

I-29 DAVID BULLER

- I-29-1** The County acknowledges the comment and notes that it expresses general opposition for the Proposed Project due to traffic-related impacts. Traffic impacts 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 Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-29-2** The comment provides an estimation of 800 vehicular trips associated with the Proposed Project that would travel to Jamul and State Route (SR) 94. The County notes that the comment incorrectly restates information contained in the Draft EIR. As shown in Figure 7-2 of Appendix 2.9-1, Transportation Impact Study, 900 ADT from the Proposed Project would travel toward Jamul. The County also refers the commenter to **Response to Comment I-1-2** regarding the Proposed Project's impact to SR-94 and Lyons Valley Road, which are the only traffic impacts north of the Project Area. Refer also to **Thematic Response – SR-94 Improvements**. 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-29-3** The comment expresses the commenter's concerns there are no road improvements north of the development and the commenter's opinion that the County is remiss in promoting smart growth. The comment also refers to the Jamul Casino.
- With respect to road improvements north of the Project Area, the County refers the commenter to Section 2.9, Transportation and Traffic, of the Draft EIR and **Response to Comment I-1-2** and **Thematic Response – SR-94 Improvements**. The comment does not raise an issue with the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-29-4** The comment expresses the commenter's opinion that a stoplight would not mitigate traffic impacts but would instead impede traffic flow-through. The Proposed Project's traffic impacts are analyzed in Section 2.9, Transportation and Traffic, of the Draft EIR. Mitigation Measure M-TR-2 requires the Proposed Project Applicant, or designee, to coordinate with Caltrans to install a traffic signal at the intersection of SR-94 and Lyons Valley Road. As shown in Table 7.7 of the Transportation Impact Study, Appendix 2.9-1 to the Draft EIR, with installation of a traffic signal at the intersection of SR-94 and Lyons Valley Road, the intersection would operate at an acceptable level of service, D. A traffic signal warrant was conducted and found that this intersection would satisfy both the 'Minimum Vehicular Traffic' and 'Interruption of Continuous Traffic' warrants. This signalization is part of a series of SR-94

improvements analyzed in the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) State Route (SR) 94 Improvement Project Draft EIR (Caltrans 2015), and is also included as a mitigation measure in the Final Tribal Environmental Evaluation/Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan for the Jamul Indian Village Gaming Development Project (Jamul Indian Village 2013).

However, as explained in **Response to Comment I-1-2** and **Thematic Response – SR-94 Improvements**, 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 to the SR-94 and Lyons Valley Road intersection (Impacts TR-9, TR-11, TR-13, and TR-15) are considered significant and unavoidable.

I-29-5 The comment expresses the commenter’s opinion that improvement in SR-94 capacity is needed. The commenter requests that the capacity of SR-94 from Steel Canyon to Proctor Valley Road be increased, with corresponding improvements to Proctor Valley Road between the development and SR-94. The County further refers the commenter to **Thematic Response – SR-94 Improvements**.

The County notes that the Draft EIR includes an alternative to the Proposed Project that would include widening Proctor Valley Road to four lanes and providing a direct connection to SR-94, as anticipated by the Otay Ranch General Development Plan/Otay Subregional Plan, Volume II (Otay Ranch GDP/SRP). Please refer to the discussion and analysis of the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP Four-Lane Proctor Valley Road Alternative in Section 4.7 of the Draft EIR. The analysis of this alternative to the Proposed Project found that operational traffic impacts would likely be decreased by providing additional capacity on Proctor Valley Road, as described further in Section 4.7.4, Feasibility, on page 4-62:

However, because the GDP/SRP Proctor Valley Road Alternative would involve the widening of Proctor Valley Road, it would result in greater impacts to aesthetics, biological resources, and cultural resources. Additionally, a wider Proctor Valley Road would likely induce additional traffic, albeit with improved levels of service, resulting in increased operational impacts to air quality, GHG [greenhouse gas] emissions, and noise. A General Plan Mobility Element Amendment would also be required to widen Proctor Valley Road from a two-lane Collector to a four-lane Major Road. The GDP/SRP Proctor Valley Road Alternative

would not reduce or avoid significant impacts to any resource areas other than transportation and traffic.

Therefore, analysis of an alternative that includes roadway capacity improvements was conducted in the Draft EIR, and it was found not to be feasible or environmentally superior compared to the Proposed Project. 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.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK