

I-22 LINNEA PELTOLA

- I-22-1** The comment provides an introduction to comments that follow. The County acknowledges the commenter's general opposition to the Proposed Project. This comment does not raise an issue concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-22-2** The County acknowledges the comment and notes that it expresses general opposition to the Proposed Project. This comment does not raise an issue concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-22-3** The comment expresses concerns about traffic on Proctor Valley Road and State Route (SR) 94. Traffic impacts from the Proposed Project were adequately analyzed in Section 2.9, Transportation and Traffic, of the Draft EIR.

The Draft EIR determined that the only potentially significant impact to SR-94 would occur at the intersection of SR-94 and Lyons Valley Road (Impacts TR-9, TR-11, TR-13, and TR-15, which would occur under the Existing Plus Project, 2025 Cumulative, 2030 Cumulative, and 2030 with Hypothetical Development of State Preserve Property scenarios, respectively). The traffic impact to the intersection of SR-94 and Lyons Valley Road would be mitigated by implementing Mitigation Measure M-TR-2, which includes coordinating with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to signalize the intersection of SR-94 and Lyons Valley Road, as described on page 2.9-74 in Section 2.9, Transportation and Traffic, of the Draft EIR. However, because the improvements are under the jurisdiction and control of Caltrans and; therefore, the County does not have the authority to permit or implement the improvements, the implementation of improvements cannot be ensured. Therefore, for the purposes of the Draft EIR, Impacts TR-9, TR-11, TR-13, and TR-15 are considered significant and unavoidable. The County further refers the commenter to **Thematic Response – SR-94 Improvements**.

With respect to impacts to Proctor Valley Road, the County refers the commenter to **Response to Comment I-7-2**.

- I-22-4** The comment expresses concerns regarding traffic and evacuation resulting from Casino events. The County refers the commenter to **Response to Comment I-16-2**. The Proposed Project's impacts to emergency access were analyzed in Section 3.1.1.2.5, Emergency Response Plans, of the Draft EIR. The Emergency Response Plan discusses system programs and implementation practices for emergency responses, and determined that impacts to emergency response plans resulting from

- implementation of the Proposed Project would be less than significant. Further, the Proposed Project's cumulative impacts to traffic were analyzed in Section 2.9, Transportation and Traffic, of the Draft EIR. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.
- I-22-5** The commenter states that Caltrans does not have plans for road improvements along SR-94. Section 2.9.6 of the Draft EIR describes Mitigation Measure M-TR-2, which requires improvements to the SR-94/Lyons Valley Road intersection. If implemented, these improvements would reduce the Proposed Project's identified significant impact at that intersection to less than significant. The County further refers the commenter to **Thematic Response – SR-94 Improvements**. The County acknowledges the comment and notes that it does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-22-6** The comment expresses the commenter's opinion that there would not be enough space for wildlife. Section 2.4, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR analyzed the Proposed Project's impacts to wildlife, habitats, and wildlife movement. The Draft EIR determined that impacts to biological resources, including wildlife, would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-22-7** The comment expresses concerns regarding general impacts to loss of biological habitat in Rancho San Diego. Section 2.4, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR analyzed impacts to habitats. The Draft EIR determined that impacts to biological resources, including habitats, would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the analysis provided in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.