

I-20 NATALIE SHAPIRO

- I-20-1** The comment provides an introduction to comments that follow. The comment does not raise an environmental issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-20-2** The comment expresses general opinions on wildlife habitat impacts. Section 2.4, Biological Resources, analyzes impacts to wildlife habitats. As described in Section 2.4.7, Conclusion, all Proposed Project impacts to biological resources would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated. The comment does not raise a specific issue regarding adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-20-3** The comment states that approximately 10 golden eagles have used this area for foraging continually since the 2007 fires. The comment also requests removing impacts from the golden eagle habitat and nesting areas. Please see **Thematic Response – Golden Eagle** regarding the Draft EIR’s analysis of Proposed Project-related impacts on golden eagle nesting and foraging habitat. As discussed in this thematic response, the Proposed Project implements measures to reduce impacts to golden eagle foraging habitat and potential nesting areas.
- I-20-4** The comment generally describes the ecological importance of the Proctor Valley area and the commenter’s opinion regarding wildlife connectivity in the area. Section 2.4, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR, analyzes the Proposed Project’s impact to biological resources, including wildlife corridors. As described in Section 2.4.7, Conclusion, all Proposed Project impacts to biological resources would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-20-5** The comment expresses an opinion that the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) is not adequately protected and asks to remove impacts from the MSCP. The County does not agree with the statement that Draft EIR does not adequately protect the MSCP; rather, as described in further detail in Section 2.4.3.5, Guideline 4.5: Local Policies, Ordinances, and Adopted Plans, and Section 3.1.3.2.3, Conflict with Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan, the Proposed Project is consistent with the MSCP County Subarea Plan and the Otay Ranch Resource Management Plan. Accordingly, the Proposed Project is consistent with the MSCP County Subarea Plan and adequately protects the MSCP through this conformance with the applicable regional planning efforts. The comment does not

raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.

- I-20-6** The comment states that the Draft EIR needs to redo sections on impacts to golden eagle, Quino checkerspot butterfly, and spadefoot. The Proposed Project's impacts to golden eagle, Quino checkerspot butterfly, and spadefoot are analyzed in Section 2.4, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR. Please refer to **Thematic Response – Golden Eagle**, **Thematic Response – Quino Checkerspot Butterfly**, and **Response to Comment A-3-180** regarding spadefoot. The comment but does not raise a specific issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.