

Response to Comment Letter I79

**Karen Binns
September 25, 2017**

Letter
179

From: Royalviewranch@aol.com
To: [CAB](#)
Subject: Climate Action Plan DEIR comments
Date: Sunday, September 24, 2017 2:05:34 PM
Attachments: [Climate Action Plan DEIR my comments.doc](#)

Maggie, Attached are my comments on the Plan. Thank you. Karen Binns
p.s. Can you acknowledge receipt, please?

September 24, 2017

Karen Binns
 2637 Deer Springs Place
 San Marcos, CA 92069-9761
 760-744-5916
rovalviewranch@aol.com

San Diego County Planning & Development Services
 5510 Overland Avenue
 Suite 310
 San Diego, CA 92123

RE: County of San Diego Climate Action Plan, General Plan Amendment, Draft SEIR

Dear Maggie Soffel,

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment on the Draft SEIR for the County's Climate Action Plan.

179-1

I live in Twin Oaks Valley, yet Twin Oaks does not have a Community Plan. Our Sponsor Group has requested help with this several times a year for several years now. We have a huge development proposed for our area (Newland Sierra, 2135 homes) and your SEIR states that Community Plans **"identifies an area to which development should be directed"**. How can a development of this size be approved without a Community Plan? How can they see if the development goes along with the wishes of the community without a Community Plan?

179-2

Newland Sierra is considered "sprawl development" in the eyes of the community.

Traffic is the biggest cause of Climate Change. There are too many people and not enough roads. The freeways here in this area are clogged as they are all over San Diego, yet they want to build more and more homes. The homes they are building are not "affordable homes", so why build them? California is taxing the people out of this state, with the exorbitant gas taxes, etc. In 5 years there will be a glut of homes in San Diego County.

179-3

All this traffic is what contributes the most to greenhouse gases. All this idling in traffic, gridlock, etc. This is the problem.

- 179-1** The comment provides introductory remarks and no further response is required.
- 179-2** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter about a project in the Twin Oaks Valley area that is currently under review by the County. This comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft SEIR and no further response is required. However, the comment will be included in the Final EIR and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- 179-3** The comment provides commentary on the role of traffic in exacerbating climate change. This comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft SEIR, and no further response is required. However, the comment will be included in the Final EIR and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the project.

Your Climate Action Plan was confusing at best. How does water conservation help Climate Change? There was a request for a 40% reduction in water usage. I have no idea what water conservation has to do with a Climate Action Plan. I 179-4

What does the Agricultural Conservation Easement Program (PACE) have to do with Climate Change? If agriculture uses more water, then how can PACE help if the easement will continue to be used for agriculture? I 179-5

The SEIR/DEIR lists Live Well San Diego, Food System Initiative, the MSCP program, etc. What on earth does this have to do with greenhouse gases and Climate Change? The dots need to be connected and the reasons that these programs are included as part of the CAP needs to be disclosed and explained as to how this all ties in together. There was even a paragraph on Equity and Social Well-Being. It just makes no sense to me. I 179-6

How is a Transit Village possible in a rural area? I 179-7

I find the Climate Action Plan extremely hard to follow its logic. I think it needs to be re written. I 179-8

Thank you for allowing me to comment on this matter.

Sincerely,

Karen Binns

179-4 The comment questions how water conservation helps climate change. The role of water conservation in reducing GHG emissions is described on pages 3-64 through 3-75 of the Draft CAP. Water conservation reduces GHG emissions in a number of ways including reducing the amount of energy consumed to move raw water from the source (i.e., less water needs to be moved), reducing the energy needed to treat raw water for use in residential neighborhoods (i.e., less water to be treated), and by reducing the energy needed to treat wastewater prior to disposal (i.e., less wastewater generated because less water consumed). This comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft SEIR and no further response is required.

179-5 This comment questions how the PACE is related to climate change. The role of agricultural conservation is discussed on pages 3-12 and 3-13 of the Draft CAP. Agriculture preservation can reduce GHG emissions through a variety of activities that yield different reduction values depending on the type and intensity of the preserved agricultural use and the amount of development potential that is offset. By preserving lands in more remote areas and avoiding development, the County would avoid GHG emissions from transportation and energy use and reduce VMT. In addition, GHG emissions would be avoided because water and wastewater would not be conveyed to these more remote areas.

With regard to water demands associated with agricultural operations, for a significant portion of existing agricultural lands, fruit orchards and avocado stands are the primary agricultural product and are significant sources of carbon sequestration within soils. Further, these uses require substantially less water than potential residential or commercial development that would be avoided through permanent preservation. Finally, the CAP includes GHG Reduction Strategy A-1.1 and A-1.2 (starting on page 3-78 of the Draft CAP) would encourage the conversion of farm equipment and irrigation pumps to electric, which would reduce the consumption of fossil fuels and associated GHG emissions. In general, the preservation of existing agricultural uses would reduce GHG emissions over the long-term scenario. Please

	<p>see Appendix C to the CAP for the assumptions that more fully describe how the GHG reductions were calculated. Also, see response to comment C4-6.</p> <p>I79-6 The comment questions how various County-led initiatives contribute to GHG emissions reductions. The topics of Live Well San Diego, Food System Initiative, and the MCSP program are listed on page 5 prior to the Table of Contents and further described on page ES-2 of the CAP. As described throughout the CAP, most of the GHG Reduction Measures that the County is considering have co-benefits; in addition to reducing GHG emissions, they would also result in additional benefits beyond GHG emissions reductions. It is common to see sustainability efforts (such as the Live Well San Diego, and Food System Initiative) which are actions that may reduce resource consumption, or improve resiliency, be included in a CAP because climate change-related weather events can cause food system disruptions which tend to adversely affect disadvantaged communities disproportionately.</p> <p>I79-7 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.</p> <p>I79-8 The comment provides concluding comments regarding the CAP and expresses the opinions of the commenter. No further response is required.</p>
--	--