

**I-24 MATTHEW NORRIS**

- I-24-1** The commenter is writing to voice concerns about the Proposed Project. The comment serves as an introduction to comments that follow. No further response is required or provided.
- I-24-2** The comment expresses the opinion of the commenter that the Proposed Project should be consistent with the surrounding community. Please refer to the Draft EIR, Section 1.2.2.2, Visual Character and Quality; Section 3.1.3, Land Use and Planning; and **Thematic Response – Community Character and Plan Consistency**. The commenter does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-24-3** The comment states that the Proposed Project should honor existing planning commission policies of dark sky maintenance. Please refer to the Draft EIR, Section 2.1.2.3, Light and Glare. Specifically, pages 2.1-38 and 2.1-39 state that “Lighting for the Proposed Project would be designed to adhere to the regulations of the County Light Pollution Code (the “Dark Sky Ordinance”).” Furthermore, the Draft EIR determined that the Proposed Project “would be consistent with lighting standards prevalent in urbanized and rural areas of San Diego County” (page 2.1-42 of 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-24-4** The comment expresses an opinion regarding the installation of sewer and natural gas lines. Please refer to Draft EIR, Section 3.1.8.2.2, Wastewater Treatment; Section 3.1.9.2, Natural Gas; and **Thematic Response – Sewer/Septic**. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-24-5** The comment expresses an opinion that the Proposed Project should not install infrastructure to allow unmitigated development of this region. Section 1.8, Growth Inducing Impacts, of the Draft EIR determined that the Proposed Project, while accommodating growth already planned for, would not significantly induce growth. Page 1-45 of the Draft EIR states the following:

[T]he Proposed Project would not propose more homes in Village 14 or Planning Areas 16/19 than approved in the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP as analyzed in the certified Otay Ranch PEIR; would reduce the size of Proctor Valley Road from four lanes to two lanes; would eliminate Proctor Valley Road easterly toward SR-94 through Planning Area 16; and is adjacent to Otay

Ranch RMP/MSCP Preserve lands to the west, north, and east, and Lower Otay Reservoir to the south, which would physically constrain any additional growth.

- I-24-6** The comment expresses an opinion regarding the strain the development places on limited water supply. Section 3.1.8.2.1, Water Supply, of the Draft EIR (page 3.1.8-35) states that the Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact on water supply, and would be “consistent with and will adhere to any existing and new water conservation regulations and restrictions from Executive Order B-29-15, SWRCB, and OWD.” Further, pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 610/SB 221, a Water Supply and Assessment Verification Report (Appendix 3.1.8-4) was prepared and approved by Otay Water District in November 2017 that “demonstrates and documents that sufficient water supplies are planned for and are intended to be available over a 20-year planning horizon, under normal conditions and in single and multiple dry years to meet the projected demand of the Proposed Project and the existing and other planned development projects to be served by OWD” (Draft EIR, page 3.1.8-35). The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-24-7** The comment expresses an opinion that lot sizes should not be less than one half acre. The Proposed Project is consistent with the County General Plan and Otay Ranch General Development Plan/Otay Subregional Plan, Volume II (Otay Ranch GDP/SRP) regarding lot sizes and density as determined in the Draft EIR, Section 3.1.3.2.2. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-24-8** The comment expresses an opinion that no development should occur until State Route (SR) 94/Campo Road is improved to handle the 12,000 car trips added to the road. The County does not agree with the reference to 12,000 car trips, which, as shown in Table 2.9-11 of the Draft EIR, is the total number of daily trips generated by the Proposed Project, not the number of average daily trips that would use this intersection. Please refer to Appendix 2.9-1, Transportation Impact Study, Section 4.4, Project Trip Distribution and Assignment, and Figure 5-1 of the Draft EIR regarding the percentage of trips from the Proposed Project that were modeled to head toward this intersection. As shown in Figure 5-1, only 1% of the total average daily trips were projected to use SR-94 west of Lyons Valley Road.

As explained in the Draft EIR, Section 2.9.1.1, the study area includes “All intersections and roadways where the Proposed Project would add 50 or more peak hour trips in either direction to the existing traffic.” Further, the study area also

- includes “intersections and roadways where the Proposed Project would add 25 peak hour trips on County facilities.” The intersection in question, SR-94/Campo Road, did not meet either of these thresholds in the SANDAG Series 11 Transportation Model; therefore, the intersection was not required to be analyzed. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-24-9** The comment expresses an opinion that any attempt to swap for nature preserve land is not acceptable. The comment does not specify the Preserve land referred to. The comment does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-24-10** The comment expresses an opinion that the community feels betrayed by the development of the casino and the last thing the community would want is East Lake 2.0. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-24-11** The comment states that commenter sees the negative impacts development will have on CA-52/67/Mast Boulevard. The comment also states, “we cannot allow such a thing to happen with Proctor Valley Road and SR-94.” The comment expresses the commenter’s opinions regarding traffic impacts. Please refer to the Section 2.9, Transportation and Traffic, of the Draft EIR and **Thematic Response – SR-94 Improvements**. 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