

**I-26 CHARLOTTE JOHNSON 1**

- I-26-1** The County acknowledges the commenter’s general opposition to the Proposed Project. The comment does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-26-2** The comment expresses concern with development of sensitive habitat and that “sprawl” is not in keeping with the goal of reducing carbon emissions. The County refers the commenter to Section 2.4, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR for an analysis of the Proposed Project’s impacts on biological resources, including sensitive habitat. The Draft EIR (page 2.4-148) determined that all impacts to biological resources would be mitigated to less than significant.
- The County refers the commenter to Section 2.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG), of the Draft EIR for an analysis of the Proposed Project’s GHG impacts and the determination that impacts related to GHG emissions would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-GHG-1 through Mitigation Measure M-GHG-4 (see Draft EIR, page 2.7-36). Further, the County refers the commenter to **Thematic Response – CAP Consistency** for a discussion of the Proposed Project’s consistency with the County’s Climate Action Plan.
- I-26-3** The comment expresses the commenter’s opinion that the conclusion that impacts to Golden Eagles would be less than significant is wrong, and adds: “if you go out there with binoculars you can see them.” The County refers the commenter to **Thematic Response – Golden Eagle**. No further response is required.
- I-26-4** The comment expresses general traffic impacts and concerns regarding State Route (SR) 94. The County refers the commenter to Section 2.9, Transportation and Traffic, of the Draft EIR. The County notes traffic from the casino were included as part of the regional traffic analyzed in Appendix 2.9-1, Transportation Impact Study, and Section 2.9, Transportation and Traffic, of the Draft EIR. The County also refers the commenter to **Thematic Response – SR 94 Improvements**. The commenter does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-26-5** The County acknowledges the comment and notes that it expresses general opposition to the Proposed Project. The comment does not raise an issue concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK