

I-16 STEPHANIE DILLON

I-16-1 The County acknowledges the comment as an introduction to comments that follow. The County refers the commenter to **Response to Comments I-16-2** through **I-16-5**. This comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.

I-16-2 This comment expresses concerns about traffic during construction of the casino and evacuation during the Harris Fire. These comments do not specifically address the Proposed Project or the analysis contained within the Draft EIR. Nonetheless, the County notes that construction traffic is addressed in Section 2.9.3.5 of the Draft EIR and emergency response and evacuation are addressed in Section 3.1.1.2.5 of the Draft EIR. In addition, Appendix 3.1.1-3, Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan, was prepared in coordination with the San Diego County Fire Authority. As stated on page 3.1.1-29 of the Draft EIR, the Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan was 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.

Regarding evacuation to State Route (SR) 94, the County refers the commenter to Evacuation Scenario 1 in Section 4.2 of Appendix 3.1.1-3, which anticipated 30% of project evacuation traffic evacuating north to SR-94. The County also refers the commenter to **Thematic Response – Wildfire Protection and Evacuation**. This comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.

I-16-3 This comment expresses concerns regarding evacuation and Otay Ranch villages adding traffic to county roadways.

The County refers the commenter to **Thematic Response – Wildfire Protection and Evacuation** regarding wildland fire evacuation and response. This comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.

I-16-4 This comment expresses concern regarding water availability from the Otay Water District and that that Otay Water has made it known that its resources were fully subscribed. As stated in Section 3.1.8, Utilities and Services Systems, the Proposed Project is within the service area of the Otay Water District (OWD) for water service.

Retail water service for the Proposed Project would be provided by the OWD; however, the Proposed Project would require annexation into an OWD Improvement District to obtain water service.

The near-term water service for the anticipated water demands of the Proposed Project have been accounted for in the San Diego County Water Authority's (SDCWA) and OWD's 2015 Urban Water Management Plans (UWMPs). As documented in SDCWA's 2015 UWMP, SDCWA has available water to meet all of the region's anticipated demand, including development of the Proposed Project, in average/normal and dry water years. Although long-term multiple-dry-year scenarios identify potential shortages, any potential shortages would be minimal and would be offset through carryover storage and management actions.

Additionally, the Proposed Project has a Water Conservation Plan (Appendix 3.1.2-3) that evaluates mandatory and optional water conservation measures to be incorporated into the Proposed Project and evaluates the potential water savings from implementation of these measures. The Proposed Project would implement the water conservation measures as PDF-UT-1 through PDF-UT-4. As applicable, the Proposed Project would also follow State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) usage restrictions. Also, the Proposed Project would comply with SWRCB and OWD regulations, emergency or otherwise, that are applicable and in effect at the time of building permit issuance. SDCWA and OWD will continue to have a viable supply of water. SDCWA has worked during the past decades to develop a diverse water supply for the region, and has taken steps to assist its member agencies in compliance with Executive Order B-29-15. The Proposed Project is consistent with and would adhere to any existing and new water conservation regulations and restrictions from Executive Order B-29-15, SWRCB, and OWD.

In addition, pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 610, OWD completed and approved a Water Supply Assessment and Verification (WSA&V) Report for the Proposed Project on January 3, 2018, which further details the water supply assumptions and findings of the OWD, SDCWA, and Metropolitan Water District (Appendix 3.1.8-4). The WSA&V Report identifies and describes the processes by which water demand projections for the Proposed Project would be fully included in the water demand and supply forecasts of the UWMPs and other water resources planning documents of the SDCWA and Metropolitan Water District. Water supplies necessary to serve the demands of the Proposed Project and existing and other projected future users, as well as the actions necessary to develop these supplies, have been identified in the WSA&V Report, and will be included in the future water supply planning documents of the Water Authority and Metropolitan Water District.

Finally, the WSA&V Report demonstrates and documents that sufficient water supplies are planned for and are intended to be available over a 20-year planning horizon under normal conditions and in single and multiple dry years to meet the projected demand of the Proposed Project and the existing and other planned development projects to be served by OWD.

Further, pursuant to SB 221, verification of sufficient water supply is a required condition of any tentative subdivision map associated with the Proposed Project. Thus, impacts related to the sufficiency of water supply available to serve the Proposed Project would be **less than significant**.

I-16-5 This comment asserts that the development area has been designated as a Preserve. The comment also expresses concern regarding interruption of breeding and migration corridors and asserts that no mitigation is possible.

Regarding the comment referring to the development area being located within the Preserve, it is not clear from the comment which area the commenter is specifically referring to. Please refer to **Thematic Response – Baldwin Letter and PV1, PV2, and PV3**, and **Response to Comments A-3-6 through A-3-58**. The Proposed Project's impacts to biological resources, including plants, wildlife, and wildlife corridors, were analyzed in Biological Resources, Section 2.4, of the Draft EIR. Please also refer to the Biological Resources Technical Report, Appendix 2.4-1 to the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR determined that with implementation of mitigation measures, impacts to biological resources would be mitigated to less than significant. This comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.

I-16-6 The comment expresses general opposition to the Proposed Project. This comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK