

I-327 Jane Ripley

- I -327-1** The commenter explains that they are residents of Hidden Meadows and are writing to register their objection to the Project.

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 -327-2** The commenter explains that they are concerned about building in a very high risk fire zone. The commenter explains that they are a large animal owner and there are only two ways out of Hidden Meadows. The comment states that the I-15 is already bottlenecked and that with the Project, people could not evacuate in a hurry.

For information regarding evacuation during a wildfire, refer to Draft EIR Appendix N-2, which includes the Evacuation Plan for Newland Sierra. Also refer 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. No further response is required or necessary.

- I -327-3** The commenter explains that they object to Project construction because blasting would result in silica dust and construction traffic would be an issue.

A study was included as Appendix F to Appendix G, Health Effects of Respirable Crystalline Silica in Blasting Dust. Analyzing the project's potential impacts attributable to crystalline silica exposure, the Draft EIR determined that “[m]aterials that would be blasted at the proposed project are granitic and similar to those blasted at hard rock quarries. The SCAQMD monitored respirable crystalline silica concentrations near the Azusa Rock Quarry and found that average concentrations were 0.5 µg/m³ or six times less than the reference exposure level (REL). This concentration included emissions from blasting and other construction emission sources on-site. Accordingly, concentrations that nearby receptors would be exposed to [with this project] would be considered acceptable.” (Draft EIR, p. 2.3-50.)

Further, “because the vast majority of deposited material is too large to be respirable,” “[d]ust that is deposited near sensitive receptors is unlikely to result in exposure to respirable crystalline silica.” (Draft EIR, p. 2.3-49.) In addition, “there are no existing processes taking place or future processes that would take place as part of the proposed project at nearby receptor locations that would reduce the size of particles deposited making them smaller, respirable particles.” (*Ibid.*) Finally, “the small amount of respirable dust that may be deposited would need to be re-entrained

Comment Letter Responses

into the air in order to be hazardous,” which is unlikely to occur in concentrations sufficient to cause a significant impact. (*Ibid.*)

The Draft EIR determined, on the basis of this evidence, that “deposited crystalline silica is not considered to be a source of significant health risk and impacts would be less than significant.” (Draft EIR, p. 2.3-50.) Even though impacts would be less than significant, the Draft EIR provides mitigation measures M-AQ-11 and M-AQ-12 to further control fugitive dust emissions generated during blasting activities and thereby further minimize crystalline silica exposure. 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.

The comment also addresses traffic issues, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR, specifically in Section 2.13 Transportation and Traffic. 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 -327-4** The comment states that the Project would violate GP2020 noise pollution and exhaust pollution from additional vehicle trips generated by the Project.

The comment addresses operational air quality and noise issues, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR, specifically in Section 2.3 Air Quality and Section 2.10 Noise. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding these analyses 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 -327-5** The comment states that the Project site is a habitat for wildlife and asks where wildlife would go upon construction and operation of the Project. The comment suggests that wildlife would reside in the residential streets and states that mixing snakes and coyotes with young kids is not very smart. The commenter explains that this occurs in Orange County and people are afraid after dark and in the spring.

Potential impacts to biological resources, including wildlife, received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR, specifically in Section 2.4 Biological Resources. 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.

Comment Letter Responses

- I -327-6** The comment states that water supply is overstretched and that the huge influx of residents would stretch the supplies beyond their capabilities.

Water supply impacts are disclosed in Section 2.14 Utilities and Service Systems. 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 -327-7** The comment states that the Project is in violation of the GP2020 and it would be unsafe if there was a disaster and there are too many impacts on residents, wildlife, and potential residents.

Please refer to **Topical Response LU-1**. 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.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK