

### I-202 Renee Humphrey

- I-202-1** The comment thanks the County for the opportunity to comment on the Draft EIR. The comment expresses general concern over the project and Draft EIR and introduces the commenter's list of concerns. 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-202-2** The comment describes the life of her parents, who have lived in the commenter's house since 1982. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it does not relate to any physical effect on the environment. 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 because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.
- I-202-3** The comment expresses concern that the proposed project would have an impact on the existing rural character of the area. The project's consistency with community character was analyzed in Section 2.1.3.2, Visual Character or Quality. 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-202-4** The comment expresses concern regarding increased risk of fire that would result with implementation of the proposed project. The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR. Specifically in Section 2.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials. 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-202-5** The comment expresses concern regarding emergency access in the event of a fire. The proposed project includes three access points; these include two primary access points on Deer Springs Road (Sarver Lane and Mesa Rock Road) and an additional access point off North Twin Oaks Valley Road at Camino Mayor. The proposed project includes mitigation measures to widen Deer Springs Road to four lanes, which would improve existing access in the event of an evacuation. Appendix N-2, Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan for Newland Sierra, analyzes the evacuation of the project Site in the event of a wildfire and Section 2.8.3.3 of the Draft EIR analyzes the proposed project's impacts to Emergency Response Plans and concludes the

## Comment Letter Responses

---

impacts are less than significant. Please see **Topical Response HAZ-1**. 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.

- I-202-6** The comment expresses concerns that the project site is not large enough to accommodate the proposed project, that building additional roads won't help offset impacts to traffic, fire issues, population growth, and climate change.

The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR. Specifically, the project's impacts on traffic were analyzed in Section 2.13 Transportation and Traffic; fire issues were analyzed in Section 2.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials; population issues were analyzed in Section 2.12, Population and Housing; and climate change was analyzed in Section 2.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions. 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. No further response is required.

- I-202-7** The commenter believes that the only benefit to the project includes the developer making money, while there are numerous cons. 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-202-8** The commenter asks whether or not the County acknowledges what Temecula used to look like. The commenter explains that Temecula transitioned from green to developed, with limited on/off ramps, and is concerned that the same will happen to the project area. 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-202-9** The comment expresses concern that deer, cougar, and roadrunner migration will be lost with implementation of the proposed project. Section 2.4.10 Habitat Connectivity and Wildlife Corridors of the Draft EIR describes existing conditions on the project site with respect to wildlife corridors, and Section 2.4.12.4 Wildlife Movement and

## Comment Letter Responses

---

Nursery Site analyzes the proposed projects impacts. The Draft EIR further identifies impacts WM-1 (short-term direct impacts to potential foraging and nesting habitat), WM-2 (permanent, direct impacts to the loss of potential foraging and nesting habitat), WM-3 (impact to movement of large mammals from loss of wildlife corridors), WM-4 (impacts to habitat connectivity for larger wildlife species) and WM-5 (impacts to wildlife behavior resulting from noise and/or nighttime lighting in a wildlife corridor) as significant impacts. The Draft EIR recommends mitigation measures, including M-BIO-1, M-BIO-2, M-BIO-3, M-BIO-6, M-BIO-7 and M-BIO-8A through M-BIO-8E, which reduce the anticipated impacts to less than significant levels. Also see **Topical Response BIO-2**. 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-202-10** The comment expresses concern regarding noise and dust associated with traffic, and inability to hear birds and crickets with implementation of the project. The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR. Specifically, noise impacts, which were extensively analyzed in Section 2.10, Noise, of the Draft EIR. 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. No further response is required or necessary.
- I-202-11** The comment expresses concern regarding noise and vibration from military helicopters and Camp Pendleton. Cumulative noise and groundborne vibration impacts received extensive analysis in Section 2.10, Noise, of the Draft EIR. As described in this section, cumulative impacts would be less than significant with mitigation. 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-202-12** The comment expresses safety concerns in the nearby area. Police protection was analyzed in Section 3.5 of the Draft EIR. As stated on page 3.5-16, the proposed 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

## Comment Letter Responses

---

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-202-13** The comment expresses general concern and opposition for the project and hopes that decision makers read the comments. The County acknowledges the comment letter, and notes it expresses general opposition for the project, but does not raise any issue concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR. For that reason, the County provides no further response to this comment.

**I-202-14** The comment states that the County spent millions of dollars and 10 years developing a General Plan that protected and downzoned this area and that the County then decided to downzone the project site to 99 units from 200 units. The existing General Plan land use designations would allow approximately 99 residential dwelling units and 2,008,116 square feet of commercial space on the project site. Development under the existing General Plan designations is analyzed under the Existing General Plan Alternative to the Project in Section 4.5.5 of the Draft EIR. Compared with the Project, Section 4.5.5 has determined that the Existing General Plan Alternative would actually result in greater significant impacts to Transportation and Traffic, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Aesthetics and Mineral Resources compared to the project (Draft EIR, p. 4-24). 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-202-15** The comment states the project would sever wildlife corridors in a sensitive area if developed. The comment restates information contained in the Draft EIR and does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. Specifically, Section 2.4.10 Habitat Connectivity and Wildlife Corridors, which describes existing conditions on the project site with respect to wildlife corridors, and Section 2.4.12.4 Wildlife Movement and Nursery Site, which analyzes the proposed projects impacts. The Draft EIR further identifies impacts WM-1 (short-term direct impacts to potential foraging and nesting habitat), WM-2 (permanent, direct impacts to the loss of potential foraging and nesting habitat), WM-3 (impact to movement of large mammals from loss of wildlife corridors), WM-4 (impacts to habitat connectivity for larger wildlife species) and WM-5 (impacts to wildlife behavior resulting from noise and/or nighttime lighting in a wildlife corridor) as significant impacts and recommends mitigation measures, including M-BIO-1, M-BIO-2, M-BIO-3, M-BIO-6, M-BIO-7 and M-BIO-8A through M-BIO-8E, which reduce the anticipated

## Comment Letter Responses

---

impacts to less than significant levels. 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-202-16** The comment states the proposed project has sought a “carve out” of the North County MSCP prior to adoption of the plan by the applicable agencies. The comment does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR fully analyzes the proposed projects impacts on biological resources, including the project’s compliance with Local Policies, Ordinances and Adopted Plans (See Draft EIR Section 2.4.12.5). Page 2.4-83 states that, “habitat loss from the proposed project would not preclude or prevent the North County Plan from achieving the preliminary conservation objectives from the draft North County Plan Planning Agreement (County of San Diego 2008 and 2014),” and that “the proposed project would not preclude or prevent preparation of the subregional NCCP, and impacts 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-202-17** The comment states the project would impact significant cultural sites. The comment restates information contained in the Draft EIR and does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. Specifically, Section 2.5.3 identifies ten significant impacts to cultural resources, including Impacts CR-2, CR-3 and CR-4 related to the widening of Deer Springs Road, and Impact CR-10 related to the potential for discovery of human remains. Section 2.5.6 identifies mitigation measures which reduce all impacts to cultural resources to 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-202-18** The comment states that the project would add 28,000 new trips per day to the local roads. The comment restates information contained in the Draft EIR and does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. Specifically, Section 2.13.6 of the Draft EIR, which projects the anticipated number of trips that would be generated by the proposed 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. No further response is required or necessary.
- I-202-19** The comment states that the project would bring I-15 traffic to level “F”. The comment restates information contained in the Draft EIR and does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. Section 2.13.9 analyzes the

## Comment Letter Responses

---

project's impacts to the transportation network, including impacts to freeway segments. The Draft EIR identified impacts TR-18 (I-15 from Deer Springs Road to Pomerado Road) and TR-41 (I-15 from Old Highway 395 to Pomerado Avenue) as a significant and unavoidable direct and cumulative impacts, respectively. To clarify, however, the I-15 segments identified operate at LOS F under existing conditions. (See Table 2.13-3, Existing Freeway Mainline Operations.) 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-202-20** The comment states that the project proposes to widen Deer Springs Road to six lanes and build a new I-15 interchange, drawing thousands of cut-through commuters. The comment also states that Newland plans to start building before Caltrans finishes its analysis and approval of a re-design interchange at Deer Springs Road and I-15. As stated on page 2.13-2 in Section 2.13, Transportation and Traffic, the project proposes two options for Deer Springs Road (Option A and Option B), neither of which propose full buildout of a six-lane roadway as identified in the County's General Plan (6.2 Prime Arterial). Option A would require the reclassification of Deer Springs Road in the County's General Plan Mobility Element (County of San Diego 2011a) from a 6.2 Prime Arterial classification (six-lane) to a 4.1A Major Road with Raised Median classification (i.e., a four-lane road) between the San Marcos City Limit (just north of the Twin Oaks Valley Road) and Sarver Lane; to a 2.1B Community Collector with Continuous Turn Lanes classification (i.e., a two-lane road) between Sarver Lane and Mesa Rock Road; and back to a 4.1A Major Road classification between Mesa Rock Road and the I-15 Southbound (SB) Ramps.

Option B would construct the entire length of the road from the I-15 SB Ramps to its intersection with Twin Oaks Valley Road as a four-lane road, with an approximately 7,600-foot-long section of the road between Sarver Lane and Mesa Rock Road as a 4.1B Major Road (four lanes of travel with intermittent center turn lanes), and the balance of the road, including its intersections with Sarver Lane and Mesa Rock Road, as a 4.1A Major Road. Option B would not require the reclassification of Deer Springs Road; the roadway would remain as a 6.2 Prime Arterial (six-lane) in the County's General Plan Mobility Element (County of San Diego 2011a) from I-15 to the San Marcos City Limit.

Regarding the comment that Newland plans to start building before Caltrans finishes its analysis and approval of a re-design interchange at Deer Springs Road and I-15, the project applicant is to coordinate with Caltrans to improve the interchange based on the lane configuration ultimately approved by Caltrans. Construction of the interchange improvements will mitigate the project's identified significant impacts at

## Comment Letter Responses

---

that location. Moreover, the Draft EIR identifies the 370th dwelling unit as the trigger for improving the I-15/Deer Springs Road interchange to avoid a significant impact. (See Draft EIR Appendix R, Table 16-11, Existing + Project Mitigation Phasing Summary – Intersections.) Because implementation of the I-15 interchange improvements is within the jurisdiction and control of Caltrans, and the County cannot assure their implementation, the Draft EIR properly identifies the impact as significant and unavoidable. However, the project applicant to date has been coordinating closely with Caltrans regarding the interchange improvements and, therefore, it is reasonable to conclude as a practical matter that the improvements will be in place prior to the triggering of a significant impact. See **Topical Response TR-2**. 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-202-21** The comment states that Vallecitos Water District projects a water supply deficit for the next 20 years and that the District’s Water Supply Assessment requires a 36% water supply cut to existing customers in order to serve the Newland Sierra development. The following statement was published by VWD:

“The Vallecitos Water District is not in a drought emergency and therefore is not imposing any mandatory water-use cuts (reductions). In addition, the District would never impose water-use reductions to any customers to allow for any proposed development, including the Newland Sierra project.

To continue to provide reliable water service to our customers, Vallecitos is guided by its Master Plan, which analyzes existing and future land uses, as well as current water demands and trends, to evaluate the existing and future water needs for District customers well into the future. Even with the 1,624 acre-feet\* of annual water demand projected for the proposed Newland Sierra development, the District has already anticipated greater water use (1,825 acre-feet per year) identified for this property during the 2017 Master Plan process without the development. In other words, even if this development moves forward, the District will have sufficient water supplies for all new and existing customers.

During the recent drought, the cutbacks to our customers were not due to a supply shortage, as Vallecitos had sufficient water supplies. The cutbacks were mandated by an Executive Order from Governor Brown. Even during the depth of the drought, Vallecitos’ water provider - the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA), projected 85,196 acre-feet of water in storage after assuming an additional three consecutive years of drought. Since the drought has ended, SDCWA now has 171,000 acre-feet of water in storage, and no restrictions on deliveries to the Vallecitos Water

## Comment Letter Responses

---

District, or any agency. This is in addition to the drought-resilient water available from the Pacific Ocean from the District's direct connection to the Claude "Bud" Lewis - Carlsbad Desalination Plant."<sup>220</sup>

Regarding the proposed projects impacts to water supply, the Draft EIR analyzes water supply in Section 2.14.1, Water Supply and Service. The proposed project would increase overall demand for potable water; however, the Draft EIR compares the planned water usage for the project Site with the estimated water demand based on the proposed project land uses and water conservation measures and concludes the impacts to water supplies would be less than significance. 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. For additional detail refer to **Topical Response UTL-1 and UTL-2**.

**I-202-22** The comment states that the project is in a "Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone." The comment restates information already contained within the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR addresses the project's location in a VHFHSZ in Section 2.8, specifically, page 2.8-17 states, "The proposed project is situated in an area that, due to its steep terrain, heavy fuels, adjacent ignition sources, and fire history, is subject to periodic wildfire. The project Site and the nearby communities of Castle Creek, Hidden Meadows, and Lawrence Welk Resort are all located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, as designated by CAL FIRE." 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. See **Topical Response HAZ-1**.

**I-202-23** The comment states that the project does not provide enough emergency access routes in the event of a fire which would cause gridlock during an evacuation. The comment restates information already contained within the Draft EIR. Appendix N-2 is the Evacuation Plan for Newland Sierra, which was prepared in coordination with the Deer Springs Fire Protection District and County of San Diego, and does not conflict with existing evacuation and pre-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." 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.

---

<sup>220</sup> <http://www.vwd.org/Home/Components/News/News/2358/18?backlist=/>



## Comment Letter Responses

---

**I-202-24** The comment states that the County Board of Supervisors spent millions of dollars and 10 years developing a General Plan that protected and downzoned this area, and that a few years ago the Board of Supervisors voted to approve the plan and protect this area from development. The comment does not challenge the adequacy of the Draft EIR, nor does it does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. However, it should be noted the Draft EIR includes the Existing General Plan as an Alternative. Please refer to Draft EIR Section 4.5 for a comparison of the impacts of the proposed project and the Existing General Plan. In addition, the Draft EIR thus acknowledges the project would develop more residential than permitted by the existing General Plan land use designations, but would develop substantially less commercial space and retain more open space than existing General Plan designations. See **Topical Response LU-1**. 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-202-25** The comment states that the County should not approve the project until the Climate Action Plan (CAP) has been completed. The comment also states that the Golden Door and Sierra Club recently won a trial court decision invalidating the County's threshold for measuring greenhouse gas impacts. The County adopted its CAP on February 14, 2018. The County refers the commenter to **Topical Response GHG-3** regarding the County's 2018 CAP.

Regarding the invalidated GHG threshold, the County acknowledges the comment and notes the proposed project did not use the Efficiency Metric for analyzing the proposed project's impacts. Refer to **Response to Comment O-1-186**. 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.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK