

I-390 Linda Trueblood and Toru Ishido

I -390-1 The comment explains that her and her husband have lived in Hidden Meadows for two years and they moved to the area because they value the rural atmosphere. The commenter explains that the Hidden Meadows Community lives in harmony with the fragile native ecosystem and they enjoy the plants, butterflies, birds, and other animals and do their best to support them.

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 -390-2 The comment states that the Project would impact the native plants and animals. The comment raises a general subject area, biological resources, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR, specifically Section 2.4. The County notes the comment expresses the opinions of the commenter, and does not specifically state which impacts to wildlife would occur. As the comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis, 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 -390-3 The comment states that the Project would impact nearby residents, who pay taxes, and do their best to support the native ecosystem. The comment is general in nature and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR. Given that the comment is general, a general response is all that is required. (*Paulek v. California Dept. Water Resources* (2014) 231 Cal.App.4th 35, 47-52.) Therefore, no further response is required or needed.

I -390-4 The comment explains that they object to the Project as proposed and urge the County to adhere to the General Plan, which was intended to focus new housing and infrastructure away from rural spaces. The commenter urges the County to consider the results of the Draft EIR.

Please refer to **Topical Response LU-1**. The County notes 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.

Comment Letter Responses

I -390-5 The comment states that the Draft EIR reveals that the Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts in areas such as air quality, noise, and traffic.

The comment is general in nature and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR. Given that the comment is general, a general response is all that is required. (*Paulek v. California Dept. Water Resources* (2014) 231 Cal.App.4th 35, 47-52.) Therefore, no further response is required or necessary.

I -390-6 The comment states that the County should deny the Project and should vote to maintain the rural spaces and encourage developers to build new homes closer to sources of employment and mass transportation.

The County acknowledges the comment and notes it 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.