont.



1236-10
Cont.

Comment Letters



1236-10
Cont.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK