

I-235 Harris Korn (1)

I-235-1 The commenter thanks the County for reading this comment letter and states that there were many areas of concern, which are highlighted in the comment letter. The commenter states that there is a separate letter detailing traffic 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-235-2 The comment explains that the commenter's husband suffers from post-traumatic stress disorder from the Vietnam War and that they chose to live in the rural area for peace and quiet. The commenter explains that there are concerns that blasting will trigger flashbacks and that the Draft EIR did not include blast times, locations and noise levels. The commenter states that there is concern for the horses that will be subject to excessive noise from blasting and rock crushing.

Please refer to **Topical Response AQ-2**.

I-235-3 The comment states that another area of concern is property damage from blasting. The commenter asks how residents will be protected and who would monitor that property damage does not occur.

Please refer to **Topical Response NOI-1**.

I-235-4 The comment states that residents in the area pay a special state tax for residing in a high risk fire area. The commenter describes the traffic congestion that was experienced during the Cedar and Witch Creek fires. The comment states that this issue is not addressed in the Draft EIR. The commenter asks if the County is prepared to take on the liability and consequences in the event this will occur in the Project area.

For information regarding evacuation during a wildfire, refer to Draft EIR Appendix N-2, which includes the Evacuation Plan for Newland Sierra. Also refer to **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 or necessary.

I-235-5 The comment states that a bobcat recently crossed the commenter's property, which is purposely unfenced to allow wildlife to access their natural corridors. The comment states that while the project includes open space it will infringe on natural corridors wildlife uses, cutting off access in the areas crossing under the I-15.

For information on wildlife corridors and connectivity refer to **Topical Response BIO-2**. The County acknowledges the comment letter, and notes it expresses general

Comment Letter Responses

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-235-6 The comment states that the existing Vallecitos Water District tax-paying citizens and businesses have been told that there is a drought and to cut back on water. The commenter explains that despite conservation efforts, water rates increases and will increase again, yet the Water District claims there will be enough water to serve the project. The commenter asks why tax-paying citizens are being penalized for a new influx of population growth. The comment states that the Draft EIR lacks these details.

Refer to **Topical Response UTL-1 and UTL-2**. The Twin Oaks Valley Property Owner's Association made the same or similar comment in a newspaper ad, noting that "36% cuts to resident's water supply" would be required so as to serve the proposed project. The VWD responded by posting on its website a "Correction of Misinformation." According to VWD, the District is not mandating the rationing of its water supplies to existing District customers (by 36% or any percentage), so as to be able to serve any proposed new development, including the Newland Sierra project. For that reason, VWD considered the Twin Oaks' statement "false," requiring correction.

The above comment makes the same statement. Based on the information provided by VWD, the County concurs that the statement is inaccurate should be corrected.

The VWD's correction is quoted below in full:

"Recently, the Twin Oaks Valley Property Owner's Association published a newspaper ad noting "36% cuts to resident's water supply" in relation to a proposed Newland Sierra housing project. This statement is false. 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 [asterisk omitted] 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*

Comment Letter Responses

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 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.

Regardless of development in our community, we encourage all residents to continue to make water conservation a permanent way of life. Click on the links for more information about conservation or the District's Master Plan or contact us at (760) 744-0460.²²⁷ (Italics added.)

In addition, at the November 16, 2016 public meeting in which the VWD Board of Directors considered and approved the project's WSA, Director Hernandez specifically rejected this "mandatory rationing" requirement:

"And I, too, wanted to make it perfectly clear - we've mentioned this a number of times. I know there are some out there that still come up and tell us that they're concerned about that the existing rate payers are going to pay for some portion of the new water. That's absolutely false. That's absolutely wrong. Every new home that is going to be built is going to pay its own way. There is [no] burden on any of the existing rate payers, whether it's one home or 600 homes. It makes no difference. The developers have to pay for all of the new development and the capacity that is required." (See VWD Board of Directors' meeting transcript, Nov. 16, 2016, p. 31, italics added.)

²²⁷ The VWD's "Correction of Misinformation" is incorporated by reference and available for public review upon request to the County. It is also available for review at VWD's website: <http://www.vwd.org/Home/Components/News/News/2358/18> (last accessed November 8, 2017.)

Comment Letter Responses

I-235-7 The comment states that the local citizens and County spent many years and dollars to make the General Plan. The commenter asks why the County is wasting time to consider a project that deviates from the General Plan.

Please refer to **Topical Response LU-1**.

I-235-8 The comment states that the commenter was born and raised in Oceanside and currently resides in San Marcos. The comment states that the commenter has experienced good and bad planning and that the project is an infringement.

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-235-9 The comment states that the Project is not the right development to fit in the rural area and that the proper infrastructure cannot be burdened with the tremendous spillover associated with the Project. The comment states that it is important to keep some areas of the County pristine, exactly as the General Plan provides.

Please refer to **Topical Response LU-1**. 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.