

COMMENTS

RESPONSES

Dear Ms. Ehsan:

First, I want to thank you and your colleagues at Planning and Development Services for all the time and work you've put into reviewing the Valiano project. It really means a great deal to our community and appreciate that you are giving it the due diligence it deserves. My name is Leslie Caskey and I've lived at 2703 El Rocko Road in Harmony Grove since 1986 when I bought my property and built my modest custom home and moved my horses here.

As you know, the project, as proposed, threatens to destroy the wonderful community we are part of and that has existed, undisturbed for over 125 years. It is a unique and special place in San Diego County, the last of its kind west of the 15, I'm afraid. I am taking the opportunity to provide my comments on the Draft EIR for this project in the hopes that the developer will seek to follow the vision of the General Plan and that of the Community.

The following are my major concerns with the project:

• **General Plan Update:** In the 2000s, the County staff and many members of our community (upwards of 60+ over many many meetings) collaborated on the General Plan Update and it was decided that our community should take "our share of density" to accommodate the growth that SD County would experience over the next 20 years. This is where the Community Development Model was implemented where our share of this density would form part of a denser village and then the density would feather outwards away from the village limit line, in order to protect the rural nature and the values of our community. *We agreed with this compromise.* This project violates that compromise and it violates the Community Development Model as it creates higher density outside the village core after the "feathering out" has occurred. This is significant.

• **Harmony Grove Village:** Then came New Urban West proposing a massive development. I was part of the community group that worked with them over several years to come up with a project that fits in with the Community Development Model and our community plan previously elaborated with County Staff. It fulfilled our obligation to accept our fair share of density and growth in San Diego County. We played fair because that is who we are. We are not NIMBYS who reject any and all application. HGV is a clear example of that. AND, it maintained the Community Development model by keeping density in "the village" and feathering out with lower density the further you get away from the village. In fact, the lots to the north of HGV right next to Valiano's proposed area, are large lots (some as big as 10-20 acres), as are virtually every surrounding property to Valiano. The majority of the properties are 1 acre or more. So Valiano violates the word AND the spirit of our community plan and the compromise we made by clustering houses closely together in very high density clusters. To approve this increase in density would be a slap in the face to the community and, frankly, would destroy any trust our community (and many others) have in our County administration.

• **NC17:** This property had already received an up zone from SR2 to SR1. Then they came back in front of the BOS to ask for yet another up zone to SR0.5. This time, the BOS denied them for the reasons mentioned above: it violates the CDM, this community has already accepted its fair share and it violates the spirit of the agreement we made with county during the general plan process. Now, they are trying a third time to get an up zone. Nothing has changed on the ground since it was rejected the last time. The same logic applies and BOS should not approve this up zone for the same reasons as before. I find it very disturbing that a developer can come in and request rezoning and that the residents who have been here for so long have to continue fighting to maintain the rural atmosphere we moved here to experience.

• **Community Plan:** Our community plan calls for a rural community with rural zoning and rural environment. The applicant claims it is a semi-rural development and claim to have rural themes. If houses tightly clustered together, with 1000 foot walls, 20 feet high, manufactured slopes, street lights, fencing and gates and cul-de-sacs can be defined as rural, I think they are

AF-1 Thank you for your introductory comment. This comment indicates that the Project would threaten to destroy the community (character); please note that the EIR analysis does not come to the same conclusion. Your hope for the developer to follow the vision of the General Plan is hereby included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Project.

AF-2 This is a repeat of comment AD-2. See Response AD-2.

AF-3 This is a repeat of comment AD-3. See Response AD-3.

AF-4 This comment is substantially similar to comment AD-4. See Responses AD-4.

AF-5 This comment is substantially similar to comment AD-5. See Response AD-5.

COMMENTS

RESPONSES

AF-5 cont. looking at the wrong dictionary. Please, look "rural" up in the dictionary. For me, rural means... [INSERT MORE OF WHAT RURAL MEANS TO YOU PERSONALLY, EG RANCH FENCING, BARN, OPEN SPACE, WILDLIFE, ANIMAL SMELLS, SOUNDS ETC.] Valiano is none of these things. Not only is this a significant impact but it is an existential impact: our community would be destroyed if Orange County-style developments like Valiano are squeezed into our little bucolic valley.

AF-6 • **Septic:** Our community plan calls for septic, not sewage treatment plants (again, not rural). The Valiano plan would place a sewage treatment plan directly in front of my property destroying the view of the valley that I love to observe with a glass of wine on my deck in the evening.

Fire Safety Examples:

AF-7 I am very concerned about the impacts that this project will have on my safety and those of my community. I have evacuated twice and almost had to evacuate two other times since I have been here. During the Cocos fire, we had to battle traffic to finally leave our home – it was frightening to say the least.

• From the DEIR it is clear that they have not taken into account the most recent fire, Cocos Fire. [INSERT PERSONAL ANECDOTE ABOUT THE FIRE]. The DEIR states most fires come from the East, when the last few fires, including Coco's came from the West.

AF-8 • The 326 houses proposed will make evacuation a very difficult proposition. The DEIR does not show how evacuation will proceed during a wildfire event. The only egress, Country Club Road, will be at LOS F (according to the DEIR) and evacuation on this two lane road will be hazardous and create a fire trap. The people who do not live in the community and who came to gawk at the fire and those of us trying to get our animals to safety caused a huge problem. Adding the additional vehicles from this new development would cause deadlock and is a huge concern. Country Club is only a 2 lane road. It is facing evacuation traffic from 742 houses at HGV, 325 houses at Valiano in addition to the trailers for upwards of 180 horses in Eden Valley as well as the many looky lous who were parked all along the road, semi-blocking it.

AF-9 • The Fire Protection Plan (FPP) makes no mention of evacuating horse trailers and how that would impact evacuation. Please address this. We have twice as many horses in Eden Valley than we have houses. Trailers are slow, hard to maneuver, big and, importantly very hard to load animals on to. There is only one way out of that valley: Country Club Road towards Autopark way. If the fire comes west, like it did during Cocos there will be a massive traffic jam (LOS F means bumper to bumper traffic in non-evacuation circumstances) that could doom residents to a death trap. This is significant and not mitigated.

AF-10 • Additionally, they are increasing our risks by asking for (and have already received) a variance on road width on Hill Valley because they don't have easements to widen it. It is not wide enough for two fire trucks to pass side by side. SMFD gives them the variance, but other FD will likely respond (and deal with the safety consequences). **This puts us at more risk as firetrucks will have reduction of access to Hill Valley Road.**

AF-11 • Lastly, the FPP focuses exclusively on the impacts to the project but no reference to how it will jeopardize the wellbeing and safety of existing community.

Traffic Examples:

• [SEE EVACUATION ISSUES ABOVE]

AF-6 See Topical Responses: Sewer, and General Plan Amendment and Subarea Boundary Change CEQA Analysis, and Responses G-3 and G-7 for discussion of the EFHGCP's direction regarding septic.

Based on review of Google Earth, your property is located approximately 0.1 mile northeasterly from the proposed WTWRP. Views to the facility would be lateral. The entire footprint of the WTWRP would be smaller than 0.4 acre, which would include ponds and the small structure. As described in Subsection 1.2.1.1 of the EIR in the discussion of "Wastewater Treatment and Water Reclamation Facility, architectural design would include a building not to exceed 20 feet in height and which would be designed to mimic rural ranch styling. Please see the text excerpt from EIR Subchapter 2.1, Subsection 2.1.2.1 under the discussion of "Massing and Scale" describing the WTWRP in Response U-2a.

Elements that reduce visual effects from Country Club Drive also would be expected to minimize visual effects from your residence. The lateral nature of the view, and the intervening home to the west of your residence, as well as the taller vegetation associated with the Neighborhood Park planned for this area, and located immediately north of the WTWRP also would play a part (see VIA Figure 6 and EIR Figure 1-12). The screening provided by the roadside vegetation, combined with the ground-level nature of most of the facilities and the rustic architecture required for structures would result in this industrial feature blending with the agribusiness endeavors in the area, as well as the abutting existing equestrian facility.

AF-7 This comment is substantially similar to comment AD-7. See Topical Response: Fire/Evacuations regarding fire evacuation and Response AD-7 regarding treatment of the Cocos Fire in the FPP.

AF-8 This comment is substantially similar to comment AD-8 but adds that there were onlookers contributing to the traffic problem. See Topical Response: Fire/Evacuations. The bad decisions people make to insert themselves into a disaster area cannot be anticipated in a CEQA analysis. Therefore, no response is provided.

AF-9 This comment is a repeat of comment AD-9. See Response AD-9.

AF-10 This is a repeat of comment AD-11. See Response AD-11.

AF-11 This comment is a repeat of comment AD-13. See Response AD-13.

COMMENTS

RESPONSES

- AF-12 [
 - No analysis was made of the traffic heading West towards Elfin Forest Road. We know, from observation, that the traffic flow is more than 6% as stated in the DEIR. There is also a bottle neck at San Elijo Road.
- AF-13 [
 - The intersection of Country Club and Autopark Way (the main ingress and egress of the project) is already majorly congested. Even now, without HGV built out, we sometimes have to wait two light cycles just to turn left onto Auto Park Way. What's going to happen when all the houses from HGV and Valiano go in? This is an unacceptable, unmitigated impact.
- AF-14 [
 - Furthermore, when the Sprinter comes by every 30 minutes (and soon, it will come every 15 minutes, according to NCT) it becomes even more congested. This impact is significant and unmitigated properly in the plan.
- AF-15 [
 - Citracado Parkway has not been funded yet and there is no indication as to when it might come online. The traffic study doesn't reflect that correctly.
- AF-16 [
 - The sight lines at the intersection of Mt. Whitney and Country Club as well as those at Hill Valley and County Club do not meet county standards.

Equestrian Examples:

- AF-17 [

The applicant's attempt at incorporating a small number of equestrian lots to somehow check the box on rural and equestrian fails on a number of levels.

 - First, there aren't enough equestrian lots. We are an equestrian community and outnumbering equestrian houses with non-equestrian houses will tip the balance against horse-keeping and more towards suburban living.
- AF-18 [
 - Shoe-horning horses and stalls onto 1/3 acre lots along with a two story house and garage makes it less likely that the property will be used for horse-keeping. There is barely enough space for a horse to be kept humanely.
- AF-19 [
 - A horse eats at least 600 pounds of hay a month and produces 500 pounds of manure and soiled bedding every week. On a 1/3 acre lot, there is really no place to pile manure or store hay in a safe manner. Hay, if not kept correctly, can spontaneously combust. It is the cause for many a barn fire.

General Plan Incompatibility:

- AF-20 [

If the project is allowed to proceed as proposed it will be in direct conflict with at least two of the initiatives contained within the County's Strategic Plan. Specifically:

 - *Make neighborhoods healthy places to live, work and play*
 - The noise, air pollution and traffic associated with this project would make my neighborhood a markedly unhealthier place to live, work and play compared to today
 - *Help communities prepare, respond and recover from public health threats, environmental hazards and other emergencies*
 - If this project was built as proposed, the inability to evacuate safely and in a timely manner during a wildfire would leave my community far less able to respond to such an emergency
- AF-21 [

Visual Character Examples:

- AF-12 This is a repeat of comment AD-14. See Response AD-14.
- AF-13 This is substantially similar to comment AD-15. See Response AD-15.
- AF-14 See Response I-61 regarding impacts of the SPRINTER.
- AF-15 This is a repeat of comment AD-17. See Response AD-17.
- AF-16 This is a repeat of comment AD-18. See Response AD-18.
- AF-17 This is a repeat of comment AD-19. See Response AD-19.
- AF-18 This is a repeat of comment AD-20. See Response AD-20.
- AF-19 This is a repeat of comment AD-21. See Response AD-21.
- AF-20 See Topical Response: General Plan Amendment and Subarea Boundary Adjustment CEQA Analysis and Responses G-1, G-7, I-7, and I-15, as well as Section 3.1.4 of the EIR. The Valiano Specific Plan is consistent with the overarching goals and intent of the General Plan. The Specific Plan's consistency with the General Plan and the proposed GPAs are described in general, below, in relation to each individual General Plan Element. The Mobility Element provides a framework for a balanced, multi-modal transportation system for the movements of people and goods within the unincorporated areas of the County of San Diego.

The Valiano Specific Plan includes a circulation plan with five street types and an integrated multi-use trail network that would connect to existing and proposed road and trail networks. See Responses D-1 and D-4a regarding Smart Growth.

COMMENTS

RESPONSES

AF-20
cont.

This Specific Plan is consistent with the seven goals of the County's Mobility Element. The Safety Element of the General Plan addresses the natural hazards and human activity that may pose a threat to public safety in the areas of wildfires, geologic and seismic hazards, flooding, hazardous materials, law enforcement and airport hazards. The Plan has been reviewed for safety in all of these areas. This Specific Plan is consistent with the 15 goals of the County's Safety Element. –

The Noise Element of the General Plan provides for control and abatement of environmental noise to protect citizens from excessive exposure. A noise study was prepared for the Plan. This Specific Plan is consistent with the six goals of the County's Noise Element. –

An evacuation analysis has been prepared and is included in Section 4.7 of the Valiano FPP. The surrounding community is actually safer with new developments such as Valiano and Harmony Grove because these new developments are required to have fire buffer zones and brush management per recent County standards. In addition, the new developments would install drought tolerant landscape which slows down the rate of fire movement and allows more time for evacuation. The Project would include fire retardant roofs, sprinklered homes and block walls at certain perimeter locations. New infrastructure on site would provide improved water pressure and fire flow. The Project is adding 32 additional fire hydrants and 12 of the hydrants are in close proximity to existing homes along the eastern perimeter of the Project site. The Project is contributing to the new Harmony Grove Fire Station which should be operational in late 2018.

The Project is also contributing to the construction of a new potable water tank included Rincon MWD's 2014 Water Master Plan. The new tank will be located in the northern portion of the Project site on land owned by the Rincon MWD. This new tank will provide increased fire protection and water storage for the community. The opening of Citracado Parkway to the I-15 freeway provides for a much shorter evacuation route than existed previously. In addition, the Project includes improvements to Mt. Whitney Road and Hill Valley Road as well as other internal access streets providing more accessible areas for fire trucks and emergency vehicles. The Project would participate in the County's Emergency Response website where people can download applications directly to their cell phones for reverse 911 calls to allow for earlier, safer and more orderly evacuation of the area.

AF-21

See Topical Response: Fire/Evacuations.

COMMENTS

RESPONSES

AF-22 The project will be introducing elements that drastically change the aesthetics and visual character of the community in a permanent and significant way:

- AF-23 • Extensive grading, manufactured slopes of up to 60 feet tall;
- AF-24 • 1000 foot walls of up to 20 feet tall, extensive fencing, retaining walls and sound walls,
- AF-25 • not to mention the clustered nature of the development with very high density housing scattered around the project area.
- AF-26 • The DEIR seems to hugely downplay these impacts and show very vague photo simulations (with far away vantage points) which do not show the true nature of these visual and aesthetic impacts.
- Goes against General Plan policy COS 12.1 (does not preserve hillsides and ridgelines, mass grading of natural landforms).

Water

- AF-27 • We are in a major drought and have mandatory water conservation measures being imposed on the current residents.
- AF-28 • It is irresponsible to add more density to this area and cause further hardship to existing residents by having to share water that there is too little of already.
- AF-29 • The HGV project is watering extensively at the moment to establish the new landscaping (even low water use plants need water to get established and putting in landscaping at this time of year requires more water to get plants established). Landscaping should be done in the fall.
- AF-30 • They are also not following the mandates to only water between 8:00pm and 9:00am no more than 2 times/week.

Construction Related Impacts Examples

AF-31 The construction calls for a large amount of blasting and grading for a period of at least 2 years, and in areas that are in close proximity to houses on hillsides as well as the valley floor. They are also within proximity to livestock and, particularly, horses, which can be very sensitive to noise and vibration. Two years of blasting and grading will be a huge imposition on the local residences and create unsafe situations involving large animals.

- AF-32 • A sound wall will not prevent horses from being spooked by large explosions which can cause a very unsafe situation for horse handlers and riders. It will also destroy the ability for property owners to use their properties in the way they choose (for equestrian purposes, for example).
- AF-33 • The suggested mitigation measure of having livestock moved out of the blasting area every time there will be blasting, is unreasonable and unfeasible. Remember, there are over 180 horses in Eden Valley alone. Moving large animals is a complicated and potentially dangerous job. Doing so on a large scale would be very impractical. Several properties adjacent to the project site have 20 to 120 horses onsite at any given time.
- AF-34 • I have elderly horses who are much more susceptible to illness or injury due to moving from familiar environs. They lost a huge amount of weight when we evacuated last year and it took months to restore them to health. It is not reasonable to suggest moving them so an out of town developer can make money.

AF-35 In summary, I feel that we have acted in good faith working with the developers but they have not done so in return. The initial plans for the HGV project that we worked on and approved are nothing like the final project which is just another high density housing development with a half-hearted attempt to appease residents by putting in what they call "multi-use" trails. There is insufficient room for two horses going in opposite directions to pass safely and put in moms with strollers and bicycles and someone is going to get hurt – it is only a matter of time.

AF-22 As explained in EIR section 2.1.2.1, Project grading would result in modified slopes. Use of retaining walls has been incorporated into the Project to minimize the modification footprint required. The introduction of these walls with hard-edged horizontal line elements and rectilinear surface planes and the visual contrast with the backdrop of rolling hillsides and steep ridgelines, however, results in some associated visual impacts being identified as significant. Mitigation is identified to lower these impacts to less than significant levels.

As stated in EIR section 2.1.2.2, the development of the Proposed Project would not impact or block views to any unique landforms or topographic features in the immediate vicinity, such as Mt. Whitney or other prominent ridgelines or hills. There are no prominent or unique rock outcroppings on the site. While approximately 15 percent of the Proposed Project site is County's Resource Protection Ordinance steep slopes (RPO; i.e., slopes with a natural gradient of 25 percent or greater and a minimum rise of 50 feet), proposed lot grading conforms to the RPO requirements.

The Proposed Project would include approximately 928,000 cubic yards of balanced cut and fill, substantially in support of proposed structure pads and Project roadways. The grading would generally follow the existing nature of the Project parcels, with grading in the valley, and extending westerly into the lower portions of the hills edging the valley floor. Most of the houses would be sited within the valley, while steeper slopes and hills within and surrounding the site would remain undeveloped. As depicted on EIR Figures 2.1-9 and 2.1-11, the Project pads would follow the rising topography, and would not result in a single flat development pad. As a result, the underlying topography would be respected. Therefore, the Project has incorporated elements to retain "the aesthetics and visual character of the area" and while impacts are permanent, they would be mitigated to less than significant after an initial state of landscape establishment (approximately 5 years).

AF-23 See Response AD-5 regarding 1,000 foot long walls, extensive fencing and fire/retaining walls. Specific to retaining walls, that response is focused on the longest proposed retaining wall, which also includes the 20-foot high section, the highest retaining wall proposed. As described in Subchapter 2.1, Subsection 2.1.2.1 under the discussion of "Retaining Walls":

Retaining wall heights would range between 2 and 20 feet.... The tallest walls (at 18 and 20 feet in height, respectively) would be located at the back of lots 153 to 156 and 157 to 159, as well as Lot 161. These walls would be largely, if not completely, shielded by the homes placed between these walls and the off-site viewers, as well as by Project landscaping. This would be the result of the homes on the lots where the walls would

AF-23
cont.

be sited, as well as homes across the street from them. This double, and in some cases, triple shielding rows of intervening uses would virtually eliminate views to these walls. Most of these walls would be interior to the Project; many would be perpendicular in orientation to off site viewers, and most would have heights ranging from two to eight feet. These walls would not draw the eye the way that larger, and perimeter, walls would. They also would be largely screened from off-site viewers by Project homes and elements of Project landscaping.

Following discussion of perimeter barriers that would be screened by landscaping, the discussion goes on to address walls that would edge the Project perimeter, but would have less landscaping. Remaining significant impacts identified for these walls would be addressed through M-AE-2, requiring staining, texturing and coloring to reduce remaining visibility to less than significant levels.

Sound barriers would be required for the Project in only one area. That would be in Neighborhood 5, where a few homes are located adjacent to Country Club Drive north of the proposed Neighborhood Park. As stated in EIR Subsection 2.1.2.1:

The walls would be five and a half to six feet in height and would extend for varying distances along Country Club Drive from Mt. Whitney Road to the northern Project entrance on Country Club Drive (approximately 380 linear feet behind lots 291 to 295) and from that entrance southerly behind lots 296 and 297 for approximately 230 linear feet. This totals approximately 610 feet along Country Club Drive. There would be 30-foot long returns perpendicular to Country Club Drive wherever a break or terminus in the wall is required.

Because the walls would be sited downslope at the edge of residential lots (approximately 20 feet from road right-of-way north of the entry and ranging from 10.5 to 29 feet west of road right of way south of the entry), the full height of the walls would not be visible from the road. The noise wall is depicted in Figure 2.6-1, described more fully below, under Illustrative Simulations. As shown, only the upper portions of the wall(s) would be visible, or approximately four feet of their height. Motorists would view the wall and associated landscaping for a maximum of approximately 28 seconds at 30 miles per hour, and approximately 24 seconds at 35 miles per hour—although actual viewing time would probably be less due to the lateral nature of the view and competing visual elements related to the hill on the other side of the road and other road users. Regardless, the cobble design assumed by the Proposed Project landscape architect combined with Project-mandated landscaping would turn this wall into an aesthetically pleasing feature. Coffeeberry and sugar bush shrubs from the buffer landscape palette were simulated in that figure. These shrubs reach visual maturity in one to three years. Although the soundwall would comprise a visually unique configuration along this roadway, its visible scale and screening would result in a less than significant visual impact related to change in community character.

AF-24 See Response U-2a regarding the consolidated, or smaller, footprint proposed by the Project.

AF-25 The visual effects of the Project have been objectively discussed and analyzed in conformance with the County’s Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements, Visual Analysis. As discussed in Subsection 2.1.2.1, under the heading “Illustrative Simulations,” the purpose of simulations is to provide the reviewer with a reasonably accurate projection of future conditions based on Project-related changes to current views. Simulations do not provide illustrations of every viewpoint, but depict future snapshots of specific locations. Based on considerations including the type of views and their sensitivity and exposure, scenic status of local roadways, and the number of observers exposed to the view, the visual analysis team and County staff identified four publically accessible key viewpoints (Key Views 1 through 4, depicted on EIR Figures 2.1-9a, 10a, 11a and 12a, respectively) that most clearly display the visual effects of the Project from various locations.

Lot locations and sizes as described in Chapter 1 of the EIR, architectural information currently available, and the potential palette of possible plant varieties provided in the Project Specific Plan are all depicted, with likely vegetation and maturity shown at five years after installation based on Project uses. Five years following installation was chosen because (as depicted) vegetative screening would adequately minimize potentially significant impacts related to structure placement at that point. Additional vegetation density or height experienced as the decades progress would simply contribute to greater screening, and would therefore be additionally beneficial. Important criteria in the more long-distant simulations are the overall planting density as well as the depth of the planted corridor. In all instances, a distance of 20 horizontal feet (or on slopes, 30 vertical feet) from crown edge to crown edge of canopy trees has been maintained, consistent with the Project Fire Protection Plan.

Photo simulations A through D (Figures 2.1-9b through 2.1-12b, Key View 1 / Photosimulation A through Key View 4 / Photosimulation D) illustrate views of the Proposed Project post development from Key Views 1 through 4, and represent a typical view of the residential portion of the Proposed Project from public roadways adjacent to, or in close proximity to the Project site. These simulations are intended to represent the Project at buildout, or when all buildings have been installed and all remedial grading has been completed. As noted above, Proposed Project landscaping is shown in these figures at five years maturity, to depict a conservative (greatest adverse effect) snapshot of how much visual screening would be provided.

Within the simulations, the visual “frame” of the Project site largely remains. Background slopes to the west, and background urban development areas to the east that are visible in “before” photographs

COMMENTS

RESPONSES

AF-25 cont.	<p>remain as prominent background elements in the “after” photographs. Where the Key View is from the most commonly traveled road (Country Club Drive) foreground elements illustrate how retention of those existing uses would minimize Project visual effects in the north, and that the immediately developed portions of the site from this road in the south would either largely be shielded by landscaping or would be more in the nature of a short-term view experienced by northbound drivers on County Club Drive after rounding a hill south of the Project. It can be seen that although specific use patterns on the Project site would change, the landform underlying and surrounding the proposed use changes would remain largely the same. Considering the above elements, the EIR does not downplay the impacts or show vague simulations, but accurately and objectively reflect future conditions from the viewpoints in question. Contrary to the assertion, the EIR adequately evaluates the aesthetic environmental impacts that would result, consistent with CEQA and the County CEQA Guidelines.</p>
AF-26	<p>See Response K-16 regarding Project consistency with General Plan Policy COS-12.1 and Response AF-22 regarding mass grading.</p>
AF-27	<p>The mandatory water conservation measures that are being imposed are acknowledged. However, the comment does not raise an environmental issue with respect to the EIR so no further response is possible.</p>
AF-28	<p>See Responses C-2, C-8, and C-10 for the Project’s consistency with the Rincon del Diablo Municipal Water District’s (Rincon MWD) Drought Ordinance and the 2014 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) update and the Project’s reduction of water use compared to the historical baseline.</p>
AF-29	<p>The comment does not raise an environmental issue with respect to the EIR. The Harmony Grove Village project is not a part of the Proposed Project. Project landscaping would comply with all applicable standards and ordinances.</p>
AF-30	<p>The comment does not raise an environmental issue with respect to the EIR. The Harmony Grove Village project is not a part of the Proposed Project.</p>
AF-31	<p>See Response K-149a for the requirement to prepare a blasting control plan and Response K-149b with respect to potential impacts to livestock and a Project alternative that minimizes grading and blasting.</p>
AF-32	<p>As described in EIR Table 1-4, Project Design Features, would include at least a 48-hour notice to residents within 600 feet of a blasting event. All equestrian trails within this distance would also be marked with warning tape and blasting details. This would also include the owner option of livestock being moved to a designated remote location for the duration of the of blasting operation. The remote location(s) would be identified</p>

COMMENTS

RESPONSES

- AF-32 cont. on the blasting plan and would be the responsibility of the blasting contractor. The advanced warning and measures would allow situations where horses may be spooked, causing an unsafe situation to horse handlers and their riders, to be minimized. In addition, see Response K-149b for a Project alternative that minimizes grading and blasting.
- AF-33 It should be noted that moving livestock out of the blasting area is a Project Design Feature (see Table 1-4 of the EIR) and not a mitigation measure. Any evacuation of horses would be strictly voluntary; it would be the horse owner's decision whether to participate. See Response K-149b for more information on the design feature and a Project alternative that minimizes grading and blasting.
- AF-34 See Response K-149b with respect to potential impacts to livestock and a Project alternative that minimizes grading and blasting, as well as voluntary participation of horse owners in any decision as to participate in relocation of horses during blasting.
- AF-35 The comments related to the Harmony Grove Village project do not raise an environmental issue with respect to the Project EIR. The Proposed Project would not be a high-density housing development, and would be classified as Semi-Rural (see Response G-6 for more information). Regarding trail safety, the public multi-use trail would be 10 feet wide bound by fencing on one or both sides, which would meet the County's trail standards for public multi-use trails and provide ample room for a horse to pass in one direction and a bicycle or pedestrian in the other. In addition, signage depicting trail safety and rules would be located at strategic places along the trail.

COMMENTS

RESPONSES

Thank you for considering these issues. I urge you to do the right thing for the current residents of Harmony Grove and Eden Valley.

Sincerely,

Leslie J. Caskey
2703 El Rocko Road
Escondido, CA 92029
760-745-2689