

I-17 SANDY ZELASKO

I-17-1 The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Proposed Project. The comment does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.

I-17-2 The commenter references impacts to 1,284 acres of impacts to golden eagle habitat. The County does not agree that there would be 1,284 acres of golden eagle habitat impacted. Section, 2.4, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR analyzes the Proposed Project's impacts to golden eagle. The Final EIR, Section 2.4.3.1 states that the impacts to golden eagle habitat would be approximately ~~779.8~~780.8 acres.

Impacts to golden eagle habitat are discussed in detail in the Final EIR, Section 2.4.3.1, Candidate, Sensitive, and Special-Status Species, under Guideline 1E. As stated therein:

The key determination when assessing the Proposed Project's impacts to golden eagle is whether the Proposed Project is consistent with the impact and conservation assumptions of the MSCP Plan, the MSCP County Subarea Plan, and the Otay Ranch RMP, and whether it complies with the protective conditions set forth in Table 3-5 of the MSCP Plan and in the Section 10 permit. The impact analysis focuses on consistency with the MSCP Plan because golden eagle is a Covered Species under the MSCP Plan and MSCP County Subarea Plan, both of which were adopted after the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP and Otay Ranch RMP. Table 3-5 of the MSCP Plan includes conservation standards for golden eagle to ensure its continued viability within the MSCP planning area. This EIR uses those conservation standards as the criteria for determining the significance of the Proposed Project's impacts on golden eagle. As shown in Table 2.4-9, MSCP-Defined Golden Eagle Suitable Foraging Habitat within the Project Area, 1,325.5 acres of golden eagle foraging habitat occurs in the Project Area, ~~779.8~~780.8 acres of which would be impacted by the Proposed Project (Impact BI-6).

Please also refer to **Thematic Response – Golden Eagle** for additional discussion of the Proposed Project's impacts to golden eagle.

I-17-3 The commenter states that golden eagles have used the area for nesting and foraging since the 1920s and that the area should not be destroyed and is critical for golden eagles in the County. Section 2.4.1.6, Special-Status Wildlife Species, pages 2.4-36 through 2.4-40 of the Draft EIR, discusses golden eagle nesting and foraging habitat.

Further, Guideline 1F on pages 2.4-88 and 89 states that “surveys and analyses conducted by H.T. Harvey & Associates in 2016 and 2017 (Appendix C of the Biological Resources Technical Report) indicate that the Proposed Project would not cause any lethal take of individual golden eagles or nests, would not disturb any active or occupied golden eagle nest, and would not place human disturbances within 4,000 feet of any active or occupied golden eagle nest.”

With respect to the comment that the “area is critical for Golden eagles,” the County clarifies that, as stated in Section 2.4, Biological Resources, and Section 2.4.1.6 of the Draft EIR, the Project Area does not include designated critical habitat for golden eagle. Please also refer to **Thematic Response – Golden Eagle**.

- I-17-4** The commenter states that the County is “fast-tracking” the Proposed Project in spite of a scientific report on the status of golden eagles in the Project Area. The comment expresses the opinions of the commenter. Please refer to **Responses to Comments I-17-5** and **I-17-8** regarding the scientific report referenced in the comment. This comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-17-5** The commenter provides a link to a Bloom Biological report on golden eagle and states, “do the right thing for our county wildlife.” The comment expresses the opinions of the commenter. Regarding the Bloom Biological report, the County notes that this report was included as an attachment to the comment letter. Please refer to **Response to Comment I-17-8**. This comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-17-6** The commenter states, “we must keep our open spaces open” and “we cannot keep ... filling our backcountry with homes and more development.” The comment states, “Stop the nonsense and save our backcountry for Golden Eagles and other wildlife.” The comment expresses the opinions of the commenter. The County acknowledges the commenter’s opposition to the Proposed Project. Please also refer to **Thematic Response – Golden Eagle**. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-17-7** The commenter expresses appreciation for “taking a stand for wildlife.” The comment provides concluding remarks. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-17-8** The comment is a memo prepared by Bloom Biological dated January 19, 2018, with the subject line, “On the past and present status, and potential future value of the

Rancho San Diego Golden Eagle nesting territory, located near the City of Jamul, San Diego County, California.”

The comment is the same attachment as Exhibit 11 of Comment Letter O-6 from the Endangered Habitats League; therefore, the County refers the commenter to **Responses to Comments O-6-134 and O-6.11-1**. The County also refers the commenter to **Thematic Response – Golden Eagle** and **Responses to Comments A-3-100 through A-3-102** and **Responses to Comments O-6.1-47 through O-6.1-69** for additional discussion of Proposed Project impacts to golden eagle.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK