		Response to Comment Letter C6
From: morgan 7070/80cox.net To: CAP: Soffel, Maggie Subject: CAP Climate Action Flan Date: Monday, September 25, 2017 2:38:21 PM Attachments: CAP Climate Action Flan.odf	Letter C6	Bonsall Community Sponsor Group Margarete Morgan, Chair
Thank you for the opportunity to provide our comments.		September 25, 2017
Margarete Morgan, Chair Bonsall Sponsor Group		

BONSALL COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

Dedicated to enhancing and preserving a rural lifestyle



September 25, 2017

Via email (CAP@sdcounty.ca.gov)

Ms. Maggie Soffel Land Use/Environmental Planner San Diego County Planning & Development Services 5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310 San Diego, CA 92123

Dear Ms. Soffel,

The Bonsall Sponsor Group appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the County's draft Climate Action Plan (CAP).

We appreciate the County's efforts to reduce GHG emissions and comply with state laws aimed at reducing GHG emissions. Fighting climate change is an important mission for the local, national, and international leaders of this generation. We are happy to offer comments with specific emphasis on our unique location in a very rural area that borders one of the region's primary transportation routes in Interstate 15.

C6-1

We understand that a large portion of the County's estimated GHG emissions come from the transportation sector. We encourage the County to focus on policies in the CAP aimed at reducing leapfrog development with a major reliance on vehicles and on limiting the length of vehicle trips. Land use decisions play an important role in decreasing transportation emissions. The CAP should consider the role land use decisions play in ensuring the County reduces emissions from the transportation sector. As a rural community, we understand that sprawl development would increase GHG emissions contrary to the goals of the CAP. We encourage the County to include requirements in the CAP that would prevent sprawl development in Bonsall Sponsor Group and other rural areas that would increase GHG emissions.

C6-2

What proposals in the CAP address sprawl development? What requirements do other counties and cities have that reduce GHG emissions from sprawl development, and were these studied as part of the CAP? Why were any such proposals included or not included in the CAP?

C6-3



http://www.bcsg.org



- **C6 -1:** The comment provides an introductory statement and emphasizes support for County's efforts to reduce GHG emissions. No further response is required.
- **C6-2:** The comment expresses concern that the CAP should include policies which are more focused on limiting vehicle miles associated with new development and sprawling development patterns. Please refer to response to comment C4-3.
- C6-3: The comment asks what proposals in the CAP address sprawl development, what other agencies have included to address sprawl development, and why those measures were not included in the CAP. Please refer to response to comment C4-4

BONSALL COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

Dedicated to enhancing and preserving a rural lifestyle



C6-4

C6-5

C6-6

C6-7

C6-8

A target of 40% water reduction seems unrealistic as a typical rural CAP strategy. Please explain how reducing water use will decrease GHG emissions and how this strategy impacts the CAP.

Please explain how the Agriculture Conservation Easement Program would lead to GHG reduction. There needs to be a better explanation of how these strategies tie to the goals of the CAP.

How do you develop a Transit Village in a rural area? And how does this not encourage cluster and/or leap frog development?

How does the CAP address the number of vehicles? Where in the County are public charging stations being placed? This needs to be shown on a map in the CAP.

As traffic congestion increase over the near future, so will the GHG emissions, this assumption was not addressed nor did the CAP address how the GHG from automobiles and trucks will be measured. The CAP listed various strategies but failed to connect those dots with the goals of the CAP. It was poorly written and difficult to follow the various recommendations.

Thank you for your efforts to reduce GHG emissions.

Sincerely,

Margarette Morgan, Chair Bonsall Community Sponsor Group



http://www.bcsg.org



- C6-4: This comment appears to express concern regarding GHG Reduction Measure W-1.2 and whether it is realistic to achieve a 40% reduction in outdoor water use for landscaping. Please refer to response to comment C4-5.
- C6-5: This comment requests additional clarification regarding how the Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easement (PACE) Program (GHG Reduction Measure T-1.2) would lead to future GHG emissions reductions. Please refer to response to comment C4-6.
- C6-6: The comment questions how a transit village could be developed in a rural area. It is unclear what is meant by the comment. The Draft CAP does not identify any reduction strategies that would develop transit villages in rural areas. This comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft SEIR and no further response is required.
- **C6-7:** The comment requests more information regarding the placement of future public electric vehicle stations and the number of vehicles being accounted for. Please refer to response to comment C4-8.
- C6-8: This comment requests clarification regarding the methodology for measuring future GHG emissions related to future on-road vehicles. Please refer to response to comment C4-9. The comment also states the CAP is not clear and does not describe how the strategies will meet the goals. The County disagrees with the commenter's opinion. Please refer to response to comment C4-10.