

X-2 ROBERT AND NANCY FOOR

- X-2-1** The comment expresses concern about the Proposed Project’s potential impacts on residents of Whispering Meadows Lane and Valley Knolls Road. The County acknowledges the comment as an introduction to comments that follow. The comment does not raise a specific issue as to the adequacy of the analysis contained in the Draft EIR; therefore, no more specific response is required or provided.
- X-2-2** The comment states the commenter’s understanding that the “County may seize” portions of Whispering Meadows that is currently a private road to assist the Proposed Project build ingress/egress into Planning Area 16. The County refers the commenter to **Thematic Response – Proctor Valley Road and Other Offsite Roads**, which clarifies that Irrevocable Offers of Dedication (IODs) have been offered to the County for Whispering Meadows Lane and Valley Knolls Road. The comment does not raise a specific issue as to the adequacy of the analysis contained in the Draft EIR; therefore, no more specific response is required or provided.
- X-2-3** The comment states that Whispering Meadows Lane is a narrow road which is capable of accommodating current residents, but that the addition of the 40 to 50 new homes would have a devastating impact on current residents.

The County does not agree with the comment. The Draft EIR, Section 2.9-1, states the following (page 2.9-21):

Whispering Meadows Lane

The Proposed Project would include an access point via a new connection to Whispering Meadows Lane. The new connection point would extend from an internal Proposed Project roadway, which provides access to the 125 estate homes located in Planning Areas 16/19, and connects to Proctor Valley Road to the west. Due to the location of the connection and the route that would be required for residents within the Village 14 portion of the Proposed Project (994 single-family homes) to access this connection (residents would need to drive out of direction approximately 1.1 miles to reach Melody Road), it is anticipated that this connection would be utilized primarily by the 125 estate homes in Planning Areas 16/19, and only those accessing the Jamul area (which is 6% of the total traffic generated from Planning Areas 16/19). The 125 estate homes would generate a total of 120 AM peak hour trips; thus, a total of 7 trips in the AM peak hour (120 total peak hour trips x 6%) and 9 trips in the PM peak hour (150 total peak hour trips x 6%) would use the

Whispering Meadows connection on a typical day (see Table 4.1 of Appendix 2.9-1 for detailed Proposed Project trip generation calculations).

The County traffic study guidelines require the analysis of all local roadway segments, including all state surface routes, intersections, and mainline freeway locations, where the Proposed Project would add 20 or more peak-hour trips in either direction to the existing roadway traffic. The reasoning behind the 20 peak-hour threshold is because it is reasonable to conclude that projects that would generate less than 20 peak hour trips at a particular location would not result in significant impacts at that location. Based on the calculations provided in the previous paragraph and the minimal number of peak hour trips that potentially would use the subject access point, the traffic added to Whispering Meadows Lane by the Proposed Project would be less than the 20 trip minimum. Therefore, no further analysis is required as the Proposed Project would not result in significant project related impacts along Whispering Meadows Lane.

The County notes that the above analysis from the Draft EIR is considered a conservative approach because not all 125 homes would use Hidden Meadows Road and Valley Knolls because they would be closer to Proctor Valley Road and taking Hidden Meadows would be out-of-direction.

- X-2-4** The comment asks if the County seizes Whispering Meadows Road and makes it a County road, whether the County plans to compensate current owners. Please refer to **Thematic Response – Proctor Valley Road and Other Off-Site Roads**. The comment does not raise a specific issue as to the adequacy of the analysis contained in the Draft EIR; therefore, no more specific response is required or provided.
- X-2-5** The comment asks if the County would widen Whispering Meadow Road further and compensate current owners who would lose developed portions of their property, including perimeter fencing, walls and landscaping. Please refer to **Thematic Response – Proctor Valley Road and Other Off-Site Roads**. The comment does not raise a specific issue as to the adequacy of the analysis contained in the Draft EIR; therefore, no more specific response is required or provided.
- X-2-6** The comment questions how the existing Whispering Meadows Road would accommodate all the heavy construction traffic ingressing and egressing the Proposed Project. Construction traffic is not anticipated to use Whispering Meadows Road, rather, it would use roads constructed through the Proposed Project to avoid existing residential streets. The County would further condition the Proposed Project to prohibit

heavy construction equipment on Valley Knolls Road and Whispering Meadows Lane. The Draft EIR, Section 2.9.3.5, Construction Impacts, analyzed impacts associated with construction traffic. The analysis concludes that, “potential significant impacts that might occur in connection with construction activities would be mitigated by road improvements previously constructed as Project mitigation.” The comment does not raise a specific issue as to the adequacy of the analysis contained in the Draft EIR; therefore, no more specific response is required or provided.

X-2-7 The comment asks about noise and dirt generated by increased traffic. The Draft EIR, Section 2.3, Air Quality analyzed particulate matter (i.e., dirt) and Section 2.8, Noise, analyzed off-site traffic noise and construction impacts. Mitigation measures to reduce air quality and noise impacts are recommended. These measures would reduce construction-noise related impacts to less than significant, and would reduce air quality emissions; however, construction air quality impacts would remain significant and unavoidable as disclosed in Section 2.3 of the EIR. The comment does not raise a specific issue as to the adequacy of the analysis contained in the Draft EIR; therefore, no more specific response is required or provided.

X-2-8 The comment suggests requiring the developer to construct a permanent access road to Highway 94, which would alleviate the need to disrupt the lives and potentially damage the property of current residents on Whispering Meadows Lane.

The County acknowledges the recommendation and refers the commenter to the Draft EIR, Section 4.7, GDP/SRP Proctor Valley Road Alternative, which included a four-lane access road to SR-94 as the comment recommends. As described therein, such an alignment would result in additional impacts to aesthetics, biological resources and cultural resources due to the increased impact area associated with pioneering a new road. The comment does not raise a specific issue as to the adequacy of the analysis contained in the Draft EIR; therefore, no more specific response is required or provided.

X-2-9 The comment expresses an opinion that “seizing the road, allowing the developer to “Swap” the land currently at the Whispering Meadows in nature preserve for other property that the developer has promised to keep in open space is shortsighted and damaging to [the] community.” The County clarifies that the Proposed Project does not include a “Swap” as the comment suggests, and that the Draft EIR determined the Proposed Project is consistent with the MSCP County Subarea Plan and Otay Ranch RMP. The comment does not raise a specific issue as to the adequacy of the analysis contained in the Draft EIR; therefore, no more specific response is required or provided.

- X-2-10** The comment expresses the commenter’s opinion that access to Planning Area 16 direct to Highway 94 would seem to make better sense. The County refers the comment to **Response to Comment X-2-8**. The comment does not raise a specific issue as to the adequacy of the analysis contained in the Draft EIR; therefore, no more specific response is required or provided.
- X-2-11** The comment states that the commenter would appreciate hearing the supervisor’s views on this issue and any recommendations to help assist the community in keeping their corner of Jamul a safe and quiet neighborhood.
- The comment does not raise a specific issue as to the adequacy of the analysis contained in the Draft EIR; therefore, no more specific response is required or provided.
- X-2-12** The County acknowledges the comment provides concluding remarks that do not raise a specific issue as to the adequacy of the analysis contained in the Draft EIR; therefore, no more specific response is required or provided.