

Letter C1e

CHAPTER 3: ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT 1

Subject: RDEIR Public Comment to the Proposed Accretive Lilac Hills Ranch General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan PDS2012-3800-12-001 (GPA), PDS2012-3810-12-001 (SP), RDEIR Chapter 3.1.4 Land Use Planning

Valley Center Community Planning Group Comments:

3.1.4 Land Use Planning

I. General Plan Inconsistency Overview

In comments submitted over the last two years, the Valley Center Community Planning Group and the Valley Center Design Review Board have challenged the proponent's assertions that this Specific Plan/General Plan Amendment ("SP/GPA") is consistent with the adopted County General Plan ("GP"), or with Valley Center's Community Plan ("VCCP"), or with Valley Center Design Guidelines.

These previous comments, which are attached hereto as Exhibits 1-2 are incorporated herein by reference, submitted as part of the public comments on this RDEIR and require a response. These previous comments have also challenged the logic exhibited throughout the Specific Plan and now in the RDEIR: that amending a particular GP regional Category to suit the Project somehow also reconciles the Project's inconsistencies with a wide array of General and Community Plan Goals and Policies.

The proposed SP/GPA is inconsistent in broad and fundamental ways with the San Diego County General Plan and the Valley Center Community Plan. Further the RDEIR fails to disclose and analyze these broad and fundamental inconsistencies and their environmental consequences, as CEQA requires. The RDEIR is derelict in concluding as it does that: *"Overall the project would be consistent with the General Plan; therefore land use impacts associated with policy inconsistencies would be less than significant"* (RDEIR Chapter 3 Environmental Effects Found Not To Be Significant p.3-65) As explained below, the project presents multiple inconsistencies with the GP and VCCP and a "reasonable person" could not find this project to be consistent with either the GP or the VCCP. See *No Oil v. City of Los Angeles* (1987) 196 Cal.App.3d 223, 242; *Mitchell v. County of Orange* (1985) 165 Cal.App.3d 1185.

This RDEIR fails to perform the analyses required for decision makers to understand the parameters of this proposal, and to appreciate the nature and reach of its impacts. The RDEIR does not even have a rudimentary analysis of Consistency with the General Plan.

California State Law requires internal consistency of all County General Plans in California. Therefore, in considering a Specific Plan, particularly one that requires

C1e-1

C1e-2

C1e-3

C1e-4

C1e-1 The comment expresses the opinions of the commentator only. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

C1e-2 Please refer to Global Response: General Plan Amendment CEQA Impacts Analysis. (See also FEIR, Chapter 3.0; Appendix W.)

C1e-3 The project proposes a project-specific General Plan Amendment (GP 12-001) to: (1) amend the regional Land Use Element map to change the existing Semi-Rural Regional Category to a Village Regional Category, (2) amend the Valley Center Community Plan Map to change the existing land use designation from Semi-Rural SR-4 to Village Residential and Village Core (and revise the community plan text to include the project as a third village) and (3) amend the Bonsall Community Plan to change the existing land use designation from Semi-Rural to Village Residential land uses, (and revise the community plan text to include the project). The General Plan Amendment to change the regional category designation of the project site from Semi-Rural to Village is one component of the project and has been analyzed and determined to be consistent with General Plan Policies LU-1.1 and LU-1.2. Please refer to Global Response: Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.2, and FEIR Appendix W.)

The FEIR frames the General Plan consistency analysis at subchapter 1.4 under "Environmental Setting," and describes its current land use planning context (current general plan land uses and both community plans). (FEIR, subchapter 1.4) Subchapter 1.6 describes the General Plan amendment required for approval of the project and is analyzed by the FEIR. Also, every chapter of the FEIR contains a discussion of the project's consistency with the existing General Plan and whether any physical environmental impacts may result. The land use consistency analysis for the entire project as proposed is presented in the FEIR subchapter 3.1.4 and in Appendix W. The FEIR does conclude that land use impacts would be less than significant in that the project would be consistent with the General Plan. The FEIR clearly and thoroughly presents analysis of the potential physical environmental impacts that would result from project approval and the amendment of the Regional Land Use Element Map to change the regional land use category from Semi-Rural to Village.

LETTER

RESPONSE

<p>amendments to an adopted General Plan, it is crucial to understand exactly where the Specific Plan is inconsistent with General Plan regional categories, land use designations and road classifications, principles, elements, goals and policies.</p> <p>A Specific Plan is an implementation vehicle. Approval requires compliance with CEQA. An RDEIR must examine consistency issues including the web of interconnected and mutually supporting elements, goals, policies and maps of the County General Plan. 14 Cal. Code Regs. Section 15125(d). Inconsistency requires denial of the project, redesign of the project or amending the General Plan to fit the Specific Plan – the tail wagging the dog.</p> <p>Making major changes to, for example, the Land Use, Mobility and Safety Elements in the San Diego County General Plan to achieve consistency with the proposed Specific Plan will require revisiting the environmental impacts of the entire San Diego County General Plan. Specific amendments, if not pursued with great caution, would possibly invalidate the entire San Diego County General Plan based upon internal consistency defects.</p> <p>These are all of course very serious issues for the entire County. Accordingly, both the law and sound public policy require that the RDEIR for the SP/GPA analyze specifically and individually the General Plan Vision and Guiding Principles and the reflection of these in the Community Development Model, as well as specific goals, policies and relevant maps across the GP's seven elements: Land Use, Mobility, Conservation and Open Space, Housing, Safety and Noise. The goals and policies of the Bonsall and Valley Center Community Plans must also be considered.</p> <p>Once inconsistencies are disclosed there are only three ways to resolve them: reject the project, re-design the project, or re-build the County General Plan to suit these applicants. Inconsistencies with General and Community Plans, Design Guidelines and other ordinances and policies are NOT subordinate to this project's Specific Plan, as the Specific Plan asserts.</p> <p>California Government Code Section 65454 "Consistency with General Plan" provides:</p> <p>No specific plan may be adopted or amended unless the proposed plan or amendment is consistent with the General Plan</p> <p>As detailed below, the Accretive Lilac Hills SP is inconsistent with multiple principles, goals and policies of the County General Plan and the VCCP. These inconsistencies must be fully identified, analyzed and cured.</p>		<p>C1e-3 (cont.)</p> <p>The project also includes a General Plan Amendment to the Mobility Element to downgrade the segment of West Lilac Road from Running Creek Road to Main Street from a 2.2C to a 2.2F road, addressed in subchapter 1.6 of the FEIR (See also subchapter 2.3, Traffic with respect to West Lilac Road and Road 3). An amendment to Table M-4 would also be required because the reduction of West Lilac Road from a 2.2C to a 2.2F would result in West Lilac Road operating below acceptable levels of service. West Lilac Road is being proposed to be added to Table M-4 and exempt from LOS standards. This amendment was included as part of the project's circulation design and analyzed in FEIR subchapter 2.3. Subchapter 2.3.2.3 of the FEIR analyzed the issue of transportation hazards with respect to the road network design for the project, and determined that overall the road network design for the project would provide adequate ingress and egress for residents as well as emergency access and therefore impacts associated with transportation hazards would be less than significant. Please refer to Appendix W.</p> <p>C1e-4</p> <p>CEQA requires an environmental document to analyze any project inconsistencies with general plan policies that could result in an environmental impact. The proper basis for such analysis is to compare the project (which includes the Specific Plan) with the existing general plan. (CEQA Guidelines § 15125(d).) Also, a proposed project must be compared to the <i>existing physical conditions</i>. (See EPIC v. El Dorado, (1982) 131 Cal.App.3d 350). The FEIR properly compares the proposed project to the <i>existing physical conditions</i> and analyzes the physical impacts resulting from the project to the <i>existing physical environment</i>. Please refer to response to comment C1e-3 above.</p> <p>Also, Appendix W analyzes the Project to the existing General and Community plans to determine whether any inconsistency would result in an environmental impact. Although not required by CEQA, this Matrix helps to avoid confusion by the public and the reviewing body by explaining how the project is consistent with the policies. By way of example, in Appendix W Bonsall Community Plan Policy LU-1.1.1 is analyzed as compared to the Project. Policy LU-1.1.1 requires development in the community to preserve the rural qualities of the area, minimize traffic congestion, and to not adversely affect the natural environment. The Project was determined to be consistent with this policy because the project</p>
--	--	--

C1e-4
cont.

C1e-5

C1e-6

C1e-7

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>C1e-4 (cont.) was designed to be consistent with the Community Development Model that would locate housing close to retail, services, schools, and jobs and would preserve open space. This will contribute to the retention of the rural setting and lifestyle of the adjacent community.</p> <p>C1e-5 The project does not propose to amend any guiding principles, goals, objectives or policies of the San Diego County General Plan adopted August 11, 2011. The project proposes and will require a project-specific General Plan Amendment (GP 12-001). Specifically, GP 12-001 proposes to: 1) amend the regional Land Use Element map to change the existing Semi-Rural Regional Category to a Village Regional Category, 2) amend the Valley Center Community Plan Map to change the existing land use designation from Semi-Rural SR-4 to Village Residential and Village Core (and revise the community plan text to include the project as a third village), 3) amend the Bonsall Community Plan to change the existing land use designation from Semi-Rural to Village Residential land uses, (and revise the community plan text to include the project), and 4) amend the Mobility Element to downgrade the segment of West Lilac Road from New Road 3 to Main Street from a 2.2C to a 2.2F road, addressed in subchapter 1.6 of the FEIR (See also subchapter 2.3, Traffic with respect to West Lilac Road and Road 3) allowing West Lilac Road to operate below acceptable levels of service. An amendment to Table M-4 would also be required because the reduction of West Lilac Road from a 2.2C to a 2.2F would result in West Lilac Road operating below acceptable levels of service. West Lilac Road is being proposed to be added to General Plan Table M-4, which lists those roads where a failing level of service has been accepted. Since the General Plan Amendment will not amend General Plan principles, goals, objectives or policies, it will not necessitate countywide environmental review of the General Plan Update adopted on August 11, 2011.</p> <p>C1e-6 Please refer to response to comment C1e-1 and C1e-3 above.</p> <p>C1e-7 Please refer to response to comment C1e-3 and C1e-5 above.</p>
--	--

II. GP AMENDMENTS NECESSARY TO ACCOMMODATE THIS SP/GPA WILL REQUIRE REJECTING THE GP'S FOUNDATIONAL VISION OF SMART GROWTH AND ELIMINATING MANY GP POLICIES SUPPORTING IT.

It is manifestly not the intention of the San Diego County General Plan to drop "new villages" into semi-rural areas. To the contrary, the County General Plan is rooted in its "Smart Growth" intention. Smart Growth is a two-sides concept. On the one hand, Smart Growth locates future development in areas where infrastructure is established; and on the other hand, Smart Growth also retains and/or enhances the County's rural character, economy, environmental resources, and unique communities. These are integrated, co-dependent concepts. They work together.

The proposal to drop a dense, from scratch 608-acre Village of 5000 people into several thousand acres of infrastructure-lacking, Semi-Rural and Rural land is fundamentally inconsistent with the County's commitment to "sustainable development." This foundational concept is described at length in the introduction to the County General Plan; and it is expressed across the web of interdependent GP Guiding Principles, Goals and Policies that have been put in place to bring about the County's Smart Growth Vision. To reject this Vision now will, in essence, require an entirely new County General Plan.

III. PARAMOUNT AMONG THE PROJECT'S GP INCONSISTENCIES IS ITS FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH LAND USE GOAL LU-1 AND POLICY LU-1.2

Consistency with Land Use Goal LU-1 and with Policy LU-1.2 is especially crucial for this project's approval. These provisions speak directly to the requirements for establishing NEW villages in San Diego County. They emphasize the primacy of the Land Use Element and the Community Development Model, and prohibition of Leapfrog Development.

Land Use Element Goal LU-1: Primacy of the Land Use Element. A land use plan and development doctrine that sustain the intent and integrity of the Community Development Model and the boundaries between Regional Categories.

Land Use Element Policy LU-1.2: Leapfrog Development. Prohibit leapfrog development, which is inconsistent with the Community Development Model. Leapfrog Development restrictions do not apply to new villages that are designed to consistent with the Community Development Model, that provide necessary services and facilities, and that are designed to meet the LEED- Neighborhood Development Certification [LEED ND] for an equivalent. For purposes of this policy, leapfrog development is defined as Village densities located away from established villages or outside established water

C1e-8

C1e-9

C1e-8

Although the General Plan has directed growth to certain areas within the community planning areas of Valley Center and Bonsall for development, General Plan Policy LU-1.2 provides a degree of flexibility to the General Plan to accommodate additional population increases as necessary in a manner that meets the requirements of the Sustainable Communities Strategy of the General Plan (consistent with Assembly Bill 32) (County of San Diego General Plan, adopted August 3, 2011, pp 2-7 through 2-9, which pages are incorporated herein by this reference.) The General Plan clearly allows for future amendments to the Land Use Map and Regional Categories Map and is intended to be a dynamic document and provides that amendments will be reviewed to ensure that the change is in the public interest and would not be detrimental to public, health, safety, and welfare. (County of San Diego General Plan, adopted August 3, 2011, page 1-15, which page is incorporated herein by reference.) Please refer to Global Response: Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.2 and Appendix W for a thorough discussion on related topic.

C1e-9

General Plan Policy LU-1.1 provides that land use designations on the Land Use Map are to be assigned in accordance with the Community Development Model and boundaries established by the Regional Categories Map. This does not prevent future amendments to the Regional Land Use Map; rather the Regional Categories Map and the Land Use Maps are graphic representations of the Land Use Framework and the related goals and policies of the General Plan. The Land Use Maps must be interpreted in conjunction with the language of the General Plan's Goals and Policies which expressly provide authority to make future amendments as may be determined appropriate by the County Board of Supervisors. (County of San Diego General Plan, adopted August 3, 2011, pages 1-18, which page is incorporated herein by this reference.)

Please refer to Global Response: Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.2 for a full discussion relevant to these issues.

<p><i>and sewer service boundaries. (See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.)</i></p> <p>The RDEIR for this SP/GPA asserts that the project is consistent with GP Policy LU-1.2. But, this is clearly not the case. The SP/GPA fails in the most fundamental ways to respect the County's commitment to sustainable development.</p> <p>A. The project is inconsistent with the GP Community Development Model, B. The project is inconsistent with LEED ND standards, C. The project is inconsistent with the 3rd requirement for waiving the prohibition on leapfrog development: provide necessary services and facilities. Among other impacts, the project requires (at least) ten (10) modifications to the County road standards to REDUCE capacities to sub-standard levels. Traffic impacts are significant and deemed immittigable by the RDEIR and the project fails to meet 5-minute response times for Fire and Emergency Medical Services.</p> <p>The project also fails to present a legal and viable point design for sewage and wastewater treatment and there is insufficient, unavailable right of way for private roads into and out of the proposed development.</p> <p><u>A. The Accretive SP/GPA is Inconsistent with the GP Community Development Model</u></p> <p>The proposal, by definition, is inconsistent with the Community Development Model because consistency can be achieved only by amending the General Plan to fit the project. The General Plan states (San Diego County General Plan: Land Use Framework; Community Development Model, p.3-6): <i>"The Community Development Model directs the highest intensities and greatest mix of new uses to Village areas, while directing lower-intensity uses, such as estate-style residential lots and agricultural operations to Semi-Rural areas ... To facilitate a regional perspective the Regional Categories of Village, Semi-Rural and Rural Lands have been applied to all privately-owned lands..."</i></p> <p>First, as the above statement in the County General Plan makes clear, the Community Development Model is not a moveable abstract concept. If this were true then Village "puzzle pieces" could be dropped into Semi-Rural and Rural lands anywhere in the County and pronounced consistent with the Community Development Model.</p> <p>Rather, the Community Development Model reflects a complex of planning principles and ideas that are expressed through the whole system of the General Plan's Regional Categories. Amending a Regional Category, therefore, require</p>	<p>C1e-10 The FEIR (subchapter 3.1.7.1) described several alternatives for treatment of wastewater, both on and offsite as requested by VCMWD. The FEIR also includes alternative routes for wastewater transmission lines. The project applicant would implement one of the options for wastewater treatment as approved by the VCMWD. The ultimate wastewater option would be subect to the approval of the VCMWD. VCMWD has conceptually approved the Wastewater Management Report for Lilac Hills Ranch which provides additional information about all treatment options. As stated in the Project Description (Chapter 1.0), if one of the on-site wastewater treatment scenarios is selected, the project would require temporary trucking of sewage during the initial phases of the project. This is necessary because a minimum wastewater flow is needed to operate an on-site WRF. For an on-site permanent WRF, trucking would be required for up to the first 100 homes (approximately three truck trips per day) to allow for a sufficient minimum flow to operate the facility. For a smaller on-site interim WRF, trucking would be required until as few as 25 homes are occupied. In either case, as soon as sufficient flows are available, trucking operators would cease. Truck trips associated with interim hauling of wastewater would be associated with temporary trips on surrounding roadways. As specified in section 11.1 of the Traffic Impact Study included as Appendix E to the FEIR, "the project is expected to generate 6 truck trips (equivalent to 15 vehicle trips) per day from waste water transport activities between the project site to the Moosa Water Reclamation Facility located along Circle R Drive, just east of Old Highway 395.</p> <p>Regarding timing of construction of the WRF, the project has provided for a full service facilityto be constructed on-site, pursuant to approval of a separate Major Use permit. The existing Lower Moosa Canyon WRF currently treats approximately 0.35 mgd and has an existing MUP and EIR for up to 1.0 mgd of treatment on-site. The timing of construction of the project in relation to construction within the Lower Moosa Canyon WRF could be such that the VCMWD finds it in the best interest of its customers to construct the wastewater capacity needed for the project at the Lower Moosa Canyon WRF. With respect to available right of way, please refer to Global Response: Off-Site Improvements - Environmental Analysis and Easement Summary Table.</p>
--	--

CHAPTER 3: ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT 5

also amending the network of planning concepts that the category implements, for example:

1. The General Plan states (pp. 3-7), *"Village areas function as the center of community planning areas and contain the highest population and development densities. Village areas are typically served by both water and wastewater systems. Ideally, a Village would reflect a development pattern that is characterized as compact higher density development that is located within waling distance of commercial services, employment centers, civic uses, and transit when feasible."*
2. The proposed site is designated not for Village development but for large semi-rural parcels (SR-10 and SR-4). This SP/GPA proposes to place a high density Village into the middle of an area that the Community Development Model designates for Semi-Rural and Rural development. This action requires AMENDING the Community Development Model. Instead, with no discussion or analysis, the SP/GPA and the RDEIR all assert that consistency with the Community Development Model is achieved with a simple change to the Land Use map.
3. The site abuts SR-4, SR-10 and Rural-40 acreage. The Community Development Model **requires** a "feathering " of residential densities from intense Village development to SR-0.5, SR-1, SR-2, SR-4, and so forth. (GP pp.2-8 through 2-9) The Accretive SP/GPA is inconsistent with the concept of feathering which is reflected properly in the current pattern of land use designations in Valley Center's central valley.
4. This SP/GPA is located many miles from areas that the Community Development Model designates for Village development and miles from employment centers, shopping, entertainment, medical services, and civic organizations and activities.
5. Regarding infrastructure, there are few existing roads in the area. They are built and planned to service Semi-Rural and Rural development, as in the current General and Community Plans. Despite proposing intense Village development, the proponents also propose to retain or **reduce** capacities of these roads. Water infrastructure serves 50 homes and agricultural irrigation. There is no wastewater service.
6. The intent of the Community Development Model is to intensify development in **existing** Villages – not to create NEW Villages through the destruction of Semi-Rural and Rural lands. The Community Development Model was applied in Valley Center during the General Plan update process. Village boundaries were drawn. Village densities were planned to feather from the commercial and mixed-use core to meet the Semi-Rural designations. Twenty-five percent (25%) of the community's future development is now planned for the "Village" area in the center of the Valley Center Planning Area, at the community's traditional "crossroads" where road, water and wastewater infrastructure, as well as schools, churches, shops, and businesses are **already** in place.

C1e-11
(cont.)

C1e-12

C1e-13

C1e-14

C1e-15

C1e-16

C1e-11 The Community Development Model is a planning model adopted by the County that is used in part to assign future land use designations on the County's Land Use Map and for the application of Land Use Policy LU-1.2. To assert that the Community Development Model can only be applied to those villages that have been established by the current General Plan would prohibit the County from amending its General Plan in the future to allow for the establishment of any new villages. Please refer to Global Response: Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.2 for a full discussion relevant to these issues. The General Plan states that it is intended to be a dynamic document and there are numerous policies in the General Plan that contemplate that future growth will occur and provide direction with respect to its future planning, such as M-2.1 (require development projects to provide road improvements), M-3.1 (require development to dedicate right-of-way), S-3.1 (Require development to be located to provide adequate defensibility) and COS-2.2 (Requiring development to be sited in least biologically sensitive areas). (County of San Diego General Plan, adopted August 3, 2011, respectively at PP 4-13, 4-14, 7-8, 5-8 which pages are incorporated by this reference.)

The project is designed to be consistent with the Community Development Model by proposing a new "Village" Regional Category that is surrounded by Semi-Rural Regional Category lands, which transitions to Rural Regional Category areas. The project has been designed with the highest intensities (commercial, mixed-use and attached residential) within the central portion of the project (Town Center) and the lower-intensity residential uses around the perimeter of the site (single-family detached residential uses.) The Project is anchored by a pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use Town Center that includes high-density residential, commercial and professional offices, various private and public facilities, a park and the community trails. Compact residential neighborhoods radiate out from the Town Center towards the Project perimeter and support several small parks and the community trails. Neighborhood centers include clusters of attached homes, commercial and professional uses, a 13-acre park and the community trails. The project perimeter

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>C1e-11 (cont.) transitions to surrounding semi-rural areas by featuring: wider, ranchette-style lots, a 50-foot wide orchard-planted buffer, swaths of a 104 acre natural preserve, and the community trails. The road network is densest at the Town Center and there are over sixteen miles of landscaped, lighted, and signed multi-use community trails connecting every part of the community together and to county regional trails. (See Specific Plan, Part V.B., pp. v-7 to v-9) Please refer to the Global Response: Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.2, which addresses comformance with the Community Development Model.</p> <p>C1e-12 The Regional Categories Map and Land Use Maps are graphic representations of the Land Use Framework and the related goals and policies of the General Plan. (Chapter 3, page 18.) General Plan Policy LU-1.2 permits new villages that are consistent with the Community Development Model and meet the requirements set forth therein. Therefore the language in the General Plan allows for future amendments to the Land Use Map and Regional Categories Map. Please refer to Global Response: Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.2 and Appendix W for a thorough discussion on related topic. Regardless whether existing village areas are considered the “centers” of these communities, the General Plan allows for the designation of new villages that meet the criteria of LU-1.2. The Community Development Model is a planning model adopted by the County that is used in part to assign future land use designations on the County’s Land Use Map and for the application of Land Use Policy LU-1.2. The General Plan states that it is intended to be a dynamic document and there are numerous policies in the General Plan that contemplate that future growth will occur and provide direction with respect to its future planning, such as M-2.1 (require development projects to provide road improvements), M-3.1 (require development to dedicate right-of-way), S-3.1 (require development to be located to provide adequate defensibility), and COS-2.2 (requiring development to be sited in least biologically sensitive areas). (County of San Diego General Plan, adopted August 3, 2011, respectively at PP 4-13, 4-14, 7-8, 5-8 which pages are incorporated by this reference.)</p> <p>Please refer to Global Response: Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.2 for a thorough discussion on this related topic.</p>
--	--

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>C1e-13 The project is designed to be consistent with the Community Development Model by proposing a new “Village” Regional Category that is surrounded by Semi-Rural Regional Category lands, which transitions to Rural Regional Category areas. The project has been designed with the highest intensities (commercial, mixed-use and attached residential) within the central portion of the project (Town Center) and the lower-intensity residential uses around the perimeter of the site (single-family detached residential uses.) The Project is anchored by a pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use Town Center that includes high-density residential, commercial and professional offices, various private and public facilities, a park and the community trails. Compact residential neighborhoods radiate out from the Town Center towards the Project perimeter and support several small parks and the community trails. Neighborhood centers include clusters of attached homes, commercial and professional uses, a 13-acre park and the community trails. The Project perimeter transitions to surrounding semi-rural areas by featuring: wider, ranchette-style lots, a 50-foot wide orchard-planted buffer, swaths of a 104 acre natural preserve, and the community trails. The road network is densest at the Town Center and there are over sixteen miles of landscaped, lighted, and signed multi-use community trails stitching every part of the community together and connecting to county regional trails. (See Specific Plan, Part V.B., pp. v-7 to v-9) Please refer to the Global Response: Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.2, which addresses comformance with the Community Development Model.</p> <p>C1e-14 Please refer to the Global Response: Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.2 and response to comments C1e-9, C1e-11, C1e-12, and C1e-13 above.</p> <p>C1e-15 Please refer to subchapter 2.3 of the FEIR, which provides the analysis of the project’s impacts to roads, intersections and Caltrans’ facilities and is based on the Traffic Impact Study, attached as Appendix E to the FEIR. A complete synopsis of the Significant Direct and Cumulative impacts related to the Project can be found in subchapter 2.3.S.1. Table 2.3-24 and Table 2.3-25 provide a mitigation summary for the direct and cumulative impacts, respectively, for the project. Please also refer to comment C1c- 18 for a description of the roadway improvements. The project includes ten requests for exceptions to County Road Standards as part of this project and are described in Figures 1-4A and 1-4B. All of the exceptions being requested for the roadway improvements were</p>
--	--

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>C1e-15 (cont.)</p> <p>included as part of the project's circulation design and considered as a part of the analysis for each subject area discussion within the FEIR. The exceptions could be granted by the County where capacity and safety are not unduly affected. (FEIR, subchapter 2.3.2.3.) The proposed roadway exceptions would not affect road capacity. As detailed in Table 1-2 of Chapter 1 of the FEIR, four of the 10 proposed roadway exception requests would affect design speed and two of those roads are internal to the project site.</p> <p>The project also includes a change to the Mobility Element classification of West Lilac Road (between Main Street and New Road 3) from 2.2C to 2.2F. This change would reduce required right-of-way and shoulder width but would not impact road capacity. The project would include improvements to 2.2F standards subject to an exception request (#5) that would allow construction of a modified half-width 2.2F Light Collector improvement widening the existing 24 feet of pavement to 26 feet. Road Design Alternative 5 analyzes alternative options for improvements to West Lilac Road along the project frontage including (A) follow the existing pavement and build to classification 2.2F, (B) follow the existing pavement and build to classification 2.2C, and (C) follow the SC-270 alignment and build to classification 2.2C. With any of these options, the road would function adequately with implementation of the project improvements. The FEIR does not identify significant and unmitigated impacts to any segments of West Lilac Road.</p> <p>West Lilac Road Improvements between Old Highway 395 and Main Street would be required to meet the General Plan Mobility Element classification 2.2C, subject to exceptions as approved by the County. Refer to subchapter 2.3 and Appendix E of the FEIR for details on the analysis of impacts and proposed improvements along West Lilac Road. The analysis shows that project impacts to West Lilac Road would be fully mitigated to below a level of significance.</p> <p>Also see Global Response: Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.2 for a thorough discussion on the related topic of the community development model. The availability of water infrastructure is addressed in FEIR subchapter 3.1.7. Also, with respect to wastewater please refer to response to comment C1e-10 above.</p>
--	--

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>C1e-16 The comment quotes a portion of the General Plan relating to Village areas, with the point of asserting that the existing areas designated as Village in the Community plans for Bonsall and Valley Center are village cores within a community development model.</p> <p>Regardless whether existing village areas are considered the “village cores” of these communities, the General Plan allows for the designation of new villages that meet the criteria of LU-1.2. Please refer to Global Response: Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.2 for a full discussion relevant to these issues.</p>
--	---

LETTER

RESPONSE

<p>7. A key component of including a Community Development Model in the General Plan with "integrity" was to create a framework for future growth in and around existing villages. The RDEIR ignores this GP concept by concluding that a high density project placed in a semi-rural and rural area would not be growth inducing. This conclusion defies reality and contradicts the General Plan, which identifies existing villages as the hubs for growth.</p> <p>8. The lands surrounding the proposed project (and some lands which the proposed project surrounds) will still be designated at lower semi-rural densities than the village densities proposed for the Accretive SP/GPA. Into the future, these landowners will likely seek similar higher density treatment. The County has a long track record of approving General Plan Amendments that increase density using the density of adjacent properties as justification. The RDEIR claims that this would not occur, but history and reality have proven otherwise.</p> <p>9. The RDEIR refers to the Property Specific Request (PSR) General Plan Amendment process that was directed by the Board of Supervisors and claims that the project is not growth inducing. This suggestion is misleading. The outcome of the PSR/GPA process remains to be seen. Approval is not a foregone conclusion and processing will be lengthy. More likely is that approval of the Accretive Lilac Hills project would usher approval of the PSRs/GPAs in Valley Center, thus inducing unplanned growth of this area.</p> <p>Second, the project design defies the GP principles, goals and policies for Village development and for Village expansion, which the Community Development Model reflects.</p> <p>1. The 608-acre project site, only a portion of which is actually owned by the applicant, sprawls 2 miles N-S, and 1 mile E-W across several thousand acres, largely in active agriculture. These surrounding acres are owned by people whose dreams and ambitions for their rural properties are in accord with the Community Development Model's Regional Category assignment: Semi-Rural and Rural.</p> <p>2. The sprawling site creates some 8-miles of edge effects that will threaten surrounding agriculture, horticulture, and animal husbandry that the GP Community Development Model protects by designating this area for Semi-Rural and Rural development. This sprawling shape also increases the likelihood that the proposed project will be growth inducing as previously mentioned.</p> <p>3. With 1746 units and 90,000 SF of commercial on 608-acres, there is insufficient land available for "feathering" residential densities as the Community Development Model intends and describes.</p> <p>4. The site requires 3 separate commercial nodes to support the "walk-able" claim. The project cannot be characterized as a "walk-able Village" when it is, in fact, three circles of dense housing. Two of these housing areas are</p>		<p>C1e-17 Regarding growth inducement, subchapter 1.8 of the FEIR was revised to conclude that the intensification of land uses on-site could encourage intensification in the immediate project vicinity and thus be growth inducing. However, potential impacts are too speculative for evaluation in the FEIR because the specific nature design and timing of future projects are unknown at this time. Any direct and cumulative impacts that could be associated with the identified growth inducing features of the project would be evaluated at the time future projects are identified and processed.</p> <p>C1e-18 Regarding growth inducement, subchapter 1.8 of the FEIR was revised to conclude that the intensification of land uses on-site could encourage intensification in the immediate project vicinity and thus be growth inducing. Please refer to response to comment C1e-17 above.</p> <p>C1e-19 Please refer to response to comment C1e-17 above.</p> <p>C1e-20 The comment expresses the opinions of the commentator. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. Please refer to response to comment C1e-2 above regarding consistency with General Plan.</p> <p>C1e-21 The comment states that the size of the project will result in 8 miles of edge effects that will threaten surrounding agricultural uses and the sprawling shape will also be growth inducing. As discussed in FEIR subchapter 2.4.6 or Section 3.4 of the Agricultural Resources Report (Appendix H) of the FEIR; the project would include on-site biological open space, common open space, and LBZ, as well Mitigation Measures 2, 3, and 4, in order to ensure that urban/agriculture compatibility conflicts are less than significant. A minimum of 50 foot buffer with two rows of orchard trees are required at all of the agricultural adjacency (AA) areas regardless of the crop type grown within the off-site parcel. In addition to the 50-foot buffer, most of the AA areas are also required to implement fences, Fuel Modification Zone restrictions, and nighttime lighting requirements. The FEIR Agricultural Resources Report includes mitigation measures to ensure that no significant unmitigated impacts to existing agriculture will occur, such as: 1. 50-foot wide buffers planted with two-rows of citrus, avocado, or olive trees (M-AG-1). 2. Installing 6-foot high fencing to protect adjacent</p>
--	--	--

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>C1e-21 (cont.) agricultural activities from unwanted intrusions by people and domestic pets (M-AG-2). 3. Prohibiting habitable structures as well as any structure that could attract residents, visitors, or children to congregate nearby (M-AG-3).</p> <p>With respect to growth inducing, see response to comment C1e-17 above.</p> <p>C1e-22 Please refer to comment C1e-13 above and Global Response: Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.2 for a thorough discussion on this topic.</p> <p>C1e-23 The goal of creating a walkable and mixed-use community can be achieved in a number of different ways; the project proposal is an example of a compact design which encourages residents to walk to amenities and service, and all residential units will be within a one-half mile from either the mixed-use Town Center or from one of the two Neighborhood Centers.</p> <p>Please also see Global Response: Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.2 for a thorough discussion on this topic.</p>
--	---

CHAPTER 3: ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT 7

at least a mile from what the Community Development Model would characterize as Village amenities. The LEED Neighborhood Development standard (LEED ND) for “walking distance” is ½ mile, the GP also cites ½ mile (GP, p.3-8)

- 5. This is not the “walk-able” compact Village it purports to be. The faux Town Center is more than one and half miles from the ½ mile standard required by LEED ND and cited in the General Plan.
- 6. The proximity of Rural Lands to the project presents wildfire threats, which the applicant’s Fire Protection and Evacuation Plans recognize. However the threats are not adequately mitigated. In addition to wildfire, the Accretive project adds the additional hazards of Urban Multi Story Structure Fires and nearly two orders of magnitude increased volume and complexity of Emergency Medical Services (EMS). The Accretive Fire Protection Plan barely mentions the Structures and EMS hazard potential, and does not provide reasonable mitigation plans. The Deer Springs Fire Protection District (DSFPD) has gone on the record three times (6/12/2012, 3/5/2013 and 8/7/2013) stating that DSFPD has major issues with the Project as proposed. Accretive has glossed over these issues raised by a Public Safety agency and the County has allowed the Project to proceed in the General Plan Amendment process. The RDEIR needs to specifically address the issues raised by the DSFPD.

C1e-23
Cont.

C1e-24

B. The Accretive SP/GPA is inconsistent with LEED Neighborhood Development Certification standards

Compliance with LEED Neighborhood Development Certification standards is a second critical requirement for this project. Without meaningful the analyses required by CEQA, the RDEIR merely asserts compliance with the LEED-Neighborhood Development requirement.

The RDEIR is required to comprehensively address the numerous and exacting requirements of LEED Neighborhood Development Certification (“LEED ND”). If the County is not applying LEED ND but an “equivalent standard” as policy LU1.2 allows, the RDEIR analysis must name the standard and show how it is equivalent.

We believe there is no recognized equivalent to LEED ND.

Referenced here as Exhibit “3” are key excerpts from the booklet, *LEED 2009 for Neighborhood Development* [refer to materials submitted in comments in August 2013]. However, the RDEIR, in analyzing consistency, should consider the entire publication where these exacting standards are discussed and illustrated in detail. The booklet is published by the U.S. Green Building Council and is available on its website, USGBC.org

C1e-25

C1e-26

C1e-24 and C1e-25

1. Fire hazard. The FPP evaluated the fire hazard of the area and its potential effect on the project as well as the potential increased hazard that may result from the proposed project. A wildland Fire Behavior Assessment was included in the FPP to provide four worst-case scenarios for wildland fires. (See Section 3.3.2 of the FPP) As a result of the findings of the fire modeling, project design features were incorporated into the Project in order to reduce the risk of fire hazard, including fuel modification zones, use of ignition resistant building materials, and the provision of secondary emergency access roads. The project would also meet all fire and building code requirements, and an adequate supply of water for fire hydrants was deemed available (See Appendix T). The Draft FEIR analyzed each of the design features to determine whether the features would reduce the risk of exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death from wildland fires. The FEIR found that with the adoption of Mitigation Measure M-HZ-1, impacts to wildland fires would be reduced to less than significant. (FEIR, subchapter 2.7.2.4, and subchapter 2.7.3.4 of the FEIR also identified that the project’s contribution to a potential cumulative impact would be less than cumulatively considerable with respect to wildland fire hazards based on implementation of the FPP, associated landscaping plans.

The Evacuation Plan (FEIR Appendix K) considers both evacuation and first responders’ traffic, as shown by it stating the following: “[d]uring an emergency evacuation from the proposed Lilac Hills Ranch development, the primary and secondary roadways will have to be shared with responding emergency vehicles...” As indicated in the FEIR subchapter 2.7.6, impacts associated with emergency response and evacuation plans would be less than significant and no mitigation is warranted. The contingency plan provides that evacuations will be implemented in phases based on predetermined trigger points, so smaller percentages of the evacuees are on the road at the same time. When a wildfire occurs, if it reaches a predetermined trigger point, then the population segment located in a particularly vulnerable area downwind of that trigger point would be evacuated. Then, when the fire reaches the next trigger point, the next phase of evacuation would occur. This would allow smaller groups of people and correspondingly fewer vehicles to more freely evacuate areas. The Evacuation Plan determined that the location of the project and the existing and planned roads provide adequate multi-directional primary and secondary emergency evacuation routes (Evacuation Plan, page 8).

	<p>C1e-24 and C1e-25 (cont.)</p> <p>2. The comment asserts that the FPP does not sufficiently address structure fires or emergency medical services such that the impact and mitigation can be assessed. The Fire Response Capabilities Assessment, prepared by Dudek and Hunt, dated May 24, 2014, (“Capabilities Assessment”), evaluated three separate response scenarios, including a structure fire, a wildland fire with structural threat, and a medical aid response. The response routes included one from each of the four existing stations providing service to DSFPD (Stations No. 11, 12, 13, and 15). (See Capabilities Assessment, attached as an Appendix to the Specific Plan, Section 2.3, page 50.) In addition, structure fires are included in analyzing the call load data and was included in the call volume and is a part of the evaluation. The data indicated that a very large volume of responses for DSFPD is for medical aid (37%), traffic collisions (11%), and cancelled calls (17%). Based on this data, and the information presented in the Capabilities Assessment, the FPP concluded that DSFPD would have the existing capacity to respond to all of these types of expected calls from the proposed Lilac Hills Ranch project (see FPP APPENDIX ‘K’ - 2005–2011 Response Data for Deer Springs Fire Protection District). (See also Section 4.1 of the FPP) Also, the project included design features for new development in WUI areas to minimize structural ignitions as well as providing adequate access by emergency responders. (See Section 1.1.2 of the Capabilities Assessment.) Fire protection measures for individual commercial/structure and other public facilities will be established in accordance with the requirements of the County Consolidated Fire Code and California Building Code. (Section 4.9 of the FPP) The County of San Diego and the DSFPD will review all proposed building plans for compliance with the requirements of fire codes and this Fire Protection Plan. Also the FPP includes specific requirements, for commercial, industrial, school, age-restricted community, and other public facilities structures on the project site.</p> <p>3. The comments from DSFPD that are referred to herein do not reflect the most recent comment letter provided by DSFPD, dated July 28, 2014. See Global Response: Fire and Medical Services for a thorough discussion of this topic.</p> <p>The comment states that the project is inconsistent with LEED-ND Certification standards and that there is no recognized equivalent to LEED-ND. Please refer to Global Response: Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.2.</p>
--	--

LETTER

RESPONSE

<p>As the referenced excerpts make clear, to obtain LEED ND Certification, <u>certain location, conservation and design criteria are mandatory. This means that, regardless of how many "points" are accumulated for "green" amenities, LEED ND Certification cannot be achieved without meeting essential standards in particular categories.</u></p> <p>GP LU Policy 1.2 provides that the Accretive SP/GPA must comply with all essential standards that are required for LEED-Neighborhood Development Certification. These standards include the following:</p> <p>SMART LOCATION and LINKAGE <u>These are PRE-REQUISITE criteria. Compliance is mandatory.</u> Prerequisite 1 Smart Location Prerequisite 2 Imperiled Species and Ecological Communities Prerequisite 3 Wetland and Water Body Conservation Prerequisite 4 Agricultural Land Conservation Prerequisite 5 Floodplain Avoidance</p> <p>NEIGHBORHOOD PATTERN AND DESIGN <u>These are PRE-REQUISITE criteria. Compliance is mandatory.</u> Prerequisite 1 Walkable Streets Prerequisite 2 Compact Development Prerequisite 3 Connected and Open Community</p> <p>Accretive's SP/GPA fails to meet fundamental requirements for LEED ND Certification for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The site is not a "Smart Location." (See p. 1 <i>LEED 2009 for Neighborhood Development</i> ["LEED 2009] attached hereto as Exhibit 3). The RDEIR concludes that the project is consistent with LEED ND but completely overlooks its mandatory site selection requirements. Further, the RDEIR does not address how this site selection aspect of LEED ND can simply be overlooked when the LEED program was specifically designed to "place emphasis" on site selection. A fundamental premise of Smart Growth is to lower automobile dependency as compared to average development. The SANDAG average miles/trip for all of San Diego County is 5.8 miles/trip. The SANDAG average miles/trip for unincorporated San Diego County is about 13 miles/trip, which is why the region is directing growth to the incorporated cities and existing villages. Accretive is proposing an automobile based urban sprawl community that even with exceedingly high and unsubstantiated internal trip rate estimates (see traffic analysis submitted under separate cover) is 47% higher than the San Diego County average (8.5/5.8) trip distance. 2. The site is too large (exceeds the 320-acre maximum size). (See p. xvi LEED 2009) This maximum area is based on critical factors such as providing the appropriate density of services and neighborhoods within a 	<p>C1e-26 through C1e-37</p> <p>Comments C1e26 through 37 apply the specific requirements for LEED-ND to the project. Please refer to Global Response: Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.2 for a full discussion relevant to these issues.</p>
---	--

C1e-26
cont.

C1e-27

C1e-28

C1e-29

CHAPTER 3: ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT 9

compact community and achieving walkability. The RDEIR fails to address how the project is still in compliance with the LEED ND program when it exceeds a standard that was determined by the "core committee's research."

C1e-29
cont.

3. The proposed SP/GPA fails to meet LEED ND standards for a "walkable" neighborhood. (See p. xvi LEED 2009). The RDEIR repeatedly asserts that the proposed project will be "walkable." However, the only "evidence" provided of "walkability" consists of three circles on a map and a suggestion that someone could walk to someplace within any circle. This does not provide evidence or constitute a walkable community. The LEED ND standards were developed through research of a core committee which suggests that a walkable neighborhood is no more than 320 acres and all services, civic uses, employment, and high density housing are contained within that 320 acres.

C1e-30

Describing the proposed project as walkable is unsubstantiated and misleading. Further, technical analyses that rely on the unfounded and unsubstantiated premise that the project is walkable have impacted the assessment of impacts and thereby likely underestimated the impacts of the project on traffic, air quality, and greenhouse gas emissions.

4. **The proposed project is neither an infill site nor a new development proximate to diverse uses or adjacent to connected and previously developed land. It is sprawl placed into a functioning agricultural area, with no existing infrastructure.** (See p. 1 LEED 2009) The objectives of the LEED ND program are clearly compatible and in alignment with the guiding principles of the County of San Diego's General Plan and with the siting of "new green neighborhoods." As a result, the LEED ND program was integrated in to the Leapfrog development policy of the General Plan. Any proposed deviation from LEED ND, such as ignoring siting criteria, size restrictions, and density guidelines, should be carefully scrutinized for significant environmental impacts.

C1e-31

5. **Because a site design is not available for the Town Center area we have no way of knowing whether this area itself complies with LEED ND standards.** The Specific Plan claims compliance, but this claim is not substantiated.

C1e-32

6. **The site is not served by existing water infrastructure that is adequate to serve urban density.** Water infrastructure is designed for agricultural users and needs significant revision for high density Urban uses. There is no wastewater infrastructure.

C1e-33

7. **No water or wastewater service is planned to serve urban development of this area.** (See p. 1 LEED 2009) The General Plan and the VCMWD's plans do not currently call for expansion of the infrastructure required for a project such as this. The project clearly must provide new water and wastewater infrastructure but it cannot do so because Accretive does not own sufficient easements for sewer and

C1e-34

<p>wastewater lines. (See Letter from Kevin K. Johnson APLC regarding Wastewater Management Alternatives Study submitted to the County on August 9, 2013).</p> <p>8. The Project description demonstrates that the SP/GPA cannot satisfy ANY of the 3 OPTIONS for the Smart Location REQUIREMENT. (See p. 1 LEED 2009):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. It is not an Infill project. b. It is not an Adjacent Site with Connectivity [does Not have at least 90 intersections/square mile as measured with a ½-mile distance of a continuous segment of the project boundary, equal to or greater than 25% of the project) boundary that is adjacent to previous development. c. The site is not designed as a Transit Corridor or Route with Adequate Transit Service. The only mass transit consists of two bus routes located 4 miles north of the Project, which run the circuit of the four Indian Casinos on SR-76. d. None of the LEED ND significant public transit service requirements are met by the proposed circulation system. e. The only transit mentioned by the Specific Plan and/or the RDEIR is that NCTD <u>might consider a</u> bus stop serving part of the project. This is inadequate. <p>On RDEIR page 3-88 of Chapter 3, <i>Impact found not to be Significant</i>, the County asserts:</p> <p><i>"The project is designed to meet the LEED for Neighborhood Development Certification or an equivalent program and was planned by Calthorpe and Associates in order to create a new urban village consistent with these principles."</i></p> <p>1). Provide certification from Calthorpe and Associates over the seal and signature of a Licensed California Professional Engineer certifying that Calthorpe and Associates have provided the Design of the Lilac Hills Ranch Urban Village as presented in the current version of the Lilac Hills Ranch Specific Plan.</p> <p>Or remove this comment from the RDEIR.</p> <p>2). National Expert, and LEED-ND author, Kaid Benfield has rated the Lilac Hills Ranch Project using a structured analytical approach that analyzes the purported sustainability of the proposed Project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a). Please read again Kaid Benfield's analysis of the Lilac Hills Ranch Project at: (http://www.citylab.com/design/2013/09/sprawl-still-sprawl-even-if-its-green/6756/). The Endangered Habitats League presented this information to the County as a Public Comment on September 3, 2013. 	<p>C1e-34 cont.</p> <p>C1e-35</p> <p>C1e-36</p> <p>C1e-37</p>
---	---

The RDEIR ignores its existence. The County's requirement is to present unbiased information to Decision Makers. Please answer why substantiated opposing viewpoints were not incorporated into the RDEIR and their conclusions not made aware to Decision Makers. Also answer why factual information was not evaluated when establishing Impact and evaluating Significance.

C. The Accretive SP/GPA fails to provide necessary services and facilities for the intense urbanization being proposed.

1. ROADS. Traffic impacts are significant and the applicant has proposed no acceptable mitigation measures.

Accretive proposes Village development of a rural area but it **does not propose** Village capacity roads necessary to accommodate the traffic that will be generated by the Village project.

One key purpose of the General Plan Mobility Element and County Road Standards is to specify road standards and automobile capacities that are necessary to serve the surrounding land uses throughout the County. Land Use and Mobility Elements are coordinated and interrelated. Village-capacity roads are specified as necessary to serve Village land uses. Degrading road capacity standards will likely cause a variety of known and unknown environmental impacts.

In essence, the applicant proposes to compromise standards that are employed uniformly across the County in order to win for themselves entitlements to urbanize land uses – without responsibility for urbanizing road capacities. Specifically, they propose to add 20,000 Average Daily Trips to Mobility Element roads, and to pass the real costs of improving these roads on to the taxpayers. They seek "consistency" with County planning standards not by complying with them, but by relaxing them.

For example, their proposal is to **Downgrade** West Lilac Road from its current Class 2.2C to a reduced-capacity Class 2.2F (RDEIR Ch. 2.3, p. 2.3-23) They further propose that two segments of West Lilac Road and one segment of Old Highway 395, which will operate at unacceptable Levels of Service E and F as a result of the Project, be sanctioned as official "exceptions" to the County standard for minimum Level of Service. TIF fees of approximately \$5 Million are utterly inadequate to afford the road reconstruction necessary to service this development's traffic. The Valley Center Road widening five years ago cost in excess of \$50 Million.

C1e-37
cont.

C1e-38

C1e-39

C1e-40

C1e-38 and C1e-39

The project does include ten requests for exceptions to County Road Standards as part of this project and are described in Figures 1-4A and 1-4B. The purpose of the exceptions being requested are to reduce traffic speeds to support traffic calming measures.

All of the exceptions being requested for the roadway improvements were included as part of the project's circulation design and considered as a part of the analysis for each subject area discussion within the FEIR. The exceptions could be granted by the County where capacity and safety are not unduly affected. (FEIR, subchapter 2.3.2.3.) The proposed roadway exceptions would not affect road capacity As detailed in Table 1-2 of Chapter 1 of the FEIR, four of the 10 proposed roadway exception requests would affect design speed. Two of those roads are internal to the project site.

Subchapter 2.3 of the FEIR provides the analysis of the project's impacts to roads, intersections and Caltrans' facilities and is based on the Traffic Impact Study, attached as Appendix E to the FEIR. A complete synopsis of the Significant Direct and Cumulative impacts related to the Project can be found in subchapter 2.3.S.1. Table 2.3-24 and Table 2.3-25 provide a mitigation summary for the direct and cumulative impacts, respectively, for the project. There are two significant and unavoidable impacts to County roadways. The remaining significant and unavoidable impacts are to Caltrans facilities. Significant impacts to County roads include: the segment of Pankey Road, between Pala Mesa Drive and SR-76 (identified in the FEIR as Impact TR-16) and the segment of Gopher Canyon Road between E. Vista Way to Little Gopher Canyon Road (identified in the FEIR as Impact TR-12) . Mitigation for these road segments is determined infeasible, as discussed in section 6.4 of Appendix E of the FEIR, because the cost to construct the improvement is not roughly proportional to the impact of the project. Mitigation measures must be roughly proportional to the environmental impacts caused by the project. These significant and unmitigable impacts are fully disclosed in the FEIR for consideration by the Board of Supervisors. In addition, the segment of Pankey Road is currently required to be improved to the Mobility Element Road Classification of 4.2B as a condition of the previously approved

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>C1e-38 and C1e-39 (cont.)</p> <p>Campus Park and Meadowood projects. While the General Plan has a desired LOS standard for Mobility Element roads, the General Plan does not prohibit projects from having significant and unmitigable impacts on County roadways. Subchapter 2.3.2.3 of the FEIR analyzed the issue of transportation hazards with respect to the road network design for the Project, and determined that overall the road network design for the Project would provide adequate ingress and egress for residents as well as emergency access and therefore impacts associated with transportation hazards would be less than significant. A number of exceptions pertain to the roundabouts that are proposed along W. Lilac Road and Main Street. The roundabouts help to calm traffic, improve safety, and increase roadway capacity, thereby enhancing the comfort and safety of both cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>The resulting effects on roadway capacity of each of the design exceptions are also described in the TIS. All of the exceptions being requested for the roadway improvements, were included as part of the project's circulation design and considered as a part of the analysis for each subject area discussion within the FEIR. None of the proposed exception requests to road standards would affect the capacity of the roadways, including Mountain Ridge Road in which it was concluded that Mountain Ridge Road could accommodate the project's 1,190 ADT. (Subchapter 1.2.3 of the TIS, attached as Appendix X.)</p> <p>The project also includes a Road Design Alternative in Chapter 4.0 of the FEIR that evaluates the proposed project without each of the exception requests. Ultimately, the Board of Supervisors will decide whether to approve the proposed project or pick and chose from the excetion requests analyzed in the alternative.</p> <p>C1e-40 The project includes a General Plan Amendment to the Mobility Element to downgrade the segment of West Lilac Road from New Road 3 to Main Street from a 2.2C to a 2.2F road, addressed in subchapter 1.6 of the FEIR (See also subchapter 2.3, Traffic with respect to West Lilac Road and Road 3). Under the General Plan Build-out condition (see FEIR, subchapter 2.3.3.2), an amendment to Table M-4 would also be required because the reduction of West Lilac Road from a 2.2C to a 2.2F would result in West Lilac Road operating below acceptable levels of service. As described under</p>
--	---

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>C1e-40 (cont.)</p> <p>Goal M-2, there are instances where the County considers it more appropriate to retain a road classification that could result in a LOS E/F rather than increase the number of travel lanes where the County has determined that the adverse impacts of adding travel lanes does not justify the resulting benefit of increased traffic capacity. These instances are based on criteria established under Policy M-2.1.</p> <p>West Lilac Road is being proposed to be added to Table M-4 and exempt from LOS standards because improvements to General Plan standards of 2.2C would adversely affect active agricultural operations and mature oak woodland habitat. Additionally, the improvement of West Lilac Road to 2.2C width would require the condemnation of private land on the northern side of West Lilac Road. West Lilac Road would be improved in compliance with the County Public Road Standards, unless road exceptions are granted by the County. The section of West Lilac Road proposed to be downgraded to a 2.2F Mobility Element road will operate at LOS D or better in every scenario except with Road 3 as shown on the current Mobility Element. As noted in the TIS, Section 9.2.3, SANDAG has purchased the 902 acre Rancho Lilac property, through which Road 3 runs for permanent biological open space. Therefore, it would be unlikely that Road 3 would be constructed in this location. (See FEIR, subchapter 2.3, Traffic.)</p> <p>With respect to TIF fees, said fees are established by the County and are assessed in order for developers to pay their fair share for cumulative impacts to roadway network when warranted.</p>
--	--

LETTER

RESPONSE

<p>In remote places road improvement costs are often enough to make projects infeasible. Here the project applicant argues against improving roads to capacities that are functional and safe because it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is too difficult and costly • Will require rights-of-way that are unobtainable • Will be time consuming to construct • Will be disruptive to off-site property owners • Will face opposition from existing neighbors • Will require condemnation of right-of-way • Will impact biological open space <p>These are, of course, the exact reasons why the San Diego County General Plan and LEED ND both direct urban development away from undeveloped sites like this one into areas where infrastructure, necessities and amenities required for urban dwellers are already present. In other words, the clear goal is to avoid sprawl.</p> <p>The proposed SP/GPA will add 5000 urban residents to country roads while reducing road widths, reducing road design speeds and ignoring other standards established for safe, efficient transportation. The proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fails to provide necessary services and facilities • Is inconsistent with GP premises that development will pay for itself • Is inconsistent with the GP minimum standard for LOS D on County roads • Compromises the safety, comfort and quality of life of prospective residents as well as the other residents of Valley Center who depend on these Mobility Element roads. <p>Sanctioning the requested road standard exemptions will create significant long term SAFETY and liability issues for the County of San Diego.</p> <p>2. Intersections. Additionally, in order to meet County Road Standards, two out of four secondary access intersections (Covey Lane and Mountain Ridge Road) with public roads will require the use of County prescriptive rights (for continual brush clearance) and eminent domain (to secure land from unwilling property owners). Accretive Investments has filed Sight Distance Analyses on these two intersections that confirm the above assertion.</p> <p>3. RESPONSE TIME. The SP/GPA fails to meet 5-minute response time for Fire and Emergency Medical Services. The Deer Springs Fire Protection District has commented in writing that none of the proposed</p>	<p>C1e-41 The comment asserts that the roadway exceptions are being requested for the reasons listed in the comment. The purpose of the exception requests are to avoid impacts to surrounding properties and to support traffic calming measures. See comment C1e-38-39 above. See also Global Response: Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.2.</p> <p>C1e-42 Please refer to response to comment C1e-38, C1e-39 and C1e-40.</p> <p>A complete synopsis of the Significant Direct and Cumulative impacts related to the traffic impacts of the Project can be found in subchapter 2.3.S.1. Table 2.3-24 and Table 2.3-25 provide a mitigation summary for the direct and cumulative impacts, respectively, for the project. There are two significant and unavoidable impacts to County roadways. The remaining significant and unavoidable impacts are to Caltrans facilities. Significant impacts to County roads include: the segment of Pankey Road, between Pala Mesa Drive and SR-76 (identified in the FEIR as Impact TR-16) and the segment of Gopher Canyon Road, between E. Vista Way to Little Gopher Canyon Road(identified in the FEIR as Impact TR-12) . Mitigation for these road segments is determined infeasible, as discussed in section 6.4 of Appendix E of the FEIR, because the cost to construct the improvement is not roughly proportional to the impact of the project. Mitigation measures must be roughly proportional to the environmental impacts caused by the project. These significant and unmitigable impacts are fully disclosed in the FEIR for consideration by the decision maker. In addition, the segment of Pankey Road is currently required to be improved to the Mobility Element Road Classification of 4.2B. While the General Plan has a desired LOS standard for Mobility Element road, the General Plan Table M-4 identifies those roads where a lower LOS has been accepted due to various factors.</p> <p>The cost of improving Mobility Element roads is not passed on to the taxpayer. The project applicant will mitigate direct impacts through construction of improvements as noted in the FEIR, Chapter 1.0 and as required through mitigation measures in subchapter 2.3. Cumulative impacts will be mitigated through the payment of TIF, whenever available and feasible to mitigate the cumulative impacts. Table 2.3-24 and Table 2.3-25 provide a mitigation summary for the</p>
--	---

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>C1e-42 (cont.) direct and cumulative impacts, respectively, for the project as related to traffic by equivalency dwelling units (EDUs). If any impacts cannot be mitigated, the FEIR has fully informed the decision maker of such fact for their consideration.</p> <p>C1e-43 Please refer to the Global Response: Easements (Covey Lane and Mountain Ridge Roads) for a thorough discussion on this topic.</p> <p>C1e-44 The commenter raises a concern about project fire response times. Please refer to Global Response: Fire and Medical Services for a thorough discussion on related topic.</p> <p>C1e-45 The FEIR (subchapter 3.1.7.1.) described several alternatives for treatment of wastewater, both on and offsite as requested by VCMWD. The project applicant would implement one of the options for wastewater treatment as approved by the VCMWD. See comment C1e-10 above.</p> <p>With respect to the comment related to having sufficient right of way to construct the sewer force main or recycled water lines, a fourth alternative pipeline location has been added to Appendix S of the FEIR (Wastewater Management Alternatives Report). This alternative would utilize public road rights-of-way along Covey Lane (upon acceptance of the IODs), West Lilac Road and Circle R Road to reach the Lower Moosa Wastewater Treatment Facility. This alternative does not have any new impacts to undisturbed land because the pipeline would be located within existing roadways. This alternative would require the County acceptance of an existing IOD and for the County to grant additional right of way to VCMWD for the construction of the pipeline. FEIR subchapters 1.2.1.7 and 3.1.7.2 have been revised after receipt of public review comments to clarify that additional alternative routes for sewer lines have been considered and analyzed. Locating the pipeline along a public road right of way is consistent with VCMWD Administrative Regulations Sec. 200.4 provides that under normal circumstances, sewer and water lines are to be located in a maintained roadway.</p>
--	--

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>C1e-45 (cont.)</p> <p>With respect to the comment regarding the lack of legal viability of the other options because of lack of right of way, VCMWD has stated that in order for the project to use three of the four routes additional right-of-way may need to be secured. VCMWD Administrative Regulations Sec. 200.3[d] provides that properties requiring an offsite line extension that do not have adequate easements to extend water lines may petition the VCMWD Board of Directors to initiate proceedings to acquire the easements through eminent domain. Ultimately it is in the discretion of the Board of Director's to decide whether to initiate proceedings to acquire the easements. California law also grants local public agencies the ability to impose conditions on private development requiring the construction of public improvements located within land not owned by the developer. (See Government Code Section 66462.5) Therefore none of the four alternatives are infeasible because of easement restrictions in that such rights may be legally obtained.</p>
--	--

CHAPTER 3: ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT 13

options listed in the Specific Plan and Fire Protection Plan are feasible solutions for the District to meet the 5-minute emergency response requirements for Lilac Hills Ranch.

- 4. **WASTEWATER TREATMENT.** The project fails to present a legal and viable point (site location and sewage and wastewater treatment functional description) design for sewage and wastewater treatment. The preferred option listed by the applicant lacks legal right of way for offsite sewer and recycled water pipelines.

IV. THE ACCRETIVE SP/GPA IS INCONSISTENT WITH THE PURPOSE, INTENT AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF THE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN.

A. Purpose of the General Plan. Chapter 1 of the General Plan contains in its Introduction and Overview an array of highly relevant directives that the RDEIR fails to discuss.

The General Plan must be referred to in its entirety, including separately bound portions (such as the community plans). While the General Plan is internally consistent, some issues are addressed through multiple policies and some receive refined and more detailed direction in community plans. (GP at p. 1-4)

- 1) Policies cannot be applied independently.
- 2) If you are a SD County resident or property owner, the General Plan indicates the general types of uses that are permitted around your home and changes that may affect your neighborhood, and the policies the County will use to evaluate development applications that might affect you or your neighbors. The Plan also informs you regarding how the County plans to improve mobility infrastructure, continue to provide adequate parks, schools, police, fire, and other public services, protect valued open spaces and environmental resources...
- 3) Future development decisions must be consistent with the Plan
- 4) The essence of the Plan lies in its goals, policies, and implementation programs.
- 5) Policies provide guidance to assist the County as it makes decisions relating to each goal and indicates a commitment by the County to a particular course of action. (GP at p.1-5)

General Plan Guiding Principles. These Guiding Principles are intended to Guide development and conservation in San Diego County.

Advance Planning Staff worked with hundreds of stakeholders-citizens, property owners, real estate developers, environmentalists, agricultural organizations, building industry representatives, and professional planners

C1e-44
cont.

C1e-45

C1e-46

C1e-46

Regarding project consistency with the General Plan ten guiding principles, all of the goals and policies of the General Plan are based upon the ten guiding principles that are set forth in Chapter 2 of the General Plan. (General Plan, pp.-6) The FEIR analyzes whether the project meets the ten guiding principles by its analysis of the appropriate policies that implement those principles throughout each of the subchapters of the FEIR and in Appendix W to the FEIR. Please also refer to Global Response: General Plan Amendment CEQA Impacts Analysis and Global Response Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.2. (See also FEIR, Chapter 3.0.)

LETTER

RESPONSE

<p>for years to create a General Plan that would build what is reasonably needed, and to conserve what we must. These Guiding Principles gave birth to the Community Development Model, and to the systematic method through which planning principle, and the County's commitment to authentic sustainable development, was transferred from human hearts and minds to the ground.</p> <p>The RDEIR should, but does not, thoroughly discuss and analyze the GP Guiding Principles (GP pp. 2-6 through 2-15), but merely cursorily sets them out, and in some cases, without analysis of the factual aspects of the Accretive project, asserts compliance.</p> <p>The following discussion reviews several key San Diego County General Plan Guiding Principles, their application to the proposed project and reveals the project's failure to comply with these guiding principles.</p> <p>Guiding Principle 1: Support a reasonable share of regional population growth. (GP p.2-6)</p> <p>The RDEIR fails to note that the GP forecasts Valley Center to have 9,796 residential housing units at the end of 2030, the General Plan planning horizon. (GP Housing Element Update Report p.41). At the average Valley Center persons/house factor of 2.97 persons, this equates to a residential population at build out of 29,094, not the 41,000-plus that would result from this project's placement of a new city in the middle of a well-functioning agricultural area. This discrepancy is not recognized or analyzed. Additionally, the General Plan already accommodates more growth than SANDAG projects for 2050. In this context, the RDEIR fails to justify the need for 1,746 additional homes and 90,000 additional SF of commercial.</p> <p>There are significant environmental and planning consequences from providing an excess of housing and employment in a rural area that are not addressed in the RDEIR:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As a region, with SANDAG providing coordination, we have been trying to steer growth to incorporated cities where transportation investments are occurring and goods, services, and employment are in abundance. The proposed project undermines this effort. It contradicts growth principles that all jurisdictions have developed through SANDAG, and conflicts with the Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). 2. The SCS is the region's strategy for addressing GHG emissions targets for land use and transportation yet the 	<p>C1e-47</p> <p>The proposed project does comply with Guiding Principle one in that it would help contribute to the County-wide need for housing. Although the commenter notes that Valley Center already accommodates increases in population as forecasted under the current General Plan, the County population forecast model was intended to forecast population at a regional scale, and did not consider individual property boundaries or individual property constraints. The model identified the number of future residential units that would be allowed at build-out according to the proposed land use map and derived the forecasted population for the various community plan areas. (County of San Diego's General Plan Update Final Program EIR, Section 1.13.1, page 1-27 which page is incorporated by reference into this response.) In other words, the population of the various community planning areas were theoretical projected at build out but no adjustments were made for actual physical constraints (such as setbacks, slope, terrain, water availability, and other physical limitations) or constraints related to actual market availability of land parcels. The numbers and actual location of growth are not certain in that it is impossible to anticipate all the circumstances that can affect development nor the reduction of units that may result due to such constraints. Actual development in any city or county is a result of market forces, population growth (including birth rates and immigration) as well as physical constraints, availability of resources and other federal, state and local regulations. The County has only limited control over growth and cannot control external factors such as market demands and the intent of individual property owners, businesses and citizens. While population growth and associated development through the horizon year of the General Plan can be considered reasonably foreseeable, potential development on any particular parcel is not certain at a general plan level. In fact the North and South Villages of the Valley Center Community Plan were found to pose a number of constraints and limitations as described in comment C1c-6.</p>
---	--

C1e-46

C1e-47

C1e-48

C1e-49

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>C1e-47 (cont.)</p> <p>Although the General Plan has directed growth to certain areas within the community planning areas of Valley Center, General Plan Policy LU-1.2 provides flexibility to the General Plan to accommodate population increases as necessary in a manner that meets the requirements of the Sustainable Communities Strategy of the General Plan. (consistent with Assembly Bill 32) The General Plan clearly allows for future amendments to the Land Use Map and Regional Categories Map and is intended to be a dynamic document and provides that amendments will be reviewed to ensure that the change is in the public interest and would not be detrimental to public, health, safety, and welfare. (General Plan, page 1-15) See also comment C1c-6. The project is amending the General Plan by adding a new Village that meets the criteria of Policy LU-1.2. and would provide housing within the Valley Center and that would contribute to the forecasted growth of Valley Center. Please refer to Global Responses: Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.2 for a full discussion relevant to these issues.</p> <p>C1e-48</p> <p>Additional information was added to subchapter 3.1.4.1 of the FEIR, to include a project consistency analysis with relevant policies of SANDAG's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and its Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS). Information was also added to subchapter 3.1.4.1 pertaining to the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors in 2004, which serves as a blueprint for the region's future growth and development. SANDAG is currently working on an effort to merge the RCP with the 2050 RTP and the SCS. This effort is known as San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan and is scheduled for adoption in 2015. As explained in subchapter 3.1.4.1, the project would not be in conflict with the objectives of the 2050 RTP/SCS and RCP. Potential impacts associated with plans or policies would thus be less than significant.</p> <p>Please note that SANDAG's SCS, including the forecasted development pattern, is not intended to regulate the use of land, as explicitly provided by the California Legislature when enacting SB 375. Rather, pursuant to Government Code section 65080(b)(2)(K), the SCS does not regulate the use of land; does not supersede the exercise of the land use authority of cities and counties within its region; and, does not require that a city's or county's land use policies and regulations, including its general plan, be consistent with it.</p>
--	--

CHAPTER 3: ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT 15

RDEIR fails to address the consequences of the proposed project conflicting with it.

3. By providing a glut of housing in a rural area, the proposed project throws a wrench in the region's growth strategy. The provision of more homes in Valley Center will reduce demands for homes elsewhere. Generally, it has been the incorporated cities that have needed to plan for more homes to accommodate future regional growth. The proposed project will redistribute that need by 1746 homes. If built in the incorporated cities pursuant to regional plans, these homes would have shorter vehicle trip lengths, be closer to transit, jobs, and services, and use less water and electricity. The RDEIR fails to address these consequences.

C1e-49 cont.

C1e-50

There are also impacts of providing excessive commercial uses. The proposed project plans for commercial uses in excess of local and regional forecasted needs. There are two possible consequences of this situation:

C1e-51

1. The commercial space in the proposed project will remain vacant and the town center will not function as intended
2. The proposed project will pull commercial uses from other existing commercial areas nearby such as Valley Center and Bonsall town centers. This will result in vacancies and blight in these established village centers and will undermine their growth strategy and vision.

C1e-52

The RDEIR need to include a comprehensive economic study of the proposed project and its economic viability within the context of community and regional plans. The results of such a study will reveal grounds for the evaluation of additional environmental impacts of the project.

C1e-53

Guiding Principle 2: Promote health and sustainability by locating new growth near existing and planned infrastructure, services, and jobs in compact pattern of development. (GP p. 2-7)

As previously discussed the Accretive project site lacks both existing and planned infrastructure. Infrastructure proposed by the project cannot be provided at a level consistent with County standards. The proposed project is not a compact pattern of development. It sprawls over 2 miles and has to include 3 town centers rather than 1 to try to support the claim that it is "walkable" and thus, presumably, compact.

C1e-54

The project and RDEIR fail to analyze this inconsistency with Guiding Principle 2 (and its implementing Goals and Policies) and attempt to avoid

C1e-49 Please refer to response to comment O9-60.

C1e-50 The comment asserts that this project will eliminate the need for 1,746 homes that would otherwise have been built in a city. There is no support or documentation for this assertion. SANDAG projects the need for 388,000 new homes of all types in all areas of the county (including cities) by 2050. The project will provide a very small portion of these homes. See Table 3.2 – 2050 Regional Growth Forecast Projections, available at http://www.sandag.org/uploads/2050RTP/F2050rtp_all.pdf, which is incorporated herein by this reference.

C1e-51 through C1e-53

Section 4.1 of the TIS (attached Appendix E to the FEIR) describes the commercial center as consisting of commercial retail uses which may include a 25,000 square foot general store-local serving, small scale and boutique style specialty retail – nothing of the nature that would raise the issue of blight as suggested by the commenter. Also, it is unlikely that the proposed project would pull commercial uses from other existing commercial areas, the FEIR, subchapter 2.3, and Table 2.3-10, shows a maximum of 920 trips on any segment of Camino Del Rey at project buildout. With two phases of the project built, prior to any commercial within the project, less than 300 trips are added to any segment of Camino Del Rey (TIS Table 5.7). In short, very few residents are driving to Bonsall with or without onsite commercial uses. In the town of Valley Center, the project only adds 80 trips to Valley Center Road between Woods Valley Road and Lilac Road at build out (TIS Table 5.3). This is the location of the North and South Villages. In short, few project residents will be driving to the commercial areas in central Valley Center.

While economic and social effects ordinarily need not be discussed in an EIR, physical changes, such as blight, are secondary impacts that must be analyzed if they are significant. The potential for commercial uses in the project blighting other parts of the community planning areas is too speculative. The commercial uses intended for the project will be sized to meet the needs of the project. The Specific Plan design guidelines for the Town Center and Neighborhood Centers specifically exclude big box type commercial uses within the project area. In addition, the lead agency is not obligated to assess indirect impacts resulting from urban decay merely because the project includes a commercial center and

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>C1e-51 through C1e-53 (cont.) therefore no economic study is required by CEQA. (Melom v. City of Madera (2010) 183 Cal.App4th 41.) The project does not include a supercenter and the commercial uses would not have hours of operation or traffic concerns that would be similar to these types of uses. No substantial evidence to the contrary has been presented by the comment.</p> <p>C1e-54 The commenter questions the consistency of the project with Guiding Principle 2, raising specific concerns about infrastructure, compact development and feathering. The project is amending the General Plan by adding a new Village in accordance with the criteria of Policy LU-1.2. See Global Response: Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.2 for a more detailed discussion on these topics.</p> <p>The project includes several methods of transitioning from the denser uses onsite to the less dense uses surrounding the property. These include the use of the biological open space to separate the project from adjacent uses and buffers where adjacent to existing agricultural areas. The Specific Plan also requires the use of wider lots and certain grading techniques to further separate the project from adjacent uses. The Project is anchored by a pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use Town Center that includes high-density residential, commercial and professional offices, various private and public facilities, a park and the community trails. Compact residential neighborhoods radiate out from the Town Center towards the Project perimeter and support several small parks and the community trails. Neighborhood centers include clusters of attached homes, commercial and professional uses, a 13-acre public park and the community trails. The Project perimeter transitions to surrounding</p>
--	--

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>C1e-54 (cont.)</p> <p>semi-rural areas by featuring: wider, ranchette-style lots, a 50-foot wide orchard-planted buffer, a 104 acre natural preserve, and the community trails. The road network is densest at the Town Center and there are over sixteen miles of landscaped, lighted, and signed multi-use community trails stitching every part of the community together and connecting to county regional trails. (See Specific Plan, Part V.B., pp. v-7 to v-9)</p> <p>The comment also refers to the existing Villages that are designated in the Bonsall and Valley Center Community Plans as “village cores” within the community development model and contends that the project will destroy these existing Villages’ design and compliance with the Community Development Model. The General Plan allows for the designation of new villages that meet the criteria of LU-1.2. The project will have little impact on either town as is documented by the number of trips that will be added to the roads. (See comment C1e-51-53 above.)</p>
--	--

LETTER

RESPONSE

<p>it with the fiction that adopting a map with different land use designations for 608 acres will create compliance with the County General Plan.</p> <p>The GP and VC Community Plan currently embody and comply with Guiding Principle 2, with the design for then central Villages and the feathered-out supporting semi-rural and rural designations. The Accretive project is inconsistent with and would destroy that design and compliance.</p> <p>Guiding Principle 3: Reinforce the vitality, local economy, and individual character of existing communities when planning new housing, employment, and recreational opportunities. (GP p. 2-9)</p> <p>The Accretive project does not comply with or implement this Principle. The RDEIR fails to recognize Valley Center's two existing villages or analyze the impact of the Project on the existing and proposed central Village economy and character. In its inadequate discussion of the key CEQA issue whether the project will physically "Divide an Established Community" the RDEIR states that "Since the site currently does not serve as a connection point between community areas, the project would not significantly disrupt or divide an established community," (RDEIR Ch. 3, section 3.2.4, p. 3-171) and thus there is no need to address this issue in the RDEIR. The central valley villages will be economically affected by a competing commercial center in western Valley Center, and they are where the GP and CP plan Valley Center's future growth consistent with the General Plan. Consistency with Guiding Principle 3 must be fully analyzed in the RDEIR.</p> <p>Guiding Principle 4: Promote environmental stewardship that protects the range of natural resources and habitats that uniquely define the County's character and ecological importance. (GP p. 2-10)</p> <p>The Project fails to comply with this principle and proposes bulldozing over 4 Million cubic yards of natural hills to make manufactured slopes to accommodate an urban-style city in an active and productive agricultural area.</p> <p>Guiding Principle 5: Ensure that development accounts for physical constraints and the natural hazards of the land. (GP p. 2-11)</p> <p>In contrast to this principle, the Project proposes bulldozing over 4 Million cubic yards of natural hills to make manufactured slopes, to accommodate an urban-styled city in an active and productive agricultural area.</p> <p>Guiding Principle 6: Provide and support a multi-modal transportation network that enhances connectivity and supports</p>	<p>C1e-55 With respect to the comment that the proposed project fails to analyze the impact of the Project on the existing and proposed central Village economy and character, the project is located 10-12 miles away from the town centers of Valley Center and Bonsall. The project will have little impact on either town as is documented by the number of trips that will be added to roads. The FEIR, subchapter 2.3, Table 2.3-10, shows a maximum of 920 trips on any segment of Camino Del Rey at project buildout. With two phases of the project built, prior to any commercial within the project, less than 300 trips are added to any segment of Camino Del Rey (TIS Table 5.7). In short, very few residents are driving to Bonsall with or without onsite commercial uses. In the town of Valley Center, the project only adds 80 trips to Valley Center Road between Woods Valley Road and Lilac Road at build out (TIS Table 5.3). This is the location of the North and South Villages. In short, few project residents will be driving to the commercial areas in central Valley Center.</p> <p>Section 4.1 of the TIS describes the commercial center as consisting of commercial retail uses which may include a 25,000-square-foot general store-local serving, small scale and boutique style specialty retail nothing of the nature that would raise the issue of blight as may be suggested by the commenter. The potential for commercial uses in the project blighting other parts of the community planning areas is too speculative. The commercial uses intended for the project will be sized to meet the needs of the project. The Specific Plan design guidelines for the Town Center and Neighborhood Centers specifically exclude big box type commercial uses within the project area. In addition, the lead agency is not obligated to assess indirect impacts resulting from urban decay merely because the project includes a commercial center and therefore no economic study is required by CEQA. The project does not include a supercenter and the commercial uses would not have hours of operation or traffic concerns that would be similar to these types of uses. (See <i>Melom v. City of Madera</i> (2010) 183 Cal.App4th 41.)</p> <p>The commenter raises concern about the project dividing an established community. As the FEIR discusses the project will not divide an established community (FEIR, subchapter 3.2.4) because the project site is at the western edge of Valley Center and does not serve as a connecting point between community areas. The roadways on-site provide access to the on-site uses but do not provide a connection between community areas. Since the project</p>
---	--

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>C1e-55 (cont.)</p> <p>does not serve as a connection point between community areas, the project would not significantly disrupt or divide an established community. However, the FEIR, subchapter 3.2.4 has been clarified after public review to explain that the project site is currently a mix of undeveloped open space, agricultural uses and rural residences. The project site is located along the western fringe of the rural community of Valley Center. On site, the project consists of rural residential uses and agricultural land. Although the proposed Project would not divide an established community, the project addressed its relationship to existing and planned land uses with adjacent properties. Subchapter 3.1.4.2 evaluated the project's compatibility with surrounding off-site land uses and the project's internal compatibility with existing and planned land uses on site. Compliance with the goals and policies of both Valley Center and Bonsall community plans are detailed in the General Plan Consistency Analysis (see Appendix W) and in subchapter 3.1.4.2. Compliance with the project's design guidelines and other provisions of the Specific Plan assures the project's compatibility with the adjacent off-site land uses and within the project. Overall, the project is consistent with the relevant policies of both the Bonsall Community and Valley Center Community Plans and land use impacts associated with policy inconsistencies would be less than significant.</p> <p>C1e-56</p> <p>The project would not result in significant impacts to biological resources. The property is not located within a proposed Pre-Approved Mitigation Area and impacts to upland vegetation will be mitigated through the dedication of appropriate habitat. (Subchapter 2.5 of the FEIR.) The project design incorporates the preservation of 104.1 acres of open space, the on-site creation of 6.0 acres of wetland habitat for wildlife use, and the enhancement of 12 acres of existing disturbed riparian habitat to native riparian habitat for wildlife use. See FEIR, subchapter 2.5 and Biological Resources Report, Section 8.0 and Table 10.</p> <p>The biological open space being preserved on the project site conserves the local important wildlife corridors. See Figures 14a and 14b of the FEIR, subchapter 2.5 and Biology Resource Report. In addition, see Section 8.0 and Table 10 for a summary of impacts and mitigation measures. Mitigation measures will protect raptor foraging habitat, will restore, enhance, and maintain open space subject to a reviewed Resource Management Plan, funded through an</p>
--	--

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>C1e-56 (cont.)</p> <p>endowment or community facilities district, will enhance and create wetlands, under the jurisdiction of local, state, and federal resource agencies, and will include a Revegetation Plan, with numeric success criteria, and subject to local, state, and federal review and approval prior to issuance of wetland and the first and all subsequent grading permits. The FEIR shows impacts on agriculture will be mitigated by the preservation of off-site agricultural land. The project incorporates mitigation measures and project design features to assure the protection of agricultural operations. Specifically, on-site prime and statewide importance soils that would be converted to non-agricultural uses would be mitigated through the purchase of agricultural conservation easements at a 1:1 ratio. Additionally, 42.2 acres of agricultural buffers and agricultural open space are included as part of the project design, and ongoing agricultural cultivation would be allowed to continue in these areas. (Subchapter 2.4.6 of the FEIR.)</p> <p>The commenter raises concerns about grading. Grading for the project maintains the overall general contour of the property, requiring 2,300 cubic yards of grading per home (which would require a minor grading permit on an individual lot basis). This is consistent with projects of this size. As discussed in FEIR subchapter 2.1, contour grading techniques are utilized to protect the undeveloped character of existing hillsides. The project has been designed to reflect the existing topography with streets and neighborhoods following the natural layout of the land. The FEIR includes conceptual grading plans showing how the grading would adhere to existing landforms and contours. The project Grading Plan is at FEIR Figure 1-15.</p> <p>The Specific Plan, Ch. III, Section G, includes guidelines for grading all areas of the project beginning on page III-51. Grading in all phases, including off-site improvements, would comply with these Landform Grading Guidelines as contained in the Specific Plan, which will include the blending and rounding of slopes, roadways, and pads to reflect the existing surrounding contours and undulating slopes, replicating the natural terrain. Therefore the project's grading would conform to the natural contours of the land and would not substantially alter the profile of the site as shown by the grading cross-sections included as Figure 68 in the Specific Plan. In addition, approximately 99.7 percent of the RPO 'steep slopes' are avoided. All graded areas will be landscaped with drought-tolerant plantings</p>
--	--

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>C1e-56 (cont.) that are compatible with the surrounding environment as well as the theme of the project.</p> <p>No more than 50 acres of the project site will be actively graded at any one time. See FEIR, Table 1-4 for grading phasing. Please refer to FEIR, Appendix W, for a thorough discussion of project consistency with General Plan Land Use policies.</p>
--	--



Construction Management and Consulting Services

1940 Gamet Ave., Suite 300
 San Diego, CA 92109
 Tel: 858 273 5400
 Fax: 858 273 5455
 www.kcmgroup.net

November 24, 2014

Accretive Investments, Inc
 12275 El Camino Real, Ste. 110
 San Diego, CA 92130
 Attn: Jon Rilling

RE: Response to Lilac Hills Ranch VCCPG Comment - C1e-56

Mr. Rilling,

We are aware that the EIR for the above referenced project has been circulated and you have received comments from the community some of which pertain to Guiding Principle #4 which states "Promote environmental stewardship that protects the range of natural resources and habitats that uniquely define the County's character and ecological importance." In response to the VCCPG Comment – C1e-56 which states that the Lilac Hills Ranch project "...fails to comply with this principle and proposes bulldozing over 4 million cubic yards of natural hills to make manufactured slopes to accommodate an urban-style city in an active and productive agricultural area", KCM Group has performed an analysis of similar projects in similar terrain and setting. This research includes Master Planned communities in the San Diego (SDC), Riverside (RC), and Los Angeles (LAC) Counties and has been formulated to not only address the concerns about the quantity of grading but also underscore the environmental measures which have been featured in the project to specifically satisfy GP#4. The analysis below presents the grading cut/fill yardage in consideration of the acreage and lot count of the various projects analyzed. The data and analysis is as follows:

Project	Units	Density (DU/AC)	CY per Unit	CY per Acre
Lilac Hills Ranch	1,746	2.87	2,290	7,950
SDC Project #1	1,659	4.40	3,440	14,965
SDC Project #2	844	4.20	3,065	12,810
SDC Project #3	415	3.80	2,770	10,540
SDC Project #4	37	1.50	5,990	8,870
RC Project #1	563	4.50	4,180	18,855
RC Project #2	464	4.00	5,200	20,910
RC Project #3	139	2.00	5,905	11,895
LAC Project #1	1260	1.60	16,500	26,280

Per the analysis, the Lilac Hills project has the least amount of grading per unit as well as the least amount of grading per acre of all the projects analyzed which is indicative of the design sensitivities which have been taken into account on the project. Also, as demonstrated by the data, the project has an average unit density that is lower than all but two projects of the other projects. The lower amounts of earthwork per unit and per acre are due to the project design which reflects the existing topography with streets and neighborhoods following the natural layout of the land. The proposed earthwork has been minimized (especially along all perimeters of the site) by focusing the higher density units in locations where the existing slopes are minimal. As discussed in EIR Subsection 2.1, contour grading techniques are utilized to protect the undeveloped character of existing hillsides. The

LETTER

RESPONSE

unit design techniques have also contributed to grading reduction as shown in the Specific Plan text which includes a number of single family development templates that step down the hillsides. All earthwork activities will also occur only within the project boundaries as required. In the final grading process, grading will be further refined to mimic adjacent natural slopes, blending into the surrounding landscape.

In addition to minimizing the proposed earthwork, the Lilac Hills Ranch project proposes many other improvements which promote environmental stewardship and protect the range of natural resources and habitats including utilizing measures to mitigate the impacts of the anticipated increase in peak single-event runoff, water quality runoff, and hydromodification as a result of the proposed development, as defined below;

1. Each single-family lot, multi-family lot and town center will be equipped with a bio-retention area or other similarly effective treatment facilities within the landscaped areas which will accommodate all the anticipated discharge from hardscaped areas such as roof tops and paved driveways and walkways prior to entering the main storm water conveyance system. This ensures that only treated, clean runoff enters the storm drain system. This is the first step in enhancing the quality of the stormwater leaving the site.
2. The runoff from paved roadways will first enter fossil filter equipped catch basins and curb inlets before entering the storm drain system. These fossil filters will pre-screen most of the trash, debris, and larger sediment particles before the first flush runoff enters the catch basins or curb inlets.
3. Once the pre-screened first flush runoff enters the catch basins or curb inlets, a water quality low-flow pipe installed below the regular 100-year peak runoff conveyance pipe will convey the first flush runoff to nearby bio-retention areas built into adjacent slopes to treat the first flush runoff before discharging onto natural terrain. The low-flow pipes will only have the capacity to handle the first flush runoff. Higher intensity runoff will overwhelm and bypass them and enter the main storm drains.
4. Finally, the main storm drains will convey the 100-year peak runoff into one of three proposed detention basins. One basin is located at the final discharge point of each of the three watersheds in this project just before the on-site runoff leave the project site. These detention basins will function as the 100-year peak runoff attenuation devices where a restricted outlet structure will control the outflow from these basins to be at or below that of the pre-development conditions such that the runoff will not result in additional impact to downstream facilities.
5. These detention basins are also designed to mitigate the anticipated hydromodification effects of the proposed project. The outlet structures of the detention basin will be equipped with restriction devices such that the storm water discharge leaving the project site will be at or below the pre-development runoff in both duration and frequency within the compliance storm events from 10% of the 2-year runoff up to the 10-year storm as defined by the County of San Diego HMP manual.
6. These detention basins are the last step of the water quality treatment process. The bottom of these detention basins will be vegetated to provide additional bio-retention and infiltration of the first flush runoff, further enhancing the overall water quality of the runoff reaching downstream facilities.
7. Smart landscaping and irrigation will be employed for the project. Draught and pest tolerant and native vegetation will be planted such that the need for regular and frequent irrigation beyond the establishment period can be minimized. This will further reduce the potential of pollutant laden runoff being generated and discharged into downstream facilities.
8. In addition to the fossil filters, bio-retention facilities and detention basins proposed for the Lilac Hill Ranch project, the application also proposes optional measures (subject to the approval of the RWQCB as acceptable mitigation) such as permeable pavers on the streets and rain barrels for future individual homes as an enhancement to the stormwater treatment facilities. The permeable pavers and rain barrels will be closer to the source of the pollutants – i.e. streets and roof tops. The permeable pavers and their engineered base material will