

I-102 Edith Demik

- I-102-1** The comment states that the project violates the general plan which was prepared after long thought and great expense. The comment also states that the area is already plagued by excessive traffic and it will impact I-15 and SR-78. See **Topical Response -LU-1 (General Plan Consistency)**. The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR; specifically, in Section 2.13 Transportation and Traffic. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and, therefore, no more specific response can be provided or is required. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I-102-2** The comment expresses concern over wildfires and evacuation during a wildfire. Potential impacts associated with wildfire hazards and evacuations have been adequately analyzed in Section 2.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials as well as, Appendix N, Fire Protection Plan and Appendix N2, Evacuation Plan. Mitigation has been provided when necessary to avoid or lessen potentially significant impacts. Also see Topical Response to Comment (Hazards – Evacuation). The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I-102-3** The comment states that the project would be detrimental to the area due to the noise and disruption from construction. The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR. Construction noise impacts have been adequately analyzed in Section 2.10 Noise, specifically in sub-section 2.10.3.2 Project-Generated Airborne Noise. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and, therefore, no more specific response can be provided or is required. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I-102-4** The comment states that water supply is short and that consumption would be too high with such a large development. The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR; specifically, in Section 2.14 Utilities and Service Systems. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and, therefore, no more specific response can be provided or is required. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I-102-5** The comment states that upgrading infrastructure would be very expensive to San Diego citizens. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for

Comment Letter Responses

review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.

- I-102-6** The comment states that habitat for animals would be destroyed and that the General Plan was intended to safeguard from adverse impacts to sensitive areas. Potential impacts to wildlife have been adequately analyzed in Section 2.4 Biological Resources. In addition, the proposed project would preserve 1,209 acres of onsite biological open space and an additional 212 acres of off-site biological open space. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I-102-** The comment states that local schools are not prepared for such a great increase in student population. The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR; specifically, in Section 3.5 Public Services. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and, therefore, no more specific response can be provided or is required. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I-102-8** The comment states that the same problems would have come from the Merriam Mountains project, which was rejected in the past. The County acknowledges the comment as expressing the opinion of the commenter. Please see **Response to Comment O-1-377**.