The County acknowledges these introductory comments; however, they do not raise an issue concerning the environmental analysis or adequacy of the EIR. Please see the responses below to specific comments.

Response to Comment I23-2
It is acknowledged that the Project exceeds the number of lots (approximately 220) allowed for the site under the 2011 General Plan land use designations. Even with this increased density, the Project is considered consistent with community character. Please see the Global Response to Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.4.

Response to Comment I23-3
Although community character is mentioned, this comment focuses on fire evacuation. For that reason, the remainder of this response focuses on fire evacuation and secondary access. Please see the Global Responses to Fire Hazards Impact Analysis and Adequacy of Emergency Evacuation and Access.

Response to Comment I23-4
Please see the Global Responses to Fire Hazards Impact Analysis and Adequacy of Emergency Evacuation and Access.
Response to Comment I23-5
The comment requests review of a recent fire and evacuation in Portugal. A comparison between Portugal and Harmony Grove Village South is not valid as the factors and conditions related to each location are different or unknown. For example, the wildfire in Portugal had different roadway conditions, evacuation process, emergency management oversight, wildland fuels, number of persons and vehicles, distance to safe areas, and options for temporarily refuging on-site. The Portugal wildfire was burning in eucalyptus and pine forest, which would produce a much more aggressive fire than the coastal sage scrub and grasslands around the Project site and larger Harmony Grove Valley. Many other fire protection features built into the Project and measures routinely enacted by emergency personnel in San Diego County are not available and were not employed in the Portugal fire. Therefore, neither the Fire Protection Plan (FPP) or EIR was revised to include this information.

Response to Comment I23-6
The County acknowledges this comment and its opposition to the Project. This comment does not raise specific issues regarding the substantive environmental analysis conducted within the EIR. The comment will be included as part of the administrative record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the Proposed Project. No additional response is required.