

- Why has the report not focused on the fact that the project sits directly beneath residences on Flicker Drive and that sound carries upward both during the construction period and after? FOF b-166

- Why is there so little focus on the operation of a marina, and day-to-day use of 50 residences, including musical devises, automobiles, power tools and similar measures? FOF b-167

- What justification does the report have for the addition of a marina with its accompanying noise, when there are already public launch facilities on the north shore of Big Bear Lake and significant boat storage facilities on the south shore of Big Bear Lake? FOF b-168

- Why does the report not provide for effective third party enforcement of regulations against short term rentals? FOF b-169

- Why does the report not address the impact of residential noise and marina noise on wildlife migration, foraging and perching patterns? FOF b-170

- The primary noise is developed on weekends when people come here from the city. During the week the level of noise is down significantly from weekend levels. The use of averages for noise is therefore not valid and must be recalculated. FOF b-171

- The Moon Camp EIR refers to the reduction to 50 residential lots as being wonderful. Any lots will create substantial noise. Initially there would be significant noise when the infrastructure is installed, roads, water lines, electricity and sewers. None of these are ever done at the same time; so with winter weather restrictions, these could take more than one or two years. After the infrastructure is complete and the lots are sold, how many years more will we be subjected to construction noise during build out? This proposed project threatens to raise the overall noise level for the Fawnskin area for an extended period of time and that drawn out process has not been accounted for in the calculations, nor taken into consideration in evaluating the level of impact. Please evaluate that consideration. FOF b-172

- Many statistics are included regarding noise levels, but none of them are calculated from the proper basis, which should be mid-week at the site of the proposed project. This would be a much lower basis from which to measure the difference that would be created by this proposal. The noise levels have therefore been understated from their true impact and must be recalculated to determine the true level of significance. FOF b-173

- Construction is to be allowed from 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM, Monday through Saturday. The forest and wild life are never mentioned as "Existing sensitive receptors". What impact would this construction noise have on those resources? FOF b-174

- Wouldn't 7:00 AM until 5:00 PM be sufficient for construction and on only Monday through Friday? The DEIR document states that we can keep our doors and windows closed during the noisy construction. Are we to be prisoners in our own homes? What emotional impact is there from not being able to enjoy to natural outdoors for what could be several years just to avoid the noise of the construction? Many of us like to work in our yards. Is the DEIR suggesting that everyone give up FOF b-175

yard work during this trying period in order to reduce the significance of the impacts of noise?

↑
FOF b-175

- The basis for measuring existing traffic noise is erroneous in that it measures the traffic at three very busy intersections a few miles from the actual site. The noise levels at those sites (see Table 4.6-3) have no relevance to the existing noise levels in Fawnskin and at or near the proposed project site. This basis creates a falsely elevated level for existing noise and artificially reduces the measurements of the actual increases in noise level. These calculations must be redone with a more accurate basis level.
- The DEIR does not discuss that the threshold for excessive noise in the Fawnskin area is much lower than most other places being measured to the County standards. Fawnskin noise levels are just above those for forest land, not for other residential areas in the county. Using county standards of residential noise levels (table 4.6-4) is insufficient and leads to artificially reduced measurements of the severity of the impacts. The noise calculations must be based on existing noise levels in this area, not on County standards which serve for urban areas.
- The CC&R restriction prohibited house rentals of less than 30 days is irrelevant and unenforceable. The Flicker Rd. CC&R's also have such a restriction and yet there are homes on that street that do weekend rentals and attempts to stop them have been unsuccessful. This cannot be counted as a reduction in the noise levels.
- The location for the dock is not relatively isolated, as the DEIR states on page 4.6-13, from the homes that currently exist along North Shore Drive, nor from the national forest just beyond that.
- The measurements of noise for the marina are based on boat noise on the lake, but the basis for the noise level increase would be the proximity of boats to the east Fawnskin area where very few now come. No calculations were done in the DEIR to measure the difference in noise from this perspective and the measurements of increase and impact are therefore artificially low.
- Noise from a marina on the east end of Fawnskin is not something that exists at present so this would be a whole new type of noise added to the ambient level. That, along with another layer of noise from people and cars in the marina parking lot when added to the new traffic and residential noise would be a substantial increase in ambient noise and even if this only existed on weekends, according to the threshold criteria would merit a finding of significance.
- Noise level of dBA 60 or more is INTRUSIVE, see Table 4.6.1. The large trucks and excavations of construction would be much noisier than that level and could go on for years. This is definitely a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels of the area and therefore merits a finding of significance.
- Vibration is a very technical measurement that may affect the adjacent properties. If damage does occur AND can be proven, the owner has ten years to file a claim. What measures would be taken to protect adjacent properties from this potential damage?

FOF b-176

FOF b-177

FOF b-178

FOF b-179

FOF b-180

FOF b-181

FOF b-182

FOF b-183

- The EIR responses to comments received from the public on the prior EIR refers to how much less noise will be generated because the project is now proposed to be 50 building lots instead of 90. Given the topography of the site, 50 are still too many to reduce the noise significantly, especially with the addition of a marina. The EIR states that only 50 lots would have a negligible impact on the ambient noise due to its low-density nature. Most of the lots adjacent to the "Existing sensitive receptors" did not reduce in size enough to have a negligible impact from the previous 90-lot proposal, so this conclusion is erroneous. FOF b-184

- Regarding the 55 capacity marina, on the significant weekends mentioned above, the noise would NOT be at acceptable levels. The EIR states that the proposed dock is relatively isolated. Noise travels across water as loudly as it is generated and does not reduce significantly over land when it is unobstructed as it is in the canyons running up Fawnskin. FOF b-185

- Mitigation Measures NOI-1,2,3,4 assumes that all contractors would maintain their equipment at the highest levels to live up to these measures. What is the inspection process that would be put in place to assure these measures are adhered to? What remedies would residents have if they were not? What agency would be enforcing these measure? FOF b-186

- The potential impacts of offsite construction noise for such things as the extensive water pipelines that could possibly be installed all through the east side of Fawnskin have not been even discussed let alone included in the measurements of noise level differences. This impact would pass the threshold of significance according to the criteria listed in the DEIR. FOF b-187

- All mitigation measures cover installation of the infrastructure. There is no mention of the noise generated from home construction, which would probably last for years. This possibility must be included in the calculations for raising the ambient noise level. FOF b-188

- The traffic mitigation is only considering daily average. This is not valid. The weekends represent the worst-case scenarios and must be used separately from weekdays to provide accurate information. The daily average on the EIR chart from the 2006 information shows 57.92 dBAs. That tells me that weekends will be well over the 60 dBA level that is considered intrusive and it is the worst case scenarios that must be used for calculated the potential increases. FOF b-189

In summary, many of the measurements in the increase of noise levels have been artificially reduced in this analysis, making it invalid in substantiating that noise increase would be less than significant. Since the previous EIR determined findings of significance and since the reductions from the smaller project have been artificially enhanced over what the actual reductions would be, a finding of significance would be a more accurate determination. FOF b-190

Public Services

County policy clearly emphasizes that all necessary infrastructure and public services must be adequate to support new subdivision proposals. This is even more imperative when there is a zoning change involved. FOF b-191