

LETTER

RESPONSE

Letter I32

From: Jack Fox [mailto:fordtrk56@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 25, 2014 8:21 AM
To: Slovick, Mark
Subject: Re: Nelson Way access

Comments to the Lilac Hills Ranch new DEIR.....6/25/2014

- 1...Are all the county departments,its employees and its legal team associated with this development including the Board of Supervisors ready,willing and able to accept total financial and moral responsibility for any lives lost during a fire and evacuation?
2...How will the Alzheimer patients be protected from smoke inhalation during a fire if the have to remain "in place"?
3...How does the county plan to address the lack of adequate fire escape routes as well as fire equipment access routes to this project in the event of a catastrophic fire such as we had recently north of Old Hwy 395 and in other areas of the north county?
4...Will the W Lilac bridge be expanded by this developer?
5...How can the county's traffic engineer make a statement,such as he did on 6/17/2014 at the public hearing in Valley Center's Library,that the county has no interest in this project pro or con when Chris, at this same meeting, stated the county has provided ALTERNATIVE options to the developer,one of which would be to seize private property through eminent domain for Mountain Ridge Rd to become a public road?
6...If a private sewer treatment plant is built in this project how and where would the solid waste to be disposed of or would this be considered a mitigated matter?
7..Will ANY Tax Payer dollars be used in any way to finance or purchase any property for mitigation of on site facilities,off site improvements of any nature such as roads,water,power,sewer,fire stations?
8...If the Valley Center Fire Protection District does not have the necessary finances to staff any new fire stations to facilitate this development,how does the county plan to address this situation?

Respectfully submitted,
John E. Fox
8612 Nelson Way
Escondido,ca. 92026

On Mon, Jun 23, 2014 at 1:07 PM, Jack Fox <fordtrk56@gmail.com> wrote:
Thanks..I will be emailing my concerns about this development in the coming weeks
On Mon, Jun 23, 2014 at 1:03 PM, Slovick, Mark <Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov> wrote:

Hi Jack,

No, the project does not propose to use Nelson Way for access to the development. The EIR does not include an alternative with Nelson Way as access to the development.

Please let me know if you have any other questions.

Thanks, Mark

I32-1 The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding the adequacy of the environmental document. Fire safety is discussed in subchapter 2.7 of the FEIR. See response to comment I26-1 that provides details of the Fire Protection Plan (Appendix J) and Evacuation Plan (Appendix K).

I32-2 Implementation of a memory care facility would require approval of a future Major Use Permit, which would include future site-specific review for wildfire hazards. This type of facility is required to maintain a disaster and evacuation plan as part of its licensing requirements under the California Department of Social Services. A facility specific emergency response plan would address the potential hazards and measures needed to ensure safety of elderly residents.

I32-3 The Evacuation Plan (Appendix K) of the FEIR does include multiple components intended to create an orderly and safe evacuation of the project site in time of emergency. As discussed in subchapter 2.7 of the FEIR, the Evacuation Plan provides evacuation routes, evacuation points, and implementation of a resident awareness and education program to keep future residents and employees informed about what to do if a wildfire occurs and to ensure safety at a time of evacuation.

In addition to the education materials that will be provided to all residents and businesses which includes the implementation of a "Ready, Set, Go" Program, the Evacuation Plan includes both primary and secondary evacuation routes for use during an emergency. The evacuation routes include project egress at multiple locations, directing traffic as shown in Figure 2.7-3 of the FEIR. As shown highlighted in red on Figure 2.7-3, primary evacuation routes consist of Main Street, Street "Z," Lilac Hills Ranch Road, Covey Lane and Mountain Ridge Road. Additionally, the project site would also be served by secondary emergency evacuation routes using Street "F" and Birdsong Drive on the north and Rodriguez Road in the south. Specifically, exiting Mountain Ridge Road would provide access to Circle R Drive with a direct connection to Old Highway 395.

All roads proposed for use during an evacuation would be constructed to Consolidated Fire Code standards which allow for emergency equipment to utilize the roads simultaneously with evacuating residents.

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>I32-4 The widening of the West Lilac bridge is not proposed as part of this project. However, the project will add a sidewalk to one side of the bridge. Additionally, the project will make frontage improvements along its property and intersection improvements at West Lilac Road and Old Highway 395.</p> <p>I32-5 CEQA requires an EIR to describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project (CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6) Chapter 4.0 of the FEIR includes eight alternatives. Each alternative proposes a potential alternative to the project ranging from no development (Alternative 1) to all characteristics being the same except for the location of the fire station and widening of Mountain Ridge Road to public road standards (Alternative 8).</p> <p>These alternatives permit informed decision making because there is enough variation amongst the alternatives that provide a reasonable range. See Tables 4-1 through 4-7 of the FEIR for a comparison of the alternatives component features and merits of each.</p> <p>The balance of the comment does not identify inadequacies with the environmental document. See response to comment I27-5 related to the issue of Eminent Domain.</p> <p>I32-6 The sewer treatment plant would be a public facility (not private) owned and operated by the Valley Center Municipal Water District. Subchapter 3.1.7 of the FEIR discusses sewer treatment for the project. The construction of an on-site water reclamation facility (WRF) with solid treatment is one of four possible options. As discussed in the Wastewater Management Alternatives Report (Appendix S of the FEIR), solid waste would be disposed of in a landfill. Complete details associated with all wastewater treatment options are found in Chapter 4.0 and Appendix S of the FEIR.</p> <p>I32-7 All land required for mitigation would be financed by the applicant.</p> <p>I32-8 Refer to the Global Response: Fire and Medical Services included in the introduction to these responses to comments.</p>
--	--

LETTER

RESPONSE

**From:** Jack Fox [mailto:[fordtrk56@gmail.com](mailto:fordtrk56@gmail.com)]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 23, 2014 12:37 PM  
**To:** Slovick, Mark  
**Subject:** Nelson Way access

Jack Fox here....I wish to inquire about a rumor I heard that Accretive is attempting,planning,talking about or has made conversation with others regarding utilizing Nelson Way as another ALTERNATIVE to gain access to the proposed development..Please expand on this subject



I32-9

I32-9 Nelson Way is not proposed as an access point for the proposed project. The FEIR addresses the potential use of Nelson Way as a secondary evacuation route. As stated in subchapter 2.7 of the FEIR, there is the potential to coordinate with the Deer Springs Fire protection District and the San Diego County Water Authority to utilize Nelson Way in the event of an emergency situation. The project's Evacuation Plan, Appendix K of the FEIR, also indicates Nelson Way could potentially be used as an evacuation route.