

I-13 CYNTHIA EVANS

- I-13-1** The comment questions if the development is consistent with all respects of the County General Plan. Please refer to the Draft EIR Section 3.1.3.2.2, Land Use and Planning, pages 3.1.3-20 through 3.1.3-22, and Appendix 3.1.3-1, General Plan Amendment Report/Plan Consistency Analysis, for a discussion of General Plan consistency. Based on the analysis, the Draft EIR determined that Proposed Project is consistent with applicable goals and policies of the 2011 County General Plan. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-13-2** The commenter asks how the developer has coordinated evacuation plans with the County's own evacuation plan for East County, and whether roads recommended for the Proposed Project's evacuation routes are able to accommodate the new population of evacuees. The comment further asks that California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) figures and roadway grading be cited and asks for assurance that roads already graded "F" by Caltrans not be used for the development's evacuation plans.

The Draft EIR, Section 3.1.1.2.5, Emergency Response Plans, page 3.1.1-29 states the following:

Proposed Project's Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan has been prepared based on the Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization and County of San Diego Operational Area Emergency Operations Plan – Evacuation Annex (Appendix 3.1.1-3). It also incorporates key information from the Jamul Community Protection Plan (Jamul Disaster Team 2006), Evacuation Plan Appendix.

Please also see **Thematic Response – Wildland Fire and Evacuation**.

The Proposed Project Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan, Section 4.2, describes the roadway capacities, lane configurations, routes, signals, and general roadway functions during an emergency event. As discussed in the Proposed Project Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan on pages 14 and 15 (Draft EIR, Appendix 3.1.1-3):

The community's primary evacuation routes are accessed through a series of internal neighborhood roadways, which connect with the primary ingress/egress roads that intersect off-site primary and major evacuation routes. Based on the existing road network, the community can evacuate once off site to the north, south, east, or west depending on the nature of the emergency.

Depending on the nature of the emergency requiring evacuation, it is anticipated that the Proposed Project community traffic would exit the area via Proctor Valley Road to the north or south as follows:

- In the southern and central portion of the community – Proctor Valley Road, the Proposed Project’s primary access, provides access to other primary evacuation routes (i.e., East H Street or Otay Lakes Road via Hunte Parkway) that intersect with State Route (SR) 125 on-ramps.
- In the northern portion of the community – Proctor Valley Road connects with Campo Road (SR-94) via Melody Road.

The Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan does not discuss the Level of Service (LOS) of the evacuation routes. LOS is based on typical daily operations and is presented in the tables at the end of Section 2.9 of the Draft EIR.

I-13-3 The comment asks how many planned schools will be completed before the first home in the development area is offered for sale. The Draft EIR, Section 3.6.6.2.3, Schools, page 3.1.6-25, discusses the elementary school site within the Proposed Project:

The Proposed Project reserves an elementary school site (9.7 acres) centrally located within Village 14. The Village 14 school site would be reserved for acquisition by the CVESD [Chula Vista Elementary School District] or dedication to the school district, pursuant to an agreement between the applicant and CVESD. If CVESD determines that the school site is needed, a graded site would be provided to CVESD, including utilities to the site and an all-weather road acceptable to the fire department and CVESD. The Otay Ranch Facilities Implementation Plan is based on the premise that schools will be constructed when no greater than half of the school’s projected students reside in the community; however, facility phasing is solely determined by CVESD based on available school capacity in the vicinity of the Project Area.

Additionally, as discussed in the Draft EIR, Section 3.1.6.2.3, Schools, on page 3.1.6-27: “The school district(s) and Proposed Project applicant may enter into a School Mitigation Agreement to ensure the timely construction of school facilities to serve students from new residential development, which would offset the impacts to school services.”

The Draft EIR analysis determined that the Proposed Project's impact to schools would be less than significant. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.

- I-13-4** The comment asks if the fire station will be completed before the first home in the Project Area is offered for sale. The Draft EIR, Section 3.1.6.2.1, Fire Protection, page 3.1.6-19, states the following:

The provision of Aa permanent on-site fire station within the Village Core would be finalized and documented in a Fire Services Agreement between the Proposed Project applicant and the SDCFA [San Diego County Fire Authority]. Phasing of the Proposed Project may require construction of a temporary station if the permanent station is not constructed by the commencement of construction of other Proposed Project features. The temporary fire station, if necessary, would be available and located in the Project Area per SDCFA guidance so that fire resources are available during construction and for a specified amount of time. Construction of the permanent fire station would be on the public safety site identified in the Otay Ranch Village 14 and Planning Areas 16/19 Specific Plan and Tentative Map at an agreed upon "trigger threshold" that would be detailed in a Fire Service Agreement between the SDCFA and the applicant.

The County notes that the Fire Services Agreement would be required to be executed before a Final Map is recorded (DEIR, page 3.1.6-20). As determined in Section 3.1.6 of the Draft EIR, impacts related to fire protection and emergency services would be less than significant. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.

- I-13-5** The comment asks whether the swim clubs, public parks, trails, and recreational facilities will be completed before the first home is offered for sale. The Public Facilities Financing Plan (Appendix 3.1.6-1 to the Draft EIR) and the Specific Plan, V. Implementation, C. Phasing Plan specifically addresses the timing of the proposed improvements to park facilities. In addition, the provision of private swim clubs (private recreation facilities) and trails are planned to be constructed consistent with the Village 14 and Planning Areas 16/19 Specific Plan. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.

- I-13-6** The comment asks if no junior high school or high schools are to be built to serve students from the Proposed Project. Please refer to the Draft EIR, Section 3.1.6.2.3,

Schools, on page 3.1.6-28 for an analysis of middle schools available to serve middle school students from the Proposed Project:

...[M]iddle school students generated by Village 14 may attend Eastlake Middle School, which is located approximately 1.3 miles from Village 14 (SUHSD 2012). Eastlake Middle School has a planned capacity of 1,995 students. Estimated enrollment for 2016/2017 is 1,626 students; thus, existing capacity is approximately 369 students (SUHSD 2012). Village 14 is anticipated to generate 121 middle school students; thus, there is sufficient existing capacity for students residing in Village 14.... SUHSD [Sweetwater Union High School District] will determine where middle school students will be served based on available capacity.

JDUSD [Jamul–Dulzura Union School District] has indicated that students generated by development of Planning Areas 16/19 could attend Oak Grove Middle School, which is located approximately 3.75 miles from Planning Areas 16/19 (Appendix 3.1.6-1). As shown in Table 3.1.6-5, Oak Grove Middle School currently has capacity for 82 additional students. As shown in Table 3.1.6-11, Planning Areas 16/19 are anticipated to generate 15 middle school students, thus, there is sufficient existing capacity for students residing in these Planning Areas.

Please refer to the Draft EIR, Section 3.1.6.2.3, Schools, on pages 3.1.6-29 and 3.1.6-30 for an analysis of high schools available to serve high school students from the Proposed Project:

Bonita Vista is approximately 4.5 miles west of Village 14 and has existing capacity for approximately 390 students, and Otay Ranch High School is approximately 5 miles from Village 14 and has existing capacity for approximately 375 students. ... SUHSD will determine where students will be served based on available capacity.

It is anticipated that high school students from Planning Areas 16/19 would be served by GUHSD [Grossmont Union High School District] and would attend Steele Canyon High School. Steele Canyon High School has indicated in a letter that the school can currently accommodate up to 2,200 students, and current enrollment in the 2016/2017 school year is 2,142 students (Appendix 3.1.6-1). Therefore, Steele Canyon High School has capacity to accommodate the approximately 18 students from Planning Areas 16/19.

- The Draft Section 3.1.6 indicates impacts to middle school and high school services would be less than significant. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-13-7** The comment asks which roadways will be utilized to transport students to and from school. The Draft EIR, Section 2.9 Transportation and Traffic, discusses the existing and proposed road network, and analyzes the Proposed Project's traffic impacts. Traffic distribution was based on the SANDAG, Series 11 regional transportation model. The commenter does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-13-8** The comment asks whether parents will have the choice of where to send their children to school. Parent's school choice is not an issue under CEQA; therefore, the Draft EIR does not address this question. This comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-13-9** The comment states Caltrans has rated SR-94 an "F" and asks how much the development will contribute to congestion on this roadway. The comment asks what the Proposed Project's plans are for traffic mitigation. The Draft EIR, Section 2.9 Transportation and Traffic, and Section 2.9.3.3 Two Lane Highways and Freeway Mainline, analyzed the Proposed Project's traffic impacts on SR-94. Mitigation Measure M-TR-2 requires the Project Applicant, or its designee, to coordinate with Caltrans to install a traffic signal at the intersection of SR-94 and Lyons Valley Road (refer to Section 2.9.6 of the Draft EIR). Please also refer to **Thematic Response – SR-94 Improvements**. No other significant impacts to SR-94 are identified as a result of the Proposed Project.
- I-13-10** The comment requests Caltrans roadway grades and traffic figures be cited. Draft EIR, Section 2.9, Transportation and Traffic, describes the traffic modeling and the interface with Caltrans standards related local roadways. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-13-11** The comment describes congestion on SR-94 which the commenter has witnessed. Existing volumes on segments of SR-94 between Vista Sage and Otay Lakes Road are provided in Appendix 2.9-1, Traffic Impact Analysis, specifically Table 3.3 – Two Lane High Segment LOS Results, Existing Conditions. As shown in Table 3-3, the segment between Vista Sage Lane and Lyons Valley Road currently operates at LOS E. Also, the segment from Lyons Valley Road to Jefferson Road is

approximately 100 ADT under the threshold for LOS E. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.

- I-13-12** The comment asks how the watershed for the City of San Diego will be impacted by this development and what features have been incorporated to ensure that the City of San Diego water supply is not adversely impacted. Section 3.1.2 of the Draft EIR analyzes the Proposed Project's impacts to hydrology and water quality. On page 3.1.2-24, the Draft EIR states

In summary, the Proposed Project is not expected to cause adverse effects to the Upper Otay Reservoir and Lower Otay Reservoir due to the anticipated lower TDS [total dissolved solids] concentration in the Proposed Project's irrigation water compared with the TDS at the reservoirs outfall, the use of source-control BMPs, and the decrease in overall erosion potential due to reduced natural areas. The Proposed Project would not contribute pollution in excess of that allowed by applicable state or local water quality objectives, or cause or contribute to the degradation of beneficial uses. Overall, water quality impacts from the Proposed Project would be **less than significant**.

The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.

- I-13-13** The commenter asks what public transportation options will be implemented. Section 2.9.3.8, Alternative Transportation, of the Draft EIR analyzes public transportation. As stated on page 2.9-53 of the Draft EIR:

Bus service for the Proposed Project may be provided by Metropolitan Transit Service (MTS). MTS provides bus service throughout San Diego, including the Chula Vista eastern territories of Southwestern College and Otay Ranch Town Center. Proctor Valley Road connects to routes 705 (E Street), 709 (H Street), and 712 (Palomar/Telegraph Canyon Road). Future expansion of transit service to the Project Area may include a bus route further east along Proctor Valley Road to the Village Core area; however, no such service is proposed at this time.

The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.

- I-13-14** The comment offers an opinion that a development of this size would negatively impact the existing community with increases in noise, light and the number of traffic

trips. The Draft EIR analyzes the Proposed Project's noise, light and traffic impacts in Sections 2.8, Noise; 2.1.2.3, Light and Glare; and 2.9, Transportation and Traffic respectively. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.

- I-13-15** The comment raises concerns about the Proposed Project's ability to purchase credits for carbon offsets elsewhere. Please refer to **Thematic Response – Carbon Offsets**. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK