

**I-8 JOSHEPH COPPOLA**

**I-8-1** The comment expresses concerns about the expansion in the number of home and the adverse impact on traffic on State Route (SR) 94 and access roads. County refers the commenter to the Draft Appendix 2.9-1, Transportation Impact Study, specifically, Figure 5-2, Proposed Project Daily Roadway Trip Assignment, which shows approximately 200 average daily traffic (ADT) on SR-94 from the Proposed Project. Proposed Project impacts to SR-94 are further analyzed in Section 2.9, Transportation and Traffic. The only potentially significant impact to SR-94 would occur at the intersection of SR-94 and Lyons Valley Road (Impact TR-9, Impact TR-11, Impact TR-13, and Impact TR-15, which occur under the Existing Plus Project, 2025 Cumulative, 2030 Cumulative, and 2030 with Hypothetical Development of State Preserve Property, respectively). This impact would be fully mitigated by implementing Mitigation Measure M-TR-2, which would include signalizing the intersection of SR-94 and Lyons Valley Road, as described under Impact TR-9 on page 2.9-83 in Section 2.9 of the Draft EIR. However, the following is explained under Impact TR-9:

This intersection is a Caltrans [California Department of Transportation] facility in which the County does not have jurisdiction to permit or implement improvements. Therefore, for purposes of this analysis, mitigation is considered infeasible and the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. However, it should be noted that this improvement is part of the improvement project analyzed in the Caltrans State Route 94 Improvement Project Draft EIR (Caltrans 2015). In addition, this improvement is also included as a mitigation measure in the Jamul Indian Village Final Environmental Evaluation.

No other impacts to SR-94 are identified as a result of the Proposed Project. The County also refers the commenter to **Thematic Response – SR-94 Improvements**. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the Proposed Project.

Regarding Proposed Project impacts to access roads, please refer to **Thematic Response – Proctor Valley Road and Other Off-Site Roads**.

**I-8-2** The commenter states concerns about traffic safety, and air and noise pollution.

Regarding the commenter's concerns about traffic safety, the Draft EIR analyzed traffic hazards in Sections 2.9.3.6, Hazards Due to an Existing Transportation Design

Feature, and Section 2.9.3.7, Hazards to Pedestrians or Bicyclists. As analyzed on page 2.9-51, the Draft EIR determined that, with conformance to applicable County Code of Regulatory Ordinances and safety design standards as set forth by the County and Caltrans, Proposed Project impacts related to hazardous design would be less than significant. Similarly, page 2.9-53 of the Draft EIR determined that “the Proposed Project would adequately facilitate pedestrian and bicyclist travel, and impacts would be less than significant.”

The Draft EIR analyzed air quality and noise impacts in Sections 2.3, Air Quality and 2.8, Noise, respectively. As analyzed on page 2.3-29, the Draft EIR determined that construction-related traffic is not expected to impact local intersections or cause an exceedance of the carbon monoxide (CO) California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS), and impacts would be less than significant. Additionally, operational CO impacts at studied intersections were analyzed on pages 2.3-30 through 2.3-32 and the Draft EIR determined that CO concentrations would not exceed CAAQS, and impacts would be less than significant.

Regarding traffic-related noise impacts, on- and off-site traffic noise were analysed in Section 2.8, Noise-Sensitive Land Uses Affected by Airborne Noise, on pages 2.8-18 through 2.8-21 of the Draft EIR. As described further in Section 2.8.7, Conclusion, all on- and off-site traffic-related noise impacts would be mitigated to less than significant. This comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.

- I-8-3** The comment addresses a general subject area, traffic on roadways in Jamul, which received extensive analysis in Section 2.9, Transportation and Traffic, of the Draft EIR. The commenter does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis or evidence to support the claim that additional traffic cannot be tolerated on SR-94. Therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-8-4** The comment provides an opinion regarding impacts to schools. The County refers the commenter to pages 3.1.6-24 through 3.1.6-30 in Section 3.1.6.2.3, Schools, in 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-8-5** The comment expresses an opinion regarding the potential for higher crime rates. The County refers the commenter to pages 3.1.6-22 through 3.1.6-24 in Section 3.1.6.2.2, Law Enforcement, in 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.