

### I-123 Tony Eason (4)

- I-123-1** The comment summarizes and restates information from Section 2.3, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, specifically regarding the DEIR's findings of significant and unavoidable impacts for CO, PM2.5, PM25 (sic) and VOC's. The comment states that the DEIR "is supposed to provide mitigation" whether it reduces impacts to a less than significant level or not. The comment restates information contained in the Draft EIR and does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. Section 2.3, Air Quality, identifies 17 mitigation measures, as well as 32 Project Design Features (PDFs) to reduce impacts to air quality. 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 project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I-123-2** The comment states that the commenter does not believe all feasible mitigation measures have been applied because sound walls have not been provided. The commenter states that these walls have been shown to be effective in dispersing the kinds of pollutants the proposed project is trying to mitigate. The County acknowledges the comment as an introduction to comments that follow. Please see **Response to Comment I-120-3, I-120-4 and I-120-9**, below. This comment is included in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I-123-3** The comment summarizes information from the study referenced in Comment I-120-2 , above. The County notes this not a comment on the Draft EIR. The County has reviewed and considered the comment and the cited document and offers the following response to comment, below. This comment is included in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I-123-4** The comment states that the referenced study was done along a freeway and not an arterial roadway, but that the topography and prevailing wind directions place the Deer Springs Oaks residents in the path of pollutants that may be dispersed by sound walls. The comment states these sound walls were shown in the study to reduce pollutants between 30% and 50%. The comment concludes that dispersion of these pollutants would mitigate the threat to health.

The County acknowledges the comment and clarifies that the pollutants in question and the study results are conflated. Implementation of sound walls, as prescribed by the comment and the referenced article, would not reduce emissions of the pollutants referenced by the commenter in comment I-120-1. Accordingly, implementation of a sound wall would not reduce an identified impact within the meaning of CEQA because such sound walls would not reduce emissions of pollutants. Regarding

## Comment Letter Responses

---

human health risk, the County refers the reader to Topical Response AQ-1. This comment is included in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.

- I-123-5** The comment states that sound walls would also mitigate noise from construction and traffic that will result from the proposed project. The County acknowledges the comment and refers the reader to the Draft EIR, Section 2.10, Noise. As analyzed in Section 2.10, noise impacts have been evaluated and mitigated for both construction and operation of the proposed project. Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures have been incorporated to reduce impacts to less than significant. Traffic noise impacts were determined to be less than significant at the Deer Springs Oaks mobile home parks. Accordingly, sound walls would not be required to reduce any identified potentially significant impact. 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 project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I-123-6** The comment states that an expert reviewed the Noise Technical Study and “invalidated” its findings and pointed out errors and deficiencies. The County acknowledges the comment and refers the commenter to O-1.15, dBF Associates Inc., prepared by Mr. Jeffrey Fuller. 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 project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I-123-7** The comment restates information from page 2.10-38 of the Draft EIR regarding the feasibility of mitigation for cumulative off-site impacts along Deer Springs Road. The comment restates information contained in the Draft EIR and does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. The County acknowledges the comment as an introduction to comments that follow. Please see **Response to Comment I-120-8**, below. This comment is included in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.
- I-123-8** The comment lists reasons why a sound wall would not be invalid on Deer Springs Road along the Deer Springs Oaks Mobile Home Estates. The comment states that the effectiveness of sound barriers is well documented and there should be no sight line questions because a similar sound wall was approved by County staff for the previously proposed Merriam Mountains project. The County acknowledges the comment and agrees with the conclusion about the effective of sound walls; however, the County refers the commenter to Response to Comment O-120-5, above, which states that no noise impact was identified to the Deer Springs Oaks Mobile Home Estates which would require mitigation in the form of a sound wall; thus, no sound wall is required for the proposed project. The County will include the comment as

## Comment Letter Responses

---

part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

- I-123-9** The comment concludes by stating that because the County has not considered sound all, the Draft EIR has not considered “all feasible mitigation” and requests the County reconsider and correct this deficiency. Please refer to Response to Comments O-120-4 through O-120-8, above. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it provides concluding remarks that do not raise new or additional environmental issues concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR. For that reason, the County provides no further response to this comment.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK