

I-4 LAURA ROCKWOOD

I-4-1 The County acknowledges the comment and notes that it expresses opposition to building homes in the Project Area. This comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.

I-4-2 The comment expresses concerns regarding increased traffic in Jamul. The commenter does not provide evidence to support that the increased traffic as a result of the Proposed Project cannot be handled on the roadways in Jamul. Traffic was analyzed in the Draft EIR in Section 2.9, Transportation and Traffic. The County refers the commenter to **Response to Comment I-1-2**, which addresses impacts to SR-94 and Lyons Valley Road, the only traffic impact identified in Jamul, outside of the Project Area, as well as **Thematic Response – SR-94 Improvements**. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis; therefore, no more specific response can be provided or is required.

I-4-3 The County acknowledges the commenter's concern about improvements on State Route (SR) 94. The comment addresses another project, the Jamul Indian Village Casino, and does not address the analysis contained in the Draft EIR. Nonetheless, Appendix 2.9-1, Traffic Impact Analysis, addresses the Proposed Project's traffic impacts on SR-94. Specifically, Figure 5-2, Proposed Project Daily Roadway Trip Assignment, which shows approximately 200 average daily trips on SR-94 from the Proposed Project.

Proposed Project impacts to SR-94 are analyzed in Section 2.9, Transportation and Traffic, of the Draft EIR. Specifically, the only potentially significant impact to SR-94 would occur at the intersection of SR-94 and Lyons Valley Road. Please refer to **Response to Comment I-1-2** and **Thematic Response – SR-94 Improvements**.

I-4-4 The County does not agree with the statement that the Project Area is a nature and wildlife preserve. The County refers the commenter to **Thematic Response – Baldwin Letter and PV1, PV2 and PV3**. Accordingly, the Proposed Project would not amend or adjust the boundaries of an established nature and wildlife preserve for a housing development.

The County acknowledges that as part of the required mitigation for the Proposed Project, the applicant or its designee would be required to acquire approximately 350 acres of Otay Ranch Resource Management Plan Preserve land and offer it for dedication to the Otay Ranch Preserve Owner/Manager in satisfaction of the Preserve

Conveyance Obligation described in Mitigation Measure M-BI-3 (Draft EIR, Section 2.4.6, pages 2.4-137 and 2.4-138).

I-4-5 The County acknowledges the comment and notes that the comment provides background information about signage and fencing on Proctor Valley Road and does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. The County notes that the comment raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.

I-4-6 The County acknowledges the comment and notes that there was a public meeting on March 27, 2018, at the Oak Grove Elementary School Library, as the comment states. The County notes that the Proposed Project has been prepared and processed in compliance with CEQA, which included a Notice of Preparation (NOP) that was distributed for public review on December 15, 2016, for 30 days, during which the County received 15 comment letters. The Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR was posted on March 1, 2018, and the Draft EIR was available on the County's website and at four local libraries for 45 days as required by CEQA.

Further, the County notes that the Jamul/Dulzura Community Planning Group held multiple meetings since the Proposed Project application was submitted at which the Proposed Project was discussed. Lastly, the County has maintained a website with all publicly available information for the Proposed Project since the NOP was distributed.

The County further notes that the Proposed Project is part of the Otay Ranch General Development Plan/Otay Subregional Plan, Volume II (Otay Ranch GDP/SRP), which was approved in 1993 by both the City of Chula Vista and County of San Diego after a 4-year planning process. In addition, the Proposed Project was part of the 2011 County General Plan Update, which was a 10-year update to the County's General Plan and included the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP.

I-4-7 This comment expresses the opinions of the commenter regarding development on their property. Please refer to **Responses to Comments I-4-4** and **I-4-5** regarding the Project Area being a "protected area" and the restricting of access from Proctor Valley Road.

Regarding the comment referring to the County's "agenda on slow growth and urban sprawl," Section 3.1.3.2.2, Conflict with Plans, Policies, and Regulations, and

Appendix 3.1.3-1, General Plan Amendment Report, of the Draft EIR, determined that the Proposed Project was consistent with the County's General Plan, Otay Ranch GDP/SRP, and other applicable plans and policies. Specifically, the following is stated on pages 3.1.3-28 and 3.1.3-29 of the Draft EIR:

[T]he Proposed Project is consistent with applicable goals, policies, and regulations of the County General Plan, Jamul/Dulzura Subregional Plan, Otay Ranch GDP/SRP, County Zoning Ordinance, Otay Ranch Resource Management Plan, MSCP Plan, MSCP County Subarea Plan, County Light Pollution Code, City of Chula Vista General Plan Land Use and Transportation Elements, Otay River Watershed Management Plan, Otay Valley Regional Park Concept Plan, and SANDAG 2050 RTP/SCS. A comprehensive policy consistency analysis of the County General Plan, Jamul/Dulzura Subregional Plan, and Otay Ranch GDP/SRP is provided in Appendix 3.1.3-1, and a comprehensive policy consistency analysis of the SANDAG 2050 RTP/SCS is provided in Section 2.7, Table 2.7-12. The Proposed Project, would not conflict with any applicable goals, policies, or regulations; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- I-4-8** The County acknowledges the comment and notes that it provides concluding remarks that do not raise new or additional issues concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Therefore, no further response is required or provided.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK