

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: right;">Comment Letter Rel30</p> <p>From: Causes <causes@raptorridge.net> Sent: Saturday, October 12, 2024 11:32 AM To: Vargas, Nora (BOS); Lawson-Remer, Terra; Anderson, Joel; MontgomerySteppe, Monica; Desmond, Jim; Salazar, Maykent L; Kazmer, Gregory; Yuen, Jeffrey; Henson, Eric; McDonald, Hunter; Smith, Rebecca (BOS); Lynch, Dahvia; Harbert, Amy; Slovick, Mark; efhgtr@gmail.com; Lorenzana, Bianca; Montagne, Sarah; DMcQuead, Dave Subject: [External] Harmony Grove Village South is a firetrap. You have the power to fix it.</p> <p>Dear Supervisors and Fire District,</p> <p>This project was approved by the last Board of Supervisors and staff in 2018. After the community and environmental groups sued the County and the developer, it was rescinded and the new board wisely chose not to appeal. Since then, much has changed. The wildfire landscape in California has gotten dramatically worse. The County issued new guidelines and a new Climate Action Plan that specifically avoids development in Very High Fire Severity Zones. This project violates all of that.</p> <p>The state Attorney General weighed in on similar projects, questioning the wisdom of placing more homes in the "wildland urban interface." The AG also issued new guidelines. All of these things would negate the project. However, the County seems intent on moving forward.</p> <p>Wildfires have become far more intense and frequent, and this year we've already crossed the million-acre mark. CalFire has even reclassified our entire area, including the proposed development, as a Very High Fire Severity Zone. It's clear that our valley is in more danger than ever, and yet this project doesn't account for those growing risks.</p> <p>Our community has put together a wildfire evacuation plan, and it's clear that any new development would need to incorporate it into their planning. But HGV South seems to completely ignore that. The fact that the County already rejected Lilac Hills Ranch in Valley Center because of inadequate evacuation routes should be telling. That project had multiple ways out—this one only has one.</p> <p>We understand that housing is needed and our community has dutifully accepted a more than doubling of housing in our community via the HGV project which we all supported. We testified in support of that project because the County promised us that this would be our contribution and that that would be it. Now, in retrospect, it seems as if HGVs was already foreseen despite the promised to the contrary.</p> <p>Please do the right thing and vote against this project. The risks are too high for all of us.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Jan Denny 2255 Seaquest Trail Elfin Forest, CA 92029</p>	<p>Response to Late Comment Rel30-1</p> <p>Seven letters (Rel30 through Rel36) were submitted after the October 7, 2024 4:00 p.m. deadline for submittal of comments on recirculated Subchapter 2.7 and support documents.</p> <p>As a result of late submittal, individual responses to each of the comments are not being authored. That does not mean, however, that the comments go unanswered. Two sets of three letters each are identical within their groups in substantive comments/statements. One set includes Rel30, Rel34, and Rel36; and one set includes Rel32, Rel33, and Rel35. One letter, Rel31, is not a repeat of the others. All of the letters, however, repeat topical concerns raised by others, often verbatim. These comments are therefore responded to as a group, with cross references to prior individual responses submitted within the six-week comment period, for which full individual responses were provided, as appropriate.</p> <p>The County appreciates the comments. Relative to 2018 approval of the Project "despite the clear guidance from independent experts" the County disagrees, as did the Court during the CEQA challenge to the Project. The safety analysis (wildfire risks and impact assessment as well as evacuation planning) was prepared by a team of County and emergency response professionals, as well as a qualified consultant on the topic. Detailed responses were provided to comments submitted on the Project in 2017 and 2018. Relative to restatements of issues about overall Project fire safety, access, egress, secondary access, etc., these issues were all subject to previous review/approval and not specifically part of the 2024 recirculation for which comments were solicited. For description of the scope of recirculation for this EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(c), please see Response to Comment ReO6a-17 and the Recirculation Readers Guide, dated August 22, 2024. Prior safety analyses withstood qualified third-party review, and subsequently withstood CEQA challenge. Petitioners' assertions were not upheld by the Court (refer to Response to Comment Rel1-1 for Appellate Court conclusions regarding Project fire and evacuation safety analyses, as well as to Global Response: Res Judicata and New Information. Please also refer to 2018 Global Responses:</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
	<p data-bbox="1077 167 1990 232">Fire Hazards Impact Analysis and Adequacy of Emergency Evacuation and Access and to Global Response: 2024 Fire / Evacuation.</p> <p data-bbox="1077 272 1860 305">The latter four sources also provide specific information regarding:</p> <ul data-bbox="1125 345 1990 1320" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1125 345 1990 492">• Secondary access and how/why the suite of design features proposed by the Project appropriately address dead end road length and result in an emergency plan that is equivalent to the level of “safety” offered by secondary access <li data-bbox="1125 532 1990 597">• Relevancy of evacuation experience (time-consuming, understandably scary, and difficult) to whether evacuation is successful <li data-bbox="1125 638 1990 816">• How and why the HGV South Project would not result in fire experiences similar to other notable fire events such as the Paradise fire due to different environmental conditions (and, it is noted the Maui fire), the age of those homes, and lack of fire hardening, among other considerations <li data-bbox="1125 857 1990 922">• The new County Fire Protection Plan Guidelines and Project consistency with them <li data-bbox="1125 963 1990 1027">• The new California Attorney General Wildland Urban Interface Guidelines and Project consistency with them <li data-bbox="1125 1068 1990 1141">• Reclassification of Project adjacent areas as very high fire severity zone and why that does not result in changes to Project risk analyses <li data-bbox="1125 1182 1990 1247">• A new Community Wildfire Evacuation Plan and why that document does not result in changes to Project evacuation conclusions <li data-bbox="1125 1287 1665 1320">• The very tragic loss of a neighbor in 1996 <p data-bbox="1077 1360 1990 1498">As indicated in the bullets above, some comments received in this group of late letters suggested that new documents, standards or regulations adopted or enacted post 2018 Project approval would affect prior conclusions. In particular, Global Responses: 2024 Fire / Evacuation and Res Judicata and</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
	<p>New Information, directly address new fire planning documents since 2018 approval of the Project. In each case, the Project is found consistent with new guidelines and regulations. No change is required to the less than significant CEQA conclusions of the 2018 document. Those conclusions remain valid for the current review period.</p> <p>Regarding concerns that additional cars may render evacuation impossible in the future, please refer to Responses to Comments ReI1-1 and ReI10a-1. Where comments are related to scenarios addressed in the Cova report (an additional approximately 3,500 cars/seven-hour evacuation period/potential for fire spread) please see Responses to Comments ReO6b-8, -9, and ReI1-2.</p> <p>Regarding the new County Climate Action Plan (CAP), the Project is not being processed under the Plan, and it is thus not relevant to Project analyses. Information regarding the (non-applicability) of the Fire Safe and VMT Efficient Alternative circulated in the EIR addressing the CAP, however, is provided in Responses to Comments ReO6a-4, ReI4a-7 and Global Response: Reconsideration of General Plan Consistency Determination.</p> <p>Regarding increases in wildfire number and severity, please refer to Response to Comment ReI4a-2.</p> <p>Regarding resident associated increases in fire starts, please refer to Responses to Comments ReO4b-16, ReO6a-62 and Global Response: 2024 Fire / Evacuation.</p> <p>Regarding prior support of HGV and belief that additional development in the area would not be proposed, please refer to Response to Comment ReI2-4.</p> <p>Refer to Response to Comment ReI5-4 regarding lack of relevancy of Lilac Hills denial to the Project and adequacy of Project-proposed fire safety measures.</p> <p>Regarding VMT analysis, please note that the 2018 VMT discussions comprise an issue previously decided and were found adequate by the Court during</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
	<p>CEQA challenge. Refer to Responses to Comments ReO1-5 and ReI3-2. No additional VMT study is necessary.</p> <p>Opposition to the Project on behalf of each of the commenters is noted, is part of the administrative record, and will be before decision makers during consideration of the Project.</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: right;">Comment Letter Rel31</p> <p>October 6, 2024</p> <p>Planning & Developments Services, 5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 210, San Diego, CA 92123</p> <p>ATTN: Bianca Lorenzana</p> <p>Reference: PDS2015-GPA-15-002, PDS2015-SP-15-002, PDS2015-REZ-15-003, PDS2018-TM-5626, PDS2015-MUP-15-008, PDS2015-ER-15-08-006</p> <p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>The Revised EIR for the Harmony Grove Village South is inadequate for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The wildfire risk of this proposed development is simply too high. There are insufficient evacuation routes and it is impossible to add more, due to the steep, rugged terrain. The property is in a "Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone." The Cocos Fire burned right next to this property in 2014, burning 30 homes. 2. There is only one evacuation route from this property. To meet a minimum level of safety, there would have to be a second way out. But because of steep slopes in the area, there is no feasible way to build a road to create a second evacuation route. 3. Adding more people to this high-risk zone increases the risk to current residents as well as putting new residents at risk. 4. Instead of building here, we should be operating under the guidelines of the Fire Safe Infill Alternative, building homes close to villages and in urban centers. 5. By approving this development despite the obvious safety risks, the County is putting residents at risk, and is prioritizing profits over people. <p>Due to changes in County regulations on Fire and Vehicle Miles Traveled since the original Final EIR was proposed in 2018, the Revised EIR is inadequate and should be required to do a new wildfire analysis and evacuation plan as well as being required to analyze VMTs.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Jessica Dummer</p>	<p>Response to Late Comment Rel31-1</p> <p>The County appreciates the comments. Please refer to the Responses to Comments provided for late Letter Rel30 regarding concern over evacuation routes and need for secondary access, very high fire hazard severity zones, additional residents and potential for increased risk, the Fire Safe and VMT Efficient Alternative, approval despite perceived "obvious" safety risks, and changes to County regulations and requirements for fire and VMT analyses.</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Letter Rel32</p> <p>From: Jan Hall <janh001@aol.com> Sent: Friday, October 11, 2024 3:54 AM To: Vargas, Nora (BOS); Lawson-Remer, Terra; Anderson, Joel; MontgomerySteppe, Monica; Desmond, Jim; Salazar, Maykent L; Kazmer, Gregory; Yuen, Jeffrey; Henson, Eric; McDonald, Hunter; Smith, Rebecca (BOS); Lynch, Dahvia; Harbert, Amy; Slovick, Mark; efhgtr@gmail.com; Lorenzana, Bianca; Montagne, Sarah; DMcQuead, Dave Subject: [External] Don't let past supervisors' mistakes dictate the future of our fire-prone community.</p> <p>Honorable Supervisors and Fire District:</p> <p>The previous Board of Supervisors voted to approve HGVS project despite the clear guidance from independent experts that this would make evacuation extremely dangerous. The country roads in Elfin Forest, Harmony Grove, and Eden Valley are beautiful but also narrow, winding two-lane roads lined with dense vegetation and chaparral. Adding the traffic from HGVS would make evacuation during a wildfire practically impossible.</p> <p>The Cocos Fire of 2014 really scared those of us who were around at the time. People were stuck in standstill traffic on both ends of the valley, with some barely making it out before the fire reached their neighborhoods. Since then, the Harmony Grove Village project was built (which was supported by the community on the condition that this would be the last large project to limit our evacuation hazard and wildfire risks). If the HGV South project is approved there will be six times more cars evacuating but no new road capacity. Something like 3500 vehicles will pack onto two-lane roads trying to escape a fire. It would take 7 hours to evacuate everyone. Hopefully, a nearby fire would overwhelm the community in less than 2 hours.</p> <p>What you may not know is that this community has weathered dozens of major wildfires, on average every four years since the 1980s. We've lost many homes over the years and even a neighbor who was killed trying to escape the Harmony Grove fire. It's hard to understand how this project could move forward without adequate fire safety measures in place, such as a secondary evacuation route and expanded road capacity.</p> <p>The County and Fire District supported this project, despite it requiring a waiver of fire safety standards (secondary egress requirement), feels like a betrayal. We're already at risk given the growth we've seen in the past decade (more than double the housing). Approving HGVS would push us over the edge. It risks turning our community into the next Maui or Paradise, where evacuating isn't even an option because of the overwhelming number of vehicles and insufficient infrastructure.</p> <p>Please, the last Board got it wrong. I urge you to vote no on this dangerous project, or at the very least require a thorough new fire safety analysis and demand a secondary egress. Our lives depend on it.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Jan Hall Elfin Forest Resident</p> <p>Sent from my iPhone</p> <p style="text-align: center;">1</p>	<p>Response to Late Comment Rel32-1</p> <p>The County appreciates the comments. Please refer to the Responses to Comments provided for late Letter Rel30 regarding prior approval despite alternative “guidance,” evacuation potential with HGV South/HGV added to area development, Cocos Fire evacuation experience, community wildfire frequency, 1996 tragic loss of a neighbor, adequacy of Proposed Project fire safety measures, secondary access, perceived waiver of fire safety standards, potential for community to be the next Maui or Paradise, need for new review, and general opposition.</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Letter Rel33</p> <p>From: myriam khawand <mlkhawand@gmail.com> Sent: Monday, October 7, 2024 7:24 PM To: Vargas, Nora (BOS); Lawson-Remer, Terra; Anderson, Joel; MontgomerySteppe, Monica; Desmond, Jim; Salazar, Maykent L; Kazmer, Gregory; Yuen, Jeffrey; Henson, Eric; McDonald, Hunter; Smith, Rebecca (BOS); Lynch, Dahvia; Harbert, Amy; Slovick, Mark; efngtc@gmail.com; Lorenzana, Bianca; Montagne, Sarah; DMcQuead, Dave Subject: [External] Don't let past supervisors' mistakes dictate the future of our fire-prone community.</p> <p>Honorable Supervisors and Fire District:</p> <p>The previous Board of Supervisors voted to approve HGVS project despite the clear guidance from independent experts that this would make evacuation extremely dangerous. The country roads in Elfin Forest, Harmony Grove, and Eden Valley are beautiful but also narrow, winding two-lane roads lined with dense vegetation and chaparral. Adding the traffic from HGVS would make evacuation during a wildfire practically impossible.</p> <p>The Cocos Fire of 2014 really scared those of us who were around at the time. People were stuck in standstill traffic on both ends of the valley, with some barely making it out before the fire reached their neighborhoods. Since then, the Harmony Grove Village project was built (which was supported by the community on the condition that this would be the last large project to limit our evacuation hazard and wildfire risks). If the HGV South project is approved there will be six times more cars evacuating but no new road capacity. Something like 3500 vehicles will pack onto two-lane roads trying to escape a fire. It would take 7 hours to evacuate everyone. Hopefully, a nearby fire would overwhelm the community in less than 2 hours.</p> <p>What you may not know is that this community has weathered dozens of major wildfires, on average every four years since the 1980s. We've lost many homes over the years and even a neighbor who was killed trying to escape the Harmony Grove fire. It's hard to understand how this project could move forward without adequate fire safety measures in place, such as a secondary evacuation route and expanded road capacity.</p> <p>The County and Fire District supported this project, despite it requiring a waiver of fire safety standards (secondary egress requirement), feels like a betrayal. We're already at risk given the growth we've seen in the past decade (more than double the housing). Approving HGVS would push us over the edge. It risks turning our community into the next Maui or Paradise, where evacuating isn't even an option because of the overwhelming number of vehicles and insufficient infrastructure.</p> <p>Please, the last Board got it wrong. I urge you to vote no on this dangerous project, or at the very least require a thorough new fire safety analysis and demand a secondary egress. Our lives depend on it.</p> <p>Sincerely, Myriam</p>	<p>Response to Late Comment Rel33-1</p> <p>The County appreciates the comments. Please refer to the Responses to Comments provided for late Letter Rel30 regarding prior approval despite alternative “guidance,” evacuation potential with HGV South/HGV added to area development, Cocos Fire evacuation experience, community wildfire frequency, 1996 tragic loss of a neighbor, adequacy of Proposed Project fire safety measures, secondary access, perceived waiver of fire safety standards, potential for community to be the next Maui or Paradise, need for new review, and general opposition.</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Letter Rel34</p> <p>From: Marilyn Kozlow <mjkozlow90@yahoo.com> Sent: Monday, October 7, 2024 6:59 PM To: Vargas, Nora (BOS); Lawson-Remer, Terra; Anderson, Joel; MontgomerySteppe, Monica; Desmond, Jim; Salazar, Maykent L; Kazmer, Gregory; Yuen, Jeffrey; Henson, Eric; McDonald, Hunter; Smith, Rebecca (BOS); Lynch, Dahvia; Harbert, Amy; Slovick, Mark; efngtc@gmail.com; Lorenzana, Bianca; Montagne, Sarah; DMcQuead, Dave Subject: [External] Harmony Grove Village South is a firetrap. You have the power to fix it.</p> <p>Dear Supervisors and Fire District,</p> <p>Please do not approve this measure. My church community in Harmony Grove was destroyed in the Cocos Fire. Please help us survive.</p> <p>This project was approved by the last Board of Supervisors and staff in 2018. After the community and environmental groups sued the County and the developer, it was rescinded and the new board wisely chose not to appeal. Since then, much has changed. The wildfire landscape in California has gotten dramatically worse. The County issued new guidelines and a new Climate Action Plan that specifically avoids development in Very High Fire Severity Zones. This project violates all of that.</p> <p>The state Attorney General weighed in on similar projects, questioning the wisdom of placing more homes in the "wildland urban interface." The AG also issued new guidelines. All of these things would negate the project. However, the County seems intent on moving forward.</p> <p>Wildfires have become far more intense and frequent, and this year we've already crossed the million-acre mark. CalFire has even reclassified our entire area, including the proposed development, as a Very High Fire Severity Zone. It's clear that our valley is in more danger than ever, and yet this project doesn't account for those growing risks.</p> <p>Our community has put together a wildfire evacuation plan, and it's clear that any new development would need to incorporate it into their planning. But HGV South seems to completely ignore that. The fact that the County already rejected Lilac Hills Ranch in Valley Center because of inadequate evacuation routes should be telling. That project had multiple ways out—this one only has one.</p> <p>We understand that housing is needed and our community has dutifully accepted a more than doubling of housing in our community via the HGV project which we all supported. We testified in support of that project because the County promised us that this would be our contribution and that that would be it. Now, in retrospect, it seems as if HGVS was already foreseen despite the promised to the contrary.</p> <p>Please do the right thing and vote against this project. The risks are too high for all of us.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Marilyn</p> <p style="text-align: center;">1</p>	<p>Response to Late Comment Rel34</p> <p>The County appreciates the comments. Please refer to the Responses to Comments provided for late Letter Rel30 regarding issues of changes in numbers and severity of wildfires, (non)relevancy of the new County CAP to HGV South, reclassification of adjacent very high fire hazard severity zones, a new community wildfire plan, (non)relevancy of Lilac Ranch finding to HGV South, belief that HGV “would be it” in terms of area development, and overall Project opposition.</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Letter Rel35</p> <p>From: Jehan Lalkaka <jehan.ri@gmail.com> Sent: Monday, October 7, 2024 7:28 PM To: Vargas, Nora (BOS); Lawson-Remer, Terra; Anderson, Joel; MontgomerySteppe, Monica; Desmond, Jim; Salazar, Maykent L; Kazmer, Gregory; Yuen, Jeffrey; Henson, Eric; McDonald, Hunter; Smith, Rebecca (BOS); Lynch, Dahvia; Harbert, Amy; Slovick, Mark; efngtc@gmail.com; Lorenzana, Bianca; Montagne, Sarah; DMcQuead, Dave Subject: [External] Don't let past supervisors' mistakes dictate the future of our fire-prone community.</p> <p>Honorable Supervisors and Fire District:</p> <p>The previous Board of Supervisors voted to approve HGVS project despite the clear guidance from independent experts that this would make evacuation extremely dangerous. The country roads in Elfin Forest, Harmony Grove, and Eden Valley are beautiful but also narrow, winding two-lane roads lined with dense vegetation and chaparral. Adding the traffic from HGVS would make evacuation during a wildfire practically impossible.</p> <p>The Cocos Fire of 2014 really scared those of us who were around at the time. People were stuck in standstill traffic on both ends of the valley, with some barely making it out before the fire reached their neighborhoods. Since then, the Harmony Grove Village project was built (which was supported by the community on the condition that this would be the last large project to limit our evacuation hazard and wildfire risks). If the HGV South project is approved there will be six times more cars evacuating but no new road capacity. Something like 3500 vehicles will pack onto two-lane roads trying to escape a fire. It would take 7 hours to evacuate everyone. Hopefully, a nearby fire would overwhelm the community in less than 2 hours.</p> <p>What you may not know is that this community has weathered dozens of major wildfires, on average every four years since the 1980s. We've lost many homes over the years and even a neighbor who was killed trying to escape the Harmony Grove fire. It's hard to understand how this project could move forward without adequate fire safety measures in place, such as a secondary evacuation route and expanded road capacity.</p> <p>The County and Fire District supported this project, despite it requiring a waiver of fire safety standards (secondary egress requirement), feels like a betrayal. We're already at risk given the growth we've seen in the past decade (more than double the housing). Approving HGVS would push us over the edge. It risks turning our community into the next Maui or Paradise, where evacuating isn't even an option because of the overwhelming number of vehicles and insufficient infrastructure.</p> <p>Please, the last Board got it wrong. I urge you to vote no on this dangerous project, or at the very least require a thorough new fire safety analysis and demand a secondary egress. Our lives depend on it.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jehan Lalkaka Harmony Grove Village homeowner and resident</p>	<p>Response to Late Comment Rel35-1</p> <p>The County appreciates the comments. Please refer to the Responses to Comments provided for late Letter Rel30 regarding prior approval despite alternative “guidance,” evacuation potential with HGV South/HGV added to area development, Cocos Fire evacuation experience, community wildfire frequency, 1996 tragic loss of a neighbor, adequacy of Proposed Project fire safety measures, secondary access, perceived waiver of fire safety standards, potential for community to be the next Maui or Paradise, need for new review, and general opposition.</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Letter Rel36</p> <p>From: James Shen <shen_james@outlook.com> Sent: Saturday, October 12, 2024 4:28 PM To: Vargas, Nora (BOS); Lawson-Remer, Terra; Anderson, Joel; MontgomerySteppe, Monica; Desmond, Jim; Salazar, Maykent L; Kazmer, Gregory; Yuen, Jeffrey; Henson, Eric; McDonald, Hunter; Smith, Rebecca (BOS); Lynch, Dahvia; Harbert, Amy; Slovick, Mark; efhtc@gmail.com; Lorenzana, Bianca; Montagne, Sarah; DMcQuead, Dave Subject: [External] Harmony Grove Village South is a firetrap. You have the power to fix it.</p> <p>Dear Supervisors and Fire District,</p> <p>This project was approved by the last Board of Supervisors and staff in 2018. After the community and environmental groups sued the County and the developer, it was rescinded and the new board wisely chose not to appeal. Since then, much has changed. The wildfire landscape in California has gotten dramatically worse. The County issued new guidelines and a new Climate Action Plan that specifically avoids development in Very High Fire Severity Zones. This project violates all of that.</p> <p>The state Attorney General weighed in on similar projects, questioning the wisdom of placing more homes in the "wildland urban interface." The AG also issued new guidelines. All of these things would negate the project. However, the County seems intent on moving forward.</p> <p>Wildfires have become far more intense and frequent, and this year we've already crossed the million-acre mark. CalFire has even reclassified our entire area, including the proposed development, as a Very High Fire Severity Zone. It's clear that our valley is in more danger than ever, and yet this project doesn't account for those growing risks.</p> <p>Our community has put together a wildfire evacuation plan, and it's clear that any new development would need to incorporate it into their planning. But HGV South seems to completely ignore that. The fact that the County already rejected Lilac Hills Ranch in Valley Center because of inadequate evacuation routes should be telling. That project had multiple ways out—this one only has one.</p> <p>We understand that housing is needed and our community has dutifully accepted a more than <i>doubling</i> of housing in our community via the HGV project which we all supported. We testified in support of that project because the County promised us that this would be our contribution and that that would be it. Now, in retrospect, it seems as if HGVS was already foreseen despite the promised to the contrary.</p> <p>Please do the right thing and vote against this project. The risks are too high for all of us.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Jing Shen & Jiang Qian 20111 Collina Encantada Way Escondido, CA 92029</p> <p style="text-align: center;">1</p>	<p>Response to Late Comment Rel36-1</p> <p>The County appreciates the comments. Please refer to the Responses to Comments provided for late Letter Rel30 regarding issues of changes in numbers and severity of wildfires, (non)relevancy of the new County CAP to HGV South, reclassification of adjacent very high fire hazard severity zones, a new community wildfire plan, (non)relevancy of Lilac Ranch finding to HGV South, belief that HGV “would be it” in terms of area development, and overall Project opposition.</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: right;">Comment Letter Rel37</p> <p>From: Damian Bagby <dbagby22@gmail.com> Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2025 6:48 PM To: Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcountry.ca.gov>; MontgomerySteppe, Monica <Monica.MontgomerySteppe@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Salazar, Maykent L <MaykentL.Salazar@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Kazmer, Gregory <Gregory.Kazmer@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Yuen, Jeffrey <Jeffrey.Yuen@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Henson, Eric <Eric.Henson@sdcountry.ca.gov>; McDonald, Hunter <Hunter.McDonald@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Smith, Rebecca (BOS) <Rebecca.Smith2@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Lynch, Dahvia <Dahvia.Lynch@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Harbert, Amy <Amy.Harbert@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Mecham, Tony@CALFIRE <Tony.Mecham@fire.ca.gov>; Slovick, Mark <Mark.Slovick@sdcountry.ca.gov>; eflgtc@gmail.com; Lorenzana, Bianca <Bianca.Lorenzana@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Montagne, Sarah <montagne@rsf-fire.org>; mcquead@rsf-fire.org; ashcraft@rsf-fire.org; hillgren@rsf-fire.org; malin@rsf-fire.org; stine@rsf-fire.org; palomaguire@gmail.com; jmccann@chulavistaca.gov; district1@chulavistaca.gov; Vivian@vivianmoreno.com; MollyW@sanidiego.gov; Weber, Molly <Molly.Weber@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Pallinger, David <David.Pallinger@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Barnhart, Douglas <Douglas.Barnhart@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Edwards, Michael (LUEG) <Michael.Edwards@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Hitzke, Ginger <Ginger.Hitzke@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Ashman, Ronald <Ronald.Ashman@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Calvo, Yolanda <Yolanda.Calvo@sdcountry.ca.gov>; LUEG, PDS.PlanningCommission <PDS.PlanningCommission@sdcountry.ca.gov> Subject: [External] Don't let a bad decision haunt you forever. Force developer of HGV South to build a secondary exit.</p> <p>Honorable County Supervisors, Fire Officials, Planning Commissioners, and Potential District 1 Candidates:</p> <p>I lived through the Cocos Fire and witnessed firsthand how quickly a blaze can tear through our community. Thirty of my neighbors lost their homes. Watching the current devastation in Los Angeles brings back those same fears.</p> <p>It's hard to fathom that the County and Fire District might allow Harmony Grove Village South to move forward with only one exit—even though it's in a Very High Fire Severity Zone that has burned multiple times since the 1980s. One person died attempting to flee the last Harmony Grove fire, and now we risk an even greater tragedy if thousands of residents are trapped during a fast-moving wildfire. With standstill traffic during the 2014 Cocos Fire—and that was before Harmony Grove Village (not South) was built—you can imagine how dire things could become with six times more cars.</p> <p>We were promised that Harmony Grove Village (not South) would meet our housing obligations and that we wouldn't have any more developments jamming 1000's more cars onto our limited rural evacuation route. Yet here we are, discussing a massive new development with no expanded road capacity and no secondary evacuation route. Experts say it could take seven hours to evacuate; a wildfire can arrive in two.</p> <p>I respectfully ask you to reject this proposal, or at least demand a thorough new fire safety analysis and require a secondary egress. When the next fire erupts, your decision today could save—or endanger—thousands of lives.</p> <p>Sincerely, Damian</p>	<p>Response to Late Comment Rel37-1</p> <p>Twenty-three communications were submitted by 21 commenters (Rel37 through Rel55) on two days in January (14 and 15), 2025. These letters were submitted after the October 7, 2024 deadline for submittal of comments on the Recirculated Final Environmental Impact Report (RFEIR), and are therefore late.</p> <p>As a result of late submittal and consistency of comment content, individual responses to each of the comments are not being authored. That does not mean, however, that the comments go unanswered. Although the letters are not form letters, they are similar in content, with a number of identical passages. Similar to the late letters received in October (see Rel30) all of the letters repeat concerns raised by others, often verbatim. These comments are therefore responded to as a group, with cross references to prior individual responses submitted within the six-week comment period, as appropriate.</p> <p>The County appreciates the comments. All of the letters provide some general information. Also often verbatim, this can include information regarding the writer; e.g., the location of their residence, whether they were present during the Cocos Fire (or other fire events in the area), what they and/or their neighbors experienced (including some explanatory pictures), if they were evacuated during the Cocos Fire and for how long that evacuation occurred, professional background, and/or emotional response to the January Los Angeles fires. Some comments also provide summary information about the Harmony Grove community, loss of structures in the Cocos fire (likely primarily from the Harmony Grove Spiritualist's Association), the writer's opinion regarding the Project developer goals/location/supposed actions, and difficulty in obtaining fire insurance and the expectation that it will be more difficult to do so given the Los Angeles fires. These statements can be of interest but they: (1) are not questions, and (2) do not relate to adequacy of the EIR prepared for the Project. Therefore, no responses are provided to these general information passages.</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
	<p>Potentially CEQA substantive comments are also included. Statements (often duplicative with those of past or current letters) are made as to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Project being located within a very high fire hazard severity zone • Changes in rate and severity of wildfires • Belief that adjacent Harmony Grove Village would be the last residential project proposed for the area • The tragic loss of a person in 1996 • Belief that the Project is obtaining a “waiver” from “crucial fire code requirements” which allow the Project to move forward “without adequate fire safety measures” and/or that it does not meet the state Fire Code (i.e., that the Project is unsafe due to lack of secondary access) with subsequent likelihood of entrapment during a fast-moving wildfire • Lack of permission to use an off-site dirt road in case of emergency and assertion that the road is “impassable” • Level of congestion during the Cocos Fire evacuation and/or fear over “six times more cars” present during evacuation than during the Cocos Fire (or approximately 3,500 vehicles), sometimes mentioning lack of “new road capacity” • Belief that it could take seven hours to evacuate the area and a wildfire could “arrive in two” <p>As a general comment, please note that the safety analysis (wildfire risks and impact assessment as well as evacuation planning) was prepared by a team of County and emergency response professionals, as well as a qualified consultant on the topic. The analyses withstood qualified third-party review and subsequently withstood CEQA challenge. None of the comments provided since Project approval changes those conclusions. Please refer to Response to</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
	<p data-bbox="1077 167 1997 350">Comment Rel1-1, which includes quotes from the Appellate Court regarding conclusions on fire and evacuation analyses adequacy. Please also refer to 2018 Global Responses: Fire Hazards Impact Analysis and Adequacy of Emergency Evacuation and Access and to Global Responses: 2024 Fire / Evacuation and Res Judicata and New Information.</p> <p data-bbox="1077 391 1812 418">The latter four sources provide specific clarification regarding:</p> <ul data-bbox="1125 459 1997 1000" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1125 459 1997 532">• Very high fire hazard severity zone rating and why that does not result in changes to Project risk analyses <li data-bbox="1125 573 1997 711">• Secondary access and how/why the suite of design features proposed by the Project appropriately address dead end road length and result in an emergency plan that is equivalent to the level of “safety” offered by secondary access <li data-bbox="1125 751 1997 824">• The off-site dirt road identified as a potential route that emergency responders could direct evacuees toward if they decided to do so <li data-bbox="1125 865 1997 938">• Relevancy of evacuation experience (time-consuming, understandably scary, and difficult) to whether evacuation is successful <li data-bbox="1125 979 1577 1000">• The 1996 tragic loss of a neighbor <p data-bbox="1077 1040 1997 1341">Please note as well that Global Responses: Res Judicata and New Information and 2024 Fire / Evacuation also directly address new fire planning documents since 2018 approval of the Project; including new County Fire Protection Plan Guidelines and new California Attorney General Wildland Urban Interface Guidelines. In each case, the Project is found consistent with new guidelines and regulations. No change is required to the less than significant CEQA conclusions of the 2018 document. Those conclusions remain valid for the current review period.</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
	<p>Regarding increases in wildfire number and/or severity, please refer to Response to Comment ReI4a-2.</p> <p>Regarding prior support of HGV and belief that additional development in the area would not be proposed, please refer to Response to Comment ReI2-4.</p> <p>Regarding the contention that a dirt road leading east of the Project could not be used subject to direction by emergency personnel, please refer to Response to Comment ReO2-2.</p> <p>Regarding concerns that additional cars may render evacuation impossible in the future, please refer to Response to Comment ReI10a-1. Where comments are related to scenarios addressed in the Cova report (an additional approximately 3,500 cars/seven-hour evacuation period/potential for fire spread) please see Response to Comment ReO6b-8. Please also refer to Response to Comment ReO6b-9 which additionally discusses issues related to suggested fire spread rates.</p> <p>Regarding General Plan compliance, please refer to FEIR Section 3.1.5, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>, 2018 Global Responses: Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.4 and Regional Plan Conformity, as well as Global Response: Reconsideration of General Plan Consistency Determination (confirming above analyses and addressing affordable housing).</p> <p>In closing, it is noted that each of the January communications end with a request that the County reject the Project, and sometimes add that at a minimum the County should require a new fire safety analysis and secondary egress based on comments provided within the letter(s). As noted, the fire safety analysis stands. Specifically regarding secondary access, commenters are referred to the global response discussions cited above. Opposition to the Project on behalf of each of the commenters is noted, is part of the administrative record, and will be before decision makers during consideration of the Project.</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p>From: April Bevins <aeb8150@gmail.com> Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2025 9:34 PM To: Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; MontgomerySteppe, Monica <Monica.MontgomerySteppe@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Salazar, Maykent L <MaykentL.Salazar@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Kazmer, Gregory <Gregory.Kazmer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Yuen, Jeffrey <Jeffrey.Yuen@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Henson, Eric <Eric.Henson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; McDonald, Hunter <Hunter.McDonald@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Smith, Rebecca (BOS) <Rebecca.Smith2@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Lynch, Dahvia <Dahvia.Lynch@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Harbert, Amy <Amy.Harbert@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Mecham, Tony@CALFIRE <Tony.Mecham@fire.ca.gov>; Slovick, Mark <Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov>; efhgtc@gmail.com; Lorenzana, Bianca <Bianca.Lorenzana@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Montagne, Sarah <montagne@rsf-fire.org>; mcquead@rsf-fire.org; ashcraft@rsf-fire.org; hillgren@rsf-fire.org; malin@rsf-fire.org; stine@rsf-fire.org; palomaguirre@gmail.com; jmccann@chulavistaca.gov; district1@chulavistaca.gov; Vivian@vivianmoreno.com; MollyW@sandiego.gov; Weber, Molly <Molly.Weber@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Pallinger, David <David.Pallinger@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Barnhart, Douglas <Douglas.Barnhart@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Edwards, Michael (LUEG) <Michael.Edwards@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Hitzke, Ginger <Ginger.Hitzke@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Ashman, Ronald <Ronald.Ashman@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Calvo, Yolanda <Yolanda.Calvo@sdcounty.ca.gov>; LUEG, PDS.PlanningCommission <PDS.PlanningCommission@sdcounty.ca.gov> Subject: [External] HGVS desperately needs a second access road if approved!</p> <p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>As a homeowner on Mt. Whitney Rd with our home having been hit by the Coco's and Harmony Grove fires, we are begging you to make Harmony Grove Village South if approved add a second road. We believe it's terribly unsafe to allow that many people only one way in and out. I cannot imagine if we had a fire even a portion of the LA fires here with that many additional vehicles as there's already more with HGV than past fires.</p> <p>We were promised that Harmony Grove Village (not South) would meet our housing obligations and that we wouldn't have any more developments jamming 1000's more cars onto our limited rural evacuation route. Yet here we are, discussing a massive new development with no expanded road capacity and no secondary evacuation route. Experts say it could take seven hours to evacuate; a wildfire can arrive in two.</p> <p>I respectfully ask you to reject this proposal, or at least demand a thorough new fire safety analysis and require a secondary egress. When the next fire erupts, your decision today could save—or endanger—thousands of lives.</p> <p>Sincerely, April Bevins-Cooper 3151 Mt. Whitney Rd.</p>	<p>Response to Late Comment Rel38-1</p> <p>The County appreciates the comments. Please refer to the Responses to Comments provided for late Letter Rel37 regarding prior area fire experience, concern over need for secondary access/egress, additional residents/vehicles in HGV and potential more with HGV South, belief that there would not be additional developments after HGV, evacuation timing, request for new analyses/secondary access, and overall Project opposition.</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p>From: Cerami Tony <tonycerami@gmail.com> Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2025 6:44 PM To: Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcountry.ca.gov>; MontgomerySteppe, Monica <Monica.MontgomerySteppe@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Salazar, Maykent L <MaykentL.Salazar@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Kazmer, Gregory <Gregory.Kazmer@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Yuen, Jeffrey <Jeffrey.Yuen@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Henson, Eric <Eric.Henson@sdcountry.ca.gov>; McDonald, Hunter <Hunter.McDonald@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Smith, Rebecca (BOS) <Rebecca.Smith2@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Lynch, Dahvia <Dahvia.Lynch@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Harbert, Amy <Amy.Harbert@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Mecham, Tony <CALFIRE@Tony.Mecham@fire.ca.gov>; Slovick, Mark <Mark.Slovick@sdcountry.ca.gov>; efigtc@gmail.com; Lorenzana, Bianca <Bianca.Lorenzana@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Montagne, Sarah <montagne@rsf-fire.org>; mcquead@rsf-fire.org; ashcraft@rsf-fire.org; hillgren@rsf-fire.org; malin@rsf-fire.org; stine@rsf-fire.org; palomaguire@gmail.com; jmccaun@chulavistaca.gov; district1@chulavistaca.gov; Vivian@vivianmoreno.com; MollyW@sandiego.gov; Weber, Molly <Molly.Weber@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Pallinger, David <David.Pallinger@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Barnhart, Douglas <Douglas.Barnhart@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Edwards, Michael (LUEG) <Michael.Edwards@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Hitzke, Ginger <Ginger.Hitzke@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Ashman, Ronald <Ronald.Ashman@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Calvo, Yolanda <Yolanda.Calvo@sdcountry.ca.gov>; LUEG, PDS PlanningCommission <PDS.PlanningCommission@sdcountry.ca.gov> Subject: [External] Haven't we learned our lesson? How is SD County waiving fire code for developers in very high wildfire risk areas. Please vote No on HGV South.</p> <p>Honorable Supervisors, Commissioners, Fire District, staff and potential District 1 candidates:</p> <p>Having survived the Cocos Fire that ravaged our fire-prone neighborhood and burned down 30 of my neighbors' homes, I am now witnessing the horrendous situation unfolding in Los Angeles and reliving that trauma every time I turn on the news.</p> <p>To add insult to injury, it is hard to believe that County and Fire District are really considering waiving crucial fire code requirements for the developer of Harmony Grove Village South. It would be insane to allow this project to move forward with only one egress, despite it being in a Very High Fire Severity Zone in a neighborhood that has burned down at least twice a decade since the 1980s. This neighborhood has lost many homes over the years and had a fatality when a community member was killed trying to escape the Harmony Grove fire. It's hard to understand how this project could move forward without adequate fire safety measures in place, something as basic as a secondary evacuation route and expanded road capacity. With what we're seeing in L.A, it is unconscionable.</p> <p>The Cocos Fire of 2014 really scared those of us who were around at the time. People were stuck in standstill traffic on both ends of the valley, with some barely making it out before the fire reached their neighborhoods. This was before the Harmony Grove Village (not south) project was even built.</p> <p>Our community dutifully supported HGV (not South) because the County promised us that this would fulfill our obligation to bring housing to our little rural community. Dahvia Lynch, the DCAO of land use and planning today, was the planner at the time and she held visioning workshops and diplomatically brought our community around to supporting a project that would double our population with 742 homes. We were assured by staff and by the Supervisors at the time that, due to the limited evacuation infrastructure and increased wildfire risk, this would be the last big project for a very long while. Not 2 years later, a Colorado billionaire buys up foreclosed land and embarks on a quest to undermine the community for the deceptively named Harmony Grove Village South. Ironically, that same billionaire lost his family home in 2022 during the Marshall fires.</p> <p>If the HGV South project is approved there will be approximately six times more cars evacuating than we saw during Cocos fire, but no new road capacity. Something like 3500 vehicles will pack onto two-lane roads trying to escape a fast moving fire. According to an independent evacuation expert, it would take 7 hours to evacuate the immediate vicinity. A fire starting within 6 miles of us could overwhelm the community in less than 2 hours.</p> <p>Please, the last Board got it wrong. I urge you to vote no on this dangerous project, or at the very least require a thorough new fire safety analysis and demand a secondary egress. Our lives depend on it. When the next fire hits, you, as decision-makers, will live with the consequences of your ultimate decision. It will be your legacy. Let's hope it will be the right legacy.</p> <p>Sincerely, Anthony Cerami</p>	<p>Response to Late Comment Rel39-1</p> <p>The County appreciates the comments. Please refer to the Responses to Comments provided for late Letter Rel37 regarding prior (Cocos) fire experience, renewed concern based on January 2025 fires in Los Angeles, perceived waiver of fire safety standards, concern over evacuation routes and need for secondary access/egress, very high fire hazard severity zones, loss of neighborhood homes, 1996 tragic loss of a neighbor, adequacy of Proposed Project fire safety measures, belief that HGV “would be it” in terms of area development, additional residents/vehicles, potential for increased risk during evacuation, Cocos Fire evacuation experience, request for new review/secondary access, and overall Project opposition.</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Letter Rel40</p> <p>From: Patricia Connell <patriceconnell1@icloud.com> Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2025 6:55 AM To: Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcountry.ca.gov>; MontgomerySteppe, Monica <Monica.MontgomerySteppe@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Salazar, Maykent L <MaykentL.Salazar@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Kazmer, Gregory <Gregory.Kazmer@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Yuen, Jeffrey <Jeffrey.Yuen@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Henson, Eric <Eric.Henson@sdcountry.ca.gov>; McDonald, Hunter <Hunter.McDonald@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Smith, Rebecca (BOS) <Rebecca.Smith2@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Lynch, Dahvia <Dahvia.Lynch@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Harbert, Amy <Amy.Harbert@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Mecham, Tony@CALFIRE <Tony.Mecham@fire.ca.gov>; Slovick, Mark <Mark.Slovick@sdcountry.ca.gov>; eflagtc@gmail.com; Lorenzana, Bianca <Bianca.Lorenzana@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Montagne, Sarah <montagne@rsf-fire.org>; mcquead@rsf-fire.org; ashcraft@rsf-fire.org; hillgren@rsf-fire.org; malin@rsf-fire.org; stine@rsf-fire.org; palomaguire@gmail.com; jmccann@chulavistaca.gov; district1@chulavistaca.gov; Vivian@vivianmoreno.com; MollyW@sandiego.gov; Weber, Molly <Molly.Weber@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Pallinger, David <David.Pallinger@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Barnhart, Douglas <Douglas.Barnhart@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Edwards, Michael (LUEG) <Michael.Edwards@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Hitzke, Ginger <Ginger.Hitzke@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Ashman, Ronald <Ronald.Ashman@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Calvo, Yolanda <Yolanda.Calvo@sdcountry.ca.gov>; LUEG, PDS.PlanningCommission <PDS.PlanningCommission@sdcountry.ca.gov> Subject: [External] One way out is just not safe. Please force developer of HGV South to build a secondary road. Don't let us get entrapped during the next fire.</p> <p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>The area where the new homes will be built has been burned before. I lived through the Cocos Fire and almost lost my home. The fire came within 45 yards of my back yard. We witnessed firsthand how quickly a blaze can tear through our area. Thirty of my neighbors lost their homes nearby. We had to evacuate for 3 days and the fire moved all the way east past Kauana Loa.</p> <p>It's hard to fathom that the County and Fire District might allow Harmony Grove Village South to move forward with only one exit—even though it's in a Very High Fire Severity Zone that has burned multiple times since the 1980s. One person died attempting to flee the last Harmony Grove fire, and now we risk an even greater tragedy if thousands of residents are trapped during a fast-moving wildfire. With standstill traffic during the 2014 Cocos Fire—and that was before Harmony Grove Village (not South) was built—you can imagine how dire things could become with six times more cars.</p> <p>We were promised that Harmony Grove Village (not South) would meet our housing obligations and that we wouldn't have any more developments jamming 1000's more cars onto our limited rural evacuation route. Yet here we are, discussing a massive new development with no expanded road capacity and no secondary evacuation route. Experts say it could take seven hours to evacuate; a wildfire can arrive in two.</p> <p>I respectfully ask you to reject this proposal, or at least demand a thorough new fire safety analysis and require a secondary egress. When the next fire erupts, your decision today could save—or endanger—thousands of lives.</p> <p>Sincerely, Patricia Connell Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Response to Late Comment Rel40-1</p> <p>The County appreciates the comments. Please refer to the Responses to Comments provided for late Letter Re137 regarding Cocos fire experience, loss of neighborhood homes, speed of area burns, need for secondary access, 1996 tragic loss of a neighbor, very high fire hazard severity zones, additional residents and potential for increased risk during evacuation, Cocos Fire evacuation experience, belief that HGV “would be it” in terms of area development, concern over additional cars on the roads during evacuation, evacuation timing, request for new review/secondary access, and overall Project opposition.</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Letter Rel41</p> <p>From: Livia D <liviadg1@gmail.com> Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2025 11:17 AM To: Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; MontgomerySteppe, Monica <Monica.MontgomerySteppe@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Salazar, Maykent L <MaykentL.Salazar@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Kazmer, Gregory <Gregory.Kazmer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Yuen, Jeffrey <Jeffrey.Yuen@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Henson, Eric <Eric.Henson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; McDonald, Hunter <Hunter.McDonald@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Smith, Rebecca (BOS) <Rebecca.Smith2@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Lynch, Dahvia <Dahvia.Lynch@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Harbert, Amy <Amy.Harbert@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Mecham, Tony @CALFIRE <Tony.Mecham@fire.ca.gov>; Slovick, Mark <Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov>; eflgtc@gmail.com; Lorenzana, Bianca <Bianca.Lorenzana@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Montagne, Sarah <montagne@rsf-fire.org>; mcquead@rsf-fire.org; ashcraft@rsf-fire.org; hillgren@rsf-fire.org; malin@rsf-fire.org; stine@rsf-fire.org; palomaguire@gmail.com; jmccann@chulavistaca.gov; district1@chulavistaca.gov; Vivian@vivianmoreno.com; MollyW@sandiego.gov; Weber, Molly <Molly.Weber@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Pallinger, David <David.Pallinger@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Barnhart, Douglas <Douglas.Barnhart@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Edwards, Michael (LUEG) <Michael.Edwards@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Hitzke, Ginger <Ginger.Hitzke@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Ashman, Ronald <Ronald.Ashman@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Calvo, Yolanda <Yolanda.Calvo@sdcounty.ca.gov>; LUEG, PDS.PlanningCommission <PDS.PlanningCommission@sdcounty.ca.gov> Subject: [External] Don't let a bad decision haunt you forever. Force developer of HGV South to build a secondary exit.</p> <p>Honorable County Supervisors, Fire Officials, Planning Commissioners, and Potential District 1 Candidates:</p> <p>I lived through the Cocos Fire and witnessed firsthand how quickly a blaze can tear through our community. Thirty of my neighbors lost their homes. Watching the current devastation in Los Angeles brings back those same fears.</p> <p>It's hard to fathom that the County and Fire District might allow Harmony Grove Village South to move forward with only one exit—even though it's in a Very High Fire Severity Zone that has burned multiple times since the 1980s. One person died attempting to flee the last Harmony Grove fire, and now we risk an even greater tragedy if thousands of residents are trapped during a fast-moving wildfire. With standstill traffic during the 2014 Cocos Fire—and that was before Harmony Grove Village (not South) was built—you can imagine how dire things could become with six times more cars.</p> <p>We were promised that Harmony Grove Village (not South) would meet our housing obligations and that we wouldn't have any more developments jamming 1000's more cars onto our limited rural evacuation route. Yet here we are, discussing a massive new development with no expanded road capacity and no secondary evacuation route. Experts say it could take seven hours to evacuate; a wildfire can arrive in two.</p> <p>I respectfully ask you to reject this proposal, or at least demand a thorough new fire safety analysis and require a secondary egress. When the next fire erupts, your decision today could save—or endanger—thousands of lives.</p> <p>Sincerely, Livia DeGeorge</p> <p>Sent from my iPad</p>	<p>Response to Late Comment Rel41-1</p> <p>The County appreciates the comments. Please refer to the Responses to Comments provided for late Letter Rel37 regarding Cocos fire experience, loss of neighborhood homes, speed of area burns, renewed concern based on January 2025 fires in Los Angeles, need for secondary access, 1996 tragic loss of a neighbor, very high fire hazard severity zones, additional residents and potential for increased risk during evacuation, Cocos Fire evacuation experience, belief that HGV “would be it” in terms of area development, concern over additional cars on the roads during evacuation, evacuation timing, request for new review/secondary access, and overall Project opposition.</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p>From: allegra.farr <allegrafarr@yahoo.com> Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2025 6:04 PM To: Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcountry.ca.gov>; MontgomerySteppe, Monica <Monica.MontgomerySteppe@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Salazar, Maykent L <MaykentL.Salazar@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Kazner, Gregory <Gregory.Kazner@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Yuen, Jeffrey <Jeffrey.Yuen@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Henson, Eric <Eric.Henson@sdcountry.ca.gov>; McDonald, Hunter <Hunter.McDonald@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Smith, Rebecca (BO5) <Rebecca.Smith2@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Lynch, Dahlia <Dahlia.Lynch@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Harbert, Amy <Amy.Harbert@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Mecham, Tony <CALFIRE@Tony.Mecham@fire.ca.gov>; Slovick, Mark <Mark.Slovick@sdcountry.ca.gov>; efagtc@gmail.com; Lorenzana, Bianca <Bianca.Lorenzana@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Montagne, Sarah <montagne@rsf-fire.org>; mcquead@rsf-fire.org; ashcraft@rsf-fire.org; hillgren@rsf-fire.org; malin@rsf-fire.org; stine@rsf-fire.org; palomaguire@gmail.com; jmccann@chulavistaca.gov; district1@chulavistaca.gov; Vivian@vivianmoreno.com; MollyW@sandiego.gov; Weber,Molly@Molly.Weber@sdcountry.ca.gov">Weber, Molly <Molly.Weber@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Pallinger, David <David.Pallinger@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Barnhart, Douglas <Douglas.Barnhart@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Edwards, Michael (LUEG) <Michael.Edwards@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Hirtzke, Ginger <Ginger.Hirtzke@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Ashman, Ronald <Ronald.Ashman@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Calvo, Yolanda <Yolanda.Calvo@sdcountry.ca.gov>; LUEG, PDS.PlanningCommission <PDS.PlanningCommission@sdcountry.ca.gov> Subject: [External] Haven't we learned our lesson? How is SD County waiving fire code for developers in very high wildfire risk areas. Please vote No on HGV South.</p> <p>Honorable Supervisors, Commissioners, Fire District, staff and potential District 1 candidates:</p> <p>Having survived the Cocos Fire that ravaged our fire-prone neighborhood and burned down 30 of my neighbors' homes, I am now witnessing the horrendous situation unfolding in Los Angeles and reliving that trauma every time I turn on the news.</p> <p>To add insult to injury, it is hard to believe that County and Fire District are really considering waiving crucial fire code requirements for the developer of Harmony Grove Village South. It would be insane to allow this project to move forward with only one egress, despite it being in a Very High Fire Severity Zone in a neighborhood that has burned down at least twice a decade since the 1980s. This neighborhood has lost many homes over the years and had a fatality when a community member was killed trying to escape the Harmony Grove fire. It's hard to understand how this project could move forward without adequate fire safety measures in place, something as basic as a secondary evacuation route and expanded road capacity. With what we're seeing in LA, it is unconscionable.</p> <p>The Cocos Fire of 2014 really scared those of us who were around at the time. People were stuck in standstill traffic on both ends of the valley, with some barely making it out before the fire reached their neighborhoods. This was before the Harmony Grove Village (not south) project was even built.</p> <p>Our community dutifully supported HGV (not South) because the County promised us that this would fulfill our obligation to bring housing to our little rural community. Dahlia Lynch, the DCAO of land use and planning today, was the planner at the time and she held visioning workshops and diplomatically brought our community around to supporting a project that would double our population with 742 homes. We were assured by staff and by the Supervisors at the time that, due to the limited evacuation infrastructure and increased wildfire risk, this would be the last big project for a very long while. Not 2 years later, a Colorado billionaire buys up foreclosed land and embarks on a quest to undermine the community for the deceptively named Harmony Grove Village South. Ironically, that same billionaire lost his family home in 2022 during the Marshall fires.</p> <p>If the HGV South project is approved there will be approximately six times more cars evacuating than we saw during Cocos fire, but no new road capacity. Something like 3500 vehicles will pack onto two-lane roads trying to escape a fast moving fire. According to an independent evacuation expert, it would take 7 hours to evacuate the immediate vicinity. A fire starting within 6 miles of us could overwhelm the community in less than 2 hours.</p> <p>Please, the last Board got it wrong. I urge you to vote no on this dangerous project, or at the very least require a thorough new fire safety analysis and demand a secondary egress. Our lives depend on it. When the next fire hits, you, as decision-makers, will live with the consequences of your ultimate decision. It will be your legacy. Let's hope it will be the right legacy.</p> <p>Sincerely, Allegra</p>	<p>Response to Late Comment Rel42-1</p> <p>The County appreciates the comments. Please refer to the Responses to Comments provided for late Letter Rel37 regarding prior (Cocos) fire experience, renewed concern based on January 2025 fires in Los Angeles, perceived waiver of fire safety standards, concern over evacuation routes and need for secondary access/egress, very high fire hazard severity zones, loss of neighborhood homes, 1996 tragic loss of a neighbor, adequacy of Proposed Project fire safety measures, Cocos Fire evacuation experience, belief that HGV “would be it” in terms of area development, additional residents/vehicles, potential for increased risk during evacuation, request for new review/secondary access, and overall Project opposition.</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Letter Rel43</p> <p>From: Jason Farr <jasonmfarr@gmail.com> Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2025 6:02 PM To: Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcountry.ca.gov>; MontgomerySteppe, Monica <Monica.MontgomerySteppe@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Salazar, Maykent L <MaykentL.Salazar@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Kazmer, Gregory <Gregory.Kazmer@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Yuen, Jeffrey <Jeffrey.Yuen@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Henson, Eric <Eric.Henson@sdcountry.ca.gov>; McDonald, Hunter <Hunter.McDonald@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Smith, Rebecca (BOS) <Rebecca.Smith2@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Lynch, Dahvia <Dahvia.Lynch@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Harbert, Amy <Amy.Harbert@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Mecham, Tony@CALFIRE <Tony.Mecham@fire.ca.gov>; Slovick, Mark <Mark.Slovick@sdcountry.ca.gov>; efngrtc@gmail.com; Lorenzana, Bianca <Bianca.Lorenzana@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Montagne, Sarah <montagne@rsf-fire.org>; mcquead@rsf-fire.org; ashcraft@rsf-fire.org; hillgren@rsf-fire.org; malin@rsf-fire.org; stine@rsf-fire.org; palomaguire@gmail.com; jmccann@chulavistaca.gov; district1@chulavistaca.gov; Vivian@vivianmoreno.com; MollyW@sandiego.gov; Weber, Molly <Molly.Weber@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Pallinger, David <David.Pallinger@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Barnhart, Douglas <Douglas.Barnhart@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Edwards, Michael (LUEG) <Michael.Edwards@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Hitzke, Ginger <Ginger.Hitzke@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Ashman, Ronald <Ronald.Ashman@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Calvo, Yolanda <Yolanda.Calvo@sdcountry.ca.gov>; LUEG, PDS.PlanningCommission <PDS.PlanningCommission@sdcountry.ca.gov> Subject: [External] Don't let a bad decision haunt you forever. Force developer of HGV South to build a secondary exit.</p> <p>Honorable County Supervisors, Fire Officials, Planning Commissioners, and Potential District 1 Candidates:</p> <p>I lived through the Cocos Fire and witnessed firsthand how quickly a blaze can tear through our community. Thirty of my neighbors lost their homes. Watching the current devastation in Los Angeles brings back those same fears.</p> <p>It's hard to fathom that the County and Fire District might allow Harmony Grove Village South to move forward with only one exit—even though it's in a Very High Fire Severity Zone that has burned multiple times since the 1980s. One person died attempting to flee the last Harmony Grove fire, and now we risk an even greater tragedy if thousands of residents are trapped during a fast-moving wildfire. With standstill traffic during the 2014 Cocos Fire—and that was before Harmony Grove Village (not South) was built—you can imagine how dire things could become with six times more cars.</p> <p>We were promised that Harmony Grove Village (not South) would meet our housing obligations and that we wouldn't have any more developments jamming 1000's more cars onto our limited rural evacuation route. Yet here we are, discussing a massive new development with no expanded road capacity and no secondary evacuation route. Experts say it could take seven hours to evacuate; a wildfire can arrive in two.</p> <p>I respectfully ask you to reject this proposal, or at least demand a thorough new fire safety analysis and require a secondary egress. When the next fire erupts, your decision today could save—or endanger—thousands of lives.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jason Farr</p>	<p>Response to Late Comment Rel43-1</p> <p>The County appreciates the comments. Please refer to the Responses to Comments provided for late Letter Rel37 regarding prior (Cocos) fire experience, renewed concern based on January 2025 fires in Los Angeles, loss of neighborhood homes, concern over evacuation routes and need for secondary access/egress, very high fire hazard severity zones, 1996 tragic loss of a neighbor, adequacy of Proposed Project fire safety measures, belief that HGV “would be it” in terms of area development, additional residents/vehicles, potential for increased risk during evacuation, Cocos Fire evacuation experience, request for new review/secondary access, and overall Project opposition.</p>


COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Letter Rel44</p> <p>From: Kellie Harden <kellieharden@icloud.com> Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2025 8:13 PM To: Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcountry.ca.gov>; MontgomerySteppe, Monica <Monica.MontgomerySteppe@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Salazar, Maykent L <MaykentL.Salazar@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Kazmer, Gregory <Gregory.Kazmer@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Yuen, Jeffrey <Jeffrey.Yuen@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Henson, Eric <Eric.Henson@sdcountry.ca.gov>; McDonald, Hunter <Hunter.McDonald@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Smith, Rebecca (BOS) <Rebecca.Smith2@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Lynch, Dahlia <Dahlia.Lynch@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Harbert, Amy <Amy.Harbert@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Mecham, Tony@CALFIRE <Tony.Mecham@fire.ca.gov>; Slovic, Mark <Mark.Slovick@sdcountry.ca.gov>; efigtc@gmail.com; Lorenzana, Bianca <Bianca.Lorenzana@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Montagne, Sarah <montagne@rsf-fire.org>; mcquead@rsf-fire.org; ashcraft@rsf-fire.org; hillgren@rsf-fire.org; malin@rsf-fire.org; stine@rsf-fire.org; palomaguire@gmail.com; jmccann@chulavistaca.gov; district1@chulavistaca.gov; Vivian@vivianmoreno.com; MollyW@sandiego.gov; Weber, Molly <Molly.Weber@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Pallinger, David <David.Pallinger@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Bamhart, Douglas <Douglas.Bamhart@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Edwards, Michael (LUEG) <Michael.Edwards@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Hitzke, Ginger <Ginger.Hitzke@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Ashman, Ronald <Ronald.Ashman@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Calvo, Yolanda <Yolanda.Calvo@sdcountry.ca.gov>; LUEG, PDS Planning Commission <PDS.PlanningCommission@sdcountry.ca.gov> Subject: [External] One way out is just not safe. Please force developer of HGV South to build a secondary road. Don't let us get entrapped during the next fire.</p> <p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>I've lived in Harmony Grove for over 9 years and although I didn't live through the Cocos Fire I did witness them firsthand from nearby. Watching the current devastation in Los Angeles and having to evacuate my daughter from UCLA brings fear knowing how fast these fires can spread and devastate a community.</p> <p>It's hard to fathom that the County and Fire District might allow Harmony Grove Village South to move forward with only one exit—even though it's in a Very High Fire Severity Zone that has burned multiple times since the 1980s. One person died attempting to flee the last Harmony Grove fire, and now we risk an even greater tragedy if thousands of residents are trapped during a fast-moving wildfire. With standstill traffic during the 2014 Cocos Fire—and that was before Harmony Grove Village (not South) was built—you can imagine how dire things could become with six times more cars.</p> <p>We were promised that Harmony Grove Village (not South) would meet our housing obligations and that we wouldn't have any more developments jamming 1000's more cars onto our limited rural evacuation route. Yet here we are, discussing a massive new development with no expanded road capacity and no secondary evacuation route. Experts say it could take seven hours to evacuate; a wildfire can arrive in two.</p> <p>I respectfully ask you to reject this proposal, or at least demand a thorough new fire safety analysis and require a secondary egress. When the next fire erupts, your decision today could save—or endanger—thousands of lives.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Kellie Harden</p> <p>Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Response to Late Comment Rel44-1</p> <p>The County appreciates the comments. Please refer to the Responses to Comments provided for late Letter Rel37 regarding watching the Cocos fire, loss of neighborhood homes, renewed concern based on January 2025 fires in Los Angeles, need for secondary access, very high fire hazard severity zones, 1996 tragic loss of a neighbor, additional residents and potential for increased risk during evacuation, Cocos Fire evacuation experience, belief that HGV “would be it” in terms of area development, concern over additional cars on the roads during evacuation, evacuation timing, request for new review/secondary access, and overall Project opposition.</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Letter Rel45</p> <p>From: Alice Dickey <alice.marie.dickey@gmail.com> Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2025 6:49 AM To: Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcountry.ca.gov>; MontgomerySteppe, Monica <Monica.MontgomerySteppe@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Salazar, Maykent L <MaykentL.Salazar@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Kazmer, Gregory <Gregory.Kazmer@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Yuen, Jeffrey <Jeffrey.Yuen@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Henson, Eric <Eric.Henson@sdcountry.ca.gov>; McDonald, Hunter <Hunter.McDonald@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Smith, Rebecca (BOS) <Rebecca.Smith2@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Lynch, Dalvia <Dalvia.Lynch@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Harbert, Amy <Amy.Harbert@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Mecham, Tony <Tony.Mecham@fire.ca.gov>; Slovick, Mark <Mark.Slovick@sdcountry.ca.gov>; efigtc@gmail.com; Lorenzana, Bianca <Bianca.Lorenzana@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Montagne, Sarah <montagne@rsf-fire.org>; mcquead@rsf-fire.org; ashcraft@rsf-fire.org; hillgren@rsf-fire.org; malin@rsf-fire.org; stine@rsf-fire.org; palomaguire@gmail.com; jmccann@chulavistaca.gov; district1@chulavistaca.gov; Vivian@vivianmoreno.com; MollyW@sandiego.gov; Weber, Molly <Molly.Weber@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Pallinger, David <David.Pallinger@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Barnhart, Douglas <Douglas.Barnhart@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Edwards, Michael (LUEG) <Michael.Edwards@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Hitzke, Ginger <Ginger.Hitzke@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Ashman, Ronald <Ronald.Ashman@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Calvo, Yolanda <Yolanda.Calvo@sdcountry.ca.gov>; LUEG, PDS.PlanningCommission <PDS.PlanningCommission@sdcountry.ca.gov> Subject: [External] Enforce developer of HGV South to build a secondary road. Save us from being entrapped during the next fire.</p> <p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>After watching the current devastation in Los Angeles, it's hard to fathom that the County and Fire District might allow Harmony Grove Village South to move forward with only one exit—even though it's in a Very High Fire Severity Zone that has burned multiple times since the 1980s. One person died attempting to flee the last Harmony Grove fire, and now we risk an even greater tragedy if thousands of residents are trapped during a fast-moving wildfire. With standstill traffic during the 2014 Cocos Fire—and that was before Harmony Grove Village (not South) was built—you can imagine how dire things could become with six times more cars.</p> <p>We were promised that Harmony Grove Village (not South) would meet our housing obligations and that we wouldn't have any more developments jamming 1000's more cars onto our limited rural evacuation route. Yet here we are, discussing a massive new development with no expanded road capacity and no secondary evacuation route. Experts say it could take seven hours to evacuate; a wildfire can arrive in two.</p> <p>I respectfully ask you to reject this proposal, or at least demand a thorough new fire safety analysis and require a secondary egress. When the next fire erupts, your decision today could save—or endanger—thousands of lives.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Alice Holmes</p> <p>Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Response to Late Comment Rel45-1</p> <p>The County appreciates the comments. Please refer to the Responses to Comments provided for late Letter Rel37 regarding concern based on January 2025 fires in Los Angeles, need for secondary access, 1996 tragic loss of a neighbor, very high fire hazard severity zones, additional residents and potential for increased risk during evacuation, Cocos Fire evacuation experience, belief that HGV “would be it” in terms of area development, concern over additional cars on the roads during evacuation, evacuation timing, request for new review/secondary access, and overall Project opposition.</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Letter Rel46</p> <p>From: Kristi Kenney <im2weed@icloud.com> Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2025 10:45 PM To: Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcountry.ca.gov>; MontgomerySteppe, Monica <Monica.MontgomerySteppe@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Salazar, Maykent L <MaykentL.Salazar@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Kazmer, Gregory <Gregory.Kazmer@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Yuen, Jeffrey <Jeffrey.Yuen@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Henson, Eric <Eric.Henson@sdcountry.ca.gov>; McDonald, Hunter <Hunter.McDonald@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Smith, Rebecca (BOS) <Rebecca.Smith2@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Lynch, Dahvia <Dahvia.Lynch@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Harbert, Amy <Amy.Harbert@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Mecham, Tony@CALFIRE <Tony.Mecham@fire.ca.gov>; Slovick, Mark <Mark.Slovick@sdcountry.ca.gov>; efngrc@gmail.com; Lorenzana, Bianca <Bianca.Lorenzana@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Montagne, Sarah <montagne@rsf-fire.org>; mcquead@rsf-fire.org; ashcraft@rsf-fire.org; hillgren@rsf-fire.org; malin@rsf-fire.org; stine@rsf-fire.org; palomaguire@gmail.com; jmccann@chulavistaca.gov; district1@chulavistaca.gov; Vivian@vivianmoreno.com; MollyW@sanidiego.gov; Weber, Molly <Molly.Weber@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Pallinger, David <David.Pallinger@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Barnhart, Douglas <Douglas.Barnhart@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Edwards, Michael (LUEG) <Michael.Edwards@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Hitzke, Ginger <Ginger.Hitzke@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Ashman, Ronald <Ronald.Ashman@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Calvo, Yolanda <Yolanda.Calvo@sdcountry.ca.gov>; LUEG, PDS.PlanningCommission Subject: [External] Proposed Harmony Grove South</p> <p>Honorable Supervisors:</p> <p>Hello,</p> <p>I am writing as a plea for the safety of current Harmony Grove residents as well as potential future residents. The risk from wildfires to this proposed development is far too high. Currently there is ONE evacuation route from this area.</p> <p>For MINIMUM SAFETY to all in this area, at least one more route would need to be created. The surrounding terrain is far too steep to achieve an evacuation route. The proposed area is labeled a "very high fire hazard severity zone". Adding more people to this already congested high risk zone, would be hazardous to us all.</p> <p>Current residents are having difficulties continuing or obtaining new fire insurance for their existing home. Surely it will be far more difficult for the proposed development given the current state of the LA fires.</p> <p>Please consider the safety of the residents over any monetary gain to anyone.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Kristi and Brett Kenney, Concerned Residents</p> <p>Sent from my iPad</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Response to Late Comment Rel46-1</p> <p>The County appreciates the comments. Please refer to the Responses to Comments provided for late Letter Rel37 regarding need for an additional evacuation route, very high fire hazard severity zones, additional residents and potential for increased risk, and difficulty over obtaining fire insurance.</p>

Rel46-1

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Letter Rel47</p> <p>From: Neubauer, Eric <eric.neubauer@sduhsd.net> Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2025 5:52 PM To: Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; MontgomerySteppe, Monica <Monica.MontgomerySteppe@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Salazar, Maykent L <MaykentL.Salazar@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Kazmer, Gregory <Gregory.Kazmer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Yuen, Jeffrey <Jeffrey.Yuen@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Henson, Eric <Eric.Henson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; McDonald, Hunter <Hunter.McDonald@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Smith, Rebecca (BOS) <Rebecca.Smith2@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Lynch, Dahvia <Dahvia.Lynch@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Harbert, Amy <Amy.Harbert@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Slovick, Mark <Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Elfin Forest Harmony Grove Town Council <efngtc@gmail.com>; Lorenzana, Bianca <Bianca.Lorenzana@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Montagne, Sarah <montagne@rsf-fire.org>; David C. McQuead <mcquead@rsf-fire.org>; ashcraft@rsf-fire.org; hillgren@rsf-fire.org; malin@rsf-fire.org; stine@rsf-fire.org; palomaguire@gmail.com; jmcann@chulavistaca.gov; district1@chulavistaca.gov; Vivian@vivianmoreno.com; MollyW@sandiego.gov; Weber, Molly <Molly.Weber@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Pallinger, David <David.Pallinger@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Barnhart, Douglas <Douglas.Barnhart@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Edwards, Michael (LUEG) <Michael.Edwards@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Hitzke, Ginger <Ginger.Hitzke@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Ashman, Ronald <Ronald.Ashman@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Calvo, Yolanda <Yolanda.Calvo@sdcounty.ca.gov>; LUEG, PDS.PlanningCommission <PDS.PlanningCommission@sdcounty.ca.gov> Subject: [External] Please don't approve HGV South.</p> <p>Honorable Supervisors, Commissioners, Fire District, staff and potential District 1 candidates:</p> <p>Having survived the Cocos Fire that ravaged our fire-prone neighborhood and burned down 30 of my neighbors' homes, I am now witnessing the horrendous situation unfolding in Los Angeles and reliving that trauma every time I turn on the news.</p> <p>To add insult to injury, it is hard to believe that County and Fire District are really considering waiving crucial fire code requirements for the developer of Harmony Grove Village South. It would be insane to allow this project to move forward with only one egress, despite it being in a Very High Fire Severity Zone in a neighborhood that has burned down at least twice a decade since the 1980s. This neighborhood has lost many homes over the years and had a fatality when a community member was killed trying to escape the Harmony Grove fire. It's hard to understand how this project could move forward without adequate fire safety measures in place, something as basic as a secondary evacuation route and expanded road capacity. With what we're seeing in LA, it is unconscionable.</p> <p>The Cocos Fire of 2014 really scared those of us who were around at the time. People were stuck in standstill traffic on both ends of the valley, with some barely making it out before the fire reached their neighborhoods. This was before the Harmony Grove Village (not south) project was even built. My property is only a couple hundred yards from the HGVS project and the attached picture is as the 2014 Cocos fire approached my property line with my house in the foreground. Thank God my property line is the furthest south it made it but not so lucky for my next door neighbor who lost their house and many others on the other side of her property.</p>	<p>Response to Late Comment Rel47-1</p> <p>The County appreciates the comments. Please refer to the Responses to Comments provided for late Letter Rel37 regarding prior (Cocos) fire experience, renewed concern based on January 2025 fires in Los Angeles, perceived waiver of fire safety standards, concern over evacuation routes and need for secondary access/egress, very high fire hazard severity zones, loss of neighborhood homes, 1996 tragic loss of a neighbor, adequacy of Proposed Project fire safety measures, Cocos Fire evacuation experience, belief that HGV “would be it” in terms of area development, additional residents/vehicles, potential for increased risk during evacuation, request for new review/secondary access, and overall Project opposition.</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: right;">Comment Letter Rel47</p> <p>Our community dutifully supported HGV (not South) because the County promised us that this would fulfill our obligation to bring housing to our little rural community. Dahvia Lynch, the DCAO of land use and planning today, was the planner at the time and she held visioning workshops and diplomatically brought our community around to supporting a project that would double our population with 742 homes. We were assured by staff and by the Supervisors at the time that, due to the limited evacuation infrastructure and increased wildfire risk, this would be the last big project for a very long while. Not 2 years later, a Colorado billionaire buys up foreclosed land and embarks on a quest to undermine the community for the deceptively named Harmony Grove Village South. Ironically, that same billionaire lost his family home in 2022 during the Marshall fires.</p> <p>If the HGV South project is approved there will be approximately six times more cars evacuating than we saw during Cocos fire, but no new road capacity. Something like 3500 vehicles will pack onto two-lane roads trying to escape a fast moving fire. According to an independent evacuation expert, it would take 7 hours to evacuate the immediate vicinity. A fire starting within 6 miles of us could overwhelm the community in less than 2 hours. I evacuated with the strike crews from this area as the flames raged in. It is violent and deadly and we know another brush fire is going to happen in this area as they do almost every 10 years like clockwork.</p> <p>Please, the last Board got it wrong. I urge you to vote no on this dangerous project, or at the very least require a thorough new fire safety analysis and demand a secondary egress. Our lives and our pets' lives depend on it. When the next fire hits, you, as decision-makers, will live with the consequences of your ultimate decision. It will be your legacy. Let's hope it will be the right legacy.</p> <p>Thank you in advance,</p> <p>Eric Neubauer Harmony Grove Resident</p> 	<p style="text-align: center;">Rel47-1 cont.</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Letter Rel48</p> <p>From: Stacey Nichols <staceyn2323@gmail.com> Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2025 1:09 PM To: Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcountry.ca.gov>; MontgomerySteppe, Monica <Monica.MontgomerySteppe@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Salazar, Maykent L <MaykentL.Salazar@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Kazmer, Gregory <Gregory.Kazmer@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Yuen, Jeffrey <Jeffrey.Yuen@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Henson, Eric <Eric.Henson@sdcountry.ca.gov>; McDonald, Hunter <Hunter.McDonald@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Smith, Rebecca (BOS) <Rebecca.Smith2@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Lynch, Dahvia <Dahvia.Lynch@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Harbert, Amy <Amy.Harbert@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Mecham, Tony@CALFIRE <Tony.Mecham@fire.ca.gov>; Slovick, Mark <Mark.Slovick@sdcountry.ca.gov>; efngtc@gmail.com; Lorenzana, Bianca <Bianca.Lorenzana@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Montagne, Sarah <montagne@rsf-fire.org>; mcquead@rsf-fire.org; ashcraft@rsf-fire.org; hullgren@rsf-fire.org; malin@rsf-fire.org; stine@rsf-fire.org; palomaguire@gmail.com; jmccann@chulavistaca.gov; district1@chulavistaca.gov; Vivian@vivianmoreno.com; MollyW@sandiego.gov; Weber, Molly <Molly.Weber@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Pallinger, David <David.Pallinger@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Barnhart, Douglas <Douglas.Barnhart@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Edwards, Michael (LUEG) <Michael.Edwards@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Hitzke, Ginger <Ginger.Hitzke@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Ashman, Ronald <Ronald.Ashman@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Calvo, Yolanda <Yolanda.Calvo@sdcountry.ca.gov>; LUEG, PDS.PlanningCommission <PDS.PlanningCommission@sdcountry.ca.gov> Subject: [External] No on HGV South</p> <p>Honorable Supervisors and staff:</p> <p>I am a local resident and firefighter. I have personally seen the damage and destruction of fire over the course of my career. I worked on a fire engine during many of San Diego counties major wildfires - the Harris Fire and the Witch Fire to name a few. The Cocos Fire ravaged our neighborhood and burned down 30 of my neighbors' homes. I am now witnessing the horrendous situation unfolding in Los Angeles and saddened by the loss of life and homes. The courageous men and women of the fire service are risking their lives to save others. By building more homes in areas with one evacuation route you are putting not only our lives as residents on the line but those as firefighters.</p> <p>To add insult to injury, it is hard to believe that County and Fire District are really considering waiving crucial fire code requirements for the developer of Harmony Grove Village South. It would be insane to allow this project to move forward with only one egress, despite it being in a Very High Fire Severity Zone in a neighborhood that has burned down at least twice a decade since the 1980s. This neighborhood has lost many homes over the years and had a fatality when a community member was killed trying to escape the Harmony Grove fire. It's hard to understand how this project could move forward without adequate fire safety measures in place, something as basic as a secondary evacuation route and expanded road capacity.</p> <p>The Cocos Fire of 2014 really scared those of us who were around at the time. People were stuck in standstill traffic on both ends of the valley, with some barely making it out before the fire reached their neighborhoods. This was before the Harmony Grove Village (not south) project was even built.</p>	<p>Response to Late Comment Rel48-1</p> <p>The County appreciates the comments. Please refer to the Responses to Comments provided for late Letter Rel37 regarding prior (Cocos) fire experience, loss of neighborhood homes, renewed concern based on January 2025 fires in Los Angeles, perceived waiver of fire safety standards, concern over evacuation routes and need for secondary access/egress, very high fire hazard severity zones, 1996 tragic loss of a neighbor, adequacy of Proposed Project fire safety measures, Cocos Fire evacuation congestion, belief that HGV “would be it” in terms of area development, additional residents/vehicles, potential for increased risk during evacuation, evacuation timing, request for new review/secondary access, and overall Project opposition.</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: right;">Comment Letter Rel48</p> <p>Our community dutifully supported HGV (not South) because the County promised us that this would fulfill our obligation to bring housing to our little rural community. Dahvia Lynch, the DCAO of land use and planning today, was the planner at the time and she held visioning workshops and diplomatically brought our community around to supporting a project that would double our population with 742 homes. We were assured by staff and by the Supervisors at the time that, due to the limited evacuation infrastructure and increased wildfire risk, this would be the last big project for a very long while. Not 2 years later, a Colorado billionaire buys up foreclosed land and embarks on a quest to undermine the community for the deceptively named Harmony Grove Village South. Ironically, that same billionaire lost his family home in 2022 during the Marshall fires.</p> <p>If the HGV South project is approved there will be approximately six times more cars evacuating than we saw during Cocos fire, but no new road capacity. Something like 3500 vehicles will pack onto two-lane roads trying to escape a fast moving fire. According to an independent evacuation expert, it would take 7 hours to evacuate the immediate vicinity. A fire starting within 6 miles of us could overwhelm the community in less than 2 hours.</p> <p>I urge you to vote no on this dangerous project, or at the very least require a thorough new fire safety analysis and demand a secondary egress. Our lives depend on it. When the next fire hits, you, as decision-makers, will live with the consequences of your ultimate decision. It will be your legacy. Let's hope it will be the right legacy.</p> <p>Sincerely, Stacey Nichols</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Rel48-1 cont.</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Letter Rel49</p> <p>From: Debbie O'Neill <doneill2255@gmail.com> Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2025 4:40 PM To: Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; MontgomerySteppe, Monica <Monica.MontgomerySteppe@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Salazar, Maykent L <MaykentL.Salazar@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Kazmer, Gregory <Gregory.Kazmer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Yuen, Jeffrey <Jeffrey.Yuen@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Henson, Eric <Eric.Henson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; McDonald, Hunter <Hunter.McDonald@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Smith, Rebecca (BOS) <Rebecca.Smith2@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Lynch, Dahvia <Dahvia.Lynch@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Harbert, Amy <Amy.Harbert@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Slovick, Mark <Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov>; efhgtc@gmail.com; Lorenzana, Bianca <Bianca.Lorenzana@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Montagne, Sarah <montagne@rsf-fire.org>; mcquead@rsf-fire.org; ashcraft@rsf-fire.org; hillgren@rsf-fire.org; malin@rsf-fire.org; stine@rsf-fire.org; palomaguirre@gmail.com; jmccann@chulavistaca.gov; district1@chulavistaca.gov; Vivian@vivianmoreno.com; MollyW@sandiego.gov; Weber, Molly <Molly.Weber@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Pallinger, David <David.Pallinger@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Barnhart, Douglas <Douglas.Barnhart@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Edwards, Michael (LUEG) <Michael.Edwards@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Hitzke, Ginger <Ginger.Hitzke@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Ashman, Ronald <Ronald.Ashman@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Calvo, Yolanda <Yolanda.Calvo@sdcounty.ca.gov>; LUEG, PDS.PlanningCommission <PDS.PlanningCommission@sdcounty.ca.gov> Subject: [External] Harmony Grove Village South proposed development</p> <p>Dear Supervisors and County Professionals,</p> <p>The fires in Los Angeles are a terrifying reminder of how poorly planned housing developments in the Wildland Urban Interface with limited evacuation routes are placing citizens in dangerous situations when the inevitable Santa Ana winds occur in combination with drought conditions. For 10 years now, our community has been imploring the County of San Diego to heed these warnings and not approve Harmony Grove Village South in the community of Harmony Grove in a Very High Fire Severity Zone as designated by Cal Fire.</p> <p>The San Diego County Planning Department supports the HGVS development against the wishes of the community, and despite the fact that this development, as planned, does not meet the state fire code which requires at least two or more egresses for safety during a wildfire. The road in question is a two-lane road, Country Club Drive, which goes over the Escondido Creek bridge, then evacuates to the two-lane road, Harmony Grove Road, or continues through Harmony Grove Village, with 750 homes. It is unconscionable to add an additional 453 homes, or approximately 1000 additional people without requiring an additional exit. The developer claims it isn't possible to get an additional exit. There is open land from the development to Del Dios Highway, but the developer would have to negotiate and pay the landowners for easement. For whatever reason, he has decided that making donations to politicians and agencies to ignore fire codes would be a better way to go. He spent somewhere around \$165,000 trying to get Kevin Faulconer elected against Terra Lawson-Remer, hoping to influence the Board of Supervisors to vote for HGVS. The fact that this out of state developer is willing to spend so much extra money, above and beyond what is required as part of the building application fees and taxes, demonstrates that he is trying to force through a</p>	<p>Response to Late Comment Rel49-1</p> <p>The County appreciates the comments. Please refer to the Responses to Comments provided for late Letter Rel37 regarding concern based on January 2025 fires in Los Angeles, very high fire hazard severity zones, perceived waiver of fire safety standards regarding egress, concern over evacuation routes and need for secondary access/egress, potential for increased risk during evacuation, General Plan compliance, request for new review/secondary access, and overall Project opposition.</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Letter Rel49</p> <p>development that isn't appropriate. The County of San Diego developed a multi-million dollar General Plan for development in the unincorporated areas of San Diego County. This plan took into account the best areas for development, and what size development should happen in each area based on infrastructure and safety. If HGVS complied with the General Plan, it would have already been approved and built. Instead, this out-of-state developer bought rural land and tried to bribe his way into a larger, and less safe development.</p> <p>Please don't place me and my family behind 1000 new residents trying to evacuate in a fire. We had to evacuate past flames during the Coco's fire when the wind changed direction and the fire came burning down the hills into our neighborhood. Fortunately, there were only about 75 residents living in our area south of Harmony Grove Road so we were able to get out. It is unreasonable to continue cramming housing into such a fire prone area.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Debra J. O'Neill 2966 Cordrey Drive Escondido, CA 92029</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Rel49-1 cont.</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Letter Rel50</p> <p>From: Morgan Redford <momoford21@gmail.com> Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2025 7:09 PM To: Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcountry.ca.gov>; MontgomerySteppe, Monica <Monica.MontgomerySteppe@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Salazar, Maykent L <MaykentL.Salazar@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Kazmer, Gregory <Gregory.Kazmer@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Yuen, Jeffrey <Jeffrey.Yuen@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Henson, Eric <Eric.Henson@sdcountry.ca.gov>; McDonald, Hunter <Hunter.McDonald@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Smith, Rebecca (BOS) <Rebecca.Smith2@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Lynch, Dahvia <Dahvia.Lynch@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Harbert, Amy <Amy.Harbert@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Mecham, Tony@CALFIRE <Tony.Mecham@fire.ca.gov>; Slovick, Mark <Mark.Slovick@sdcountry.ca.gov>; eflagtc@gmail.com; Lorenzana, Bianca <Bianca.Lorenzana@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Montagne, Sarah <montagne@rsf-fire.org>; mcquead@rsf-fire.org; ashcraft@rsf-fire.org; hillgren@rsf-fire.org; malin@rsf-fire.org; stine@rsf-fire.org; palomaguire@gmail.com; jmccann@chulavistaca.gov; district1@chulavistaca.gov; Vivian@vivianmoreno.com; MollyW@sandiego.gov; Weber, Molly <Molly.Weber@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Pallinger, David <David.Pallinger@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Barnhart, Douglas <Douglas.Barnhart@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Edwards, Michael (LUEG) <Michael.Edwards@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Hitzke, Ginger <Ginger.Hitzke@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Ashman, Ronald <Ronald.Ashman@sdcountry.ca.gov>; Calvo, Yolanda <Yolanda.Calvo@sdcountry.ca.gov>; LUEG, PDS.PlanningCommission <PDS.PlanningCommission@sdcountry.ca.gov> Subject: [External] One way out is just not safe. Please force developer of HGV South to build a secondary road. Don't let us get entrapped during the next fire.</p> <p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>I lived through the Cocos Fire and witnessed firsthand how quickly a blaze can tear through our community. Thirty of my neighbors lost their homes. Watching the current devastation in Los Angeles brings back those same fears.</p> <p>It's hard to fathom that the County and Fire District might allow Harmony Grove Village South to move forward with only one exit—even though it's in a Very High Fire Severity Zone that has burned multiple times since the 1980s. One person died attempting to flee the last Harmony Grove fire, and now we risk an even greater tragedy if thousands of residents are trapped during a fast-moving wildfire. With standstill traffic during the 2014 Cocos Fire—and that was before Harmony Grove Village (not South) was built—you can imagine how dire things could become with six times more cars.</p> <p>We were promised that Harmony Grove Village (not South) would meet our housing obligations and that we wouldn't have any more developments jamming 1000's more cars onto our limited rural evacuation route. Yet here we are, discussing a massive new development with no expanded road capacity and no secondary evacuation route. Experts say it could take seven hours to evacuate; a wildfire can arrive in two.</p> <p>I respectfully ask you to reject this proposal, or at least demand a thorough new fire safety analysis and require a secondary egress. When the next fire erupts, your decision today could save—or endanger—thousands of lives.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Morgan Redford Colorado State University Equine Science 619-885-1124</p>	<p>Response to Late Comment Rel50-1</p> <p>The County appreciates the comments. Please refer to the Responses to Comments provided for late Letter Rel37 regarding Cocos fire experience, loss of neighborhood homes, speed of area burns, need for secondary access, very high fire hazard severity zones, 1996 tragic loss of a neighbor, Cocos Fire evacuation experience, additional residents and potential for increased risk during evacuation, belief that HGV “would be it” in terms of area development, concern over additional cars on the roads during evacuation, evacuation timing, request for new review/secondary access, and overall Project opposition.</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Letter Rel51</p> <p>From: Justin Rodriguez <justin.rod40@gmail.com> Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2025 6:54 PM To: Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; MontgomerySteppe, Monica <Monica.MontgomerySteppe@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Salazar, Maykent L <MaykentL.Salazar@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Kazmer, Gregory <Gregory.Kazmer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Yuen, Jeffrey <Jeffrey.Yuen@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Henson, Eric <Eric.Henson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; McDonald, Hunter <Hunter.McDonald@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Smith, Rebecca (BOS) <Rebecca.Smith2@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Lynch, Dahvia <Dahvia.Lynch@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Harbert, Amy <Amy.Harbert@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Mecham, Tony@CALFIRE <Tony.Mecham@fire.ca.gov>; Slovick, Mark <Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov>; efhtgc@gmail.com; Lorenzana, Bianca <Bianca.Lorenzana@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Montagne, Sarah <montagne@rsf-fire.org>; mcquead@rsf-fire.org; ashcraft@rsf-fire.org; hillgren@rsf-fire.org; malin@rsf-fire.org; stine@rsf-fire.org; palomaguirre@gmail.com; jmccann@chulavistaca.gov; district1@chulavistaca.gov; Vivian@vivianmoreno.com; MollyW@sandiego.gov; Weber, Molly <Molly.Weber@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Pallinger, David <David.Pallinger@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Barnhart, Douglas <Douglas.Barnhart@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Edwards, Michael (LUEG) <Michael.Edwards@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Hitzke, Ginger <Ginger.Hitzke@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Ashman, Ronald <Ronald.Ashman@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Calvo, Yolanda <Yolanda.Calvo@sdcounty.ca.gov>; LUEG, PDS.PlanningCommission <PDS.PlanningCommission@sdcounty.ca.gov> Subject: [External] Don't let a bad decision haunt you forever. Force developer of HGV South to build a secondary exit.</p> <p>Honorable County Supervisors, Fire Officials, Planning Commissioners, and Potential District 1 Candidates:</p> <p>I lived through the Cocos Fire and witnessed firsthand how quickly a blaze can tear through our community. Thirty of my neighbors lost their homes. Watching the current devastation in Los Angeles brings back those same fears.</p> <p>It's hard to fathom that the County and Fire District might allow Harmony Grove Village South to move forward with only one exit—even though it's in a Very High Fire Severity Zone that has burned multiple times since the 1980s. One person died attempting to flee the last Harmony Grove fire, and now we risk an even greater tragedy if thousands of residents are trapped during a fast-moving wildfire. With standstill traffic during the 2014 Cocos Fire—and that was before Harmony Grove Village (not South) was built—you can imagine how dire things could become with six times more cars.</p> <p>We were promised that Harmony Grove Village (not South) would meet our housing obligations and that we wouldn't have any more developments jamming 1000's more cars onto our limited rural evacuation route. Yet here we are, discussing a massive new development with no expanded road capacity and no secondary evacuation route. Experts say it could take seven hours to evacuate; a wildfire can arrive in two.</p> <p>I respectfully ask you to reject this proposal, or at least demand a thorough new fire safety analysis and require a secondary egress. When the next fire erupts, your decision today could save—or endanger—thousands of lives.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>	<p>Response to Late Comment Rel51-1</p> <p>The County appreciates the comments. Please refer to the Responses to Comments provided for late Letter Rel37 regarding prior (Cocos) fire experience, loss of neighborhood homes, renewed concern based on January 2025 fires in Los Angeles, concern over evacuation routes and need for secondary access/egress, very high fire hazard severity zones, 1996 tragic loss of a neighbor, adequacy of Proposed Project fire safety measures, Cocos Fire evacuation experience, belief that HGV “would be it” in terms of area development, additional residents/vehicles, potential for increased risk during evacuation, request for new review/secondary access, and overall Project opposition.</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Letter Rel52</p> <p>From: melissarosno@gmail.com <melissarosno@gmail.com> Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2025 12:05 PM To: Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; MontgomerySteppe, Monica <Monica.MontgomerySteppe@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Salazar, Maykent L <MaykentL.Salazar@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Kazmer, Gregory <Gregory.Kazmer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Yuen, Jeffrey <Jeffrey.Yuen@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Henson, Eric <Eric.Henson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; McDonald, Hunter <Hunter.McDonald@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Smith, Rebecca (BOS) <Rebecca.Smith2@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Lynch, Dahvia <Dahvia.Lynch@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Harbert, Amy <Amy.Harbert@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Mecham, Tony@CALFIRE <Tony.Mecham@fire.ca.gov>; Slovick, Mark <Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov>; efhgtc@gmail.com; Lorenzana, Bianca <Bianca.Lorenzana@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Montagne, Sarah <montagne@rsf-fire.org>; mcquead@rsf-fire.org; ashcraft@rsf-fire.org; hillgren@rsf-fire.org; malin@rsf-fire.org; stine@rsf-fire.org; palomaguirre@gmail.com; jmccann@chulavistaca.gov; district1@chulavistaca.gov; Vivian@vivianmoreno.com; MollyW@sandiego.gov; Weber, Molly <Molly.Weber@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Pallinger, David <David.Pallinger@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Barnhart, Douglas <Douglas.Barnhart@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Edwards, Michael (LUEG) <Michael.Edwards@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Hitzke, Ginger <Ginger.Hitzke@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Ashman, Ronald <Ronald.Ashman@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Calvo, Yolanda <Yolanda.Calvo@sdcounty.ca.gov>; LUEG, PDS.PlanningCommission <PDS.PlanningCommission@sdcounty.ca.gov> Subject: [External] As LA burns, SD County waives fire code for developers in very high wildfire risk areas. Please vote No on HGV South.</p> <p>Honorable Supervisors, Commissioners, Fire District, staff and potential District 1 candidates:</p> <p>As a current resident of Harmony Grove Village and a former Los Angeles resident, I have watched the devastation caused by recent fires in Los Angeles with deep sadness. I also have friends in San Diego who lost their homes during the Cocos Fire, and their experiences weigh heavily on me as I think about the very real fire dangers in our community.</p> <p>It is alarming to hear that the County and Fire District are considering waiving critical fire code requirements for the proposed Harmony Grove Village South development. Approving this project with only one evacuation route in a <i>Very High Fire Severity Zone</i>—a community that has burned repeatedly since the 1980s—is both reckless and dangerous. This area has already suffered significant loss, including the tragic death of a community member who was unable to escape during the Harmony Grove fire.</p>	<p>Response to Late Comment Rel52-1</p> <p>The County appreciates the comments. Please refer to the Responses to Comments provided for late Letter Rel37 regarding concern based on January 2025 fires in Los Angeles, friends who lost homes during the Cocos Fire, perceived waiver of critical fire code requirements, need for secondary access, very high fire hazard severity zones, 1996 tragic loss of a neighbor, Cocos Fire evacuation congestion, concern over additional cars on the roads during evacuation, evacuation timing and rate of fire spread, belief that HGV “would be it” in terms of area development, and request for new review/secondary access, and overall Project opposition.</p>

Rel52-1

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: right;">Comment Letter Rel52</p> <p>Without essential fire safety measures like a secondary evacuation route and expanded road capacity, approving this project puts thousands of lives at risk. What we are witnessing in Los Angeles right now should serve as a dire warning. Ignoring these risks would be unconscionable.</p> <p>During the 2014 Cocos Fire, residents were trapped in standstill traffic on both ends of the valley, with some barely escaping before the fire reached their homes. This was before the original Harmony Grove Village development was even built. Now, with the proposed HGV South project, we could see six times more vehicles attempting to evacuate—approximately 3,500 cars—without any improvements to our evacuation infrastructure. An independent evacuation expert has warned that it could take seven hours to evacuate, while a fire starting within six miles could reach our community in less than two hours.</p> <p>Our community supported the original HGV project because we were assured it would be the last major development in this area due to our limited evacuation routes and high wildfire risk. Yet, just two years later, this new project threatens to undermine those promises and put even more lives in danger.</p> <p>I urge you to vote NO on the Harmony Grove Village South project. At the very least, demand a comprehensive new fire safety analysis and require a secondary evacuation route. Our lives depend on it.</p> <p>Your decision will have lasting consequences for this community. Please choose safety and responsibility.</p> <p>Sincerely, Melissa Rosno Harmony Grove Village Resident Former Los Angeles Resident</p> <p>Sincerely, Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Rel52-1 cont.</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Letter Rel53a</p> <p>From: karsandler <karsandler@yahoo.com> Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2025 6:00 PM To: Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; MontgomerySteppe, Monica <Monica.MontgomerySteppe@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Salazar, Maykent L <MaykentL.Salazar@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Kazmer, Gregory <Gregory.Kazmer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Yuen, Jeffrey <Jeffrey.Yuen@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Henson, Eric <Eric.Henson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; McDonald, Hunter <Hunter.McDonald@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Smith, Rebecca (BOS) <Rebecca.Smith2@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Lynch, Dahvia <Dahvia.Lynch@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Harbert, Amy <Amy.Harbert@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Mecham, Tony@CALFIRE <Tony.Mecham@fire.ca.gov>; Slovick, Mark <Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov>; efngtc@gmail.com; Lorenzana, Bianca <Bianca.Lorenzana@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Montagne, Sarah <montagne@rsf-fire.org>; mcquead@rsf-fire.org; ashcraft@rsf-fire.org; hillgren@rsf-fire.org; malin@rsf-fire.org; stine@rsf-fire.org; palomaguire@gmail.com; jmcann@chulavistaca.gov; district1@chulavistaca.gov; Vivian@vivianmoreno.com; MollyW@sandiego.gov; Weber, Molly <Molly.Weber@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Pallinger, David <David.Pallinger@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Barnhart, Douglas <Douglas.Barnhart@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Edwards, Michael (LUEG) <Michael.Edwards@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Hitzke, Ginger <Ginger.Hitzke@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Ashman, Ronald <Ronald.Ashman@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Calvo, Yolanda <Yolanda.Calvo@sdcounty.ca.gov>; LUEG, PDS.PlanningCommission <PDS.PlanningCommission@sdcounty.ca.gov> Subject: [External] Haven't we learned our lesson? How is SD County waiving fire code for developers in very high wildfire risk areas. Please vote No on HGV South.</p> <p>Honorable Supervisors, Commissioners, Fire District, staff and potential District 1 candidates:</p> <p>Having survived the Cocos Fire that ravaged our fire-prone neighborhood and burned down 30 of my neighbors' homes, I am now witnessing the horrendous situation unfolding in Los Angeles and reliving that trauma every time I turn on the news.</p> <p>To add insult to injury, it is hard to believe that County and Fire District are really considering waiving crucial fire code requirements for the developer of Harmony Grove Village South. It would be insane to allow this project to move forward with only one egress, despite it being in a Very High Fire Severity Zone in a neighborhood that has burned down at least twice a decade since the 1980s. This neighborhood has lost many homes over the years and had a fatality when a community member was killed trying to escape the Harmony Grove fire. It's hard to understand how this project could move forward without adequate fire safety measures in place, something as basic as a secondary evacuation route and expanded road capacity. With what we're seeing in LA, it is unconscionable.</p> <p>The Cocos Fire of 2014 really scared those of us who were around at the time. People were stuck in standstill traffic on both ends of the valley, with some barely making it out before the fire reached their neighborhoods. This was before the Harmony Grove Village (not south) project was even built.</p>	<p>Response to Late Comment Rel53a-1</p> <p>The County appreciates the comments. Please refer to the Responses to Comments provided for late Letter Rel37 regarding prior (Cocos) fire experience, renewed concern based on January 2025 fires in Los Angeles, perceived waiver of fire safety standards, concern over evacuation routes and need for secondary access/egress, very high fire hazard severity zones, loss of neighborhood homes, 1996 tragic loss of a neighbor, adequacy of Proposed Project fire safety measures, Cocos Fire evacuation experience, belief that HGV “would be it” in terms of area development, additional residents/vehicles, potential for increased risk during evacuation, request for new review/secondary access, and overall Project opposition.</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Letter Rel53a</p> <p>Our community dutifully supported HGV (not South) because the County promised us that this would fulfill our obligation to bring housing to our little rural community. Dahvia Lynch, the DCAO of land use and planning today, was the planner at the time and she held visioning workshops and diplomatically brought our community around to supporting a project that would double our population with 742 homes. We were assured by staff and by the Supervisors at the time that, due to the limited evacuation infrastructure and increased wildfire risk, this would be the last big project for a very long while. Not 2 years later, a Colorado billionaire buys up foreclosed land and embarks on a quest to undermine the community for the deceptively named Harmony Grove Village South. Ironically, that same billionaire lost his family home in 2022 during the Marshall fires.</p> <p>If the HGV South project is approved there will be approximately six times more cars evacuating than we saw during Cocos fire, but no new road capacity. Something like 3500 vehicles will pack onto two-lane roads trying to escape a fast moving fire. According to an independent evacuation expert, it would take 7 hours to evacuate the immediate vicinity. A fire starting within 6 miles of us could overwhelm the community in less than 2 hours.</p> <p>Please, the last Board got it wrong. I urge you to vote no on this dangerous project, or at the very least require a thorough new fire safety analysis and demand a secondary egress. Our lives depend on it. When the next fire hits, you, as decision-makers, will live with the consequences of your ultimate decision. It will be your legacy. Let's hope it will be the right legacy.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Sent via the Samsung Galaxy Note9, an AT&T 5G Evolution capable smartphone</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Rel53a-1 cont.</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Letter Rel53b</p> <p>From: karsandler <karsandler@yahoo.com> Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2025 6:01 PM To: Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; MontgomerySteppe, Monica <Monica.MontgomerySteppe@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Salazar, Maykent L <MaykentL.Salazar@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Kazmer, Gregory <Gregory.Kazmer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Yuen, Jeffrey <Jeffrey.Yuen@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Henson, Eric <Eric.Henson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; McDonald, Hunter <Hunter.McDonald@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Smith, Rebecca (BOS) <Rebecca.Smith2@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Lynch, Dahvia <Dahvia.Lynch@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Harbert, Amy <Amy.Harbert@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Mecham, Tony@CALFIRE <Tony.Mecham@fire.ca.gov>; Slovick, Mark <Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov>; efngtc@gmail.com; Lorenzana, Bianca <Bianca.Lorenzana@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Montagne, Sarah <montagne@rsf-fire.org>; mcquead@rsf-fire.org; ashcraft@rsf-fire.org; hillgren@rsf-fire.org; malin@rsf-fire.org; stine@rsf-fire.org; palomaguire@gmail.com; jmcann@chulavistaca.gov; district1@chulavistaca.gov; Vivian@vivianmoreno.com; MollyW@sandiego.gov; Weber, Molly <Molly.Weber@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Pallinger, David <David.Pallinger@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Barnhart, Douglas <Douglas.Barnhart@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Edwards, Michael (LUEG) <Michael.Edwards@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Hitzke, Ginger <Ginger.Hitzke@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Ashman, Ronald <Ronald.Ashman@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Calvo, Yolanda <Yolanda.Calvo@sdcounty.ca.gov>; LUEG, PDS.PlanningCommission <PDS.PlanningCommission@sdcounty.ca.gov> Subject: [External] LA County will be haunted by its bad decisions, will San Diego follow in its footsteps? Don't let developers slide on public safety.</p> <p>Honorable County Supervisors, Fire Officials, Planning Commissioners, and BOS District 1 Candidates:</p> <p>Harmony Grove is a small rural community in the unincorporated County, near Escondido. While scenic, it is in a Very High Fire Severity Zone, surrounded by thousands of acre of flammable landscape. Those of us who live here have faced dozens of evacuations over the years, hundreds of homes lost due to wildfire (Cocos, Harmony Grove, Del Dios to name a few) and unfortunately even fatalities.</p> <p>As we sit here with a red flag warning and warnings of a power shutoff, we are watching what is unfolding in LA County with horror. We see the foreshadowing of the next firestorm that will certainly come our way and wonder what our decision-makers are doing to help keep us safe.</p> <p>When HGV South was first proposed to the County, they were wisely told that a secondary egress was required, to which the developer claimed "it's not feasible." The developer consultants promised "mitigation" that came no where near offering the safety of a secondary egress. They proceeded to exploit the County's limited knowledge of our community and promised an emergency exit through a known dirt trail that is unimproved, strewn with boulders and vegetation and impassable by passenger vehicles. They have no rights to that path, cannot improve it and have no permission to use it.</p>	<p>Response to Late Comment Rel53b-1</p> <p>The County appreciates the comments. Please refer to the Responses to Comments provided for late Letter Rel37 regarding very high fire hazard severity zones, past evacuations and fire-associated deaths, loss of neighborhood homes, renewed concern based on January 2025 fires in Los Angeles, need for secondary access/egress, perceived waiver of fire safety standards, status of and potential use of a dirt road, rate and severity of wildfires, adequacy of Proposed Project fire safety measures, and request for secondary access or rejection of the Project.</p>

Rel53b-1

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: right;">Comment Letter Rel53b</p> <p>Despite having been the subject of numerous successful lawsuits by environmentalists and the community, having their project fully rescinded by the Board, they are back again with the same disingenuous fire safety plan.</p> <p>A lot has happened since 2018. Half of the state's largest fires have occurred since then. The rate and severity of fires has grown exponentially. Two separate, independent fire and evacuation experts have analyzed the evacuation routes and have determined that an entrapment situation is a matter not of "if" but "when." We truly believe our community deserves better than the lip service this developer is giving to our safety.</p> <p>Please reject HGV South or at least demand a secondary egress and improve the little country roads that serve as the evacuation infrastructure. Otherwise, I'm afraid the next fire will be a tragedy of unimaginable proportions.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Sent via the Samsung Galaxy Note9, an AT&T 5G Evolution capable smartphone</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Rel53b-1 cont.</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Letter Rel54a</p> <p>From: Cory Schmelzer <coryschmelzer@gmail.com> Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2025 7:07 PM To: Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; MontgomerySteppe, Monica <Monica.MontgomerySteppe@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Salazar, Maykent L <MaykentL.Salazar@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Kazmer, Gregory <Gregory.Kazmer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Yuen, Jeffrey <Jeffrey.Yuen@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Henson, Eric <Eric.Henson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; McDonald, Hunter <Hunter.McDonald@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Smith, Rebecca (BOS) <Rebecca.Smith2@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Lynch, Dahvia <Dahvia.Lynch@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Harbert, Amy <Amy.Harbert@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Mecham, Tony@CALFIRE <Tony.Mecham@fire.ca.gov>; Slovick, Mark <Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov>; effgtc@gmail.com; Lorenzana, Bianca <Bianca.Lorenzana@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Montagne, Sarah <montagne@rsf-fire.org>; mcquead@rsf-fire.org; ashcraft@rsf-fire.org; hillgren@rsf-fire.org; malin@rsf-fire.org; stine@rsf-fire.org; palomaguirre@gmail.com; jmccann@chulavistaca.gov; district1@chulavistaca.gov; Vivian@vivianmoreno.com; MollyW@sandiego.gov; Weber, Molly <Molly.Weber@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Pallinger, David <David.Pallinger@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Barnhart, Douglas <Douglas.Barnhart@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Edwards, Michael (LUEG) <Michael.Edwards@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Hitzke, Ginger <Ginger.Hitzke@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Ashman, Ronald <Ronald.Ashman@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Calvo, Yolanda <Yolanda.Calvo@sdcounty.ca.gov>; LUEG, PDS.PlanningCommission <PDS.PlanningCommission@sdcounty.ca.gov> Subject: [External] One way out is just not safe. Please force developer of HGV South to build a secondary road. Don't let us get entrapped during the next fire.</p> <p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>I lived through the Cocos Fire and witnessed firsthand how quickly a blaze can tear through our community. Thirty of my neighbors lost their homes. Watching the current devastation in Los Angeles brings back those same fears.</p> <p>It's hard to fathom that the County and Fire District might allow Harmony Grove Village South to move forward with only one exit—even though it's in a Very High Fire Severity Zone that has burned multiple times since the 1980s. One person died attempting to flee the last Harmony Grove fire, and now we risk an even greater tragedy if thousands of residents are trapped during a fast-moving wildfire. With standstill traffic during the 2014 Cocos Fire—and that was before Harmony Grove Village (not South) was built—you can imagine how dire things could become with six times more cars.</p> <p>We were promised that Harmony Grove Village (not South) would meet our housing obligations and that we wouldn't have any more developments jamming 1000's more cars onto our limited rural evacuation route. Yet here we are, discussing a massive new development with no expanded road capacity and no secondary evacuation route. Experts say it could take seven hours to evacuate; a wildfire can arrive in two.</p> <p>I respectfully ask you to reject this proposal, or at least demand a thorough new fire safety analysis and require a secondary egress. When the next fire erupts, your decision today could save—or endanger—thousands of lives.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>	<p>Response to Late Comment Rel54a-1</p> <p>The County appreciates the comments. Please refer to the Responses to Comments provided for late Letter Rel37 regarding Cocos fire experience, loss of neighborhood homes, speed of area burns, renewed concern based on January 2025 fires in Los Angeles, need for secondary access, very high fire hazard severity zones, 1996 tragic loss of a neighbor, additional residents and potential for increased risk during evacuation, Cocos Fire evacuation congestion, belief that HGV “would be it” in terms of area development, concern over additional cars on the roads during evacuation, evacuation timing, request for new review/secondary access, and overall Project opposition.</p>

Rel54a-1

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Letter Rel54b</p> <p>From: Cory Schmelzer <coryschmelzer@gmail.com> Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2025 7:07 PM To: Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; MontgomerySteppe, Monica <Monica.MontgomerySteppe@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Salazar, Maykent L <MaykentL.Salazar@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Kazmer, Gregory <Gregory.Kazmer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Yuen, Jeffrey <Jeffrey.Yuen@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Henson, Eric <Eric.Henson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; McDonald, Hunter <Hunter.McDonald@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Smith, Rebecca (BOS) <Rebecca.Smith2@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Lynch, Dahvia <Dahvia.Lynch@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Harbert, Amy <Amy.Harbert@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Mecham, Tony@CALFIRE <Tony.Mecham@fire.ca.gov>; Slovick, Mark <Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov>; efhtgc@gmail.com; Lorenzana, Bianca <Bianca.Lorenzana@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Montagne, Sarah <montagne@rsf-fire.org>; mcquead@rsf-fire.org; ashcraft@rsf-fire.org; hillgren@rsf-fire.org; malin@rsf-fire.org; stine@rsf-fire.org; palomaguirre@gmail.com; jmccann@chulavistaca.gov; district1@chulavistaca.gov; Vivian@vivianmoreno.com; MollyW@sandiego.gov; Weber, Molly <Molly.Weber@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Pallinger, David <David.Pallinger@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Barnhart, Douglas <Douglas.Barnhart@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Edwards, Michael (LUEG) <Michael.Edwards@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Hitzke, Ginger <Ginger.Hitzke@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Ashman, Ronald <Ronald.Ashman@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Calvo, Yolanda <Yolanda.Calvo@sdcounty.ca.gov>; LUEG, PDS.PlanningCommission <PDS.PlanningCommission@sdcounty.ca.gov> Subject: [External] Will County officials be haunted by their bad decisions? Don't let developers slide on public safety.</p> <p>Dear elected officials and staff:</p> <p>Harmony Grove is a small rural community in the unincorporated County, near Escondido. While scenic, it is in a Very High Fire Severity Zone, surrounded by thousands of acre of flammable landscape. Those of us who live here have faced dozens of evacuations over the years, hundreds of homes lost due to wildfire (Cocos, Harmony Grove, Del Dios to name a few) and unfortunately even fatalities.</p> <p>As we sit here with a red flag warning and warnings of a power shutoff, we are watching what is unfolding in LA County with horror. We see the foreshadowing of the next firestorm that will certainly come our way and wonder what our decision-makers are doing to help keep us safe.</p> <p>When HGV South was first proposed to the County, they were wisely told that a secondary egress was required, to which the developer claimed "it's not feasible." The developer consultants promised "mitigation" that came no where near offering the safety of a secondary egress. They proceeded to exploit the County's limited knowledge of our community and promised an emergency exit through a known dirt trail that is unimproved, strewn with boulders and vegetation and impassable by passenger vehicles. They have no rights to that path, cannot improve it and have no permission to use it.</p> <p>Despite having been the subject of numerous successful lawsuits by environmentalists and the community, having their project fully rescinded by the Board, they are back again with the same disingenuous fire safety plan.</p>	<p>Response to Late Comment Rel54b-1</p> <p>The County appreciates the comments. Please refer to the Responses to Comments provided for late Letter Rel37 regarding very high fire hazard severity zones, past evacuations and fire-associated deaths, loss of neighborhood homes, renewed concern based on January 2025 fires in Los Angeles, need for secondary access/egress, perceived waiver of fire safety standards, status of and potential use of a dirt road, rate and severity of wildfires, adequacy of Proposed Project fire safety measures, request for secondary access or rejection of the Project.</p>

Rel54b-1

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Letter Rel54b</p> <p>A lot has happened since 2018. Half of the state's largest fires have occurred since then. The rate and severity of fires has grown exponentially. Two separate, independent fire and evacuation experts have analyzed the evacuation routes and have determined that an entrapment situation is a matter not of "if" but "when." We truly believe our community deserves better than the lip service this developer is giving to our safety.</p> <p>Please reject HGV South or at least demand a secondary egress and improve the little country roads that serve as the evacuation infrastructure. Otherwise, I'm afraid the next fire will be a tragedy of unimaginable proportions.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <div style="position: relative; height: 150px; margin-top: 20px;"> <div style="position: absolute; top: 0; right: 0; text-align: center;">Rel54b-1</div> <div style="position: absolute; top: 0; right: 0;">↑</div> <div style="position: absolute; bottom: 0; right: 0;">↓</div> </div>	

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: right;">Comment Letter Rel55</p> <p>From: Erin Thomas <erin.weiss@gmail.com> Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2025 12:22 PM To: Erin Thomas <erin.weiss@gmail.com> Subject: [External] Please don't approve HGV South!</p> <p>Honorable Supervisors, Commissioners, Fire District, staff and potential District 1 candidates:</p> <p>I am now witnessing the horrendous situation unfolding in Los Angeles and want to stress the importance of NOT approving the development of HGV South.</p> <p>It is hard to believe that the County and Fire District are really considering waiving crucial fire code requirements for the developer of Harmony Grove Village South. It would be insane to allow this project to move forward with only one egress, despite it being in a Very High Fire Severity Zone in a neighborhood that has burned down at least twice a decade since the 1980s. This neighborhood has lost many homes over the years and had a fatality when a community member was killed trying to escape the Harmony Grove fire. It's hard to understand how this project could move forward without adequate fire safety measures in place, something as basic as a secondary evacuation route and expanded road capacity. With what we're seeing in LA, it is unconscionable.</p> <p>The Cocos Fire of 2014 really scared us. People were stuck in standstill traffic on both ends of the valley, with some barely making it out before the fire reached their neighborhoods. This was before the Harmony Grove Village (not south) project was even built.</p> <p>Our community dutifully supported HGV (not South) because the County promised us that this would fulfill our obligation to bring housing to our little rural community. Dahvia Lynch, the DCAO of land use and planning today, was the planner at the time and she held visioning workshops and diplomatically brought our community around to supporting a project that would double our population with 742 homes. We were assured by staff and by the Supervisors at the time that, due to the limited evacuation infrastructure and increased wildfire risk, this would be the last big project for a very long while. Not 2 years later, a Colorado billionaire buys up foreclosed land and embarks on a quest to undermine the community for the deceptively named Harmony Grove Village South. Ironically, that same billionaire lost his family home in 2022 during the Marshall fires.</p> <p>If the HGV South project is approved there will be approximately six times more cars evacuating than we saw during Cocos fire, but no new road capacity. Something like 3500 vehicles will pack onto two-lane roads trying to escape a fast moving fire. According to an independent evacuation expert, it would take 7 hours to evacuate the immediate vicinity. A fire starting within 6 miles of us could overwhelm the community in less than 2 hours.</p> <p>Please, the last Board got it wrong. I urge you to vote no on this dangerous project, or at the very least require a thorough new fire safety analysis and demand a secondary egress. Our lives depend on it. When the next fire hits, you, as decision-makers, will live with the consequences of your ultimate decision. It will be your legacy. Let's hope it will be the right legacy.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Erin Thomas (homeowner in Harmony Grove Village and mom of two small toddlers who's already terrified of our current evacuation paths, I can't imagine the danger if this new development is approved. Please help me sleep at night.)</p>	<p>Response to Late Comment Rel55-1</p> <p>The County appreciates the comments. Please refer to the Responses to Comments provided for late Letter Rel37 regarding concern based on January 2025 fires in Los Angeles, perceived waiver of fire safety standards, concern over evacuation routes and need for secondary access/egress, very high fire hazard severity zones, loss of neighborhood homes, 1996 tragic loss of a neighbor, adequacy of Proposed Project fire safety measures, prior (Cocos) fire experience, belief that HGV “would be it” in terms of area development, additional residents/vehicles, potential for increased risk during evacuation, Cocos Fire evacuation congestion, request for new review/secondary access, and overall Project opposition.</p>