I-359 Debra Siebert

I-359-1  The comment states the commenter is a resident of Deer Springs Oak Mobile Home Park and has concerns about 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-359-2  The comment states the commenter’s home is 40’ from Mesa Rock Road and 150’ from Deer Springs Road. The comment questions how the commenter’s home is going to be protected from its proximity to road improvements. The comment states there is no noise wall proposed by the project. The comment requests plans that will provide for the safety of the commenters home and health.

The County acknowledges the comment and notes that it provides factual background information regarding where the commenter lives, and does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. The comment addresses general subject areas, Noise, which received extensive analysis in Section 2.10 of the Draft EIR. Further, the road widening of Deer Springs Road is shown on the Tentative Map and Preliminary Grading Plan, and has been analyzed throughout the DEIR as explained in O-1.12. 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-359-3  The comment asks how it’s possible for the County to assess current residents a huge increase to water rates to pay for the proposed project. The comment asks for an explanation for how the proposed cuts will affect existing residents. The comment concludes that Deer Springs Oak Mobile Home Estates already has restrictions on water usage, and that one year of drought does not make up for water shortages in Southern California.

The County does not concur with the first part of the comment. First, the County acknowledges the comment and notes it raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment.

With respect to water supply and conservation for existing rate-payers, please see Topical Responses UTL-1 and UTL-2.

I-359-4  The comment asks where the emergency access routes are for the new residents. The comment refers to Hidden Meadows, which only has one escape route.
The County acknowledges the comment and refers the commenter to Topical Response HAZ-1, Wildlife 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.

I-359-5 The comment asks how the County can dismiss 10 years of planning that went into the General Plan Update. The comment asks why the proposed project is any different than the Merriam Mountain project that was previously denied by the Board of Supervisors. The commenter states that none of the changes “make a dent on environment, noise, health, traffic, water, and quality of life.”

With respect to the comment regarding “going against the General Plan,” please refer to Topical Response to Comment LU-1.

Regarding the differences between the proposed project and the Merriam Mountains project, the County acknowledges the comment and notes that it expresses the opinions of the commentator, 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.

The comment address general subject areas, environment, noise, health, traffic, water, which received extensive analysis in Sections 2.3, Air Quality, 2.10, Noise, 2.13, Transportation and Traffic, and 2.14, Utilities, of 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-359-6 The comment states the commenter has not read a scientific study which does not show the impact of what the proposed project may cost the nearby residents. The comment states the County is manipulating proven scientific facts to dismiss hazards. The comment states that if the proposed project is approved, the commenter will document baseline health and have health checks to monitor any changes. The comment concludes by asking how the County assesses collateral damage to current residents as insignificant.

The County does not concur with the comment. Please refer to Topical Response AQ-1. Further, the commenter does not provide any specific evidence to the claims regarding the impacts the proposed project would have on nearby residents, nor any of the scientific studies referenced in the comment. The County will include the
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