

I-12 PATRICK SULLIVAN

I-12-1 The comment expresses the opinions of the commenter regarding concerns about other roads in the area of State Route (SR) 94 that have not had the “promised work done” relating to the Jamul Casino. Please refer to **Response to Comment I-1-2** and **Thematic Response – SR-94 Improvements**. No other impacts to SR-94 or other roads north the Project Area are identified as a result of the Proposed Project.

I-12-2 The comment expresses concern about increased traffic and safety hazards along SR-94 between Dulzura and Deerhorn Valley. The roadways between Dulzura and Deerhorn Valley as referenced by the commenter were not included for analysis in the Draft EIR because the Proposed Project would not add 50 or more peak hour trips in either direction to the existing traffic levels and/or 25 peak hour trips on County facilities. Please refer to Section 2.9.2, Existing Conditions, page 2.9-2, of the Draft EIR. The Proposed Project’s impacts to SR-94 are analyzed in Section 2.9, Transportation and Traffic of the Draft EIR.

I-12-3 The comment states concerns about the SR-94 intersections at Jefferson, Lyons Valley, and Steele Canyon. The County refers the commenter to **Response to Comment I-12-1** regarding the Proposed Project’s impact and mitigation at the SR-94 and Lyons Valley Road intersection.

The intersections of SR-94 and Jefferson Road/Proctor Valley Road were analyzed in the Draft EIR, Section 2.9, Transportation and Traffic. The analysis found that this intersection would operate at acceptable levels of service under all of the analysis scenarios, thus the Proposed Project would not have a significant impact to the intersection of SR-94 and Jefferson Road/Proctor Valley Road. Please refer to the Draft EIR, Table 2.9-23 and Table 2.9-24, for analysis results.

Similar to roadways in Dulzura and Deerhorn Valley as discussed in **Response to Comment I-12-2**, Steele Canyon was not included for analysis in the Draft EIR because the Proposed Project would not add 50 or more peak hour trips in either direction to the existing traffic levels and/or 25 peak hour trips on County facilities. Please refer to Draft EIR, Section 2.9.2, Existing Conditions, page 2.9-2.

I-12-4 The comment expresses concern that more traffic will result from the south due to people looking to avoid the SR-125 highway tolls. The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) Series 11 Regional Transportation Model was used as the underlying regional transportation model in the Draft EIR, Appendix 2.9-1, Transportation Impact Analysis, and was calibrated to assume tolls on SR-125;

therefore, the analysis accurately captures diverted trips based on SR-125 tolling. No further response is required or provided.