## I-28 Chris Bentley

- **I-28-1** The County acknowledges the comment as an introduction to comments that follow. 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-28-2 The comment expresses concern over the current noise and congestion that occurs on Deer Springs Road during rush hours and states that an additional lane in each direction would help make existing traffic bearable. The comment asks how adding 12,000 vehicles to Deer Springs Road that would enter and leave the development each day is justified. The comment incorrectly cites the number of vehicles entering and leaving the site per day. The DEIR calculates the total number of daily trips in Section 2.13.6, Project Trip Generation. As stated on page 2.13-48, the full project is calculated to generate a total of 28,862 ADT with 2,130 trips (807 inbound/1,323 outbound) during the AM peak hour and 2,831 trips (1,743 inbound/ 1,088 outbound) during the PM peak hour. Please also see **Topical Response TR-3**.

The comment also asks about the impact to their health caused by noise, dust and pollution. The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and, therefore, no more specific response can be provided or is required. 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.

I-28-3 The comment states that they are already told to conserve and modify their desired water use and that it is their understanding that existing infrastructure and water supplies are deemed insufficient for the current residents in the area. The comment asks how can this development be justified with the concerns of climate change and future droughts inevitable.

Regarding the proposed projects impacts to water supply, refer to **Topical Responses UTL-1** and **UTL-2**. The DEIR analyzes water supply in Section 2.14.1, Water Supply and Service. The proposed project would increase overall demand for potable water; however, the DEIR compares the planned water usage for the project Site with the estimated water demand based on the proposed project land uses and water conservation measures and concludes the impacts to water supplies would be less than signification.

**I-28-4** The comment states that wildlife in the area would be adversely impacted and that eliminating wildlife corridors impacts birds, animals and insects. The comment questions how this development could be considered to have an insignificant impact

on existing wildlife. Section 2.4.10 Habitat Connectivity and Wildlife Corridors, which describes existing conditions on the project site with respect to wildlife corridors, and Section 2.4.12.4 Wildlife Movement and Nursery Site, which analyzes the proposed projects impacts. The DEIR further identifies impacts WM-1 (short-term direct impacts to potential foraging and nesting habitat), WM-2 (permanent, direct impacts to the loss of potential foraging and nesting habitat), WM-3 (impact to movement of large mammals from loss of wildlife corridors), WM-4 (impacts to habitat connectivity for larger wildlife species) and WM-5 (impacts to wildlife behavior resulting from noise and/or nighttime lighting in a wildlife corridor) as significant impacts and recommends mitigation measures, including M-BIO-1, M-BIO-2, M-BIO-3, M-BIO-6, M-BIO-7 and M-BIO-8A through M-BIO-8E, which reduce the anticipated impacts to less than significant levels. For additional detail refer to **Topical Response BIO-2**.

- I-28-5 The comment expresses concern over fire danger and the lack of routes to escape The County acknowledges the comment and refers the commenter to Topical Response
  HAZ-1. 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.
- **I-28-6** 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.