

I-335 Jacki Salvin

- I-335-1** The comment states the commenter has the following questions after reviewing the Draft EIR for the proposed 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-335-2** The comment states the proposed project would generate 28,000 new trips per day.

The comment restates information contained in the Draft EIR and does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. 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-335-3** The comment states the proposed project would result in LOS F on I-15 and that no new transit infrastructure is proposed.

The comment restates information contained in the Draft EIR and does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. 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.

Nonetheless, please refer to **Topical Response TR-1** regarding the proposed projects impacts on I-15.

- I-335-4** The comment states the proposed project would widen Deer Springs Road to six lanes, build a new I-15 interchange and draw thousands of cut through trips; however, the project would start construction before Caltrans finishes redesigning the I-15 interchange at Deer Springs Road.

The County does not concur with this comment for the following reasons.

First, the proposed project would only widen Deer Springs Road to four-lanes, not six lanes as the comment suggests.

Second, please refer to **Topical Response TR-2** regarding phasing of improvements and the I-15 interchange.

Comment Letter Responses

I-335-5 The comment states that the County Board of Supervisors spent millions of dollars and 10 years developing a General Plan that protected, in fact down zoned, this area. The General Plan allows for 99 homes, the proposed project would increase this by 20 times, and the Board of Supervisors already denied a similar project on the site.

The County does not concur with these comments. Please refer to **Topical Response LU-1**.