
From: EIR
Sent: Thu 6/19/2008 9:58 AM
To: EIR
Cc: jgarland@ntpitol.com
Subject: Request for Comments Notice of Draft

Comment 49

WEB FORM SUBMISSION:

FULLNAME: Jason Garland

ZIP: 92881

COMMENTS----

I think it's important to protect our friends, family and especially those that put their own lives at risk everyday. Nothing is more important than protecting those that protect us.

I am in full support of the County's Public Safety System look forward to seeing the results of their efforts.

EMAIL: jgarland@ntpitol.com

ADDRESS: 2878 Bush Circle

CITY: Corona

49-1

Jason Garland (June 19, 2008)

Response to Comment 49-1

The County appreciates the commentor's interest in the project. The comment asserts the opinion of the author in regards to how the project should be developed. This comment does not raise any new environmental issues not already thoroughly analyzed in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is needed (*Twain Harte Homeowners Ass'n v. County of Butte* (1977) 138 Cal.App.3d 664, 679).

From: EIR
Sent: Thu 6/19/2008 10:10 AM
To: EIR
Cc: edgarland@earthlink.net
Subject: Request for Comments Notice of Draft

Comment 50

WEB FORM SUBMISSION:

FULLNAME: Ed Garland

ZIP: 92881

COMMENTS: I am a long term resident of Corona and look forward to the
benefits of the County's project.

50-1

ADDRESS: 1264 West Sixth St.

EMAIL: edgarland@earthlink.net

CITY: Corona

Ed Garland (June 19, 2008)

Response to Comment 50-1

The County appreciates the commentor's interest in the project. The comment asserts the opinion of the author in regards to how the project should be developed. This comment does not raise any new environmental issues not already thoroughly analyzed in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is needed (*Twain Harte Homeowners Ass'n v. County of Butte* (1977) 138 Cal.App.3d 664, 679).

From: gcunningham2@verizon.net [mailto:gcunningham2@verizon.net]

Sent: Fri 6/20/2008 9:33 AM

To: EIR

Subject: Tall towers

Comment 51

Hi!

I would like to know the exact future location of the tall tower in Mead Valley. I would also like to know how high it will be. Please e-mail an answer to me.

Thanks!!

Yours truly,

Gail Cunningham

Mead Valley

51-1

Gail Cunningham (June 20, 2008)

Response to Comment 51-1

The information requested by the commenter was sent at the time the request was made.

From: EIR
Sent: Sat 6/21/2008 4:47 PM
To: EIR
Cc: cdfbob@msn.com
Subject: Request for Comments Notice of Draft

Comment 52

WEB FORM SUBMISSION:

FULLNAME: Robert Toups

ZIP: 92587

COMMENTS: I want to express my family's strong support for this vitally important project to improve our County's public safety communications capabilities. We also strongly believe that the infrastructure required to maximize this project to its full potential must take a higher priority than minor environmental concerns. The bigger picture of public safety must supercede all other concerns and consideration related to this project.

52-1

ADDRESS: 23200 Pretty Doe Dr

EMAIL: cdfbob@msn.com

CITY: Canyon Lake

Robert Toups (June 21, 2008)

Response to Comment 52-1

The County appreciates the commentor's interest in the project. The comment asserts the opinion of the author in regards to how the project should be developed. This comment does not raise any new environmental issues not already thoroughly analyzed in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is needed (*Twain Harte Homeowners Ass'n v. County of Butte* (1977) 138 Cal.App.3d 664, 679).

From: gcunningham2@verizon.net [mailto:gcunningham2@verizon.net]

Sent: Sat 6/21/2008 10:25 PM

To: EIR

Subject: Tower in Mead Valley

Comment 53

Hi!

I would like to know where exactly the county proposes to place the 40-330 ft. tower in Mead Valley, since I live here. Also, how tall will it be? Your map was not large enough to see details well.

Thanks!

Sincerely,

Gail Cunningham

53-1

Gail Cunningham (June 21, 2008)

Response to Comment 53-1

The information requested by the commenter was sent at the time the request was made.

From: EIR
Sent: Sun 6/22/2008 4:01 PM
To: EIR
Cc: elmri17@AOL.COMI
Subject: Request for Comments Notice of Draft

WEB FORM SUBMISSION:

Comment 54

FULLNAME: Elmer Riley

ZIP: 92241

COMMENTS: I'm for you 100%, I live back in a cove. My Cell Phone Service is bad also TV Antenna reception is bad. Thank You

54-1

EMAIL: elmri17@AOL.COMI

ADDRESS: 72800 Hilltop Rd.

CITY: DHS--Sky Valley

Elmer Riley (June 22, 2008)

Response to Comment 54-1

The County appreciates the commentor's interest in the project. The comment asserts the opinion of the author in regards to how the project should be developed. This comment does not raise any new environmental issues not already thoroughly analyzed in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is needed (*Twain Harte Homeowners Ass'n v. County of Butte* (1977) 138 Cal.App.3d 664, 679).

From: kelly.o@scgelectric.com [mailto:kelly.o@scgelectric.com]

Sent: Tue 6/24/2008 10:34 AM

To: EIR

Subject: PSEC

Comment 55

Can you tell me the dates/times of any public hearings?

55-1

Thank you,

Kelly Overholt

SCG Electric

27762 Antonio Pkwy, L1-633

Ladera Ranch, CA 92694

Phone: 949.728.9942

Fax: 949.728.9943

elogo

Kelly Overholt (June 24, 2008)

Response to Comment 55-1

The project hopes to be taken up by the Board of Supervisors in September, 2008. Information on public hearings can be found on the Riverside County Board of Supervisors website at:

http://www.countyofriverside.us/portal/page?_pageid=133,304409,133_310673&_dad=portal&_schema=PORTAL

From: dpsy@pacbell.net [mailto:dpsy@pacbell.net]
Sent: Tue 6/24/2008 11:47 AM
To: EIR
Cc: district1@rcbos.org
Subject: Response to PSEC Project DEIR-Rancho Carrillo

Comment 56

June 24, 2008

County of Riverside
Department of Facilities Management
P.O. Box 789
Riverside, Ca 92502-0789

Sent: VIA Email

cc: Bob Buster, 1st District, Riverside County Board of Supervisors

Dear Ms Ashley Mitchell and Supervisor Bob Buster,

This letter is in response to the DEIR that is now available on your website.

We are opposed to the placement of an antenna in or adjacent to Rancho Carrillo, our neighborhood, located at the extreme western edge of Riverside County for the following reasons:

1. The proposed antenna will not fulfill the stated purpose.

The stated purpose of the PSEC project is to provide radio coverage for emergency services personnel as they serve the public. The new system is urgently needed to ensure the safety of firefighters, law enforcement officers and the public. Our response to this is: The proposed antenna will not serve our community. We receive ALL emergency services from the County of Orange. The only Riverside county personnel that respond to emergencies within our neighborhood are our own volunteer firefighters who live here in our community. Since our community is in the 949 area code, when we dial 911, we receive emergency aid from the County of Orange, specifically from San Juan Capistrano, which is 15 miles away. The closest Riverside fire department and ambulance services located in Lake Elsinore, are approx 40 miles away. The nearest Sheriffs sub station is in Murrietta, which is more than 40 miles away. There would be no benefit to our community by installing an antenna

56-1

system. The proposed antenna will not be accessible to Orange County Service providers or the CHP, therefore, the proposed antenna will not fulfill its stated purpose.

**56-1
(cont.)**

2. The proposed antenna will damage the aesthetic nature of our rural wilderness surrounded community.

The placement of a 100' to 140' tower at any of the proposed locations or within the surrounding forest or wilderness would be visible from a great distance and destroy the natural area that the 1984 wilderness act sought to create when the San Mateo Canyon National Wilderness was created.

56-2

3. The proposed antenna is a waste of money.

We believe that the expense of construction and maintaining such a tower with no use to the residents of our community is a waste of money. Constructing this Aesthetic nightmare at the far end of Riverside County would be a shameful waste of money that could be better spent in other areas of the County.

56-3

4. Endangerment to our only water source.

The planned antenna location may preclude us from replacing our water tank with a larger one that is already needed by our community. The pipes that reach to our community from our existing tank are in the area of the proposed antenna site. There was no mitigation in the DEIR for our water lines. The radio waves from the proposed antenna, may interfere with our own community's water tank and our well system. They are radio controlled. This is our community's only source of water.

56-4

In closing, my family have been residents of Rancho Carrillo for over 35 years, we have seen a lot of changes, good, and bad. This antenna, if allowed to be constructed, will defiantly be in the bad category. We are opposed to the antenna placement anywhere in Rancho Carrillo, the surrounding Wilderness or our National forest.

56-5

Sincerely,
Jesse and Catherine Cope
P.O. Box 4185
Dana Point, Ca 92629
949-661-1313
949-728-0244
dpsy@pacbell.net
Lot 19

Jesse & Catherine Cope (June 24, 2008)

Response to Comment 56-1

The reader is misinformed regarding interoperability components of the proposed project. See Response to Comment 29-4 and 30-3.

Response to Comment 56-2

This comment has already been addressed in Response to Comment 22-9.

Response to Comment 56-3

The comment asserts the opinion of the author in regards to how the project should be developed. This comment does not raise any new environmental issues not already thoroughly analyzed in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is needed (*Twain Harte Homeowners Ass'n v. County of Butte* (1977) 138 Cal.App.3d 664, 679).

Response to Comment 56-4

This comment has already been addressed in Response to Comment 22-15 and 22-16.

Response to Comment 56-5

The County appreciates the commentor's interest in the proposed project.

From: EIR
Sent: Wed 6/25/2008 10:32 AM
To: EIR
Cc: Bill@boneyardbill.com
Subject: Request for Comments Notice of Draft

Comment 57

WEB FORM SUBMISSION:

FULLNAME: William G. Foster 111 & Sheila

ZIP: 92545

COMMENTS: I own property in the areas which are in need of radio towers for the communications coverage for telephones. Here are some apn #'s which could be potential sites, 315070047-1 319061002 636073011-3 All of these properties are in dead zone areas of Riverside County. Please consider using these sites for potential communication towers. For information or to inform us of what we need to do please respond at our address, email or phone# 951-926-8976. Thank You William & Sheila Foster.

57-1

ADDRESS: 26301 Amanda

EMAIL: Bill@boneyardbill.com

CITY: Hemet

William & Sheila Foster (June 25, 2008)

Response to Comment 57-1

The comment is informational in nature and does not require a response. The County appreciates the individual's interest in the project.

From: deborahimonti@verizon.net [mailto:deborahimonti@verizon.net]
Sent: Wed 6/25/2008 5:02 PM
To: EIR
Cc: jdwatson11@verizon.net
Subject: PSEC Project

Comment 58

To whom it may concern:

I would like to make it clear that I am opposed to the PSEC project. The radio tower location on Redondo Mesa would be a travesty. There is an existing microwave tower already on the plateau why erect another eye sore. Putting a radio tower next to the water tower would effect all whom own homes and live on the plateau. Not to mention it would be a visual eye soar while driving through a nature conservatory? With property prices plummeting along with an eye soar that does not benefit the community as a whole this project will put financial hardship on my husband and I. We have a home located on Marbrise Abanita below the Redondo Mesa plateau and to drive up the hill and see this tower with its flashing lights would be a shame. What can I do as a concerned homeowner to stop the tower at this location.

58-1

Regards,

Deborah Imonti
El Camino College BTC
ETP Training Coordinator
(949) 466-0008 cell
(866) 422-3637 toll free fax

Deborah Imonti (June 25, 2008)

Response to Comment 58-1

The issues raised in the commentator's correspondence have already been addressed in Response to Comment 20. The comment asserts the opinion of the author in regards to how the project should be developed. This comment does not raise any new environmental issues not already thoroughly analyzed in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is needed (*Twain Harte Homeowners Ass'n v. County of Butte* (1977) 138 Cal.App.3d 664, 679).

From: jeff@nate-ia.com [mailto:jeff@nate-ia.com]
Sent: Wed 6/25/2008 5:52 PM
To: EIR
Subject: PSEC Redonda Mesa

Comment 59

Jeff Williams

18267 Marbrise Abanita drive

Murrieta, CA 92562

County of Riverside

Department of Facilities Management

Attn. Ms Ashley Mitchell

P.O. Box 789

Riverside, CA 92502-0789

Re: PSEC project

Dear Ms. Ashley Mitchell:

I own property in Tenaja, on Redonda Mesa adjacent to the proposed tower on Redonda Mesa. I wonder if you could tell me more details about the Redonda Mesa tower specifically. Could you tell me specifically the height of the tower they are thinking of, (I know in the range is from 40 too 330 ft) and if it would have a beacon light on it?

59-1

Could you also tell me if the proposed tower would provide services for various government agencies only? Or would it also include cellular, wifi or other consumer directed services?

59-2

The road leading up to the proposed site is a privately maintained road, not part of Tenaja or county maintenance, so would the building of the tower

59-3

also include repair and maintenance of the road?

I look forward to your reply. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jeff Williams

714-442-0574

jeff@rm-pd.com

Jeff Williams (June 25, 2008)

Response to Comment 59-1

As indicated in Table 1-1 of the Draft EIR, the tower proposed for the Redondo Mesa site will be approximately 100 feet in height.

Response to Comment 59-2

Facilities built as part of the PSEC project would be restricted to governmental use only. No cellular, wi-fi, or consumer-directed services will be made available as part of the proposed project.

Response to Comment 59-3

During its due diligence review of the site, the County assessed the existing access road to the top of the mesa, and determined that it is adequate and safe in regards to conveying construction equipment to the site. The types of equipment used to construct the tower would likely be no more than that used to construct the homes that are currently located on the mesa. In fact, the amount of site preparation required at the tower site will be minimal, so the amount of heavy equipment required at the site will also be minimal. Therefore, any impacts to area roadways are expected to be negligible.