PUBLIC COMMENT LETTERS AND EMAILS

AGENDA ITEM
2

SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY

public response to proposed Negative Declaration for Mulberry Project (Case P13-005)

Jerry Griswold <jgriswol@mail.sdsu.edu>
To: "Kiss, Lisa" <Lkiss@san-marcos.net>
Cc: gkoller <gkoller@san-marcos.net>

Tue, Apr 22, 2014 at 9:32 AM

Lisa Kiss (Office Specialist, SM Planning Division)--

You will find my letter to the Planning Commission regarding the proposed adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Mulberry Project (Case P13-005) on Dropbox:

https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/21351504/LtrToPlanComm.pdf

I will also bring a hard copy by your office to give you.

I understand you will forward this to members of the Planning Commission, and I would be grateful if you would pass along the letter as well as this message (since--below--I mention a public notification problem). I have also cc'd Garth Koller.

The attached is a pdf file. If any member of the Commission would prefer this information in another file format or in hard copy, please make this available to them or advise me and I will happily supply it. I can be reached at jgriswol@mail.sdsu.edu

Finally, I wish to advise the Planning Department and the Commission of a potential problem with the public response side of this process. The announcement of the proposed Negative Declaration indicates the Commission will take up this matter at a meeting on May 19. However, in two places on the City's website, the dates given for Commission meetings are May 5 and June 2.

Thank you, Jerry Griswold
760-744-2625

April 21, 2014

To: Garth Koller (Planner) and the Planning Commission (City of San Marcos) c/o Lisa Kiss
From: Jerry Griswold. 1068 Fulton Rd San Marcos 92069
Re: Public Response to "Notice of Intent To Adopt Negative Declaration." Case No.: P13-0055; (Mulberry Residential Project).

Summary: *Rather than adopt the Negative Declaration, it is recommended that the Planning Commission return the proposal to Staff with instructions to have the contractor redraft and recalculate the Traffic Impact Report:*

a) using SANDAG standards for "peak hours" to capture data from Mission Hills High School
b) and considering and discussing the impact of Hollandia Dairy traffic on the project

1. Background.

The following remarks are limited to traffic issues surrounding the proposed project and addressed in the Environmental Review. They arise from my reading of two documents prepared by RBF Consulting: "Mulberry Residential Project Traffic Impact Analysis Report" and "Mulberry Traffic Appendixes." Because I am an ordinary person and not an engineer, I have had help understanding these technical documents from Isaac Etchamendy and Garth Koller (from the City's Planning Office) and from Mike Calandra (Senior Transportation Analyst at SANDAG). I wish to gratefully acknowledge their help. That said, if there are any errors in the following, they are entirely my own and these folks are not to blame.

2. Mission Hills High School and problems with "peak hours" calculations

Throughout RBF Consulting's "Mulberry Residential Project Traffic Impact Analysis Report" and its Appendices, *"a.m. peak hours"* are defined as 7:00-9:00 a.m. and *"p.m. peak hours"* are defined as 4:00-6:00 p.m. While documentation of 24-hour periods exist, these particular definitions of peak hours play a critical role throughout the Report and its Appendices because they provide the basis for discussions of impacts, delineate windows of attention, and are used in calculations of future scenarios.

But there are problems with these narrow definitions. By restricting the p.m. peak period to the hours 4:00-6:00, the Report fails to take into consideration nearby Mission Hills High School where the school day ends at 2:54 p.m. A sizeable educational institution, Mission Hills has more than 2500 students and employs several hundred teachers and staff. Anyone who has been in the area when school lets out knows that the roadways are then flooded with vehicles, some driven by students and staff and others by parents (since San Marcos has largely done away with school busing). At the same time, sidewalks are thronged with pedestrians; indeed, shortly after 3:00 p.m., crosswalks at the intersection of Mission and Mulberry are the busiest in the city when dozens and dozens of students cross legally and illegally and vehicle traffic is delayed accordingly. But this time period, it should be noted, falls entirely outside the Report's chosen p.m. peak hours of 4:00-6:00.

In fact, the choice of these "peak hours" may be idiosyncratic. Mike Calandra is a Senior Research Analyst and SANDAG's specialist in traffic issues; about his responsibilities, he writes, "I actually run the regional travel demand model for SANDAG, as well as the public and private sectors." Calandra notes that SANDAG's standard definition of peak hours are 6am-9am and 3pm-6pm; these are widely known and widely used, and they appear in documents distributed by SANDAG as models for planners in various communities. Calandra is puzzled, consequently, by the truncated definition of peak hours used in the Traffic Report for the Mulberry Project: "I am not sure how or why the EIR you note below refers to two-hour peak periods. This could be City of San Marcos policy, how the traffic consultant does the analysis, or an oversight..??" (See his letter in my Appendix)

That raises a question: Does the use of a shortened two-hour definition of "peak hours" in the Mulberry Traffic Report–as opposed to the more conventional three-hour definition used by SANDAG–really make any difference? To answer that, consider the following table for the roadway segment of Mulberry between Borden and Mission–in other words, the street right in front of the project and the site of the project's driveway (see the Report's original data sheet in my Appendix):

PM Period	TOTAL Vehicle Traffic
12:00/12:00-1:00 pm	509
13:00/1:00-2:00 pm	419
14:00/ 2:00-3:00 pm	577
15:00/3:00-4:00 pm	872
16:00/4:00-5:00 pm	778
17:00/5:00-6:00 pm	961
18:00/6:00-7:00 pm	616
19:00/7:00-8:00 pm	389
20:00/8:00-9:00 pm	306
21:00/9:00-10:00 pm	197

Now consider: If you chose the two "peak" hours, when would they be? In this case, rather than using the Report's idiosyncratic definition of 4:00-6:00, wouldn't the more accepted SANDAG definition of 3:00-6:00 yield a more accurate picture of the peak hours when measuring traffic impacts?

Another example. One part of the Report evaluates seventeen intersections close to the project, including a very common route home at the end of the school day: from the high school, then south on Woodland Parkway, jogging right on Rancheros and then on to westbound SR-78. If you look at information buried in the Report's appendices, you can ferret out the fact that the hour of heaviest traffic flow on these roadways is (not surprisingly) 3:00-4:00 p.m. The Report itself, however, seems determined to overlook this in its arbitrary fixation on the hours of 4:00-6:00 p.m. as its "peak hours." Again, wouldn't the more conventional (SANDAG) definition of peak hours (3:00- 6:00 p.m.) capture a more accurate views of the traffic situation if the concern is traffic impacts?

These are just two examples of traffic information not captured by the Reports's idiosyncratic definition of peak hours. But this also has wider implications in dozens of other pages in the Report since this incomplete data about the present provides the basis for projections about future scenarios.

Conclusion: The Traffic Impact Report should be recalculated and redrafted using SANDAG's conventional definition of peak hours.

3. No consideration is given to Hollandia Dairy's industrial traffic

It is surprising that the Report makes no direct mention of Hollandia Dairy traffic on Mulberry. Quite near the project's single driveway–in fact, just 70 yards to the south and across the street--is the industrial or trucking entrance to Hollandia Dairy. Though nicely hidden by tall shrubbery, the Dairy, it should be said, is not some country barn but a sizeable industrial site. With a footprint double that of the

Mulberry project, the Dairy includes a 30,400 sq. ft. creamery, a 13,500 sq. ft. wastewater facility, as well as outbuildings, offices and storage facilities exceeding 56,000 sq ft. Hollandia is one of the top employers in San Marcos with 222 employees, less than Costco (251) but more than Home Depot (200).

While employees generally enter the site from off of Mission, it is the Mulberry entrance where the main business of this firm is transacted. Eighteen-wheel vehicles (long-haul trucks and trailers) routinely enter and exit this gate to deliver, as they proudly boast on their website, "fresh milk and by-products to all of San Diego County, Orange County, and portions of Los Angeles, Riverside and San Bernardino Counties." A recent Google Earth photo (see my Appendix) shows more than seventy trucks or trailers on the property and clustered near the gate on Mulberry.

Since Hollandia's Mulberry Gate is less than a stone's throw from the entrance to this project and its 126 households, direct consideration ought to be given to the Dairy in the Traffic Report. Even if the ultimate conclusion is that its impact is insignificant, this issue merits mention. And since the Report also addresses traffic impacts during the project's construction period, attention ought to be paid as well to how the Dairy's eighteen-wheelers will need to compete with what the Report estimates to be 260 truck trips a day (28 an hour) traveling to and from the construction site.

Conclusion: The Traffic Impact Report should be rewritten to take into consideration* Hollandia Dairy*'s industrial traffic on Mulberry.

4. **Would an Amended Traffic Report make any difference in final determination of this project?**
A corrected Traffic Report might or might not result in the same Mitigated Negative Declaration. But that is not the point. The purpose of the Traffic Report--along with the other sixteen parts of the environmental review–is to provide the public, the Planning Commission, and the City Council with an accurate and complete understanding of the proposed project. In its present form, it does neither. Because of its unconventional and truncated definition of "peak hours," calculations are skewed. Because of missing data with regards to Hollandia Dairy, an incomplete picture is given.

5. Is this unfair to the developer?
It must be remembered that, in situations like these, approval is not the "default condition" so that apologies are required for any slowing of that inevitable result. Instead, it is the developer who wishes to change the status quo–asking for zoning changes and plan approvals--and this gives the City and its citizens a timely occasion to consider how the project is not only good for the developer, but good for the City, and finally good for both. To reach that determination, the public and the City, the Planning Commission and the City Council, need a correct and complete vision of the project. In fact, an accurate understanding of the project might result in suggestions about better ways to do things that everybody involved would find preferable. The problem is not with development but with the Report.

6. Isn't this all untimely and unexpected? A monkey wrench thrown in at the last minute?
On the contrary. These issues–the High School, Hollandia Dairy–are obvious to anyone who lives in the neighborhood or is familiar with it. Moreover, I discussed these issues with City staff in early February and in letter sent on February 21 where I stressed the need for the Report to especially address: a) traffic impacts arising from the high school during typical school hours and b) traffic generated by the Hollandia Dairy (see my Appendix). Since these obvious and critical issues are not addressed in the current Traffic Report, it would be best to pause and get things right.

{An appendix of six pages follows}

Subject: Fwd: question about "peak hours"

From: Jerry Griswold (jgriswol@mail.sdsu.edu)

To: jerrygriswold@yahoo.com;

Date: Sunday, April 20, 2014 10:57 PM

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: "Calandra, Mike" <Mike.Calandra@sandag.org>
Date: Thu, 10 Apr 2014 20:55:25 +0000
Subject: RE: question about "peak hours"
To: Jerry Griswold <jgriswol@mail.sdsu.edu>

Hi Jerry,

I actually run the regional travel demand model for SANDAG, as well as the public and private sectors. Thus I can answer technical questions but maybe not all of the policy questions.

SANDAG's current travel demand model assigns trips to the network in 3 time periods:

- AM Peak Period 6 am – 9 am
- PM Peak Period 3 pm – 6 pm
- Off Peak The remaining 18 hours in the day

The travel demand model is completely documented, and you will find these hours listed near the top of page 40 here:

http://www.sandag.org/uploads/publicationid/publicationid_1624_13779.pdf

Although ½ hour different than published in the Not So Brief Guide, that is SANDAG's peak period policy from a travel model standpoint . Two data sources were used to derive these peak period volumes – Travel Behavior Surveys and Caltrans freeway loop detectors.

We use these factors to convert "Peak Period" volumes to "Peak Hour:"

- AM 0.38

APPENDIX 1 of 6

OM 0.34

I am not sure how or why the EIR you note below refers to two-hour peak periods. This could be City of San Marcos policy, how the traffic consultant does the analysis, or an oversight..??

Hope this helps and best of luck…

****
* Mike Calandra
* Senior Research Analyst
* San Diego Association of Governments
* 401 B St Suite 800
* San Diego, CA 92101
* (619) 699-6929 - phone, (619) 699-1905 - fax
* mca@sandag.org<mailto:mca@sandag.org>
* www.sandag.org<http://www.sandag.org/>
****

From: Jerry Griswold [mailto:jgriswol@mail.sdsu.edu]
Sent: Thursday, April 10, 2014 10:19 AM
To: Calandra, Mike
Subject: question about "peak hours"

Mike Calandra--

I am hoping you can help an ordinary citizen.

I am looking at a Mitigated Negative Declaration for a condo proposal in San Marcos (still in draft form). I am particularly concerned about traffic impacts, especially because the proposed condo project is quite near Mission Hills High School. In the traffic section of the draft report, the City and its contractor look at nearby intersections in terms of peak hours defined as "a/m" (7:00-9:00 a.m.) and "p/m" (4:00-6:00 pm). The important point is that it ends at 2:54 p.m. As everyone can tell you, that's when roadways and sidewalks and crosswalks are flooded by more than 2500 students as well as school staff (San Marcos has largely done away with school busing). Because the San Marcos report used conventional business commuter times (4:00-6:00 pm) for their "peak hours," I am worried they did not take into consideration the school's hours and capture traffic impacts at the actual peak hours.

When I look at this particular Mitigated Negative Declaration, it seems to me that the San Marcos document often references SANDAG when identifying the procedures or research protocols they employed. With that in mind, I wonder whether you can point me to SANDAG policies or customs that indicatethat the definition of "peak hours" should be sensitive to local circumstances or be wider than those employed by San Marcos? My idea is that I could forward this logic to the folks in San Marcos while the Mitigated Negative Declaration is still in draft form before the April 28 close of the comment period.
In that regard, I note in SANDAG's "(NOT SO) BRIEF GUIDE OF VEHICULAR TRAFFIC GENERATION RATES FOR THE SAN DIEGO REGION" uses as the "p.m." peak 3:00-6:30 p.m. Elsewhere on the internet, I believe in instructions to Solana Beach planners, mention is made of the need to take into consideration the peculiarities of certain locales in deciding what to use as a "peak" instead of fixating on conventional commuting hours.

I'd be grateful for any help or instruction you might give me.

--
Jerry Griswold 760-744-2625

--
Jerry Griswold
amazon.com/author/jerrygriswold
website: http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/~jgriswol/
Twitter: @Jerry_Griswold <https://twitter.com/Jerry_Griswold>

3 of 6

Prepared by NDS/ATD

VOLUME

Mulberry Dr from Mission Rd to Borden Rd

Day: Thursday
Date: 1/23/2014

City: San Marcos
Project #: CA14_4022_005

DAILY TOTALS	NB	SB	EB	WB	Total
	4,526	4,821	0	0	9,347

AM Period	NB		SB		EB	WB	TOTAL		PM Period	NB		SB		EB	WB	TOTAL	
00:00	4		3				7		12:00	62		67				129	
00:15	5		0				5		12:15	78		67				145	
00:30	4		1				5		12:30	68		50				118	
00:45	2	15	3	7			5	22	12:45	66	274	51	235			117	509
01:00	2		0				2		13:00	55		50				105	
01:15	4		1				5		13:15	50		60				110	
01:30	1		0				1		13:30	53		55				108	
01:45	1	8	4	5			5	13	13:45	53	211	43	208			96	419
02:00	0		5				5		14:00	66		64				130	
02:15	1		1				2		14:15	85		67				152	
02:30	2		2				4		14:30	78		59				137	
02:45	2	5	2	10			4	15	14:45	82	311	76	266			158	577
03:00	0		4				4		15:00	166		107				273	
03:15	1		5				6		15:15	125		109				234	
03:30	3		5				8		15:30	109		80				189	
03:45	0	4	5	19			5	23	15:45	96	496	80	376			176	872
04:00	2		5				7		16:00	113		78				191	
04:15	0		7				7		16:15	111		82				193	
04:30	0		9				9		16:30	126		76				202	
04:45	4	6	22	43			26	49	16:45	117	467	75	311			192	778
05:00	4		13				17		17:00	166		85				251	
05:15	5		33				38		17:15	167		103				270	
05:30	3		41				44		17:30	150		74				224	
05:45	10	22	40	127			50	149	17:45	147	630	69	331			216	961
06:00	8		37				45		18:00	133		61				194	
06:15	11		62				73		18:15	106		61				167	
06:30	23		107				130		18:30	85		46				131	
06:45	37	79	119	325			156	404	18:45	76	400	48	216			124	616
07:00	24		129				153		19:00	74		41				115	
07:15	49		208				257		19:15	71		36				107	
07:30	76		243				319		19:30	58		33				91	
07:45	113	262	181	761			294	1023	19:45	47	250	29	139			76	389
08:00	63		123				186		20:00	55		24				79	
08:15	41		118				159		20:15	41		24				65	
08:30	29		125				154		20:30	52		33				85	
08:45	42	175	114	480			156	655	20:45	54	202	23	104			77	306
09:00	37		78				115		21:00	34		26				60	
09:15	22		69				91		21:15	42		18				60	
09:30	25		59				84		21:30	26		15				41	
09:45	39	123	66	272			105	395	21:45	22	124	14	73			36	197
10:00	29		56				85		22:00	22		12				34	
10:15	29		53				82		22:15	23		14				37	
10:30	40		48				88		22:30	19		4				23	
10:45	40	138	48	205			88	343	22:45	18	82	6	36			24	118
11:00	48		56				104		23:00	15		8				23	
11:15	44		67				111		23:15	7		6				13	
11:30	56		57				113		23:30	13		6				19	
11:45	50	198	64	244			114	442	23:45	9	44	8	28			17	72
TOTALS		1035		2498				3533	TOTALS		3491		2323				5814
SPLIT %		29.3%		70.7%				37.8%	SPLIT %		60.0%		40.0%				62.2%

DAILY TOTALS	NB	SB	EB	WB	Total
	4,526	4,821	0	0	9,347

AM Peak Hour	07:15	07:00	07:15	PM Peak Hour	17:00	15:00	17:00
AM Pk Volume	301	761	1056	PM Pk Volume	630	376	961
Pk Hr Factor	0.666	0.783	0.828	Pk Hr Factor	0.943	0.862	0.890
7 - 9 Volume	437	1241	1678	4 - 6 Volume	1097	642	1739
7 - 9 Peak Hour	07:15	07:00	07:15	4 - 6 Peak Hour	17:00	16:30	17:00
7 - 9 Pk Volume	301	761	1056	4 - 6 Pk Volume	630	339	961
Pk Hr Factor	0.666	0.783	0.828	Pk Hr Factor	0.943	0.823	0.890

N Bay Dr
N Bay Dr
N Bay Dr
Google

Subject: comments proposed plan for development on Mulberry

From: Jerry Griswold (jerrygriswold@yahoo.com)

To: gkoller@san-marcos.net;

Date: Friday, February 21, 2014 5:23 PM

Garth Koller, Planner, City of San Marcos
gkoller@san-marcos.net

ref to: Case P13-005. A proposed multi-family development plan on Mulberry Road

Garth Koller:

I am principally concerned with traffic impacts of the proposed multi-family development plan on Mulberry Road (Case P13-005). When a traffic assessment is prepared, I ask that the report specifically take into consideration three areas of concern:

1. Pedestrian traffic, particularly at the intersection of Mulberry and Mission during normal school hours. I believe that intersection is the most heavily used pedestrian crossing in the city; typically, at 3:00 p.m., hundreds of high school students use crosswalks in that area snarling traffic for quite some time. It is important that pedestrian flows (both legal and illegal) be measured at appropriate times on a typical school day (not a partial day) and during the regular school year (not the summer term).

2. Traffic flow from the church across the street from the project (Mission Hills Church) should especially be measured on Sunday. While vehicles access the church throughout the week, traffic on to Borden and thence on to Mulberry (and vice versa) is especially heavy on Sunday from 8:00 am to beyond the last service that begins at 6:00 p.m.

3. Commercial and industrial trucking access the Hollandia Dairy within a few hundred feet of the proposed project. Sixteen-wheel trucks regularly enter and exit the Dairy from a sole and busy access point on Mulberry. As I understand it, raw milk is brought in for processing and fresh milk and by-products are delivered to San Diego County and Orange County, as well as portions of Los Angeles, Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. While I am uncertain about its relevance, nearby the entrance/exit on Mulberry is a sign indicating trucks over seven tons are prohibited.

These and related traffic issues are my major concern with the proposed plan as now presented (I write this on February 21, 2014). I would be grateful if you would put me on the list of folks to be notified when this plan goes through its various stages.

Gratefully,

Jerry Griswold
1068 Fulton Rd.

6 of 6

Kiss, Lisa

From: Kiss, Lisa
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2014 2:04 PM
To: 'Jerry Griswold'
Cc: Koller, Garth
Subject: RE: public response to proposed Negative Declaration for Mulberry Project (Case P13-005)

Mr. Griswold:
Thank you for your e-mail. I also received the hard copy that was delivered to the Info. Desk earlier today. I have forwarded all to each of the Planning Commissioner's e-mail addresses.
In regards to the website calendar, the 5/19 PC meeting date was added this AM. We generally don't add the extra or special PC meeting dates until they are closer and the project is moving forward. The Planning Commission Legal Advertisement has not been submitted or advertised yet. Anyone within the notification radius area will receive a Planning Commission Public Notice postmarked at least 10 days prior to the PC hearing. That will likely occur the week of May 5th.

Lisa Kiss
Office Specialist III (Planning Division) City of San Marcos | 1 Civic Center Drive, San Marcos CA 92069
(760) 744-1050 x. 3233 | lkiss@san-marcos.net FREQUENTLY REQUESTED INFORMATION:
Zoning Map | Municipal Code | Website

-----Original Message-----
From: Jerry Griswold [mailto:jgriswol@mail.sdsu.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2014 9:32 AM
To: Kiss, Lisa
Cc: Koller, Garth
Subject: public response to proposed Negative Declaration for Mulberry Project (Case P13-005)

Lisa Kiss (Office Specialist, SM Planning Division)--

You will find my letter to the Planning Commission regarding the proposed adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Mulberry Project (Case P13-005) on Dropbox:

https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/21351504/LtrToPlanComm.pdf

I will also bring a hard copy by your office to give you.

I understand you will forward this to members of the Planning Commission, and I would be grateful if you would pass along the letter as well as this message (since--below--I mention a public notification problem). I have also cc'd Garth Koller.

The attached is a pdf file. If any member of the Commission would prefer this information in another file format or in hard copy, please make this available to them or advise me and I will happily supply it.
I can be reached at jgriswol@mail.sdsu.edu

Finally, I wish to advise the Planning Department and the Commission of a potential problem with the public response side of this process.

The announcement of the proposed Negative Declaration indicates the Commission will take up this matter at a meeting on May 19. However, in two places on the City's website, the dates given for Commission meetings are May 5 and June 2.

Thank you, Jerry Griswold
760-744-2625

Kiss, Lisa

From: Kiss, Lisa
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2014 1:55 PM
To: 'Bill Jacoby'; 'bruce@minnery.net'; 'carlmaas@yahoo.com'; 'Eric Flodine'; 'Eric Flodine'; 'Jim Pennock'; 'Jim Schaible'; 'Jim Schaible'; 'knorris@ucsd.edu'; 'Rod Jones'; 'sk940@cox.net'; 'Steve Kildoo'
Cc: Backoff, Jerry; 'aks@lfap.com'; Koller, Garth
Subject: FW: Forwarding an e-mail/letter as requested - Comments on Neg Dec - Mulberry Project
Attachments: DR Horton Mulberry Comment Ltr Groswold 042214.pdf

FYI:
In regards to Mr. Griswold's note at the bottom of his e-mail about the PC date on the City website: The 5/19 PC date was added to the calendar this AM. We generally don't add the "extra" meeting dates until they become closer and we know for sure that the item is moving forward. The PC Legal has not been submitted yet, and anyone in the notification radius area will receive a PC Public Notice postmarked at least 10 days prior to the 5/19 meeting.

Lisa Kiss
Office Specialist III (Planning Division) City of San Marcos | 1 Civic Center Drive, San Marcos CA 92069
(760) 744-1050 x. 3233 | lkiss@san-marcos.net FREQUENTLY REQUESTED INFORMATION:
Zoning Map | Municipal Code | Website

-----Original Message-----
From: Jerry Griswold [mailto:jgriswol@mail.sdsu.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2014 9:32 AM
To: Kiss, Lisa
Cc: Koller, Garth
Subject: public response to proposed Negative Declaration for Mulberry Project (Case P13-005)

Lisa Kiss (Office Specialist, SM Planning Division)--

You will find my letter to the Planning Commission regarding the proposed adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Mulberry Project (Case P13-005) on Dropbox:
https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/21351504/LtrToPlanComm.pdf

I will also bring a hard copy by your office to give you.

I understand you will forward this to members of the Planning Commission, and I would be grateful if you would pass along the letter as well as this message (since--below--I mention a public notification problem). I have also cc'd Garth Koller.

The attached is a pdf file. If any member of the Commission would prefer this information in another file format or in hard copy, please make this available to them or advise me and I will happily supply it.
I can be reached at jgriswol@mail.sdsu.edu

Finally, I wish to advise the Planning Department and the Commission of a potential problem with the public response side of this process.
The announcement of the proposed Negative Declaration indicates the Commission will take up this matter at a meeting on May 19. However, in two places on the City's website, the dates given for Commission meetings are May 5 and June 2.

Thank you, Jerry Griswold
760-744-2625

Kiss, Lisa

From: Kiss, Lisa
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2014 2:50 PM
To: 'jim@cciconnect.com'; 'jason@cciconnect.com'
Subject: FW: Forwarding an e-mail/letter as requested - Comments on Neg Dec - Mulberry Project
Attachments: DR Horton Mulberry Comment Ltr Groswold 042214.pdf

FYI:
(It's been forwarded to Sophia already).

Here the link:
https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/21351504/LtrToPlanComm.pdf

And, I attached the documents he dropped off.

-----Original Message-----
From: Backoff, Jerry
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2014 2:37 PM
To: Kiss, Lisa
Subject: RE: Forwarding an e-mail/letter as requested - Comments on Neg Dec - Mulberry Project

Lisa, please make me a hard copy of the response and send to Sophia and to the Simmons'.
Thanks

FYI:
In regards to Mr. Griswold's note at the bottom of his e-mail about the PC date on the City website: The 5/19 PC date was added to the calendar this AM. We generally don't add the "extra" meeting dates until they become closer and we know for sure that the item is moving forward. The PC Legal has not been submitted yet, and anyone in the notification radius area will receive a PC Public Notice postmarked at least 10 days prior to the 5/19 meeting.

Lisa Kiss
Office Specialist III (Planning Division) City of San Marcos | 1 Civic Center Drive, San Marcos CA 92069
(760) 744-1050 x. 3233 | lkiss@san-marcos.net FREQUENTLY REQUESTED INFORMATION:
Zoning Map | Municipal Code | Website

-----Original Message-----
From: Jerry Griswold [mailto:jgriswol@mail.sdsu.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2014 9:32 AM
To: Kiss, Lisa
Cc: Koller, Garth
Subject: public response to proposed Negative Declaration for Mulberry Project (Case P13-005)

Lisa Kiss (Office Specialist, SM Planning Division)--

You will find my letter to the Planning Commission regarding the proposed adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Mulberry Project (Case P13-005) on Dropbox:
https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/21351504/LtrToPlanComm.pdf

I will also bring a hard copy by your office to give you.

I understand you will forward this to members of the Planning Commission, and I would be grateful if you would pass along the letter as well as this message (since--below--I mention a public notification problem). I have also cc'd Garth Koller.

The attached is a pdf file. If any member of the Commission would prefer this information in another file format or in hard copy, please make this available to them or advise me and I will happily supply it.
I can be reached at jgriswol@mail.sdsu.edu

Finally, I wish to advise the Planning Department and the Commission of a potential problem with the public response side of this process.
The announcement of the proposed Negative Declaration indicates the Commission will take up this matter at a meeting on May 19. However, in two places on the City's website, the dates given for Commission meetings are May 5 and June 2.

Thank you, Jerry Griswold
760-744-2625

Kiss, Lisa

From: Kiss, Lisa
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2014 9:58 AM
To: Backoff, Jerry; Koller, Garth
Subject: FW: public response to proposed Negative Declaration for Mulberry Project (Case P13-005)

OK by JB -

Please advise if I can forward to the PC's now, or if I need to wait?
I was going to respond to Mr. Griswold to let him know I received his e-mail & was able to download the letter. I can also let him know that additional Planning Commission meeting dates have been added to the City website/calendar as of this AM. I just added 4/28 and 5/19. I don't generally add the "extra" meeting dates on the Calendar until we get closer and know the items are going forward. (The PC Legal for DR Horton/Mulberry has not been submitted yet).

-----Original Message-----
From: Jerry Griswold [mailto:jgriswol@mail.sdsu.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2014 9:32 AM
To: Kiss, Lisa
Cc: Koller, Garth
Subject: public response to proposed Negative Declaration for Mulberry Project (Case P13-005)

Lisa Kiss (Office Specialist, SM Planning Division)--

You will find my letter to the Planning Commission regarding the proposed adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Mulberry Project (Case P13-005) on Dropbox:

https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/21351504/LtrToPlanComm.pdf

I will also bring a hard copy by your office to give you.

I understand you will forward this to members of the Planning Commission, and I would be grateful if you would pass along the letter as well as this message (since--below--I mention a public notification problem). I have also cc'd Garth Koller.

The attached is a pdf file. If any member of the Commission would prefer this information in another file format or in hard copy, please make this available to them or advise me and I will happily supply it.
I can be reached at jgriswol@mail.sdsu.edu

Finally, I wish to advise the Planning Department and the Commission of a potential problem with the public response side of this process.
The announcement of the proposed Negative Declaration indicates the Commission will take up this matter at a meeting on May 19. However, in two places on the City's website, the dates given for Commission meetings are May 5 and June 2.

Thank you, Jerry Griswold
760-744-2625

Kiss, Lisa

From: Jerry Griswold [jgriswol@mail.sdsu.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2014 9:32 AM
To: Kiss, Lisa
Cc: Koller, Garth
Subject: public response to proposed Negative Declaration for Mulberry Project (Case P13-005)

Lisa Kiss (Office Specialist, SM Planning Division)--

You will find my letter to the Planning Commission regarding the proposed adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Mulberry Project (Case P13-005) on Dropbox:

https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/21351504/LtrToPlanComm.pdf

I will also bring a hard copy by your office to give you.

I understand you will forward this to members of the Planning Commission, and I would be grateful if you would pass along the letter as well as this message (since--below--I mention a public notification problem). I have also cc'd Garth Koller.

The attached is a pdf file. If any member of the Commission would prefer this information in another file format or in hard copy, please make this available to them or advise me and I will happily supply it.
I can be reached at jgriswol@mail.sdsu.edu

Finally, I wish to advise the Planning Department and the Commission of a potential problem with the public response side of this process.
The announcement of the proposed Negative Declaration indicates the Commission will take up this matter at a meeting on May 19. However, in two places on the City's website, the dates given for Commission meetings are May 5 and June 2.

Thank you, Jerry Griswold
760-744-2625