

APPENDIX W0
Volume II
Recirculated Public Review
Responses to Comments

Prepared by:

DUDEK

605 Third Street
Encinitas, California 92024
Contact: Brian Grover

NOVEMBER 2019

A1 California Department of Transportation, Maurice Eaton

- A1-1** This comment is introductory in nature, and specific comments follow. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.
- A1-2** In response to this comment, Table 1, City of Oceanside Economic Development Element Consistency Evaluation, of Appendix V has been revised as suggested by the commenter. These revisions to the Recirculated Final EIR are presented in ~~strikeout~~/underline format. To the extent these changes and additions to the Recirculated Final EIR provide new information that may clarify or amplify information already found in the Recirculated Final EIR, they do not raise important new issues about significant effects on the environment; therefore, such changes are insignificant as the term is used in Section 15088.5(b) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.
- A1-3** The City directs the commenter to mitigation measure MM-TRA-5, which is consistent with the recommended mitigation measure of a \$400,000 contribution towards Adaptive Traffic Signal Controls on State Route 76 (SR-76). The City will coordinate all mitigation associated with Caltrans facilities with Caltrans to ensure proper implementation consistent with Caltrans' requirements. No revisions to proposed mitigation measures are necessary.
- A1-4** Proposed improvements to Caltrans' facilities, including those required through mitigation measures, would be designed and implemented consistent with applicable Caltrans policies and other requirements.
- A1-5** The City notes and understands the need of a cooperative agreement with Caltrans to ensure timely implementation of mitigation measures associated with Caltrans' facilities. The City will continue to coordinate with Caltrans as necessary.
- A1-6** Any and all work within the Caltrans' right-of-way will obtain all necessary approvals, permits, and environmental clearance from Caltrans.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

O1 Buena Vista Audubon Society, Joan Herskowitz

O1-1 This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

O1-2 As stated in the Notice of Availability of the Recirculated EIR and Preface to the Recirculated EIR, the City recirculated the following portions of the of the EIR for review and comment: (1) Preface to Recirculated Final EIR; (2) Chapter 3, Project Description; (3) Appendix B, North River Farms Planned Development Plan; and (4) Appendix V, Oceanside General Plan Amendment Consistency Tables. The City requested that comments be limited to the recirculated documents described. Where the Preface identified strikeout/underline changes to the Final EIR to reflect project modifications, comments were to be limited to such changes. This comment does not raise any specific issue related to the adequacy of the recirculated documents. Therefore, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines 15088.5(f)(2) no further response is required.

Nonetheless, this comment discusses General Plan consistency, which received extensive analysis in Section 4.11, Land Use, of the Final EIR; refer also to Topical Responses LU-1 and LU-2 in Appendix T0, Volume II, of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and, therefore, no more specific response can be provided or is required.

This comment also correctly states that the project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to growth and traffic, which are identified in the Final EIR.

Regarding the adequacy of the greenhouse gas mitigation measures, please refer to Topical Response GHG-1 through GHG-3.

O1-3 This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

O1-4 This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City notes the commenter's opposition of the project. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I1 Alexander Earl

- I1-1** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR (see response to comment O1-2); therefore, no further response is required. While the comment does not address an issue in the Recirculated EIR, nonetheless, the City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I2 Bernadette Namauleg

- I2-1** The comment restates information contained in the Recirculated Final EIR, expresses the opinions of the commenter, and does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I2-2** The comment expresses concerns regarding traffic, public utilities, and public services, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR as well as Section 4.15, Public Services, Section 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, and Section 4.19, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and, therefore, no more specific response can be provided or is required.
- I2-3** The comment expresses concerns regarding flooding and fire hazards, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR as well as Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and, therefore, no more specific response can be provided or is required.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I3 Elaine Cefola

- I3-1** The comment raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.
- I3-2** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR (see response to comment O1-2); therefore, no further response is required. While the comment does not address an issue in the Recirculated EIR, nonetheless, the City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I3-3** The comment provides background information and does not raise an environmental issue with the Recirculated Final EIR within the meaning of CEQA. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I3-4** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I3-5** The comment expresses the opinion of the commenter, provides background information, and does not raise an environmental issue with the Recirculated Final EIR within the meaning of CEQA. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I3-6** This comment is an attachment of the same letter containing all preceding comments which have been responded to herein. No further response is required or necessary.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I4 Steve Dubois

I4-1 The comment raises concerns with the addition of the Bree Property with regard to potential future development. As discussed in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, the Bree Property has been incorporated into the project boundary and would have a condition of project approval to require the provision of an agricultural easement and/or deed restriction over the Bree Property that will preserve in perpetuity open space/agricultural uses at that property. The provision of this easement would not result in any physical changes to the environment and no development, improvements, or modifications would occur on the Bree property as part of this project. Any future development on the Bree property would be limited to that in support of agricultural/open space uses consistent with the provisions of the easement and is considered speculative at this time.

I4-2 The commenter is unclear as to what in Section 3.3.2 of the Recirculated Final EIR is of issue. As it does not appear the commenter is raising an issue pertaining to the adequacy of the environmental analysis of the EIR, no further response is required.

I4-3 The comment raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to the project's physical effect on the environment and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR (see response to comment O1-2); therefore, no further response is required. While the comment does not address an issue in the Recirculated EIR, nonetheless, the City directs the commenter to Appendix B, North River Farms Planned Development Plan, which outlines allowable uses within the Village Core commercial area. The potential land uses envisioned for the Village Core include mixed-use residential, a boutique hotel, maker spaces, retail shops, a farmers market, collaborative work space, and the Village Square Park, which are described in both Appendix B as well as Chapter 3, Project Description, of the Recirculated Final EIR. For the purposes of analysis within the Recirculated EIR and its supporting technical studies, a conservative assumption of 30,000 square feet of commercial space (including 5,000 square feet of restaurant space) and a 100-room hotel was used.

In regard to the increase in students, the City's Municipal Code provides guidelines for ensuring school facility adequacy as new development occurs and the requirement of new development impact fees towards public facilities. Oceanside Unified School District (OUSD) has a statutory fee of \$3.79 per square foot of residential development and \$0.61 per square foot of commercial development. Through payment of this fee, the proposed project would be in compliance with City requirements and would ensure that adequate school facilities remain available to existing students and children residing in new residential developments.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

Page 30 of the OUSD Long Range Facilities Master Plan (FMP) provides the school determined growth rates associated with residential development. The FMP forecasted that residential development within the OUSD service area is limited and forecasted that 1,062 new residential units would add 148 additional students at a yield rate of 0.13 within the service area. As discussed in the FMP, OUSD schools would have remaining capacity after consideration of new residential developments within the service area. Therefore, as discussed in Section 4.15, Public Services, of the Final EIR, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts to schools as the impacts of new students generated by direct and indirect growth associated with the proposed project would be avoided through payment of the OUSD statutory fees and because OUSD has remaining capacity after consideration of new residential development within the service area.

- I4-4** The comment expresses concerns regarding roadway improvements which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and, therefore, no more specific response can be provided or is required.
- I4-5** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

I5 Joe Hill

- I5-1** The comment provides background information and does not raise an environmental issue with the Recirculated Final EIR (see response to comment O1-2); therefore, no further response is required. While the comment does not address an issue in the Recirculated EIR, nonetheless, the City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I5-2** The comment expresses concerns regarding fire hazards, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR as well as Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Final EIR. The City also directs the commenter to mitigation measure MM-PUB-1 in Section 4.15, Public Services, of the Final EIR, which outlines the requirements of the proposed permanent onsite fire station. Although all specifics have not been determined at this point in time, the proposed project would further specify funding requirements as a condition of project approval. The fire station would be equipped with a quick-attack, paramedic squad that is capable of responding quickly to emergency medical calls and providing initial response to structure and wildfires within 5 minutes to all of the project site. The public benefits from this response resource include the improvement of the overall response throughout the Morro Hills, focusing on medical emergencies, which comprise over 80% of all emergency calls in Oceanside. For additional information, please also refer to the Fire Hazard and Safety Topical Responses in Appendix T0, Volume II.
- I5-3** The comment incorrectly states that the proposed project would not provide \$500,000 to the City for future improvements to the Melba Bishop Recreation Center until after the 300th unit is occupied. As stated in Chapter 3, Project Description, \$500,000 would be provided to the City prior to issuance of the 300th building permit, not 300th unit occupied. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding the environmental analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I6 Yvonne Obrite

- I6-1** The comment expresses concerns regarding water resources, infrastructure, flooding, fire safety, and traffic, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, Section 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, and Section 4.19, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and, therefore, no more specific response can be provided or is required.
- I6-1** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR (see response to comment O1-2); therefore, no further response is required. While the comment does not address an issue in the Recirculated EIR, nonetheless, the City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I6-1** The comment provides concluding remarks to the preceding comments. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I7 Terry Williams

- I7-1** This comment is introductory in nature, and specific comments follow. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.
- I7-2** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR (see response to comment O1-2); therefore, no further response is required. While the comment does not address an issue in the Recirculated EIR, nonetheless, the City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I7-3** The comment expresses concerns regarding traffic, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I7-4** The comment expresses concerns regarding public utilities and emergency services, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.15, Public Services, and Section 4.19, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I7-5** The comment expresses concerns regarding school capacity, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.15, Public Services, of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I7-6** The comment raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect of the project on the environment. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required.
- I7-7** The comment provides concluding remarks to the preceding comments. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I8 Megan Gamble

- I8-1** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR (see response to comment O1-2); therefore, no further response is required. While the comment does not address an issue in the Recirculated EIR, nonetheless, the City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I9 Cristen Kelly

- I9-1** The comment raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect of the project on the environment. The City directs the commenter to Response to Comment I5-2 above, which addressed similar concerns with regard to the proposed permanent onsite fire station. For additional information, please also refer to the Fire Hazard and Safety Topical Responses in Appendix T0, Volume II. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.
- I9-2** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR (see response to comment O1-2); therefore, no further response is required. While the comment does not address an issue in the Recirculated EIR, nonetheless, the City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I9-3** The comment raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.
- I9-4** The comment raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to the project’s physical effect on the environment. However, the City notes that development of the dog park and mountain bike trail would be conditions of project approval. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.
- I9-5** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. However, the City notes that under CEQA, a lead agency is required to recirculate an EIR, or portions of an EIR, when significant new information is added to the EIR after notice is given of the availability of the Draft EIR for public review, but before circulation. As used in section 15088.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the term “information” can include changes in the project or environmental setting as well as additional data or other information. New information added to an EIR is not “significant” unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project,

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project's proponent has declined to implement.

The project applicant has proposed a number of improvements to the project in response to comments received from the public, City staff, and Planning Commissioners throughout the CEQA and public hearing process. Because these improvements do not result in a new or worsened substantial adverse impacts, or identify a feasible mitigation measure or alternative not adopted by the applicant, recirculation is not required by CEQA. Nonetheless, in an effort to promote meaningful public review, participation, and comprehension, parts of the EIR were recirculated for review and public comment. For additional information please refer to Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

I10 Maria Mellano

- I10-1** This comment is introductory in nature, and specific comments follow. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.
- I10-2** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR (see response to comment O1-2); therefore, no further response is required. While the comment does not address an issue in the Recirculated EIR, nonetheless, the City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I10-3** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

I11 Joe Hill (2)

- I11-1** This comment is introductory in nature, and specific comments follow. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.
- I11-2** This comment is a copy of comment letter I10. Please refer to Response to Comment I10-2 above.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

I12 John A.

- I12-1** This comment is introductory in nature. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.
- I12-2** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR (see response to comment O1-2); therefore, no further response is required. While the comment does not address an issue in the Recirculated EIR, nonetheless, the City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I12-3** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I12-4** The comment provides concluding remarks to the preceding comments. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I13 Jane Marshall

- I13-1** This comment is introductory in nature. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.
- I13-2** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR (see response to comment O1-2); therefore, no further response is required. Nonetheless, the City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I13-3** The comment provides concluding remarks to the preceding comments. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I14 Mary Ellen Reese

- I14-1** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR (see response to comment O1-2); therefore, no further response is required. While the comment does not address an issue in the Recirculated EIR, nonetheless, the City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I14-2** The comment expresses concerns regarding wildfires, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I14-3** The comment expresses concerns regarding traffic and emergency evacuation, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Section 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I14-4** The comment expresses concerns regarding flooding, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I14-5** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I14-6** The comment provides concluding remarks to the preceding comments. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I15 Jane Marshall

- I15-1** The comment expresses concerns regarding traffic and emergency evacuation, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Section 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I15-2** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR (see response to comment O1-2); therefore, no further response is required. While the comment does not address an issue in the Recirculated EIR, nonetheless, the City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I15-3** The comment provides concluding remarks to the preceding comments. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.
- I15-4** This comment is an attachment to the main comment letter. The attachment does not concern the proposed project and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the attachment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I16 Julia Miller

I16-1 This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR (see response to comment O1-2); therefore, no further response is required. While the comment does not address an issue in the Recirculated EIR, nonetheless, the City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.

I16-2 The comment expresses concerns regarding traffic, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, of the Final EIR.

It should be noted that the project as revised in the Recirculated Final EIR does not propose over 600 homes; rather the project includes a development maximum of 585 homes. Please refer to Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Chapter 3, Project Description, of the Revised FEIR.

I16-3 Evacuation routes are discussed in Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, in the Final EIR. While the Final EIR does not specify evacuation routes designated by Caltrans, the analysis does identify and discuss evacuation routes designated by the City in the General Plan Public Safety Element. These evacuation routes are N. River Road, SR-76, and College Boulevard. Additionally, a project specific Evacuation Plan has been prepared for the proposed project, which is included as Appendix J2. For reasons described in Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Appendix J2, Evacuation Plan, and Topical Response FR-3 in Appendix T0, Volume II, impacts to evacuation would be less than significant.

I16-4 The commenter correctly identifies the significant and unavoidable impacts identified by the Final EIR.

I16-5 Flooding is discussed in Section 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Final EIR. The project would implement appropriate grading elevations and flood control improvements necessary to remove the portions of the property from the 100-year flood hazard area defined by FEMA through the LOMR process. The applicant shall be required to construct flood control improvements to contain or redirect the 100-year flood flows away from the property as necessary, such that hazards from the 100-year flood would not adversely affect proposed structures on site. Hydrological modeling determined that all building pads within the project site, as well as downstream and upstream of the site within the floodway, would be above the 100-year floodplain inundation elevation (Appendix L2). The commenter claims that the project would result in flood damages to Melba Bishop Park, but does not provide any basis to this claim.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

- I16-6** The comment raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to a project's physical effect on the environment. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required.
- I16-7** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I16-8** The comment expresses concerns regarding agricultural resources, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.2, Agricultural and Forestry Resources, of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I16-9** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I16-10** The comment expresses concerns regarding smart growth and land use, which received extensive analysis in Section 4.11, Land Use, of the Final EIR. Refer also to Topical Response LU-3 in Appendix T0, Volume II of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I16-11** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

I17 Paul Cassidy

I17-1 This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR (see response to comment O1-2); therefore, no further response is required. While the comment does not address an issue in the Recirculated EIR, nonetheless, the City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.

I17-2 The comment expresses concerns regarding evacuation and traffic, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR as well as Sections 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, of the Final EIR. Refer also to Topical Responses FR-3 and FR-4 regarding evacuation, specifically in the event of a fire, in Appendix T0, Volume II, of the Revised FEIR.

Additionally, the commenter appears to suggest that the project would introduce an additional 10,000 people to the area. As discussed in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, proposed project would result in an estimated 1,863 people (comprised of approximately 1,673 residents and 190 employees).

I17-3 This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I18 Britton Meland

- I18-1** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR (see response to comment O1-2); therefore, no further response is required. While the comment does not address an issue in the Recirculated EIR, nonetheless, the City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I18-2** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter, provides background information, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I18-3** The comment expresses concerns regarding smart growth and land use, which received extensive analysis in Section 4.11, Land Use, of the Final EIR. Refer also to Topical Response LU-3 in Appendix T0, Volume II of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I18-4** The comment raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.
- I18-5** The comment expresses concerns regarding evacuation routes. Evacuation routes are discussed in Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, in the Final EIR. While the Final EIR does not specify evacuation routes designated by Caltrans, the analysis does identify and discuss evacuation routes designated by the City in the General Plan Public Safety Element. These evacuation routes are N. River Road, SR-76, and College Boulevard. Additionally, a project specific Evacuation Plan has been prepared for the proposed project, which is included as Appendix J2. For reasons described in Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Appendix J2, Evacuation Plan, and Topical Response FR-3 in Appendix T0, Volume II, impacts to evacuation would be less than significant.
- I18-6** The comment expresses concerns regarding General Plan consistency and the Draft Agritourism Strategic Plan, which received extensive analysis in Section 4.11, Land Use, of the Final EIR. Refer also to Topical Response LU-1 and LU-4 in Appendix T0, Volume II of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

- I18-7** The comment expresses concerns regarding cumulative impacts, which received extensive analysis in Chapter 5, Cumulative Effects, of the Final EIR. Refer also to Topical Response CU-1 in Appendix T0, Volume II of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I18-8** The commenter correctly identifies the significant and unavoidable impacts identified by the Final EIR.
- I18-9** The comment raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required.
- I18-10** The comment expresses concerns regarding agricultural resources, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.2, Agricultural and Forestry Resources, of the Final EIR. Refer also to Topical Response AG-1 in Appendix T0, Volume II of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I18-11** The comment expresses concerns regarding flooding. Flooding is discussed in Section 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Final EIR. The project would implement appropriate grading elevations and flood control improvements necessary to remove the portions of the property from the 100-year flood hazard area defined by FEMA through the LOMR process. The applicant would be required to construct flood control improvements to contain or redirect the 100-year flood flows away from the property as necessary, such that hazards from the 100-year flood would not adversely affect proposed structures on site. Hydrological modeling determined that all building pads within the project site, as well as downstream and upstream of the site within the floodway, would be above the 100-year floodplain inundation elevation (Appendix L2). The commenter claims that the project would result in flood damages to Melba Bishop Park, but does not provide any basis to this claim.
- I18-12** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

- I18-13** The comment expresses concerns regarding compatibility with surrounding land uses, which received extensive analysis in Section 4.2, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, of the Final EIR. Refer also to Topical Responses CU-1 and LU-2 in Appendix T0, Volume II of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I18-14** The commenter notes that the Scripps Coastal Medical Center, identified as the nearest medical facility to the project site, does not operate as an emergency or urgent care facility. Additionally, the commenter states that the nearest urgent medical facility is located near the Tri-City Medical Center. An Evacuation Plan has been prepared for the proposed project and is included as Appendix J2 to the Revised FEIR. Section 1.1 of the Evacuation Plan lists the nearest medical facilities, including the Scripps Coastal Medical Center, the Tri-City Medical Center, the Naval Hospital Camp Pendleton, and other urgent care facilities. The Evacuation Plan does not indicate or imply that all listed facilities can provide emergency or urgent care. Rather, the Evacuation Plan lists the nearest medical facilities by distance to the project site. Therefore, no revisions to the EIR are necessary or required.
- I18-15** This comment expresses concerns regarding livestock and specific populations during an emergency evacuation, stating that the project's Evacuation Plan fails to address these issues. Please refer to Topical Response FR-3 in Appendix T0, Volume II of the Final EIR, regarding the adequacy of evacuation planning. The project's evacuation plan has been prepared to raise resident awareness (Appendix J2). Note that evacuation plans are not required by CEQA or City policies or regulations. For the residents of the project and the surrounding area, it should also be noted that the primary focus of an evacuation plan is to identify evacuation routes and to prepare residents for an emergency event.
- I18-16** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I19 Jane Marshall

- I19-1** The comment provides background information and does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. Nonetheless, note that SB 330, the Housing Crisis Act of 2019, referenced by the commenter, seeks to boost new housing development through establishing a 12-month timeline for processing housing permits, imposing a ban on new housing fees, and barring other restrictions that may prevent housing development. As stated in Section 1 of the Housing Crisis Act, “California needs an estimated 180,000 additional homes annually to keep up with population growth, and the Governor has called for 3.5 million new homes to be built over the next 7 years” to make inroads into addressing the housing crisis. SB 330 does not prohibit development on agricultural lands. SB 330 does not go into effect until January 1, 2020. The Recirculated Final EIR explains that the project would provide 585 homes accommodating 1,971 residents, while preserving 68.1 acres of agricultural uses onsite and another 176.6 acres of agriculture off-site as project mitigation. Therefore, the project is consistent with SB 330 and its policies. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I19-2** The comment provides background information and does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. Please also refer to Section 4.14, Population and Housing, of the Revised FEIR for a discussion of the current and adopted Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) within the City of Oceanside. No further response is required or necessary.
- I19-3** This comments raises concerns regarding the proposed rezoning and safety, which received extensive analysis in Sections 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 4.11, Land Use, of the Final EIR. Please also refer to Topical Responses FR-1 through FR-4 and LU-2 in Appendix T0, Volume II. This comment also expresses the opinions of the commenter. The attachment provided by the commenter is noted. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I20 Phil Johnston

- I20-1** The comment expresses concerns regarding General Plan consistency, which received extensive analysis in Section 4.11, Land Use, of the Final EIR. Please also refer to Topical Responses LU-1 in Appendix T0, Volume II. This comment also provides background information and does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I20-2** Please refer to Response to Comment I20-1. This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I20-3** Please refer to Response to Comment I20-1.
- I20-4** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR (see response to comment O1-2); therefore, no further response is required. While the comment does not address an issue in the Recirculated EIR, nonetheless, the City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I20-5** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I20-6** Please refer to Response to Comment I20-1. This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I21 Phil Johnston

- I21-1** This comment is introductory in nature, and specific comments follow. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.
- I21-2** The comment provides background information and does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I21-3** In response to this comment, Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, has been revised to include “General Plan consistency” among the list of concerns raised by the public and/or Planning Commissioners. These revisions to the Recirculated Final EIR are presented in ~~strikeout~~/underline format. To the extent these changes and additions to the Recirculated Final EIR provide new information that may clarify or amplify information already found in the Recirculated Final EIR, they do not raise important new issues about significant effects on the environment; therefore, such changes are insignificant as the term is used in Section 15088.5(b) of the CEQA Guidelines.
- I21-4** This comment is a quoted excerpt from Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final Environmental Impact Report. No further response is necessary.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I22 Bob Hope

- I22-1** This comment is introductory in nature, and specific comments follow. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.
- I22-2** This comment is introductory in nature, and provides background information. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.
- I22-3** This comment suggests that the project does not preserve natural resources. While the project would result in impacts to the environment, the project would still preserve natural resources. As discussed in Section 4.4, Biological Resources, the project would result in impacts to sensitive biological resources; mitigation measures MM-BIO-1 through MM-BIO-3 would fully mitigate potentially significant impacts to biological resources, including the purchase of land within the San Luis Rey Mitigation Bank. Mitigation measure (MM-) AG-1 would require purchase of mitigation credits into a potential future City agricultural lands conservation program (should one be established prior to the time of grading permit issuance) or the County program known as the PACE Program equal to the loss of significant agricultural resources. Additionally, a condition of project approval will require the provision of an agricultural easement and/or deed restriction over the Bree Property that will preserve in perpetuity open space/agricultural uses at that property.
- I22-4** This comment expresses concerns regarding traffic and cumulative growth in the project area, which received extensive analysis in the Final EIR and the Recirculated Final EIR. Trip generations are calculated using a published “Average Daily Trip” (ADT) rate. The project’s trip generation is calculated and shown in Table PR-3 in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR. Additionally, as required by CEQA, the project’s Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) (included as Appendix N), includes several study scenarios: existing, near-term, and Year 2035. Therefore, the Revised FEIR analysis accounts for cumulative traffic growth. Potential impacts and proposed mitigation measures related to traffic are discussed in Section 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, of the Final EIR.
- This comment also expresses concerns over air quality emissions from induced vehicle trips. Please refer to Section 4.3, Air Quality, and Appendix D1, which contains an analysis of air quality impacts, including from vehicles.
- Additionally, as required by mitigation measures MM-PUB-1, the project applicant shall contribute funding for the ongoing staff operations cost for two personnel at the proposed permanent fire station. The specifics of this funding are further clarified in the project’s conditions of approval.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

I22-5 This comment raises concerns regarding safety, pedestrian and bicycle circulation, schools, and other general issues. These topics received adequate and required analysis within the Revised FEIR; please refer to Sections 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, 4.15, Public Services, and 4.17, Traffic and Circulation. Refer also to Chapter 3, Project Description, and Appendix B, North River Farms Planned Development Plan, for descriptions of the proposed circulation network.

It should be noted that Revised FEIR does not claim that no impacts would occur, as suggested by the commenter. Please refer to Section ES, Executive Summary, for a summary of potential impacts of the proposed project.

Additionally, this comment raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment.

The comment regarding the accident rate and design of SR-76 is noted. This comment does not raise an issue with the adequacy of the Recirculated Final EIR. No further response is required.

I22-6 This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR (see response to comment O1-2); therefore, no further response is required. While the comment does not address an issue in the Recirculated EIR, nonetheless, the City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.

I23 Nadine Scott

- I23-1** The comment provides background information and does not raise an environmental issue with the Recirculated Final EIR within the meaning of CEQA. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I23-2** This comment raises concerns with conversion of agricultural land, consistency with the General Plan, and Smart Growth. The conversion of agricultural land is addressed in Section 4.1, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, and Topical Response AG-1 in Appendix T0, Volume II. Refer also to Section 4.11, Land Use and Planning, and Topical Responses LU-1 through LU-3 and PH-2, regarding General Plan consistency and Smart Growth. In response to the commenter's assertion that the project violates SB 330, the Housing Crisis Act of 2019, please refer to response to comment I19-1.
- I23-3** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR (see response to comment O1-2); therefore, no further response is required. While the comment does not address an issue in the Recirculated EIR, nonetheless, the City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I23-4** The attached referenced Senate Bill 330 is noted. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I24 Phil Johnston

- I24-1** This comment is introductory in nature, and specific comments follow. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.
- I24-2** This comment is introductory in nature, and specific comments follow. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.
- I24-3** The comment raises a concern about the evaluation of potential flooding as a public concern. Potential flooding is addressed in the Revised FEIR in Section 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, as well as Appendix W1, Responses to Late Comment Letters Prior to Recirculation.

As indicated by the Division of Safety of Dams' (DSOD's) Dam Breach Inundation Map Web Publisher¹, the southern portion of the project site is located within Henshaw Dam's inundation zone. The Downstream Hazard for Henshaw Dam is rated as "Extremely High". However, the downstream hazard is based solely on potential downstream impacts to life and property should the dam fail when operating with a full reservoir. This hazard is not related to the condition of the dam or its appurtenant structures. The definitions for downstream hazard are borrowed from the Federal Guidelines for Inundation Mapping of Flood Risks Associated with Dam Incidents and Failures (FEMA P-946)².

The downstream hazard potential classification for Henshaw Dam is "Extremely High," which without proper perspective may cause undue alarm; the classification is not a characterization of the dam itself, but a reflection of the downstream population size. This classification actually applies to three-quarters of the more than 1,200 State jurisdictional dams statewide and also applies to three-quarters of the 59 State jurisdictional dams in San Diego County. The classification also dictates higher dam safety standards, inspections and monitoring. This is of course to mitigate for the risk associated with having a larger population size downstream of these dams than those with less population. As identified by DSOD, Henshaw Dam's condition is rated as "Satisfactory", the highest rating possible, and is "Certified" to safely impound water specific by its Certificate of Approval³.

¹ https://fmds.water.ca.gov/webgis/?appid=dam_prototype_v2

² Federal Guidelines for Inundation Mapping of Flood Risks Associated with Dam Incidents and Failures. July 2013. https://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/96171edb98e3f51ff9684a8d1f034d97/Dam_Guidance_508.pdf

³ Dams Within Jurisdiction of the State of California. September 2018. <https://water.ca.gov/-/media/DWR-Website/Web-Pages/Programs/All-Programs/Division-of-Safety-of-Dams/Files/Publications/Dams-Within-Jurisdiction-of-the-State-of-California-2018-Alphabetically-by-County.pdf>

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

Further, it should be noted that dam inundation maps are conservatively prepared for the purpose of informing emergency response agencies for the preparation and implementation of emergency planning. It does not necessarily reflect a realistic scenario of a dam breach.

I24-4 The information provided in this comment is consistent with the DSOD's Dam Breach Inundation Map Web Publisher related to Henshaw Dam. No further response is necessary.

I24-5 As discussed in Section 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, the risk from flooding caused by dam inundation is not considered significant given the distance of Lake Henshaw from the project site, low average water retained in the Lake, earthfill structure of Henshaw Dam, its "Satisfactory" condition rating from the DSOD, and design of the project to remove proposed housing outside of the 100-year flood hazard zone. At the time of publication of the Final EIR before City Council, DSOD had not formally published the current Henshaw Dam inundation mapping referenced in this comment letter. However, the published inundation map available from DSOD does not alter the conclusions of the Revised FEIR.

I24-6 The City refers the commenter to Response to Comment I24-5.

I24-7 This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR (see response to comment O1-2); therefore, no further response is required. While the comment does not address an issue in the Recirculated EIR, nonetheless, the City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.

I24-8 The commenter is referred to Response to Comment I24-5. Note, the purpose of this document is to provide dam safety professionals with guidance on how to prepare dam breach inundation modeling studies and conduct mapping that can be used for multiple purposes, including dam safety, hazard mitigation, consequence evaluation, and emergency management.

I24-9 This comment concludes the letter. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.

I25 Bruce Howe

- I25-1** The comment addresses growth inducement and cumulative impacts, which received extensive analysis in Sections 4.7, 4.11, and 6.1 of the Final EIR. Please also refer to Topical Responses CU-1, LU-1, and PH-1. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I25-2** The comment addresses smart growth areas, which received extensive analysis in Sections 4.11 and 4.14 of the Final EIR. Please also refer to Topical Responses CU-1 and LU-3. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I25-3** Refer to Response to Comment I25-1. Additionally, the commenter does not provide evidence for the conclusion regarding “30,000 residents”. No more specific response can therefore be provided.
- I25-4** The comment generally addresses public services, which received extensive analysis in Section 4.15 of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I26 Karen Green

I26-1 This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR (see response to comment O1-2); therefore, no further response is required. While the comment does not address an issue in the Recirculated EIR, nonetheless, the City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.

I26-2 This comment discusses General Plan consistency, which received extensive analysis in Section 4.11, Land Use, of the Final EIR; refer also to Topical Responses LU-1 and LU-2 in Appendix T0, Volume II, of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.

I26-3 The comment expresses concerns regarding traffic, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, of the Final EIR. Specifically, regarding potential impacts to N. River Road and mitigation, please refer to Topical Response TR-1 in Appendix T0, Volume II. The project includes all feasible mitigation for potentially significant project impacts to traffic.

I26-4 The comment expresses concerns regarding emergency evacuation and fire safety which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Section 4.15, Public Services, of the Final EIR. Note, that no mitigation is proposed or required for evacuation, as no potentially significant impact has been identified for this issue area. The commenter appears to be referencing mitigation measure MM-PUB-1, which addresses the potentially significant impact to emergency response times to the project site.

Additionally, a project specific Evacuation Plan has been prepared for the proposed project, which is included as Appendix J2. Evacuation was also addressed in Topical Responses FR-1 through FR-5 in Appendix T0, Volume II. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.

I26-5 The comment expresses concerns regarding agricultural resources, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.2, Agricultural and Forestry Resources, of the Final EIR. Regarding the proposed mitigation for potentially significant impacts to agricultural resources, please refer to Topical Response AG-1 in Appendix T0, Volume II. Note, as discussed in Section 4.1, Aesthetics, no portion of N. River Road is designated as a scenic corridor.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

- I26-6** The comment expresses concerns regarding cumulative impacts, which received extensive analysis in Chapter 5, Cumulative Effects, of the Final EIR. Refer also to Topical Response CU-1 in Appendix T0, Volume II of the Final EIR. Additionally, potential irreversible effects of the project are discussed in Chapter 6, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- The comment also expresses the opinions of the commenter and raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment associated with the project. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I26-7** The comment expresses concerns regarding the project's consistency with recent community planning efforts. Please refer to Topical Response LU-4 in Appendix T0, Volume II of the Final EIR.
- I26-8** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter regarding adequacy of mitigation but does not raise any specific environmental issue. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I26-9** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I26-10** The comment addresses smart growth areas, which received extensive analysis in Sections 4.11 and 4.14 of the Final EIR. Please also refer to Topical Response LU-3. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I26-11** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

I27 Dennis Martinek

- I27-1** This comment is introductory in nature, and specific comments follow. This comment also expresses the opinions of the commenter and restates information from the Final EIR. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.
- I27-2** The comment expresses concerns regarding flooding, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Final EIR. Refer also to Topical Responses HY-1 and HY-2 in Appendix T0, Volume II. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I27-3** The comment expresses concerns regarding emergency evacuation and fire safety, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Section 4.15, Public Services, of the Final EIR. Additionally, a project specific Evacuation Plan has been prepared for the proposed project, which is included as Appendix J2. Evacuation was also addressed in Topical Responses FR-1 through FR-5 in Appendix T0, Volume II. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I27-4** This comment discusses General Plan consistency, which received extensive analysis in Section 4.11, Land Use, of the Final EIR; refer also to Topical Responses LU-1 through LU-3 in Appendix T0, Volume II, of the Final EIR. Further, this comment also expresses concerns regarding the loss of farmland, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.2, Agriculture, of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I27-5** Please refer to Response to Comment I27-4. The comment expresses concerns regarding compatibility with surrounding land uses, which received extensive analysis in Section 4.2, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, of the Final EIR. Refer also to Topical Responses CU-1 and LU-2 in Appendix T0, Volume II of the Final EIR. Generally, Wilshire Road, separates the project site from existing agricultural operations near the northeast tip of the project boundary. Existing agricultural lands lie immediately adjacent to the project site to the south. The proposed project would include on-site design elements of large areas of continued agricultural uses around the proposed project's south and southeast edges, landscape buffer edge around the project site in the west, north, and east, and a water retention basin, which project design features would be adjacent to and would buffer the limited agricultural lands, the residential properties, and the commercial uses along the proposed project's boundaries.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

Isolated agricultural fields exist south of the project site, across the San Luis Rey River, and are currently surrounded by existing residential subdivisions and other development. The introduction of the proposed project, given that the proposed project also includes agricultural operations and other buffers, would not adversely affect these surrounding existing agricultural lands.

- I27-6** The commenter raises concerns about the loss of agricultural lands and claims that a comprehensive analysis of the impacts of such loss should be required. A Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) Report was performed for the project site and is included as Appendix C to the Final EIR. The LESA Report was prepared in accordance to the California Agricultural LESA Model and properly assessed the project's potential impacts to important agricultural resources. As discussed in Section 4.2, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, while the proposed project would preserve 68.1 acres of agricultural uses onsite, it was nonetheless determined that it would result in a significant impact to significant agricultural resources through the direct conversion of state-designated farmland to non-agricultural use. Mitigation measure MM-AGR-1 would reduce this impact to a less than significant level by requiring preservation of 176.64 acres of agricultural land off-site within the City – if a City agricultural conservation program is in place – or, if not, within San Diego County. Thus, with mitigation incorporated, the proposed project would preserve a total 244.74 acres (68.1 + 176.64) in agricultural use. Additionally, potential cumulative impacts to agricultural resources are discussed in Chapter 5 of the Final EIR.
- I27-7** The comment raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment associated with the project. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.
- I27-8** The comment expresses concerns regarding General Plan consistency and the Draft Agritourism Strategic Plan, which received extensive analysis in Section 4.11, Land Use, of the Final EIR. Refer also to Topical Response LU-1 and LU-4 in Appendix T0, Volume II of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.

I28 David Flinn

I28-1 This comment discusses General Plan consistency, which received extensive analysis in Section 4.11, Land Use, of the Final EIR; refer also to Topical Responses LU-1 and LU-2 in Appendix T0, Volume II, of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.

This comment also expresses the opinions of the commenter. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

I28-2 This comment expresses concerns regarding traffic, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, of the Final EIR. Regarding density, as discussed in Section PR, when accounting for the project modifications of a unit count reduction and addition of the Bree Property, the overall project density would be approximately 2.73 dwelling units per acre. The highest proposed allowable density range would be located within the Village Core, along N. River Road, at 10.0-15.0 dwelling units per acre.

I28-3 This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR (see response to comment O1-2); therefore, no further response is required. While the comment does not address an issue in the Recirculated EIR, nonetheless, the City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

I28-4 This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

I28-5 This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. Please note that the proposed project has a development maximum of 585 dwelling units, as reflected in the North River Farms Planned Development Plan (Appendix B). The conditions of approval and the PD Plan, should the project be adopted, would not allow for additional units beyond the proposed maximum. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

- I28-6** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I28-7** The comment provides background information and expresses concerns regarding the Draft Agritourism Strategic Plan, which received extensive analysis in Section 4.11, Land Use, of the Final EIR. Refer also to Topical Response LU-4 in Appendix T0, Volume II of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I28-8** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I28-9** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

I29 Florence Scheft

I29-1 This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. This comment also appears to reference a public vote that is unrelated to the project. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

I29-2 The comment expresses concerns regarding evacuation and traffic, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Sections 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, of the Final EIR. Refer also to Topical Responses FR-3 and FR-4 regarding evacuation, specifically in the event of a fire, in Appendix T0, Volume II, of the Revised FEIR. This comment also expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise any additional issues related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. This comment also appears to reference a public vote that is unrelated to the project. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I30 Mark Ochs

- I30-1** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter, provides background information, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. However, the comment incorrectly claims that the project previously was not submitted as a “Planned Development”, which would require a General Plan and zoning amendment. The proposed project has always been comprised of a Planned Development Plan (requiring General Plan and zoning amendments) throughout the application and environmental review process. Please refer to the project’s Notice of Preparation, dated November 22, 2017.
- I30-2** The commenter appears to claim that the project is not consistent with the Planned Development Zoning Ordinance because the project is not “urban.” However, the policies of the Ordinance only refer to “quality urban design” and do not require the project to be an urban development to qualify for the Planned Development designation. The project is consistent with various policies of the Ordinance.
- Further, the commenter seems to state that the Planned Development proposal should not be considered by the City Council without a prior zone change to Planned Development district, which can only be considered after the General Plan amendment. The project applicant is proposing an amendment to the General Plan to change the existing land use designation to the proposed designation, which can be processed concurrently with other associated discretionary project approvals. The Planned Development Zoning Ordinance (sections 1705 and 1707) requires the Planned Development Plan be considered concurrently with the zone change to the Planned Development District.
- I30-3** The comment expresses concerns regarding the Draft Agritourism Strategic Plan, which received extensive analysis in Section 4.11, Land Use, of the Final EIR. Refer also to Topical Response LU-1 and LU-4 in Appendix T0, Volume II of the Final EIR. This comment also expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis. Therefore, no more specific response can be provided or is required.
- I30-4** The project no longer includes a General Plan Amendment to reclassify N. River Road. Please refer to Chapter 3, Project Description, of the Recirculated Final EIR.
- I30-5** The comment expresses concern regarding storm water drainage, which received extensive analysis in Section 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Final EIR. Additionally, a Drainage Study has been prepared for the proposed project and is included as Appendix L to the Final EIR. The proposed project incorporated a drainage

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

- system into the project design. The drainage system would be designed to convey runoff through a system of storm drain inlets and piping and biofiltration basins. The proposed drainage system would be designed in accordance with City requirements to accommodate predicted peak flows (including the 100-Year storm event) from the project site to eliminate the risk of flooding.
- I30-6** The comment claims that the project does not fall within a mass transit corridor. NCTD provides public transit services to the project site's vicinity. The proposed project is in proximity to the San Luis Rey Transit Center—located south of N. River Road between Vandegrift Boulevard and Waterview Way—slightly more than half a mile from the project site. The San Luis Rey Transit Center is served by Bus Routes 303, 309, 311, 313, and 315. Bike routes and pedestrian trails, proposed as part of project development would permit residents and visitors to access the Transit Center, reducing the need for single occupancy vehicle trips. According to SANDAG's comments on the NOP, the connections would help implement the Regional Plan despite the project not being located in a Smart Growth Opportunity Area. Although NCTD does not currently provide service to the project site or to the areas to the east along N. River Road, NCTD indicated that future service may be expanded to the area (Appendix A of the Draft EIR). The proposed project includes east/west bus stop infrastructure along N. River Road within the project site to prepare for any future contemplated service by NCTD.
- I30-7** Biological resources and compliance with the Oceanside Subarea Plan is discussed in Section 4.4, Biological Resources. Within the Oceanside Subarea Plan, the project site is classified primarily as agricultural lands, with some portions mapped as disturbed. The Oceanside Subarea Plan has categorized this area as an Agricultural Exclusion Zone, which states that ongoing agricultural practices may continue in this area as long as they do not remove existing habitats. Impacts to sensitive biological resources within would be fully mitigated by mitigation measure MM-BIO-2, which requires purchase of 0.61 acres of riparian habitat, which is a ratio consistent with Table 5-2 of the Oceanside Subarea Plan.
- I30-8** As discussed in Section 4.19, Utilities and Service Systems, currently, the off-site infrastructure is not available to supply recycled water to the proposed project. However, as a condition of approval, the proposed project would construct recycled water facilities to obtain beneficial use of recycled water when it becomes available. The use of recycled water would be for parks and irrigated open space. Some areas of agriculture may be able to use recycled water depending on the type and purpose of plants that are cultivated.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

- I30-9** The proposed project would incorporate solar photovoltaic panels on residential units and non-residential uses to offset the energy use. Refer to Section 4.3 and Appendix D2, PV Loads Report, for additional information.
- I30-10** It is unclear as to which section of the EIR the commenter is quoting, as Section 2.1 does not contain any of the quoted phrases in this comment. Please refer to Section 2.1.2 of the Final EIR for a general description of the surrounding land uses, as well as Topical Response LU-2 in Appendix T0, Volume II.
- I30-11** As discussed in the Recirculated Final EIR, the project has been modified to include a permanent fire station on site. Please refer to Section PR.3 and mitigation measure MM-PUB-1.
- I30-12** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I30-13** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. Note that the parking is not considered an environmental issue under Appendix G of CEQA and applicable caselaw. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I30-14** The comment expresses concerns regarding cumulative impacts, which received extensive analysis in Chapter 5, Cumulative Effects, of the Final EIR. Refer also to Topical Response CU-1 in Appendix T0, Volume II of the Final EIR. Additionally, potential irreversible effects of the project are discussed in Chapter 6, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- The comment also expresses the opinions of the commenter and raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment associated with the project. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I30-15** The comment raises economic issues that do not appear to relate to the project's physical effect on the environment. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

- I30-16** The comment raises economic and political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment associated with the project. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required.
- I30-17** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I30-18** The comment expresses the opinion of the commenter regarding mitigation for greenhouse gas emissions. Please refer to Topical Responses GHG-1 through GHG-3 in Appendix T0, Volume II. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I30-19** The comment expresses the opinion of the commenter regarding mitigation for agricultural impacts. Please refer to Topical Response AG-1 in Appendix T0, Volume II. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I30-20** This comment states that Native American artifacts have not been considered in the Draft EIR. Please refer to Section 4.5, Cultural Resources, which discusses potential impacts to archaeological resources, including those of Native American concern. Refer to Comment Letter A2 in Appendix T0 which states that the Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians are in agreement with mitigation measure MM-CUL-1. Additionally, Section 4.18, Tribal Cultural Resources, of the Final EIR documents the City's tribal consultation efforts as required by Assembly Bill 52.
- I30-21** The comment raises economic and political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.
- I30-22** This comment states that the City has not considered traffic impacts heading east from the project. As described in Section 4.17.1 and shown on Figure 4.17-1 of the Final EIR, the traffic study area includes roadway segments and intersections east of the project site along N. River Road. The Draft EIR adequately assessed potential impacts within the traffic study area utilizing the published San Diego Traffic Engineering Council/Institute of Traffic Engineers guidelines for the determination of the

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

significance of impacts, as identified in Section 4.17.3 of the Final EIR. The commenter's opinion regarding the widening of N. River Road has been noted. The City will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.

There is no Figure 1-2 in the Final EIR. However, it appears that the commenter is referring to Figure 1-2 of Appendix B, which is a vicinity map of the project. Figure 1-2 does not imply or claim to present actual paths of vehicle travel; rather it highlights several roadways in the vicinity of the project site.

Please refer to Topical Responses TR-1 through TR-3 in Appendix T0, Volume II.

- I30-23** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I31 Sharon Ochs

- I31-1** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR (see response to comment O1-2); therefore, no further response is required. While the comment does not address an issue in the Recirculated EIR, nonetheless, refer also to Topical Response LU-4 in Appendix T0, Volume II of the Final EIR, regarding the Draft Agritourism Plan. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I31-2** Please refer to Response to Comment I30-2.
- I31-3** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I31-4** The comment generally addresses utilities, energy, and evacuation, which received extensive analysis in Sections 4.6, 4.9 and 4.9 of the Final EIR. Please also refer to Topical Responses WS-1, FR-3, and FR-4 in Appendix T0, Volume II.
- I31-5** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I32 Andrea Peterson

- I32-1** The comment expresses concerns regarding smart growth and land use, which received extensive analysis in Section 4.11, Land Use, of the Final EIR. Refer also to Topical Response LU-3 in Appendix T0, Volume II of the Final EIR. The comment also expresses concerns regarding loss of farmland, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.2, Agriculture, of the Final EIR. Refer also to Topical Response AG-1 in Appendix T0, Volume II. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I32-2** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. Refer also to Topical Response LU-4 in Appendix T0, Volume II of the Final EIR, regarding the Draft Agritourism Plan. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I32-3** The comment raises concerns with flooding. Flooding is discussed in Section 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Final EIR. The project would implement appropriate grading elevations and flood control improvements necessary to remove the portions of the property from the 100-year flood hazard area defined by FEMA through the LOMR process. As a condition of approval, the applicant shall be required to construct flood control improvements to contain or redirect the 100-year flood flows away from the property as necessary, such that hazards from the 100-year flood would not adversely affect proposed structures on site. Hydrological modeling determined that all building pads within the project site, as well as downstream and upstream of the site within the floodway, would be above the 100-year floodplain inundation elevation (Appendix L2).
- I32-4** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. Refer also to Topical Response LU-4 in Appendix T0, Volume II of the Final EIR, regarding the Draft Agritourism Plan. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I32-5** The comment expresses concerns regarding emergency evacuation and fire safety which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Section 4.15, Public Services, of the Final EIR. Additionally, a project specific Evacuation Plan has been prepared for the proposed project, which is included as Appendix J2. Evacuation was

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

- also addressed in Topical Responses FR-1 through FR-5 in Appendix T0, Volume II. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and, therefore, no more specific response can be provided or is required.
- I32-6** The comment expresses concerns regarding evacuation and traffic, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Sections 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, of the Final EIR. Refer also to Topical Responses FR-3 and FR-4 regarding evacuation, specifically in the event of a fire, in Appendix T0, Volume II, of the Revised FEIR. This comment also expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I32-7** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR (see response to comment O1-2); therefore, no further response is required. While the comment does not address an issue in the Recirculated EIR, nonetheless, the City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.

I33 Dale Disharoon

I33-1 This comment is introductory in nature, and specific comments follow. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.

I33-2 This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter, provides background information, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

I33-3 The comment expresses concerns regarding traffic, emergency response, emergency evacuation and fire safety which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Public Services, and Section 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, of the Final EIR. Evacuation was also addressed in Topical Responses FR-1 through FR-5 in Appendix T0, Volume II. The project's traffic analysis was prepared in accordance with CEQA and the San Diego Traffic Engineering Council/Institute of Traffic Engineers guidelines for the determination of the significance of impacts. As such, potential impacts and mitigation measures were identified in accordance with these guidelines.

I33-4 The commenter's concern regarding potential additional traffic from a newly announced project along SR-78 is noted.

Section 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, includes a reasonable scenario for both near-term cumulative and long-term (Year 2035) traffic analysis; refer to the project's TIA (Appendix N) for a full description of the assumptions and analysis methodology.

According to Section 15130(b)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, a cumulative impact analysis may be conducted and presented by either of two methods:

(A) a list of past, present, and probable activities producing related or cumulative impacts; or

(B) a summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document, or in a prior environmental document that has been adopted or certified, which described or evaluated regional or area-wide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact.

In the case of traffic analysis, both methodologies are used.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

However, under the first methodology, only probable, not speculative, future projects are required to be included in the cumulative impacts analysis. Probable future projects are the projects for which the applicant has devoted significant time and financial resources to prepare the project for regulatory review and an application has been filed. (See *Gray v. Cnty. of Madera* (2008) 167 Cal.App.4th 1099, 1128; *Friends of the Eel River v. Sonoma Cnty. Water Agency* (2003) 108 Cal.App.4th 859 [probable future project for purposes of cumulative impact analysis are projects under environmental review].) The agency's mere awareness of a proposed project is insufficient to demonstrate that the project is a probable future project. (*Gray, supra*, 167 Cal.App.4th at 1127; see also *City of Maywood v. Los Angeles Unified Sch. Dist.* (2012) 208 Cal.App.4th 362, 397 [probable future project must both be "probable and sufficiently certain to allow for meaningful cumulative impacts analysis."].)

The referenced project along SR-78 has just been announced and is still speculative. Further, the City generally considers only those cumulative projects which are probable at the time of issuance of the notice of preparation in preparing EIRs. This is because "[p]rojects are constantly being fed into the environmental review process" and therefore, as standard practice, the City has exercised its discretion to set the issuance of the notice of preparation as the reasonable cutoff date. (See, *Gray, supra*, 167 Cal.App.4th at 1128.)

I33-5 This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. Refer also to Topical Response LU-4 in Appendix T0, Volume II of the Final EIR, regarding the Draft Agritourism Plan. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

I33-6 This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

I34 Jennifer Schauble

I34-1 This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter, provides background information, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR (see response to comment O1-2); therefore, no further response is required. While the comment does not address an issue in the Recirculated EIR, nonetheless, the City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.

I34-2 Potential impacts to biological resources are discussed in Section 4.4, Biological Resources, of the Final EIR. As discussed in Section 4.4, there are documented occurrences of least Bell's vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus*) within the San Luis Rey River. The area between the project site and the San Luis Rey River will continue to be maintained and operated as active agricultural lands providing a buffer of the existing land use between the San Luis Rey River and the proposed project; therefore, indirect impacts occurring to special-status species which use the San Luis Rey River would not change with project implementation. Minimization measures required by Section 5.2.8 of the Oceanside Subarea Plan would be applied to avoid indirect impacts to special-status wildlife species.

Breeding birds can be significantly affected by short-term construction-related noise, which can result in the disruption of foraging, nesting, and reproductive activities. Although the areas adjacent to the project site, or areas left intact on the project site following implementation of the proposed project, support very limited suitable vegetation for bird nesting, the ornamental trees surrounding the project site may support nesting habitat for raptors. Indirect impacts from construction-related noise may occur to wildlife if construction occurs during the breeding season (i.e., February 15–August 31 for most bird species and January 1–August 31 for raptors). Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant. MM-BIO-1, which requires pre-construction nesting bird surveys, would reduce potentially significant impacts to nesting birds protected under the MBTA to a level below significance.

Additionally, the project site itself is not located within a movement corridor and does not facilitate movement of wildlife species because of its proximity to other disturbed and developed sites. Thus, implementation of the proposed project would not directly impact wildlife movement. The proposed project would not affect the ability for wildlife movement that could occur within the San Luis Rey River to the south.

Therefore, with incorporation of mitigation measures, impacts to biological resources, including least Bell's vireo, would be less than significant.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I35 Phil Johnston

I35-1 This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and provides background information, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

I35-2 The commenter refers to a FEMA (floodplain) map dated May 16, 2012, inferring a more recent rendering of river conditions. This understanding is incorrect; FEMA periodically republishes all their floodplain maps, regardless of the date of the last Flood Insurance Study (FIS); this is what FEMA did in 2012 throughout San Diego County. Prior to the 2016 LOMR, which remapped the floodplain to more accurately reflect the current conditions of the river, the last floodplain study on this reach of the San Luis Rey River was completed in 1986. Changes within the river channel and on the floodplain in the past 30 plus years prompted the need to update the floodplain mapping with more current and accurate data.

I35-3 The comment claims “FEMA does not provide technical oversight of LOMR submissions, they only handle administrative aspects.” The comment mischaracterizes the rigorous process undertaken by the preparation, review and approval of a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) application package. The LOMR application, including the floodplain study supporting the LOMR application, was first prepared by a qualified local expert, who has prepared numerous floodplain studies in California and in several other states. Then, upon submittal of the complete LOMR application package to FEMA, a very comprehensive review was undertaken by qualified civil engineers contracted by FEMA. As with all such applications, the reviewers spent weeks carefully evaluating all the data, hydraulic models, photographic evidence, and topography, working both with colleagues and with the Civil Engineer who prepared the application package. The entire process took several months, as is common for all such applications.

The comment mischaracterizes the process for the LOMR application at the local (City) level, making unsubstantiated claims about the topographic data used for the hydraulic model within the LOMR application. The topographic data was prepared by qualified, experienced professional land surveyors, licensed in the state of California. The City (and all other public agencies and private clients) routinely accepts topographic information that has been certified by professional land surveyors. It is standard practice, accepted nationwide, to review information and studies with the premise that the most “fundamental” elements on which the information and studies are based, are sound.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

- The purpose of licensure is to ensure public safety, to ensure a standard of practice is followed, and to ensure that professionals follow professional ethical and technical practices. Consequences of not doing so include revocation of license.
- I35-4** Please refer to Appendix L2, Conditional Letter of Map Revision Request of the Revised EIR. This appendix includes hydraulic modeling output and flood profile data.
- I35-5** The commenters statement that “no document to show that digital modeling or any other technical work was done to support the LOMR” is inaccurate. Modeling outputs are provided in Attachment 4 and 5 of Appendix L2.
- I35-6** Please refer to Response to Comment I35-2 through I35-6.
- I35-7** Please refer to Response to Comment I35-2 through I35-6.
- I35-8** Please refer to Response to Comment I35-2 through I35-6.
- I35-9** This comment provides a definition of a floodway. Please refer to Response to Comment I35-1.

I36 Stephen Sikorski

- I36-1** The comment expresses concerns regarding traffic, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, safety, and agricultural resources, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Sections 4.1, 4.2, 4.8, 4.9, and 4.17 of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required. This comment also expresses the opinions of the commenter. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I37 Bob Nelson

- I37-1** This comment is introductory in nature, and specific comments follow. Additionally, the comment restates information contained in the Recirculated Final EIR. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.
- I37-2** The comment provides background information and does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I37-3** The comment expresses concerns regarding flooding, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I37-4** This comment expresses concerns regarding traffic, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, of the Final EIR. The TIA (Appendix N to the Revised FEIR) was prepared in accordance with CEQA and the San Diego Traffic Engineering Council/Institute of Traffic Engineers guidelines for the determination of the significance of impacts. As such, potential traffic impacts and mitigation measures were identified in accordance with these guidelines. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I37-5** The comment raises concerns with the addition of the Bree Property with regard to potential future development. As discussed in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, the Bree Property has been incorporated into the project boundary and would have a condition of project approval to require the provision of an agricultural easement and/or deed restriction over the Bree Property that will preserve in perpetuity open space/agricultural uses at that property. The provision of this easement would not result in any physical changes to the environment, and no development, improvements, or modifications would occur on the Bree property as part of this project. Any future development on the Bree property would be limited to that in support of agricultural/open space uses consistent with the provisions of the easement and is considered speculative at this time. Because the project would not result in any physical changes to the Bree property, no additional fire risk would occur, nor would the project result in a significant change in pesticide use.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

- I37-6** The commenter suggests that an extension of North Santa Fe Road be constructed with a bridge directly onto the project site to address traffic and emergency access concerns. The comment expresses concerns regarding traffic, emergency response, and emergency evacuation, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Public Services, and Section 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, of the Final EIR. Evacuation was also addressed in Topical Responses FR-1 through FR-5 in Appendix T0, Volume II. The project's traffic analysis was prepared in accordance with CEQA and the San Diego Traffic Engineering Council/Institute of Traffic Engineers guidelines for the determination of the significance of impacts. As such, potential traffic impacts and mitigation measures were identified in accordance with these guidelines. This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I37-7** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.

I38 Cesar Fernandez-Mansilla

- I38-1** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.
- I38-2** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I38-3** The comment expresses concerns regarding flood hazards and emergency evacuation, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Section 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Final EIR. Additionally, a project specific Evacuation Plan has been prepared for the proposed project, which is included as Appendix J2. Evacuation was also addressed in Topical Response FR-3 and Flood Hazard was addressed in Topical Response HY-1 in Appendix T0, Volume II. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I38-4** Evacuation routes are discussed in Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, in the Final EIR. While the Final EIR does not specify evacuation routes designated by Caltrans, the analysis does identify and discuss evacuation routes designated by the City in the General Plan Public Safety Element. These evacuation routes are N. River Road, SR-76, and College Boulevard. Additionally, a project specific Evacuation Plan has been prepared for the proposed project, which is included as Appendix J2. For reasons described in Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Appendix J2, Evacuation Plan, and Topical Response FR-3 in Appendix T0, Volume II, impacts to evacuation would be less than significant.
- I38-5** This comment provides background information, expresses the opinions of the commenter, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I39 Jane Gilligan

- I39-1** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR (see response to comment O1-2); therefore, no further response is required. While the comment does not address an issue in the Recirculated EIR, nonetheless, the City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I39-2** The comment expresses concerns regarding emergency evacuation and fire safety, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Section 4.15, Public Services, of the Final EIR. Additionally, a project specific Evacuation Plan has been prepared for the proposed project, which is included as Appendix J2. Evacuation was also addressed in Topical Responses FR-1 through FR-5 in Appendix T0, Volume II. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I39-3** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I39-4** The comment provides concluding remarks to the preceding comments. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I40 Justin Jonte

- I40-1** The comment expresses concerns regarding loss of farmland and public safety concerns, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Sections 4.2, Agriculture, 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 4.15, Public Services, of the Final EIR. Refer also to Topical Responses FR-1 through FR-5 in Appendix T0, Volume II. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I40-2** Evacuation routes are discussed in Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, in the Final EIR. The analysis discusses evacuation routes designated by the City in the General Plan Public Safety Element. These evacuation routes are N. River Road, SR-76, and College Boulevard. Additionally, a project specific Evacuation Plan has been prepared for the proposed project, which is included as Appendix J2. For reasons described in Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Appendix J2, Evacuation Plan, and Topical Response FR-3 in Appendix T0, Volume II, impacts to evacuation would be less than significant.
- I40-3** The comment provides concluding remarks to the preceding comments. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

I41 Karen Johnston

- I41-1** The comment provides background information and does not raise an environmental issue with the project within the meaning of CEQA. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I41-2** This comment is a copy of an email correspondence between the commenter and the City regarding a Public Records Request for the “Request to Speak” forms from the City Council Meeting on May 22, 2019. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the project EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I41-3** This comment is an attachment to the main comment letter. This comment is a compilation of the previously mentioned “Request to Speak” forms from the City Council Meeting on May 22, 2019. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the project EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I42 Karen Johnston

- I42-1** This comment expresses concerns regarding traffic, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, of the Final EIR. The TIA (Appendix N to the Revised FEIR), was prepared in accordance with CEQA and the San Diego Traffic Engineering Council/Institute of Traffic Engineers guidelines for the determination of the significance of impacts. As such, potential impacts and mitigation measures were identified and appropriately addressed in accordance with these guidelines.
- I42-2** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR (see response to comment O1-2); therefore, no further response is required. While the comment does not address an issue in the Recirculated EIR, nonetheless, the City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I42-3** This comment expresses concerns regarding fire hazards and emergency evacuation, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Final EIR. Additionally, evacuation routes are discussed in Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, in the Final EIR. The analysis discusses evacuation routes designated by the City in the General Plan Public Safety Element. These evacuation routes are N. River Road, SR-76, and College Boulevard. Additionally, a project specific Evacuation Plan has been prepared for the proposed project, which is included as Appendix J2. Evacuation was also addressed in Topical Response FR-3 and General Fire Safety and Potential Hazards was addressed in Topical Response FR-1 in Appendix T0, Volume II. For reasons described in Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Appendix J2, Evacuation Plan, and Topical Responses FR-1 and FR-3 in Appendix T0, Volume II, impacts to evacuation and from fire hazards would be less than significant.
- I42-4** The comment raises concerns with the addition of the Bree Property with regard to potential future development. As discussed in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, the Bree Property has been incorporated into the project boundary and would have a condition of project approval to require the provision of an agricultural easement and/or deed restriction over the Bree Property that will preserve in perpetuity open space/agricultural uses at that property. The provision of this easement would not result in any physical changes to the environment, and no development, improvements, or modifications would occur on the Bree property as part of this project. Any future development on the Bree property would be limited to that in support of agricultural/open space uses consistent with the provisions of the easement and is considered speculative at this time.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

- Further, this comment also expresses concerns regarding the loss of farmland, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.2, Agriculture, of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I42-5** This comment expresses concerns regarding traffic, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, of the Final EIR. The project's trip generation is calculated and shown in Table PR-3 in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR. Note that with the proposed modifications to the project, the overall ADT is lower than previously identified in the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that traffic analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I42-6** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I42-7** This comment expresses concerns regarding sewer infrastructure, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.19, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Final EIR. As further detailed in Appendix O, Sewer System Analysis, the project includes all necessary sewer infrastructure to accommodate the projected flows. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I42-8** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I42-9** The comment provides concluding remarks to the preceding comments. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.

I43 Karen Johnston

- I43-1** This comment is introductory in nature, and specific comments follow. Additionally, the comment restates information contained in the Recirculated Final EIR. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Recirculated Final EIR. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.
- I43-2** This comment expresses concerns regarding traffic, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, of the Final EIR. The TIA (Appendix N to the Revised FEIR), was prepared in accordance with CEQA and the San Diego Traffic Engineering Council/Institute of Traffic Engineers guidelines for the determination of the significance of impacts. As such, potential impacts and mitigation measures were identified and adequately analyzed in accordance with these guidelines.
- I43-3** This comment expresses concerns regarding traffic at the N. River Road/Vangrft Boulevard, N. River Road/SR-76, and N. River Road/Sleeping Indian Road intersections. Traffic at these intersections received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, of the Final EIR. The comment erroneously states that no mitigation was provided at these intersections. However, the City directs the commenter to MM-TRA-1, which outlines the requirements of improvements to the Vandegrift Boulevard/N. River Road intersection. Additionally, no impacts were identified under any scenario at either the N. River Road/SR-76 or N. River Road/Sleeping Indian Road intersections, and therefore mitigation is not required.
- I43-4** Please refer to Response to Comment Letters I24 and I35 above regarding dam inundation and flood hazards.
- I43-5** Please refer to Response to Comment Letters I24 and I35 above regarding dam inundation and flood hazards.
- I43-6** Evacuation routes are discussed in Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, in the Final EIR. The commenter erroneously states that the Final EIR did not mention N. River Road as a wildfire evacuation route. The analysis does identify and discuss evacuation routes designated by the City in the General Plan Public Safety Element. These evacuation routes are N. River Road, SR-76, and College Boulevard. Additionally, a project specific Evacuation Plan has been prepared for the proposed project, which is included as Appendix J2. For reasons described in Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Appendix J2,

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

Evacuation Plan, and Topical Response FR-3 in Appendix T0, Volume II, impacts to evacuation would be less than significant.

Furthermore, the project site is not located within the San Diego County Fire Protection District's service area. Oceanside Fire Department (OFD) provides fire protection services for the project. Please refer to Section 4.15, Public Services, of the Final EIR, for additional information.

I43-7 This comment expresses concerns regarding soil contamination, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Final EIR. The comment erroneously states that the Final EIR did not conduct soil testing for pesticides. As discussed in Section 4.9, Geocon Inc. performed multiple ESAs (Appendix I to the Revised FEIR) on the project site, which identified potential for residual pesticides in soil from historical and current agricultural use. Soil sampling was subsequently conducted during a limited Phase II ESA, which included 60 soil borings across the site and collecting discreet soil samples at depths of 0.5 and 2 feet for pesticide and arsenic analysis. Soil sampling and analysis concluded that potential chemical concentrations do not exceed thresholds that would adversely the public or the environment. However, should suspect or stained soils be encountered during grading, additional testing and remediation in accordance with the County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health requirements would be performed.

I43-8 Please refer to Response to Comment I43-7 regarding pesticide contamination. Additionally, the comment expresses concerns regarding air quality, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.3, Air Quality, of the Final EIR. The project site is located within the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB) and is subject to the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) guidelines and regulations. Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.) indicates that, where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or pollution control district may be relied upon to determine whether the proposed project would have a significant impact on air quality. The SDAPCD operates a network of ambient air monitoring stations throughout San Diego County, which measure ambient concentrations of pollutants and determine whether the ambient air quality meets the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) and the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). CARB, air districts, and other agencies monitor ambient air quality at approximately 250 air quality monitoring stations across the state. Local ambient air quality is monitored by the SDAPCD. The analysis within the Final EIR relies on the nearest air quality monitoring stations, which is the standard for determining the existing local ambient air quality.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

- I43-9** Caltrans submitted a comment letter on the Recirculated Final EIR dated September 25, 2019. This letter is included above as Response to Comment Letter A1. Please also refer to Topical Responses TR-1 through TR-3 in Appendix T0, Volume II regarding previous responses to traffic comments.
- I43-10** The City directs the commenter to Topical Response TR-2 in Appendix T0, Volume II regarding bridge crossings.
- I43-11** This comment expresses concerns regarding traffic, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, of the Final EIR. The TIA (Appendix N to the Revised FEIR), was prepared in accordance with CEQA and the San Diego Traffic Engineering Council/Institute of Traffic Engineers guidelines for the determination of the significance of impacts. Based on the criteria identified in the San Diego Traffic Engineering Council/Institute of Traffic Engineers Guidelines for Traffic Impact Studies in the San Diego Region, March 2, 2000, the study area cordons were determined by the limits or extent of where 50 peak-hour project trips would travel to/from the site. The traffic study area was developed through coordination between City staff and LLG traffic engineers.
- I43-12** Please refer to Response to Comment I43-11.
- I43-13** The comment expresses concerns regarding loss of farmland, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.2, Agriculture, of the Final EIR. The City directs the commenter to MM-AG-1, which outlines the requirements for purchase of mitigation credits into a potential future City agricultural lands conservation program (should one be established prior to the time of grading permit issuance) or the County program known as the PACE Program equal to the loss of significant agricultural resources. Additionally, Agriculture Mitigation is addressed in Topical Response AG-1 in Appendix T0, Volume II. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I43-14** The comment erroneously states that project did not complete any surveying for biological resources, as requested by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife during the Public Scoping Period. As discussed in Section 4.4, Biological Resources, a reconnaissance-level field survey of the project site was conducted on August 4, 2014, by Dudek biologist Patricia Schuyler. An additional site visit was conducted on September 22, 2014, by Dudek wetland specialist Vipul Joshi. The project site was surveyed on foot, and potential constraints were noted. The site was evaluated for general vegetation communities, the potential to support special-status wildlife and

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

plant species, and an evaluation of jurisdictional aquatic resources such as wetlands/riparian habitat and waters/streambeds. Biological resources encountered during site reconnaissance are extensively discussed in Section 4.4. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.

- I43-15** The comment provides concluding remarks to the preceding comments. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Recirculated Final EIR. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.

I44 Larry Balma

I44-1 This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and concerns with views and setbacks. As discussed in Section 4.1 of the Final EIR, impacts to scenic vistas would be less than significant due to the varying topography of the project site and its surroundings, distance from public vantage points, and highly developed nature of the greater Oceanside and Vista areas. Additionally, views along N. River Road are brief and obstructed, and this roadway is not designated as a scenic corridor by the City. Please also refer to the Visual Simulations prepared for the project (Figures 4.1-1 through 4.1-5) as provided in Section 4.1, or the Revised FEIR.

Regarding setbacks along N. River Road, this roadway is currently built as a two-lane collector road and is designated in the City's General Plan Circulation Element as a four-lane major road. This designation requires an 80 foot paved curb-to-curb width with 100 feet of right-of-way dedication. The proposed project would complete widening along its frontage, and complete the installation of two travel lanes, sidewalks, and landscape improvements within an average 112-foot-wide right-of-way. This would include a multipurpose trail/sidewalk, parkway landscaping and landscaping adjacent to the interior of the sidewalk. The multipurpose trail is proposed along the entire north side of the proposed project. Large canopy street trees would also be incorporated into the parkway. Please also refer to Figure 3-6a in the Revised FEIR which shows both the two-lane and four-lane N. River Road improvements with maintained setbacks from proposed residences. The minimum setback at build out would be sixty feet from edge of right of way to fence line.

I44-2 The comment expresses concerns with the cumulative growth that could occur if other agricultural land in South Morro Hills were rezoned for housing. This is considered speculative at this time, however; growth inducement is extensively discussed in Section 4.14, Population and Housing, and cumulative effects with regard to growth inducement are discussed in Chapter 5, Cumulative Effects, of the Final EIR. Additionally, Growth Inducement is addressed in Topical Response PH-1 in Appendix T0, Volume II. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.

I44-3 The comment expresses concerns with cumulative impacts to infrastructure. As discussed in Section 4.14, Population and Housing, of the Final EIR, the project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact to population and housing due to identified growth-inducing effects. Please also refer to Response to Comment I44-2.

I44-4 This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

I44-5 This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

I44-6 The comment states that the Preface to the Recirculated EIR incorrectly states that the Arrowood development has an approximate density of 2.2 dwelling units per acre. This density was based on the estimate provided in the Arrowood Specific Plan.

As stated in the comment, the project would result in a development density of 2.73 dwelling units per acre. However, it should be clarified that the original project application allowed up to 985 dwelling units, at a density of 4.12 dwelling units per acre. Therefore, the currently proposed project would result in a 68% reduction from the original application.

The comment states that a one door Fire Station is proposed but not funded by the project. This is not accurate. As stated in the Preface to the Recirculated EIR, MM-PUB-1 would require that the project provide housing accommodations for two (2) personnel to staff the fire station, provide \$350,000 for the purchase of an appropriate fire apparatus for use at the fire station, and provide funding to the ongoing staff operations cost for two personnel.

The comment states that a Restaurant/Brewery and 30,000 square feet of commercial are proposed but the owner can renegotiate with the city to build something else. This statement is incorrect, because no renegotiation would be permitted.

This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

I45 Larry Balma

- I45-1** This comment provides background information, expresses the opinions of the commenter, and raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment associated with the project. Please note that the proposed project has a development maximum of 585 dwelling units, as reflected in the North River Farms Planned Development Plan (Appendix B). The conditions of approval and the PD Plan, should the project be adopted, would not allow for additional units beyond the proposed maximum. The comment does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. No further response is required or necessary.
- I45-2** The comment provides background information and does not raise an environmental issue associated with the project within the meaning of CEQA. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I45-3** The comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and raises concerns with the addition of the Bree Property with regard to potential future development. As discussed in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, the Bree Property has been incorporated into the project boundary and would have a condition of project approval to require the provision of an agricultural easement and/or deed restriction over the Bree Property that will preserve in perpetuity open space/agricultural uses at that property. The provision of this easement would not result in any physical changes to the environment and no development, improvements, or modifications would occur on the Bree property as part of this project. Any future development on the Bree property would be limited to that in support of agricultural/open space uses consistent with the provisions of the easement and is considered speculative at this time.
- I45-4** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. However, the City directs the commenter to Section 4.11, Land Use and Planning, of the Final EIR, regarding land use compatibility, and Section 4.8, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, or the Final EIR, regarding consistency with the City's Climate Action Plan (CAP). Please also refer to Topical Responses GHG-2 and LU-1 through LU-4 in Appendix T0, Volume II.
- I45-5** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

- I45-6** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. However, the City directs the commenter to Topical Responses LU-1 and LU-4 regarding General Plan Consistency and consistency with the Draft Agritourism Strategic Plan. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I45-7** Please refer to Response to Comment I45-6.
- I45-8** The comment provides concluding remarks to the preceding comments. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.

I46 Larry Balma

- I46-1** This comment expresses concerns regarding traffic, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, of the Final EIR. The City also directs the commenter to Topical Response TR-2 in Appendix T0, Volume II regarding bridge crossings. The TIA (Appendix N to the Revised FEIR), was prepared in accordance with CEQA and the San Diego Traffic Engineering Council/Institute of Traffic Engineers guidelines for the determination of the significance of impacts. Based on the criteria identified in the San Diego Traffic Engineering Council/Institute of Traffic Engineers Guidelines for Traffic Impact Studies in the San Diego Region, March 2, 2000, the study area cordons were determined by the limits or extent of where 50 peak-hour project trips would travel to/from the site. The traffic study area was developed through coordination between City staff and LLG traffic engineers. Additionally, the significance of impacts and all feasible mitigation was determined per CEQA and SANTEC.
- I46-2** Please refer to Response to Comment I44-1.
- I46-3** The comment expresses concerns with traffic and evacuation, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Section 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I46-4** The commenter expresses concerns with traffic and erroneously states that Roadway Segment #3 in the Traffic and Circulation analysis (Section 4.17 of the Final EIR) is a segment of Vandegrift Boulevard. Roadway Segment #3 is correctly labelled in the Revised FEIR as the section of N. River Road from College Boulevard to Vandegrift Boulevard. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I46-5** The commenter expresses concerns with Roadway Segment #3 and erroneously states that this segment does not have five lanes. This segment is correctly described in Section 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, of the Final EIR as being a Five-Lane Major Arterial according to the City's Master Transportation Roadway Plan. These five lanes do not include the turn lanes mentioned by the commenter. There are five through lanes along this segment of the roadway, three northbound lanes, and two southbound lanes. Therefore, the identified segment capacity of 45,000 average daily trips (ADT) is correct in accordance with the City's Roadway Classification Table. No further response is required or necessary.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

- I46-6** The commenter expresses concerns regarding traffic, and specifically Roadway Segment #3, described in Response to Comment I46-4, and Intersection #11, N. River Road and College Boulevard. As discussed in Section 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, of the Final EIR, this intersection would be impacted under the Year 2035 conditions. MM-TRA-4 would be implemented prior to the issuance of the 127th building permit to reduce the impact at this intersection, which includes improvements to the College Boulevard Bridge and surrounding portions of the roadway. However, the identified impact would occur at an earlier equivalent dwelling unit than the 127th. Although MM-TRA-4 would fully mitigate this impact to less-than-significant once completed, the bridge improvements identified in MM-TRA-4 are not guaranteed to be completed early enough to reduce short-term significant project impacts at this location. Therefore, as identified in the Final EIR, a significant and unavoidable impact would remain at this intersection.
- I46-7** As discussed in Section 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, no mitigation would be required along Roadway Segment #3 as no impacts to this segment were identified under any scenario. However, MM-TRA-1 would be implemented at the intersection referenced by the commenter, Vandegrift Boulevard/N. River Road, to reduce impacts. Implementation of MM-TRA-1 would require the construction of a second northbound right turn lane with overlapping traffic signal phasing, and the City shall reasonably cooperate in the acquisition of right of way necessary for the improvement. This improvement would fully mitigate impacts at this intersection to a less-than-significant level. By adopting MM-TRA-1, the City agrees to reasonably cooperate in the acquisition of right-of-way necessary for the improvement from NCTD. It is anticipated that the City will be able to acquire the right-of-way as necessary to this intersection expansion and in the public interest. However, as it is not certain the needed right-of-way to construct this improvement will be timely acquired by the City, this impact is conservatively considered significant. It is further anticipated that the earliest feasible time for right-of-way acquisition and completion of this improvement, given legal constraints, is the 100th building permit for a “for sale” unit. The identified significant effect would occur at an earlier equivalent dwelling (specifically, at the 19th dwelling unit). Completion of the improvement prior to the issuance of the building permit for the 19th dwelling unit is considered legally infeasible. Temporary impacts until completion of this improvement would thus be considered significant and unavoidable.
- I46-8** This comment expresses concerns regarding fire hazards and emergency evacuation, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR as well as Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Final EIR. Additionally, these issues were addressed in Topical Responses FR-1 and FR-3 in Appendix T0, Volume II. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

I46-9 The commenter erroneously states that the traffic impact analysis did not consider peak hour or level of service for the roadway segment analysis. Please refer to Section 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, pages 4.17-23 through 4.17-50, which provide the LOS analysis for roadway segments within the study area. Please refer to Response to Comment I46-6 and I46-7.

I46-10 As discussed in Section 3, Project Description, the proposed pedestrian circulation system would link the community streetscapes, planning areas, parks, and common open space features to provide easily accessible connectivity throughout. Additionally, a perimeter trail system would allow connections between the north and south planning areas.

The proposed trail network within the project site is composed of an interconnected system of on-street sidewalks, Class II and III bicycle lanes, and Class I trails. This comprehensive system promotes alternative modes of travel and facilitates ease of access within the project site and the surrounding community without the use of automobiles. The trail network within the project site has been designed to connect to the City's planned off-site trail network by connecting to the existing trail along N. River Road and also providing a "river trail" adjacent to the San Luis Rey River setback.

NCTD provides public transit services to the project site's vicinity. The proposed project is proximate to the San Luis Rey Transit Center—located south of N. River Road between Vandegrift Boulevard and Waterview Way—slightly more than half a mile from the project site. The San Luis Rey Transit Center is served by Routes 303, 309, 311, 313, and 315. Bike routes and pedestrian trails, proposed as part of project development would permit residents and visitors to access the Transit Center, reducing the need for single occupancy vehicle trips.

As discussed in Section 4.15, Public Services, the project site is not within the service area of Mission Vista High School.

I46-11 This comment provides background information, expresses the opinions of the commenter, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I47 Louise Balma

- I47-1** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR (see response to comment O1-2); therefore, no further response is required. While the comment does not address an issue in the Recirculated EIR, nonetheless, the City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I47-2** The comment expresses concerns regarding traffic, infrastructure, and emergency evacuation which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, and Section 4.19, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I47-3** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I47-4** The comment expresses concerns regarding the sewer system, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.19, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Final EIR. As discussed in Section 4.19, the proposed sewer improvements would sufficiently serve the project. As further detailed in the project's Sewer System Analysis (Appendix O), downstream sewer infrastructure would still have sufficient additional capacity with project buildout.
- I47-5** The comment expresses concerns regarding effects on the sewer system, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.19, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 6.1, Growth Inducement, of the Final EIR. The comment suggests that a larger sewer pipeline upsize within N. River Road, between Leon Drive and the western boundary of the project site, would be required than what was analyzed in the Preface to the Recirculated EIR. Per the City's request, the project would involve an upsize of this sewer pipeline to 24 inches. The comment is speculative because currently, no other projects are proposed in the immediate area, and the project does not propose or require any upsizing of the sewer to the treatment plan.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

- I47-6** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and raises concerns with the addition of the Bree Property with regard to potential future development. As discussed in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, the Bree Property has been incorporated into the project boundary and would have a condition of project approval to require the provision of an agricultural easement and/or deed restriction over the Bree Property that will preserve in perpetuity open space/agricultural uses at that property. The provision of this easement would not result in any physical changes to the environment and no development, improvements, or modifications would occur on the Bree property as part of this project. Any future development on the Bree property would be limited to that in support of agricultural/open space uses consistent with the provisions of the easement and is considered speculative at this time.
- I47-7** The comment raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment associated with the project. However, the proposed project would provide a dog park and a multi-use trail system with a mountain bike trail which would be publicly accessible. The City directs the commenter to Chapter 3, Project Description, for additional information. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required.
- I47-8** The comment provides concluding remarks to the preceding comments. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.

I48 M. Moghadam

I48-1 This comment expresses concerns regarding aesthetics, flooding, and compatibility with surrounding land uses. These issues were extensively analyzed in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Sections 4.1, Aesthetics, 4.2, Agricultural and Forestry Resources, 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, and 4.11, Land Use and Planning, of the Final EIR. Refer also to Topical Responses LU-1 and LU-2 in Appendix T0, Volume II.

The comment also expresses the opinions of the commenter and raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to the project's physical effect on the environment. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.

I48-2 The comment expresses concerns regarding infrastructure and emergency evacuation, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, and Section 4.19, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Final EIR. Additionally, a project specific Evacuation Plan has been prepared for the proposed project, which is included as Appendix J2. Evacuation was also addressed in Topical Response FR-3 in Appendix T0, Volume II. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.

The comment also expresses the opinions of the commenter and raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment associated with the project. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I49 Phil Johnston

- I49-1** This comment is introductory in nature, and specific comments follow. Additionally, the comment restates information contained in the Recirculated Final EIR. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.
- I49-2** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I49-3** Please refer to Response to Comments I20-2 through I20-4.
- I49-4** As required by mitigation measure MM-PUB-1, the applicant shall contribute funding for the ongoing staff operations cost for two personnel at the proposed fire station. The specifics of the required funding will be further detailed in the project's conditions of approval. The fire station would be equipped with a quick-attack, paramedic squad that is capable of responding quickly to emergency medical calls and providing initial response to structure and wildfires within 5 minutes to all of the project site. The public benefits from this response resource includes improvement to the overall response throughout the Morro Hills, focusing on medical emergencies, which comprise over 80% of all emergency calls in Oceanside. For additional information, please also refer to the Fire Hazard and Safety Topical Responses in Appendix T0, Volume II.
- This comment also expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I49-5** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and raises concerns with the addition of the Bree Property with regard to potential future development. As discussed in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, the Bree Property has been incorporated into the project boundary and would have a condition of project approval to require the provision of an agricultural easement and/or deed restriction over the Bree Property that will preserve in perpetuity open space/agricultural uses at that property. The provision of this easement would not result in any physical changes to the environment and no development, improvements, or modifications would occur on the Bree property as part of this project. Any future development on the Bree property

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

would be limited to that in support of agricultural/open space uses consistent with the provisions of the easement and is considered speculative at this time.

This comment also expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

I49-6 As the comment suggests, the project would involve a sewer pipeline upsize within N. River Road, between Leon Drive and the western boundary of the project site. Per the City's request, the project would involve an upsize of this sewer pipeline to 24 inches. The upsize is associated with a request from the City and is not associated with the previous analysis or project proposal. Please refer to the Preface to the Recirculated EIR, which provides an analysis associated with the sewer upsize. As demonstrated in the analysis, the upsize would not result in new or more severe significant impacts compared to the Draft or Final EIR.

I49-7 This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

I50 Philip Deane

- I50-1** This comment is introductory in nature, and specific comments follow. Additionally, the comment restates information contained in the Recirculated Final EIR. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.
- I50-2** The comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. Additionally, evacuation routes are discussed in Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, in the Final EIR. While the Final EIR does not specify evacuation routes designated by Caltrans, the analysis does identify and discuss evacuation routes designated by the City in the General Plan Public Safety Element. These evacuation routes are N. River Road, SR-76, and College Boulevard. Additionally, a project specific Evacuation Plan has been prepared for the proposed project, which is included as Appendix J2. For reasons described in Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Appendix J2, Evacuation Plan, and Topical Response FR-3 in Appendix T0, Volume II, impacts to evacuation would be less than significant.
- I50-3** The comment expresses concerns regarding loss of farmland, traffic, fire safety, and flood hazards, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.2, Agriculture, Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, and Section 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, of the Final EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I50-4** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR (see response to comment O1-2); therefore, no further response is required. While the comment does not address an issue in the Recirculated EIR, nonetheless, the City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I50-5** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I51 Alex Heger

- I51-1** The comment expresses concerns regarding traffic and pollution, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.8, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Section 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, of the Final EIR. The TIA (Appendix N to the Revised FEIR) was prepared in accordance with CEQA and the San Diego Traffic Engineering Council/Institute of Traffic Engineers guidelines for the determination of the significance of impacts. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I52 Rachel Jonte

- I52-1** This comment is introductory in nature, and specific comments follow. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.
- I52-2** Evacuation routes are discussed in Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, in the Final EIR. While the Final EIR does not specify evacuation routes designated by Caltrans, the analysis does identify and discuss evacuation routes designated by the City in the General Plan Public Safety Element. These evacuation routes are N. River Road, SR-76, and College Boulevard. Additionally, a project specific Evacuation Plan has been prepared for the proposed project, which is included as Appendix J2. For reasons described in Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Appendix J2, Evacuation Plan, and Topical Response FR-3 in Appendix T0, Volume II, impacts to evacuation would be less than significant.
- I52-3** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I52-4** The comment expresses concerns regarding loss of agriculture and compatibility with surrounding land uses, which received extensive analysis in Section 4.2, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, of the Final EIR. Refer also to Topical Responses AG-1, CU-1, and LU-2 in Appendix T0, Volume II of the Final EIR.
- The comment also raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment associated with the project. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.
- I52-5** The comment provides concluding remarks to the preceding comments. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.
- I52-6** This comment is an attachment of a previous letter submitted by the commenter on May 2, 2019. This comment is introductory in nature, and specific comments from this attached letter follow.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

- I52-7** This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Recirculated Final EIR. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I52-8** The comment raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to the project's physical effect on the environment. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required.
- I52-9** The comment expresses concerns regarding emergency evacuation, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Final EIR. Refer also to Topical Response TR-2, in Appendix T0, Volume II, regarding potential bridge crossings of the San Luis Rey River. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and, no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required.
- I52-10** The comment raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment associated with the project. Refer also to Response to Comment I52-4. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required.
- I52-11** The comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required.
- I52-12** The comment provides concluding remarks to the preceding comments. This comment is included in the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is necessary.

I53 Larry Balma

I53-1 The comment expresses concerns regarding roadway improvements, which received extensive analysis in Section PR, Preface to the Recirculated Final EIR, as well as Section 4.17, Traffic and Circulation, and Appendix T13 of the Final EIR. The widening of the College Boulevard bridge was evaluated in the Preliminary Engineering Report for College Boulevard Widening between North River Road and Adams Street, by Nolte Associates, Inc, dated June 2009. This report includes construction cost estimates for the bridge widening and widening of the approach roadway. Exhibits 1 and 2 from the 2009 Preliminary Engineering Report show widening the bridge to three 12-foot lanes in each direction, one 5-foot shoulder/bike lane in each direction, and a sidewalk on each side of the bridge. This would generally match the roadway section south of the bridge, and would be consistent with a City of Oceanside Six Lane Major Arterial Road. Therefore, all proposed roadway improvements would be constructed to applicable construction standards. It should also be noted that although the bridge currently has four lanes, the bridge was constructed to accommodate six lanes.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I54 Letters of Opposition

- I54-1** The City notes these multiple comments in opposition of the project. These comments express general concerns regarding agricultural resources, traffic, fire safety, and flooding, which received extensive analysis in the Final EIR and the Recirculated Final EIR. These comments do not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, and no more specific response can therefore be provided or is required. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I55 Letters of General Support

- I55-1** The City notes these multiple comments in support of the project. These comments do not raise any specific issue regarding the project's environmental analysis; no further response is therefore required. The City will include the comment as part of the Revised FEIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.

APPENDIX W0 (Continued)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK