

### I-111 Ashley Dummer (4)

- I-111-1** The County acknowledges the comment as an introduction to comments that follow. This comment is included in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I-111-2** The comment states that the public didn't have enough time to read the Draft EIR and that some information was not included in the document. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commentator, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I-111-3** The comment asks how the mitigation measure for significant impacts to Buena Creek Road and South Santa Fe Avenue will mitigate the impact because vehicles have to stop prior to the intersection and there doesn't appear to be enough space to add the turning lanes. The comment also asks if the development will be providing this partial mitigation and states that rails to trails should be included in the analysis.

The Draft EIR does not conclude impacts to Buena Creek Road and South Santa Fe Avenue as being significant and unavoidable. As stated on page 2.13-7 and page 2.13-108, the impact at Buena Creek Road and South Santa Fe Avenue would be reduced to less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation measure M-TR-7. Furthermore, as stated on page 2.13-60, the limits of construction related to this intersection improvement is approximately 300 to 400 feet and only minor grading for the widening, should and roadbed improvements is anticipated. Improvements to this intersection would be provided by the proposed project.

Regarding the inclusion of rails to trails, the County notes the comment expresses the opinions of the commentator, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary. Nonetheless, the County refers the commenter to Sections 2.13.9.6, Traffic Hazards and 2.13.9.7, Alternative Transportation Policies of the County's General Plan, of the Draft EIR. As analyzed therein, the proposed project would result in **less than significant** impacts through compliance with (1) "the applicable *Public Road Standards*, the County's Mobility Element safety-related policies, and other applicable engineering requirements, and incorporation of the project's TDM measures and transportation-related project design features," and (2) "the

## Comment Letter Responses

---

applicable alternative transportation policies in the County's Mobility Element as addressed above and in more detail in Appendix DD of this EIR.”

**I-111-4** The comment states that the entire length of Buena Creek Road would have significant unavoidable impacts, but that the project can mitigate, it's just a cost associated with doing so and the developer does not want to provide, which places burden on the tax paying citizens. The County disagrees with this comment. Buena Creek Road from Monte Vista Drive to South Santa Fe Avenue would be mitigated through mitigation measures M-TR-6 and M-TR-7. However, the other half of Buena Creek Road from Monte Vista Drive to Twin Oaks Valley Road would have significant unavoidable impacts because improvements are under the jurisdiction and control of San Marcos and, thereby, subject to their concurrence and approval. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

**I-111-5** The comment states that there is no detail on how many vehicle trips would be eliminated by the proposed shuttle service to the Escondido transit center and how often it would run. The comment also asks what the impacts are of people coming from outside areas to use the park and ride facility proposed.

Appendix R3 of the Draft EIR, *Newland Sierra TDM Program* technical memorandum, Table 1, TDM Program VMT Reduction Analysis Summary” calculates a 1.2% reduction in VMT, and “Table 2: TDM Program Performance Metrics and Targets” identifies the specific performance measures that the project is committing to that would equate to the calculated TDM effectiveness percentages. As stated on page 13 of Appendix R3 states

“the Newland Sierra development, the proposed shuttle service would cover the entire development area and provide service to transit hubs, Park-and-Ride lots, commercial areas, parks, and residential communities.1 ... the proposed shuttles would take users from the residential areas and commercial center to the Escondido Transit Center, approximately 10 miles away. This reasonably allows for 30 minute headways between shuttles and connects Newland Sierra residents to the SPRINTER light rail and BREEZE bus lines.”

Further The transportation coordinator (whose role/responsibilities is described on page 6 of the *Newland Sierra TDM Program* technical memorandum) is responsible for coordinating a ride share or shuttle system that connects the project to the park-and-ride facilities and the Escondido transit center. The proposed Project has committed to providing the system (whether in partnership with others such as North County Transit District or community run).

## Comment Letter Responses

---

- I-111-6** The comment states that Section 2.13 references bicycle and pedestrian facilities being used only as a reduction to internal vehicle trips. The comment asks how this helps eliminate traffic in the surrounding area. Onsite bicycle opportunities and pedestrian facilities are not anticipated to help eliminate traffic in the surrounding area. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I-111-7** The comment states that the Draft EIR references getting water from the Central Valley Water Project; however, the Central Valley Water Project does not deliver water San Diego. It is unknown as to what information the commentator is referring to in the Draft EIR; however, the Central Valley Water Project was discussed in the Draft EIR in Section 2.14 Utilities and Service Systems, specifically in Section 2.14.1.2 Existing Conditions where a description of the overall water supply setting in California is discussed. As stated on page 2.14-14, the Vallecitos Water District is one of 24 member agencies of the Water Authority, and the Water Authority is a member agency of the MWD. MWD develops, stores, and distributes water to Southern California from two primary sources: (a) water from the Delta in northern California via the State Water Project, and (b) water from the Colorado River via the Central Valley Project. Therefore, the Draft EIR does not assume that water for the project would be delivered via the Central Valley Project. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I-111-8** The comment states that the EIR incorrectly identifies the Safe Drinking Water Act and the recycled water standards as being administered by the California Department of Public Health; however, it should be the State Water Resources Control Board. The FEIR has been revised on pg. 2.14-27 to reflect this transfer of administration pursuant to SB 861. The comment also states that the EIR does not discuss how Newland Sierra is going to haul water or provide bottle water to all of the homes. The project does not propose to haul water or provide bottles of water to homes. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I-111-9** The comment states that page 2.14-34 references water demands being based open space use, but the commentator cannot find what the open space demands were based on. Projected water demands are shown in Table 2.14-3, Summary of Projected Water Demands (WSA). As shown in that table. Open space water demands are based on 200 gpd/acre. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.

## Comment Letter Responses

---

- I-111-10** The comment states that page 2.14-34 references the need for a 1.76 million gallon tank; however, it goes on to assume the addition of a 2 million gallon tank. The comment asks what the justification is for getting credited with an additional 0.24 million gallons worth of storage. The County acknowledges the comment and notes that the proposed project is not taking credit for building additional capacity for water storage. The comment restates information contained in the Draft EIR and does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I-111-11** The comment states that page 2.14-35 references water demands for the project (5.43 million gallons), but they are unable to find what those demands are based on. Based on the information contained in the project's Master Plan of Water, the total capacity required for project is 5.43 million gallons (EIR, Appendix U). Projected water demands are shown in Table 2.14-3, Summary of Projected Water Demands (WSA). As shown in that table. Open space water demands are based on 200 gpd/acre. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I-111-12** The comment states that page 2.14-36 references grading plans, but they are unable to find them in the Draft EIR. The County does not concur with the comment. The proposed project's Tentative Map and Preliminary Grading Plans were available as Additional Items on the County's project website at <https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/ceqa/SP-15-001/NSDEIR.html>
- I-111-13** The comment states that the EIR concludes impacts to VWD's water system would be less than significant; however, they disagree and think the project will have a significant impact on water demand. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commentator, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I-111-14** The comment states that page 2.14-40 references that VWD will not be subject to any state mandated water reductions through January 2017, however, this has no relevance on the project because the EIR was not public until after January 2017. The comment asks to please provide a date in the future.

The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commentator, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific

## Comment Letter Responses

---

section or analysis of the Draft EIR. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

**I-111-15** The comment states that page 2.14-59 reference that VWD does not have adequate wastewater capacity to serve the project, nor are they part of the capital facility plans. The comment also states that the EIR goes on to state a less than significant impact, however it seems like not having adequate wastewater capacity is a major concern. As stated in Appendix X, Newland Sierra Off-Site Water and Sewer Study, “the District has determined that adequate wastewater treatment and disposal capacity exists for the proposed Project at this time, subject to the qualifications referenced in the Conclusions and Conditions.” Also stated in Appendix X, “the District has water and sewer capacity available to serve the Project as proposed. However, the ability to provide water and sewer service in the future depends upon ultimate build-out of the Project and could change depending upon the timing of the build-out, as well as the San Diego County Water Authority, the District’s treatment capacity at the EWPCF, and other factors affecting growth in the District which may change over time. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.

**I-111-16** The comment states that schools are overcrowded and cannot accommodate the additional students. The comment asks how this can be a less than significant impact to the students of the school. The comment asks how the student to teacher ratio will be maintained and how all children will be afforded the same educational opportunity. As stated in Section 3.5 Public Services on page 3.5-18, “In recognition of the impact on school facilities created by new development, the school districts and the development may enter into various mitigation agreements to ensure the timely construction of school facilities to house students from new residential development. The primary financing mechanism authorized in these mitigation agreements is the formation of a community facilities district, pursuant to the Mello-Roos Community Facilities District Act of 1982. In lieu of a mitigation agreement, the proposed project would be required to pay state-mandated school facilities fees to each school district to contribute a fair-share amount to help maintain adequate school facilities and levels of service. Regulatory compliance ensures that there would be sufficient facilities to serve the proposed project’s additional students. Ultimately, the provision of schools is the responsibility of the school districts. SB 50 provides that the statutory fees found in the Government and Education Codes are the exclusive means of considering and mitigating for school impacts. Imposition of the statutory fees constitutes full and complete mitigation (Government Code Section 65995(b)).

The proposed project would either pay the state-mandated school fees or enter into a School Mitigation Agreement(s) to ensure that schools are built as population

## Comment Letter Responses

---

- increases during the phased development. Therefore, impacts related to school facilities would be less than significant.” The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I-111-17** The comment states that an evacuation plan was prepared with the DSFPD and SDCFA and asks that this plan please be provided as a response. the project includes two Fire Protection Plans, one for the portion of the project within the Deer Springs Fire Protection District (Draft EIR, Appendix N-1 [Fire Protection Plan for the Newland Sierra Project, May 2017] and N-2 [Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan, May 2017]), and one for the portion within the San Marcos Fire Protection District (which includes only the Sierra Farms portion of the project, Draft EIR, Appendix O [Fire Protection Plan for Sierra Farms, May 2017]). The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I-111-18** The comment states that law enforcement is already under staffed or underfunded. The comment asks how the additional demand placed on law enforcement is a less than significant impact. As stated in Section 3.5, Public Services, The project and its increase in population will necessitate an increase in law enforcement to meet the additional demands for services that invariably accompany population growth. The project would result in the need for five additional sworn personnel. The project would not require the expansion of existing police protection facilities or the construction of new facilities. With incorporation of the project design features and the requirement for the proposed project to pay its fair share for increased law enforcement services via property taxes, the potential impact to law enforcement services would be less than significant. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I-111-19** The comment asks how the County justifies not reissuing the Draft EIR for another public comment period based on the comment letter provided. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I-111-20** The County acknowledges the comment and notes it provides concluding remarks that do not raise new or additional environmental issues concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR. For that reason, the County provides no further response to this comment.