

I-166 Luzanne Grainger

- I-166-1** The comment states that the County spent many years and a lot of money to determine that the project site was not appropriate for urban development. The comment states that the Draft EIR wrongly dismisses planning and land use issues as “not a significant impact.” Please refer to **Topical Response LU-1**. The comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR. 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-166-3** The comment states that the I-15 is crowded in the morning and in the evening. The comment states Newland promises to increase capacity but there is no mention of how this will happen. The comment also states that the Draft EIR says the project will only be paying for a portion of the improvements and that there is no funding mechanism in place to mitigate impacts to I-15 mainline. Please refer to **Topical Response TR-1** addressing traffic impact to I-15 and SR-78. This comment is included in 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-166-3** The comment states that Twin Oaks Valley area home owners will be required to give up some of the land to accommodate the widening of Deer Springs Road and that these homeowners bought their properties because of the rural area and it should be kept that way. The comment raises social, political, or economic issues, and does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. The comment also expresses the opinions of the commenter, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR. 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-166-4** The comment states that there is no approved evacuation plan as part of the Draft EIR, and then discussed how congested traffic was on local roads when the freeway was shut down. The County does not concur with this comment. An evacuation plan is included in the Draft EIR as Appendix N2. The commenter is also referred to **Topical Response HAZ-1** addressing evacuation. 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.

Comment Letter Responses

I-166-5 The comment states that the project is good in regard to it being a ‘green project’ but that it’s not appropriate for the rural area. The comment expresses the opinions of the commenter and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR. 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.