

Neufeld, Darin

From: Slovick, Mark
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2015 3:21 PM
To: Neufeld, Darin
Subject: FW: Newland Sierra Project

Mark Slovick, Planning Manager
County of San Diego | Planning & Development Services
T. 858.495.5172

From: Patrice Promack [mailto:ppromack@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2015 10:56 AM
To: Slovick, Mark
Subject: Newland Sierra Project

Dear Mr. Slovick,

First, thanks for being at the meeting on March 4. I know you got an earful from those attending, and have probably been inundated with comments on this project. Below are my comments. Though far from comprehensive, they concern a number of absolutely unacceptable aspects of the proposed project. The most important relate to water, air and fire (details below).

Comments on EIR for Newland Sierra; PDS2015-GPA-15-001, PDS2015-SP-15-001, PDS2015-REZ-15-001, PDS2015-TM-5597

Submitted after reading through the Initial Report, and attending the March 4, 2015 meeting. There are dozens of reasons to retain the 85-unit zoning for this piece of property. Here are some of the most important ones:

1) Water, or rather lack thereof. There is no way that Vallecitos can supply water for a development this size. If the EIR's analysis of project water supply availability does not reach this conclusion, there would be reason to suspect its accuracy. The record drought conditions will continue for many years (and these conditions will probably become "the new normal"). The desalination plant won't provide Vallecitos with enough water to make up the deficit. What little water there is, is already horribly expensive and this trend will also continue, making those of us already here become ever more impacted in our shrinking wallets. Vallecitos would no doubt increase prices even more to make up for the cost of bringing water to this proposed development. Here is a link to a recent article which highlights the situation: [California has about one year of water left. Will you ration now?](#)



California has about one year of water left. Will you ra...

Given the historic low temperatures and snowfalls that pummeled the eastern U.S. this winter, it might be easy to overlook how devastating California's wi...

[View on www.latimes.com](http://www.latimes.com)

Preview by Yahoo

2) Air pollution: having a huge number of homes that are not close to public transportation means a huge increase in GHG and other automobile emission pollutants. This is not acceptable, and cannot be mitigated. This is in addition to the impact of all the trucks that will be coming and going during the construction phase. And, as mentioned during the meeting, the blasting required would put a lot of particulates (which would include airborne silica) into the nearby air. Even though that would be temporary, the effect on the local residents (especially those of us in the community of Deer Springs Oaks, which is a 55+ community) would be significant, as we are among the "sensitive receptors" with respect to all of these pollutants. Also, as mentioned in the Air Quality section of the PDS CEQA Initial Study (Feb 12, 2015) for the project, San Diego County is ALREADY in non-attainment status for Ozone and Particulate Matter, so the additional 27,764 additional ADTs which would result from this development would take us in the WRONG direction! There is no possible mitigation for this.

3) Fire...as some signs on roads in California indicate, it's not a matter of IF but rather WHEN. And the "when" question is to be answered "sooner rather than later" if this development happens. As someone at the March 4 meeting mentioned, with all those people taking walks in the areas around the homes, there will likely be a few careless smokers who may toss their cigarettes unwisely and start a fire. It has happened more than once! And the immediate evacuation required not only for that whole community of 2135 homes but also all the surrounding threatened residences would be a NIGHTMARE! Furthermore, the fire department resources required to protect those additional homes are not adequate. And with budgetary constraints, can additional resources actually be created for that? Unlikely. The idea that there could be mitigation measures in the Fire Protection Plan that would "reduce the potentially significant impacts resulting from the lack of an alternative means of access to a level less than significant" is simply not within the realm of possibility.

- 4) In reviewing the PDS CEQA Initial study , the number of Potentially Significant Impact boxes checked is impressive! To imagine that the county would allow this development to happen in spite of all these impacts (the vast majority of which cannot be adequately mitigated), is simply beyond belief! Some of these impacts are more critical than others. But cumulatively, they add up to a determination of "No Project" as the logical conclusion (unless the developer changes to project to the 85 homes allowable under current zoning).
- 5) The idea that a vineyard would be planted is not a good one. In determining the priority of uses for water in agriculture (because the water resources will likely soon be rationed in California), growing grapes for wine is not a priority, and there are already plenty of vineyards in San Diego County and elsewhere.
- 6) Having a park available in the development is nice, but the conclusion that the residents won't still drive to other parks in the county is mistaken. Ditto the Town Center shopping options (if you have been to the Lake San Marcos development you will note that the options in the development are underused and some have gone out of business due to that fact).
- 7) In the Geology and Soils section of the Initial study, there are 3 EXTREMELY important possible events mentioned that should in themselves be showstoppers: rockfall, landslide, and liquefaction.
- 8) And the list goes on...Hydrology, Noise, Public Services sections being the most notable red flags. Police protection? Again, budgetary constraints will not allow the increase in law enforcement personnel to adequately address the needs of such a large number of residents dumped into this spot. The idea that there could be any "project design features" capable of ensuring an "adequate level of public safety", or that there could be adequate "mitigation measures" to reduce the impact to less than significant on the SD County Sheriff's department, is simply ridiculous.

9) With so many Mandatory Findings of Significance, and the knowledge that most of these significant impacts cannot be adequately mitigated, it is truly a shame that the time and money have had to be wasted by San Diego County to even consider this project. I agree with Robert Peterson, President of the Twin Oaks Valley Property Association:

"We believe that changes must be made to the way the county processes these projects. This project is essentially the same as the previous iterations put forward by 'Stonegate' and 'Merriam Mountains'. There needs to be a formula that precludes projects at the outset, that are so far out of the scope of what the County General Plan provides for.

This process only serves to waste many years of the residents time and effort and wastes County Staff's time and considerable amounts of taxpayer's money.

Thank you for your time in reading this and all other comments submitted about this project. *PLEASE DO THE RIGHT THING*: tell the Newland Sierra project managers that the maximum number of residences they can build is 85!

Respectfully submitted,
Patrice Promack, DDS
Resident of Deer Springs Oaks