

I-21 JILL POWELL

- I-21-1** The comment provides an introduction to comments that follow. The comment does not raise a specific issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-21-2** The comment raises concern about the intersection of State Route (SR) 94/Lyons Valley Road. The commenter restates that the Draft EIR identified a significant impact at this intersection in Section 2.9, Transportation and Traffic. Please refer to **Thematic Response – SR-94 Improvements**. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-21-3** The comment states the intersection of SR-94 and Lyons Valley Road is within the jurisdiction of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and requests that the County ensure safe egress to/from Lyons Valley Road by coordinating installation of a light at this intersection. Please refer to **Thematic Response – SR-94 Improvements**.
- I-21-4** The commenter states that they have reviewed letters by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) regarding impacts to habitat of wildlife including golden eagle, Quino checkerspot butterfly, and wildlife corridors over and under Proctor Valley Road. Please refer to **Responses to Comment Letters A-1 (USFWS) and A-3 (CDFW)** for responses to specific comments raised by these agencies. See also **Thematic Response – Golden Eagle** and **Thematic Response – Quino Checkerspot Butterfly**. 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-21-5** The comment expresses the commenter’s opinion that the County has not put forth the effort it should to consider further mitigation options. The Draft EIR, Section 2.4, Biological Resources, subsection 2.4.7, Conclusion, determined that, with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures (mitigation measures M-BI-1 through M-BI-21), all impacts would be reduced to less than significant. Accordingly, no further mitigation is necessary or legally required under CEQA.
- I-21-6** The comment states there is proof that under-road corridors have been developed and wildlife has thrived. The comment expresses the commenter’s opinion that this would be the least appealing for developers and would be more time consuming for the County and other agencies, but that long-term preservation was to be paramount in

dealing with development of rural lands. Section 2.4.3.4 of the Draft EIR addresses wildlife movement and corridors. Please refer to the analysis under Guidelines 4.4A, 4.4B, 4.4C, and 4.4E on pages 2.4-102 through 2.4-107 of the Draft EIR. As described therein, “three wildlife crossings would be provided under Proctor Valley Road to allow for wildlife movement through natural topography (Figure 2.4-16). Another wildlife crossing would be provided where L4 crosses an internal road.” The design of the wildlife crossings was “developed to incorporate the MSCP County Subarea Plan design criteria guidelines to the extent feasible and also to be consistent with the scientific literature to the maximum extent practical.” Accordingly, the Proposed Project does include “under-road corridors” as suggested by the commenter. 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-21-7 The comment expresses the commenter’s opinion that the trail from Village 14 to Jamul might affect wildlife and increase rubbish along the trail. Section 2.4, Biological Resources, analyzes potential impacts to wildlife. Furthermore, as part of the Proposed Project conditions, the applicants would be required to establish a Homeowners Association and/or form a community facilities district or other similar financing district that would provide for long-term ongoing management and maintenance of the trail and pathway system. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.

I-21-8 The comment asks if the County would install and be responsible for the cleanup and maintenance of trails or if that would fall on USFWS or CDFW. Maintenance of authorized trails within the Otay Ranch Resource Management Plan Preserve would fall under the responsibility of the County of San Diego and City of Chula Vista in their joint capacity as the Preserve Owner/Manager. The Proposed Project would form a community facilities district or similar financing district, which would establish a special assessment on Proposed Project residents to fund the Preserve Owner/Manager operations, including authorized trail maintenance within the Preserve lands.

The proposed pathway along Proctor Valley Road has been designed to be within the right-of-way for a Mobility Element Road. The roadway will be maintained by the County as described in Table 2, Construction and Responsibilities for Facilities and Infrastructure, of Appendix 3.1.6-1, Public Facilities Financing Plan. Please refer to **Response to Comment I-21-7** for trail maintenance.

- I-21-9** 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.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK