

**I-18 ROBERT AND DEBBIE MERRILL**

**I-18-1** The comment expresses general opposition to the Proposed Project and is an introduction to comments that follow. Please refer to **Responses to Comments I-18-2 through I-18-19** for specific responses. The comment does not raise a specific issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.

**I-18-2** The comment expresses general opposition for “any kind of development in San Diego County.” The comment also expresses the commenter’s opinions regarding “ruination” of open space and quality of life. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.

**I-18-3** The comment addresses re-zoning. The County clarifies that while the Proposed Project includes a Rezone as described in Chapter 1, Project Description, the purpose of the Rezone is to “correct minor inconsistencies, GIS registration errors, and other inconsistencies between the County’s General Plan land use and regional categories maps and the approved Otay Ranch GDP/SRP.” The proposed rezone only reconciles the boundaries of development within the County General Plan and would not designate new areas for development that were previously designated for other uses such as Open Space/Preserve. The County further refers the commenter to Section 3.1.3, Land Use and Planning, of the Draft EIR; specifically, page 3.1.3-25, which states:

The Proposed Project would include a rezone to correct County GIS mapping inconsistencies to the boundaries within the applicant’s ownership to reflect the accurate Otay Ranch GDP/SRP development boundary.... The Proposed Project is consistent with the current zoning designations and would not include any other amendments to the County Zoning Ordinance aside from these mapping corrections.

The comment does not raise a specific issue regarding the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.

**I-18-4** The comment raises economic, social, or political issues relative to a different development project not associated with the Proposed Project analyzed in the Draft EIR. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.

- I-18-5** The comment express an opinion and offers an introduction to comments that follow. No further response is required or provided.
- I-18-6** The comment refers to areas for development that should not be included. The comment does not provide specific site references to the areas the commenter is referring to. However, the County interprets the comment to refer to parcels commonly referred to as PV1, PV2, and PV3. The County does not agree that development of these parcels represents any type of discrepancy and refers the commenter to **Thematic Response – Baldwin Letter and PV1, PV2, and PV3**. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-18-7** The comment refers to violations of the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP). The County interprets the comment as a reference to development of PV1, PV2, and PV3, and refers the commenter to **Response to Comment I-18-6 and Thematic Response – Baldwin Letter and PV1, PV2, and PV3**.
- I-18-8** The comment states that impacts are not disclosed. The County does not agree that the Draft EIR does not disclose impacts. The Draft EIR has been prepared in compliance with CEQA and the County’s Format and Content Requirements for Environmental Impact Reports. Table S-1 in the Draft EIR summarizes the Proposed Project’s impacts. Chapter 2 of the Draft EIR identifies potentially significant impacts to Aesthetics, Agricultural Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Noise, Transportation and Traffic, Paleontological Resources, and Tribal Cultural Resources. The commenter does not raise a specific impact that the commenter believes is not disclosed; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-18-9** The comment expresses an opinion that carbon offset claims are false. The commenter does not provide any evidence as to why carbon offsets are false; therefore, no more specific response can be provided. Please refer to **Thematic Response – Carbon Offsets**. No further response is required or provided.
- I-18-10** The comment expresses the commenter’s opinion that visual impacts are forever changing, which results in a decrease of quality of life. Section 2.1, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR analyzes the Proposed Project’s impacts to visual resources. As described therein, the Proposed Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts (see Impacts AE-1 and AE-2). Specifically, Section 2.1.6 of the Draft EIR determined that “even with implementation of these standards and incorporation of mitigation measures, the Proposed Project would substantially change the existing character of

the Project Area, and would result in a **significant and unavoidable impact.**” Further, as stated on Page 2.1-45, “development of open, rural valley and hills would substantially impact the existing visual character and quality of the Otay Ranch area, including the undeveloped Proctor Valley landscape. As such ... the Proposed Project would contribute to a **significant and unavoidable cumulative impact** related to visual character and quality.”

The comment does not raise a specific issue or inadequacy regarding the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.

- I-18-11** The comment expresses the commenter’s opinion that fire hazards would increase greatly, which could be catastrophic to the area. The County does not agree that fire hazards would increase greatly. Please refer to Sections 3.1.1.2.4 (Wildfire Hazard), 3.1.1.2.5 (Emergency Response Plans), and 3.1.6 (Public Services) of the Draft EIR. As determined in the Draft EIR (page 3.1.1-29), “The Proposed Project demonstrates compliance with applicable fire codes, consistency with the Proposed Project’s FPP [Fire Protection Plan], and the ability to meet the County’s emergency response objectives.... As such, wildland fire impacts would be less than significant.” Please also refer to **Thematic Response – Wildfire Protection and Evacuation.**
- I-18-12** The comment expresses concern regarding the Proposed Project’s potential impacts to the Otay Reservoir System. Section 3.1.2, Hydrology and Water Quality, on pages 3.1.2-23 through 3.1.2-24 of the Draft EIR address Upper and Lower Otay Reservoirs. As discussed therein, the Proposed Project is not expected to cause an adverse effect to the Upper and Lower Otay Reservoir due to the lower total dissolved solids concentration in the Proposed Project’s irrigation water, the use of source-control best management practices, and decrease in overall erosion. Overall, the water quality impacts from the Proposed Project would be less than significant.
- I-18-13** The comment refers to the Project Area being ecologically important and states that the presence of the golden eagle in the area should be addressed. Section 2.4, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR addresses the Proposed Project’s impacts on golden eagle. Please refer to **Thematic Response – Golden Eagle.** The comment does not raise a specific issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-18-14** The comment expresses opinions generally related to development and infrastructure. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.

- I-18-15** The comment expresses the commenter’s opinion that the Proposed Project is not smart planning for this rural area. The comment also states that the Proposed Project will place more gridlock in the Highway 94, Rancho San Diego, and Eastlake areas. Section 2.9, Transportation and Traffic, of the Draft EIR analyzes the Proposed Project’s traffic impacts. The comment does not raise a specific issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-18-16** The comment refers to quality of life and the permanent loss of open space and expresses the opinion of the commenter that the Proposed Project should be reexamined. The County acknowledges that the Proposed Project would convert existing undeveloped land into a developed condition, consistent with the County General Plan and Otay Ranch General Development Plan/Otay Subregional Plan, Volume II (Otay Ranch GDP/SRP), while preserving land consistent with the MSCP County Subarea Plan and Otay Ranch Resource Management Plan. This comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-18-17** The comment states that once wildlife is gone, it will not return. Section 2.4, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR analyzes the Proposed Project’s impacts to wildlife. The comment does not raise a specific issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-18-18** The comment expresses the opinions of the commenter regarding open space and quality of life. The comment does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of a specific section or analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-18-19** The County acknowledges the commenter’s opposition to the Proposed Project. The comment does not raise an issue concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.