

COMMENTS

RESPONSES

Comment Letter I28

From: Patrick Molenaar
To: Tracy, Michelle
Cc: Patrick Molenaar
Subject: Harmony Grove Village South
Date: Tuesday, June 20, 2017 4:00:40 PM

Dear Michelle,

I am a long time resident of Harmony Grove. Over 30 years. I have lived here since 1987. We value dark skies, quiet nights, quiet roadways, abundant animal life and neighbors

that take an active part to protect our way of life. I moved out here to get away from people.

We lived with the putrid smell of the chicken farms as a price to never have our way of life intruded upon. We put up with septic tanks and little services from the county or city.

No cell services, no cable, high electric cost because there is no natural gas and bad phone lines. We had to call AT&T after every rain to get service restored. We put up with a

bridge that always floods. We have had many promises to fix it for the last 30 years. ALL promises to rebuild it

by the city and county have been cancelled or pushed out. The funds used other places.

When Escondido city and SD county moved to allow development, we citizens took our time and significant efforts to create a community plan and work with the city, county

and developers to take a share of growth. We didn't sit back and become NIMBYS. We crafted a smart plan designed to allow some controlled growth and preserve our way of

life as much as possible. That plan has been altered, spit on and obliterated. Each developer trying to get more out of our plan than the last.

It has worked. Slowly over time getting amendments to it such as density. Agencies like Ricon del Diablo water working to become a sewer contractor in order to maximise

profits and be a beneficiary of growth. It side steps our planned growth. Every group trying to pervert and extend out our general plan.

When I read the EIR, I noticed my family and address do not appear until the 2000s. However, we are one of the important residents under threat. My address is 2897 Cordrey

Dr.

I was born and raised in San Diego. This was truly America's finest city growing up. We had a southern cal city without the awfulness of Los Angeles. We were a proud city that

fought to stay a large city with a small town feel. Those days have changed thanks to city and county officials becoming builder friendly. Money seems to have become more

important than preserving quality of life. Political careers overriding what is best for the people. See melorros in Eastlake and elsewhere. The services long paid for.

I can only pray that you once knew how incredible San Diego was and can fight to preserve what we have left.

I28-1

Response to Comment I28-1

The County acknowledges the comment and opposition to the Project. While this comment does not raise specific issues regarding the content of the EIR, please see the Global Responses to General Plan/Community Plan Amendments CEQA Impact Analysis and to Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.4.

Consistent with concerns noted at the end of this comment, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires evaluation of the effects of other projects in the area when combined with those of a proposed project. This review is termed the "cumulative impact analysis," and is required during County review. The cumulative projects are introduced in Chapter 1.0, Subchapter 1.7 of the EIR. As the text states:

The State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15355) state that a cumulative impact is "the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the Project when added to other closely related past, present and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects." Sections 15065 and 15130 of the State CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR address cumulative impacts of a project when the project's incremental effects would be cumulatively considerable; i.e., the incremental effects of the project would be "considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects and the effects of probable future projects." Table 1-3, Cumulative Projects in the Vicinity of the Proposed Project, provides a list of cumulative projects within 5 miles of the Project site. Figure 1-23, Cumulative Projects, shows the general location of the projects listed in Table 1-3.

A total of 65 projects in the vicinity of the Proposed Project, as well as the Proposed Project, were considered for the analysis of cumulative impacts. The list consists of projects that are pending or recently approved within the County and other adjacent jurisdictions.

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Comment Letter I28</b></p> <p>These individual EIR reports don't seem to mention the other EIR reports filed for nearby projects or I missed it. When you take a map and link them all together, their collective force on the environment and the public in a condensed area is a crime! Individually they are a crime! They are devised to make the impacts sound minimal and isolate individual projects as having minimal impact on the surrounding lands and residents. What has happened so far in my community has been crime. Here are some of the impacts I have seen since Harmony Grove Village was approved. It's a project very near to this proposed Harmony Grove Village South.</p> <p>The traffic is not only bad but extremely dangerous. We have head on collisions, speeding cars that try to pass on the left as we turn left and pull into driveways and getting Tboned. Multiple single car crashes nearly everyday and unreported to police. Seriously this is no joke! Nearly everyday I have seen drunken drivers taken away out of my driveway in the middle of the afternoon by police and sherriff.</p> <p>Harmony Grove village was an important corridor for animals large and small. It was open, had a stream of its' own, was next to a Escondido creek, provided habitat when other nearby areas burned. When grading began all the animals moved south. During the day, which is highly unusual, we had animals like never before, traversing our properties looking for shelter and a place to hide. Deer were especially affected. They started getting slaughtered on Harmony Grove road in the middle of the day. I never saw that before in 30 years. Coyotes everywhere. I saw fights with multiple coyotes chasing one, in the day time, soon after the grading started. It was coyotes with no home trying to exist around established packs and being run down by coyotes and cars. We have a mountain lion and cubs in our area that are significantly impacted as the corridors are eliminated and the prey gets slaughtered on the road.</p> <p>This is an especially gifted area of San Diego that has features not found in southern California anymore. It's one of the largest watersheds left in San Diego. It links to other preserved areas for wild life and nature lovers. It has a creek and threatened and endangered flora and fauna. Unlike most areas of San Diego. You just don't take an area like that and destroy it with growth. In 50 years this open space will be more prized than anything else because there won't be anymore. They will all be in park like settings.</p> <p>They won't have wildlife because the animals can't survive in small ecosystems that aren't natural ecosystems. They will lack scrub brush and important food sources that support the smallest animals that in turn feed the largest. Deer will be gone for sure, they need grazing areas and Mountain lion can't survive with out corridors to travel in.</p> <p>When you look across the valley and you try to imagine houses it fairly easy to imagine. What you can't imagine is the views are cut off completely. They projects are brought</p>	<p>The combined environmental effect of these projects, as relevant, is addressed specific to topic areas in EIR Chapters 2.0 and 3.0.</p> <p><b>Response to Comment I28-2</b> The EIR analyzes potential Project-related traffic impacts and sets forth mitigation measures for significant impacts. This analysis is detailed in the <i>Traffic Impact Analysis</i> (Appendix D) and Subchapter 2.2, <i>Transportation /Traffic</i>, of the EIR.</p> <p><b>Response to Comment I28-3</b> The EIR analyzes potential Project-related biological resource impacts and sets forth mitigation measures for significant impacts. This discussion is detailed in the <i>Biological Technical Report</i> (Appendix E) and Subchapter 2.3, <i>Biological Resources</i>, of the EIR.</p> <p><b>Response to Comment I28-4</b> The EIR analyzes potential Project-related aesthetic impacts and sets forth mitigation measures for significant impacts This discussion is detailed in the <i>Visual Impact Analysis</i> (Appendix B) and Subchapter 2.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>, of the EIR.</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Comment Letter I28</b></p> <p>50 and 100 feet above road grade. All you see is retaining walls and elevated pads way above the road. You can't even see the houses because of the tall mountains of grade</p> <p>they are put on. It's horrifying. The darkness and peace of night is gone. It breaks my heart when I see a deer with a broken leg being chased unmercifully down the</p> <p>street because there are 8 and 10 ft fences on either side and nowhere to escape for several miles, by uncaring new residents that moved here for the house and could care less</p> <p>about the wild life. They want to poison the coyotes because they just threw their cat out in a traditional coyote hunting ground and are mad it disappeared.</p> <p>I also have a house a 9115 Harmony Grove Rd. The impacts of hardscape and rerouting of rain run off from upstream development has caused my house to flood more than ever</p> <p>before. I have lived here ten years and I have never had this much problem with so little rain. It used to take much more rain and sustained rain to get the flooding I get in a little</p> <p>storm now. The reason has to be Harmony Grove Village.</p> <p>The EIR does not effectively note the impact down stream. When a 1/2 inch of rain comes, I can no longer get in my house due to upstream engineering.</p> <p>Also the developer should never have been allowed to place a sewer plant near the existing homes while shielding the new homes from it's presence. We residents get the</p> <p>unsightly building and all the smell while the new homes it supports get nothing. It too is 100 feet above the road. It's a crime. We get no benefit of services but get all the side</p> <p>effects. The plant failed and sent untreated sewage down stream and ruined our wells with ecoli. This period of discussion needs to be opened up and new EIR impacts need to</p> <p>be dealt with.</p> <p>The EIR doesn't mention my well or my neighbors wells or the pollution affecting them. They are real and so is the pollution of our water.</p> <p>Please find our concerns a top priority and make someone do real time work and not these EIRs that do little to find real problems and impact on existing residents.</p> <p>Regards Paty Molenaar</p>	<p><b>Response to Comment I28-5</b> The FEIR discusses Hydrology and Water Quality in Section 3.1.4, <i>Hydrology /Water Quality</i>, of the EIR, as well as the Technical Appendices M-1 through M-4, <i>CEQA Preliminary Hydrology/Drainage Study</i>, <i>Hydromodification Screening Analysis</i>, <i>Preliminary Hydromodification Management Study</i>, <i>Hydraulic (Floodplain) Analysis for HGV South</i>, and the <i>Priority Development Project Storm Water Quality Management Plan</i> (Appendix N).</p> <p><b>Response to Comment I28-6</b> The Project's water reclamation facility would be state-of-art, as described in Chapter 1.0, <i>Project Description</i>, of the EIR. The water reclamation facility is subject to Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) permits by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) similar to the WDR requirements for existing Harmony Grove Village (HGV) water reclamation plant. Water reclamation facilities are subject to monitoring and reporting program requirements which are intended to ensure the reliability of the operation and maintenance of these facilities and to protect the water quality of receiving waters. It is noted that certain significant storm events may occasionally exceed the capacity of water treatment facilities, resulting in occasional overflows of effluent into receiving waters. These occasions are extremely rare, particularly in San Diego County. Project-related water quality was evaluated in FEIR Section 3.1.4, <i>Hydrology/Water Quality</i>, and all issues were identified as less than significant based on technical data provided in EIR technical appendices M-1, <i>the CEQA Preliminary Hydrology/ Drainage Study</i>; M-4, <i>the Hydraulic (Floodplain) Analyses for HGV South</i>; and N, the <i>Priority Development Project Storm Water Quality Management Plan</i>.</p> <p><b>Response to Comment I28-7</b> While the comment does not raise any specific issue regarding content in the EIR, it is noted that the EIR discusses both groundwater availability and water quality in Section 3.1.4, <i>Hydrology/Water Quality</i>. Regarding the potential for drawdown (impacts on groundwater availability), as stated in the FEIR:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Domestic water supplies for the Proposed Project would be obtained from the Rincon MWD, with no groundwater use proposed for domestic or other purposes. As previously</i></p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
	<p><i>noted, implementation of the Proposed Project would result in the addition of approximately 38 acres of impervious surfaces in the form of pavement and structures. As a result, approximately 73 acres (or approximately 66 percent) of the site would remain pervious, including areas such as open space, landscaping, and unlined drainage facilities (refer to Figures 1-6a and 1-13). Based on these conditions, as well as the fact that virtually all areas proposed for development currently encompass Hydrologic Group C or D soils (with low or very low water transmission rates; PDC 2017b), infiltration of surface flows and related recharge capacity within the Project site are anticipated to exhibit a only a relatively minor reduction compared to existing conditions.</i></p> <p><i>Project construction may also require localized extraction/disposal of shallow groundwater to accommodate activities such as grading and excavation. Because shallow groundwater is limited to the northernmost portion of the site, however (as described above in Section 3.1.4.1), construction-related dewatering is anticipated to be minor in extent and short-term in duration (refer also to the related discussion of potential groundwater extraction and associated water quality requirements below in this section under Guideline Nos. 8 through 11).</i></p> <p><i>Based on the above considerations, Project-related impacts associated with drawdown of local groundwater aquifers or reductions in local groundwater well yields would be less than significant (EIR pg. 3.1.4-19).</i></p> <p>Relative to water quality, the section’s introduction says:</p> <p><i>Potential Project-related water quality impacts are associated with both short-term construction activities and long-term operation and maintenance. Project-related activities that could potentially result in direct effects to groundwater quality are limited to the percolation of</i></p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
	<p data-bbox="1188 167 1877 264"><i>Project-related surface runoff and associated pollutants (e.g., in pervious portions of the proposed storm drain system) (EIR pg. 3.1.4-21).</i></p> <p data-bbox="1075 293 1990 472">The EIR reviews both types of effects between pages 19 and 26 of the section, with discussions including (but not limited to) construction controls, disposal of shallow groundwater during construction, long-term maintenance and operations, site design and source control best management practices, etc. The conclusion in the FEIR Section 3.1.4.5 states:</p> <p data-bbox="1188 513 1877 873"><i>Based on the discussions provided above, potential Project-specific and cumulative hydrology and water quality impacts associated with implementation of the Proposed Project would be effectively avoided or reduced below identified significance guidelines through implementation of recommendations provided in the Project Drainage Study, HMS [Hydromodification Study], Hydraulic (Floodplain) Analyses and SWQMP [Storm Water Quality Management Plan], as well as conformance with established regulatory requirements (EIR pg. 3.1.4-29).</i></p> <p data-bbox="1075 906 1990 1008">This information indicates that potential Project effects on area wells would be less than significant as a matter of site design and mandatory regulation and ordinance compliance.</p>