

First, Excelaron's analysis fails to take into account the fact that a nighttime temperature inversion occurs on 90% of all nights in the Huasna Valley and that such a temperature inversion can reflect and amplify project noises. The acoustic study refers to a sound-blocking ridge, but reflection of noise over the ridge due to thermal inversion could make the ridge worthless as a sound insulator.

The acoustic analysis discusses project noises in relation to county noise ordinances. CEQA however clearly considers noise impacts relative to existing background noise levels, which were measured in Dr. Lord's acoustic analysis of the Huasna Valley. The EIR should evaluate project noise impacts relative to this existing baseline data.

Additionally, Excelaron's acoustic study considers only the noise generated by a single well pump. It does not specify the type or horsepower of the pump and whether it is an electric motor as specified in the previously proposed project or the propane engine pump as specified in the currently proposed project. There is no consideration of the fact that ten of these pump engines will be operating simultaneously from three different well pads. There is no consideration of the acoustical interactions or beats from these multiple noise sources.

Finally, nowhere is there any mention of the noise generated by the **4 million BTU boiler** that will operate 24 hrs a day to heat water.

The opinion of Excelaron's acoustic consultant is in conflict with the opinion of the acoustic consultant hired by the Huasna Valley Association. Because of this controversy it seems unreasonable that the EIR would base its analysis of project noise impacts on a peer review of the applicant-funded study. The EIR should conduct an independent study, make its own measurements, and model project noise against the baseline background noise level and the climatic thermal inversion conditions that are present in the Huasna Valley. To do otherwise will end up costing the community residents and the county taxpayers money when the applicant-funded study is refuted at the draft EIR stage.