I-167 Jodi Granger

I-167-1 The comment is 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-167-2 The comment is an introduction to comments that follow. The comment also expresses concern regarding the lack of fire and police protection for the proposed homes. Fire and police protection received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR in Section 3.5 Public Services. Regarding fire protection, as stated on page 3.5-15, overall, the proposed project would increase demand on fire and emergency medical services. The County Fire Mitigation Fee Program (see County Code of Regulatory Ordinances section 810.309 and Ord. No. 10429 (N.S.), June 21, 2016) ensures that development fees are paid at the time of issuance of building permits, and those fees are intended to closely reflect the actual or anticipated costs of additional fire protection facilities and equipment required to adequately serve new development. The Deer Springs Fire Protection District (DSFPD) is a participant in the County's Fire Mitigation Fee Program.

The proposed project will pre-pay the County Fire Mitigation Fee pursuant to a Fire Fee Payment Agreement with the DSFPD which would also provide funding beyond the required County Fire Mitigation Fee to augment the DSFPD's capabilities for continued provision of timely service to its primary jurisdictional area, including the project Site. By pre-paying the County Fire Mitigation Fee, the proposed project ensures Fire Station 12 would continue to have the capacity and facilities to serve the project Site and satisfy the General Plan's 5-minute threshold (Appendix N). The final funding amount will be determined in the Fire Fee Payment Agreement, to be completed prior to map recordation per County conditions of approval. The proposed project would be in compliance with applicable portions of the San Diego County Consolidated Fire Code and the Deer Springs Fire Protection District's Ordinance No. 2013-01. The proposed project also would be consistent with the 2013 California Building Code, Chapter 7A, 2013 California Fire Code, Chapter 49, as adopted by San Diego County. Impacts associated with the degradation of fire protection services and facilities would be less than significant.

Regarding police protection, as stated on page 3.5-16 of the Draft EIR, 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. As such, the project would not result in impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered 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. No further response is required or necessary.

I-167-3 The comment states that the anticipated traffic flow was not considered and that this area is already impacted with lack of planning for existing homes in the area. The County does not concur with the comment. The increase in traffic due to the proposed project has been extensively analyzed in the EIR at Section 2.13 Traffic and Transportation, and mitigation measures have been provided to reduce or substantially lessen potentially significant impacts. The comment does not raise any specific issue with that analysis and, therefore, no further response can be provided or is required. 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-167-4 The comment states that the impact to their safety, comfort, lack of public transportation, natural resources, and water cannot be overlooked. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commenter, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR. However, these issues were addressed in the DEIR: safety and law enforcement impacts were analyzed in Section 3.5 Public Services; public transportation was addressed in Section 2.13 Traffic and Transportation; natural resources were addressed in Section 2.4 Biological Resources; and water supply was analyzed in Section 2.14 Utilities and Service Systems. Please also see **Topical Responses BIO-1**, **BIO-2**, **UTL-1**, **UTL-2**, **TR-1**, **TR-2**, and **TR-3.** 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-167-5 The comment states that schools and other means of education for families has not been considered or paid for. The County does not concur. Impacts to schools received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR at Section 3.5 Public Services. As stated on pages 3.5-18 through 3.5-19 of the Draft EIR, 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 increases during the phased development. In addition, as stated in the Final EIR at page 3.5-19, for K–8 schools, school impacts would be temporary until an on-site school is constructed. 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. No further response is required or necessary.

I-167-6 The comment states that previous research encourages new housing to be focused on infrastructure close to employment. The comment asks, "where is this?" As stated in the Draft EIR Section 1.0 Project Description on page 1-25, in the context of the project's placement within the North San Diego County subregion and centers of employment, the project Site is connected via freeways, arterials, and local roads to several neighboring cities. The project Site is less than 3 miles to the cities of Escondido, San Marcos, and Vista, and approximately 10 miles to the cities of Carlsbad and Oceanside, all North County cities serving as major centers of employment and regional shopping for North San Diego County. A jobs/housing market analysis prepared for the project by MarketPointe Realty Advisors[218] shows that 124,251 jobs exist within the State Route (SR) 78 Corridor Submarket, encompassing the cities of Escondido, San Marcos, and Vista, and certain portions of the unincorporated County. The MarketPointe Study shows that for 63 percent of these jobs, employees are currently commuting into these cities from outside the SR-78 Corridor Submarket. Of these jobs commuting into the Submarket, 58 percent are coming from other parts of San Diego County and the balance (42 percent) are coming primarily from the Riverside, Orange, and Los Angeles counties. Riverside County, the closest neighboring county and county where more than 8 percent of the

[218] The Market Analysis is incorporated by reference and is available for public inspection and review upon request to the County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Development Services. It was available on the County's website during Public Review

workers in the SR-78 Corridor Submarket live, is at least 25 miles to the north of the project Site, more than 30 miles from the center of the SR-78 Corridor Submarket. Riverside workers access to this submarket via I-15. By comparison, the project would offer a range of housing options much closer to these North County regional employment and shopping centers within the SR-78 Corridor Submarket.

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-167-7 The comment states that the lack of emergency evacuation routes cannot be overlooked and that San Diego County has a recent history of needing this type of planning. The comment states that this has been denied by the County Supervisors in the past and that a recent $18 million study was done in the area with tax payer money. With respect to emergency evacuation, Appendix N-2 is the Evacuation Plan for the Newland Sierra project, which was prepared in coordination with the Deer Springs Fire Protection District and County of San Diego, and does not conflict with existing evacuation plans. From Page 2.8-20 of the Draft EIR, "the intent of the evacuation plan is to guide implementation of an evacuation procedure such that the process of evacuating people from the Site is facilitated in an efficient manner and according to a pre-defined, practiced evacuation protocol." Appendix N-2 identifies the proposed project's evacuation road network, including internal roads which connect to three primary ingress/egress roads, and ultimately connect to major evacuation routes, including, Deer Springs Road, Sarver Lane, North Twin Oaks Valley Road, Buena Creek Road and Interstate 15. In addition, the proposed project includes improvements to Deer Springs Road which would increase capacity of the main evacuation route compared to the existing condition. Please see **Topical Response HAZ-1** for a more detailed explanation of evacuation planning.

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-167-8 The comment states that the site is currently zoned for 99 houses and the 2,135 proposed is an increase of more than 210%. With respect to the existing General Plan Land Uses and Zoning designations, the comment does not challenge the adequacy of the Draft EIR; rather, the comment restates information contained within the Draft EIR. As described in Section 1.6.1, General Plan and Zoning Amendment, the existing General Plan Land Uses for the project Site are:

- General Commercial (4.6 acres), Office Professional (53.6 acres), Semi-Rural 10 (19.6 acres), and Rural Land 20 (1,907.8 acres)

The Existing Zoning for the project site includes:

- General Commercial (C36), Office Professional (C30), Rural Residential (RR), Limited Agricultural (A70), Extractive (S82), and General Rural (S92)

As shown in Draft EIR, Table 1-11, the existing General Plan land use designations would allow approximately 99 residential dwelling units and 2,008,116 square feet of commercial space. Furthermore, the Existing General Plan Land Uses are compared to the proposed project in Section 4.5, Existing General Plan Alternative. Section 4.5.5 concludes the Existing General Plan Alternative would result in greater significant impacts to Transportation and Traffic, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Aesthetics and Mineral Resources compared to the proposed project (Draft EIR, p. 4-24). For additional detail concerning General Plan consistency, please refer to **Topical Response LU-1**.

I-167-9 The comment states: "Noise during earth moving. Blasting and sorting. Grading and compacting. Severe air quality issues and health concerns. Air born particulates." The comment lists general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR, and specifically Section 2.3 Air Quality, Section 2.10 Noise, and Section 2.6 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity. Please refer also to **Topical Response AQ-1 through AQ-3** addressing issues pertaining to construction and blasting air quality, and **Topical Response NOI-1** addressing construction and blasting noise. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and, therefore, no more specific response can be provided or is required. 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-167-10 The comment states that this is a bad choice for development but a good choice for mitigation. The comment expresses the opinions of the commenter, 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.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK