

Draft Responses to Comment Letter LL

Individual  
 Katherine S. Stewart  
 March 19, 2013

	Comment	Response to Comment
LL -1	Although the comment period ended yesterday for the draft Supplemental EIR for the FCI GPA, I wish to weigh in with a brief comment based on advice on the subject that I have received from several sources.	The County acknowledges and appreciates this comment although is arrived after the deadline for public review. The information in this comment will be in the Final SEIR for review and consideration by the County Board of Supervisors.
LL -2	If the FCI GPA had applied the Guiding Principles of the adopted General Plan to these inholdings, the result would not have resembled the Project that is proposed in the Supplemental EIR. The Proposed Project would significant intensify development in high fire hazard zones in remote, dispersed locations, where public services would be very expensive to provide and where as a result the risks to anyone building there are beyond reasonable fire risk reduction by such public services. This includes proposing building a new 'village' in the Alpine boundaries, which are scattered widely among very rugged and wild landscapes of National Forest Land.	The County acknowledges the concerns expressed by this comment that the Draft Plan (SEIR Proposed Project) would intensify development in high fire hazard zones in remote, dispersed locations. To ensure consistency with the General Plan Guiding Principles, a Staff Recommendation land use was developed that further considered the physical and environmental constraints in the project area. The staff recommendation proposes reduced densities in the remote areas of Alpine, Dulzura, Pendleton-DeLuz, and Palomar Mountain compared to the densities proposed by the Draft Plan. However, the Staff Recommendation does include a new village in Alpine. The County does not agree with the characterization of the proposed village as “scattered widely among very rugged and wild landscapes of National Forest Land.” The areas with proposed village densities are not adjacent to National Forest lands and are bordered by Interstate 8, the Viejas Reservation, and Rural Commercial-designated lands. In addition, in August 2007 the Board of Supervisors directed staff to prepare a special study to evaluate this area due to the proximity (approximately 1,000 feet) of non-tribal semi-rural residential development to the

**Draft Responses to Comments**

	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response to Comment</b>
		tribal gaming facilities, and the impacts to those residents from the gaming facilities. The staff recommendation in this area is the result of a planning process involving multiple stakeholders including Community Planning Group representatives, study area residents, along with a representative from Viejas. This area has excellent direct access to Interstate 8 and is easily accessible from the larger Alpine Village. In addition, the higher density development makes the expansion of imported water and sanitary sewer services more feasible.
<b>LL -3</b>	The environmentally superior or "Modified" Alternative is a much better Alternative because only it follows the General Plan Guiding Principles by minimizing development in intact biological habitat, in high fire hazard zones, and in remote, dispersed locations away from infrastructure and services.	The County acknowledges support for the Environmentally Superior or "Modified" Alternative. With the exception of the new village discussed in response to comment LL-2 above, the Staff Recommendation land use map is very similar to the Environmentally Superior alternative. Ultimately, the County Board of Supervisors will make the final decision as to the appropriate land use designations and will consider all information in the Final EIR and related documents before making a decision on the project.
<b>LL -4</b>	Please include these comments in the Administrative Record.	The information in this comment will be in the Final SEIR for review and consideration by the County Board of Supervisors.