
From: EIR
Sent: Wed 6/25/2008 6:25 PM
To: EIR
Cc: jeff@nate-ia.com
Subject: Request for Comments Notice of Draft

Comment 60

WEB FORM SUBMISSION:

FULLNAME: Jeff Williams

ZIP: 92562

COMMENTS----

I own a couple properties on top of Redonda Mesa, "Redonda Mesa Ranch" and was interested in the proposed tower. I would like to know how tall of a tower are you thinking of building up there, and what if any beacons are planned for it. I would really appreciate some information on this as it will help clarify some worries before the public comment period is over.

60-1

Thank you

Jeff

ADDRESS: 18267 Marbrise Abanita dr.

EMAIL: jeff@nate-ia.com

CITY: Murrieta

Jeff Williams (June 25, 2008)

Response to Comment 60-1

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. At this time, no light beacons are believed to be needed for this site, but the ultimate determination of any lighting requirements will be made by the FAA per their regulations.

From: menifeevalleyhistorical@earthlink.net [mailto:menifeevalleyhistorical@earthlink.net]
Sent: Thu 6/26/2008 5:33 PM
To: EIR
Cc: townshipcenter@earthlink.net
Subject: Draft EIR Not Available For Download!

Comment 61

We have signed on to <http://psec.co.riverside.ca.us/> at 2 different locations and on 4 different computers this last 48 hours - all to no avail!

61-1

Please advise as to where you have moved this EIR draft ASAP!

Please attach a PDF/Word copy to the following:

MenifeeValleyHistorical@earthlink.net <Barbara A Spencer President>

TriValleyTrails@earthlink.net <Tom Fuhrman Trail Boss>

mvcedco@earthlink.net <Menifee Valley Community & Economic Development Advisory Councils>

vxd120@hotmail.com <Wildomar Council-Elect - Ade, Sheryl >

menifeecityclerk@mchsi.com <Advisor Community & Economic Development>

Barbara A. Spencer (June 26, 2008)

Response to Comment 61-1

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

From: EIR
Sent: Sat 6/28/2008 12:27 PM
To: EIR
Cc: dbalsamo@sbcglobal.net
Subject: Request for Comments Notice of Draft

Comment 62

WEB FORM SUBMISSION:

FULLNAME: Donald Balsamo

ZIP: 92860

COMMENTS----

As a 30 year property owner in Norco and Corona I have seen the growth here and in the rest of the county. The current Sheriff's radio system that was built in the 1990's is underbuilt and over taxed in its daily useage. The County must move forward and replace the current system to better serve the public and the needs of Public Safety in the 21st Century. The County has given careful consideration to the needs of the environment and has only placed sites that serve both the interests of the community, the environment and the Public Safety. I strongly support the efforts of the County in this project as it is presented. I would recommend that it be approved as written.
Donald Balsamo
Norco

62-1

ADDRESS: 2440 Vine Ave

EMAIL: dbalsamo@sbcglobal.net

CITY: Norco

Donald Balsamo (June 28, 2008)

Response to Comment 62-1

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: Wed 7/2/2008 1:12 PM
To: EIR
Cc: mfrymire1@adelphia.net
Subject: Request for Comments Notice of Draft

Comment 63

WEB FORM SUBMISSION:

FULLNAME: Matthew Frymire

ZIP: 92557

COMMENTS: I am in support of this project to ensure our public safety and first responder personnel have the tools they need to ensure not only their safety, but the safety of "we the people".

63-1

ADDRESS: 23739 Heliotrope Way

EMAIL: mfrymire1@adelphia.net

CITY: Moreno Valley

Matthew Frymire (July 2, 2008)

Response to Comment 63-1

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: jacquelineanderson@wildblue.net [mailto:jacquelineanderson@wildblue.net]
Sent: Wed 7/2/2008 1:55 PM
To: EIR
Cc: BrentC@focus360.com; district1@rcbos.org
Subject: PSEC Project - Proposed Rancho Carrillo Site

Comment 64

July 2, 2008

County of Riverside

Department of Facilities Management

P.O. Box 789

Riverside, CA 92502-0789

with copy via email: EIR@co.riverside.ca.us

Subject: Response to PSEC Project NOP

I am a resident of the community of Rancho Carrillo, located at the western edge of Riverside County. Rancho Carrillo has been designated as a proposed antenna site for the Public Safety Enterprise Communication Project (PSEC).

On behalf of our community, the Rancho Carrillo Homeowners Association has already expressed the community position in opposition to placement of an antenna within our community. I agree with this position.

On behalf of my own family, I would like to separately express opposition to the County's intentions expressed in the NOP.

Here is the basis for our opposition:

COST-BENEFIT

The cost of this equipment is disproportional to the number of residents that may be effectively served. Rancho Carrillo is the only populated area

64-1

in the extreme western portion of the county, with about 60 occupied homes. If the total project were to cost \$6 million, that would be \$100,000 per home, plus an additional amount for ongoing maintenance. A less costly plan that incorporates existing satellite or cell phone technology should be seriously considered.

**64-1
(cont.)**

TRAFFIC SAFETY

The draft EIR states that "all vehicles accessing the sites will be highway registered and therefore not an incompatible use". With no further study, or assessment of the actual road that must be traveled, this issue is then dismissed as "not an incompatible use"

Clearly our narrow, climbing, winding, private road is not adequate to accommodate all "Highway registered vehicles". In fact, The Department of Transportation (DOT) recognizes that not all public roads are adequate to safely allow all highway registered vehicles. Evidence the fact they have established a special safety assessment procedure wherein the DOT,

64-2

"in consultation with the Department of the California Highway Patrol, shall compile traffic volume, geometric, and other relevant data, to assess the maximum kingpin to rearmost axle distance of vehicle combinations appropriate for those state highways or portion of highways, affected by this section, that cannot safely accommodate trailers or semitrailers of the maximum kingpin to rearmost axle distances permitted under Section 35400."

At a minimum, an assessment following the established guidelines should be undertaken before the Rancho Carrillo location is approved.

COST OF TRASH REMOVAL, ROAD MAINTENANCE AND INSURANCE

Our six mile private road is very costly to maintain and insure. Those costs multiply with increased usage, especially usage in oversized vehicles. Despite the sizeable amount we pay to the County in property taxes, the County does not currently pay a share of those costs. Since there is no apparent offer in your plan for cost sharing, you seem to be unreasonably expecting that our residents would incur extra expense. Beyond those things that we pay for, are you anticipating that the County will show up to help when our volunteers pick up trash and trim back the bushes?

64-3

COMMUNITY SAFETY

Due to the remote area we live in, we do not have active law enforcement in our community. Despite this limitation, we have achieved reasonable personal safety by vigilantly securing our access gate and by requiring residents to be personally responsible for their guests in the community. This means that we know who are guests are and that we know where our guests are. If this tower is constructed, the County should provide security screening for every person admitted to the site and should provide active law enforcement officers to oversee their activities at all times. Due to distance involved, the response time for law enforcement is not adequate to allow for providing the officers only following a resident call.

64-4

EMERGENCY SERVICES

Riverside County rarely provides emergency services to Rancho Carrillo. The nearest Sheriff substation is located in Murrieta, some 40 miles away by road. The closest fire department is located in Lake Elsinore, also about 40 miles distant. Riverside County emergency telephone numbers are not even reachable from our community, since Rancho Carrillo is located in the 949

64-5

telephone area code. All direct calls are rejected!

In contrast, Orange County Sheriff, Fire and California Highway Patrol are all dispatched from stations in San Juan Capistrano, which is a mere 14 miles distant, and new development in the Mission Viejo Ranch will cut these distances by half within a decade.

**64-5
(cont.)**

If I dial 911 from my home in Rancho Carrillo, the call goes to an Orange County agency for response. Installation of the proposed antenna will not change this situation.

CONSTRUCTION SAFETY

Paradoxically, any injury during the construction phase would result in an emergency response from Orange County officers and the victim would most likely be transported to a nearby Orange County hospital!

64-6

NO IMPROVEMENT IN SERVICES

Radio propagation maps provided to our community by members of the PSEC project team clearly illustrate that the project will provide no meaningful improvement to radio communication for our volunteer fire department in the area of their principal need - along the access road (located in Orange County) that accesses our community. Furthermore, representatives of the PSEC project team do not appear to be offering any improvement in communications with Orange County Fire Authority, California Highway Patrol, or the Orange County Sheriff's Department (all of whom have recently respond to incidents in our community). We believe the system to be ineffective and that it does not warrant consideration for accommodation in our community.

64-7

APPEARANCE

Rancho Carrillo is a unique rural community that was formed in 1962. Even after electrical power was brought to the community in 1992, residents have sought to preserve the rural character of the area by locating utility services underground at considerable expense and foregoing suburban amenities such as street lighting. We have sought to keep the community and our personal property compatible with the surrounding wilderness. The proposed PSEC antenna facility is incompatible with this aesthetic. Furthermore, we are not aware of any possible mitigation of this incompatibility due to the height of the structure.

64-8

LAND USE AND PLANNING

A radio communication tower of the type proposed is incompatible with property zoning restrictions in our community. In addition, it is specifically incompatible with the Covenants, Conditions & Restrictions that govern properties within Rancho Carrillo.

64-9

PERMISSION FOR ACCESS

County access to any tower located in or near Rancho Carrillo that relies on passage over the roads in our community will necessarily be across private property and will require easements or use permits be obtained from all affected property owners, including me. I am not inclined to grant the county such an easement or permit for the reasons outlined in this letter. Easements and/or permits may also be required from the County of Orange, Rancho Mission Viejo and the United States Forest Service to gain

64-10

non-emergency access to this area via existing roads.

MULTIPLE USERS

The EIR states that there may be up to six users of the site. Would those be public or private companies, domestic or foreign? Is this a poorly disguised attempt by the County to receive economic benefit at our expense or to give commercial or governmental access to an otherwise inaccessible area? Is this essentially a condemnation or diminishment in value of our private property for the benefit of a commercial enterprise?

64-11

SUMMARY

I believe that County and Federal resources are being wasted in an effort to locate an antenna within the area of Rancho Carrillo. Radio propagation into the surrounding canyon areas of Riverside County is not significantly improved over that which is directly available from existing facilities on Santiago Peak. Essential interoperability with the incompatible systems in Orange County is not achieved.

The dismissal of all traffic safety issues, without regard to the size or condition of our access road, is illustrative of the absurdity of this project. A more reasonable approach would be to link our emergency communications and services entirely to Orange County.

The aesthetic damage that would be done by installation of PSEC at any of the proposed locations, or within the surrounding Forest or Wilderness lands would be considerable. Such a facility 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. While CEQA is not directly applicable to projects on Federal lands within California, the protections afforded in the Federal setting must be applied in consideration of projects located in so-called "included areas" such as the Rancho Carrillo community. What is appropriate on private or non-Wilderness USFS land surrounded by the Wilderness is no different than what would be appropriate in the Wilderness itself - especially considering the height of the project being proposed.

Thus, requirements of the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) are applicable to any project located in this area because of proximity to the Federal and Wilderness lands. Mere placement of a 100 to 140 foot tower on private land in Rancho Carrillo is insufficient to mitigate the aesthetic damage that would result to my property, the community of Rancho Carrillo, and to the surrounding National Wilderness.

While we do not favor a communications site of any type, representatives of the Rancho Carrillo community offered county PSEC project representatives the opportunity to discuss installation of a scaled down facility that would be capable of being hidden on an existing structure at a location that would serve the locally populated area (which can never be geographically expanded due to our surroundings). After addressing the safety and cost issues above, this alternative should be given serious consideration in the proposed EIR and not be further ignored.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Anderson

38421 Carrillo Road (Lot 11)

Rancho Carrillo, California

Mail:

31103 Rancho Viejo Road

San Juan Capistrano, CA 92675

Telephone:

(949) 728-0732 in Rancho Carrillo

(949) 697-0732 cell

Cc: district1@rcbos.org, Bob Buster, 1st District, Riverside County Board of supervisors

Brent Chase, President Rancho Carrillo HOA

Jackie Anderson-Rose

31103 Rancho Viejo Rd #D235

San Juan Capistrano, CA 92675

<<<mailto:jacquelineanderson@wildblue.net>>> jacquelineanderson@wildblue.net

949 728 0732 (phone & fax)

949 728 9929 (phone & fax)

949 697 0732 (Jackie's cell)

949 246 2575 (Steve's cell)

Jackie Anderson_Rose (July 2, 2008)

Response to Comment 64-1

The County considered a variety of alternatives to the proposed project, including the alternatives suggested by the commentor. Therefore, 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 64-2

The County does not propose to use the existing road in an unsafe manner and the commentor provides no evidence to the contrary.

Response to Comment 64-3

This comment has already been addressed in response to Comment 22-5 and 22-22.

Response to Comment 64-4

This comment has already been addressed in response to Comment 29-5.

Response to Comment 64-5

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

Response to Comment 64-6

This comment is speculative in nature and is not relevant to the Draft EIR.

Response to Comment 64-7

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

Response to Comment 64-8

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

Response to Comment 64-9

This comment has already been addressed in response to Comment 22-18.

Response to Comment 64-10

This comment has already been addressed in response to Comment 22-5 and 22-22.

Response to Comment 64-11

As described on page 3-4 of the Draft EIR, the PSEC project will provide collocation opportunities to other governmental and quasi-governmental entities. For reasons of security and other factors, PSEC sites will not be available to commercial operators (i.e. commercial cellular service providers, etc.).

Response to Comment 64-12

This comment has already been addressed in Response to Comment 29-4, 30-2, and 30-3.

Response to Comment 64-13

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 64-14

This comment has already been addressed in response to Comment 22-9 and 22-18.

Response to Comment 64-13

The County has indicated its willingness to work with the Rancho Carrillo community as this project moves forward.

From: EIR
Sent: Sun 7/6/2008 10:39 AM
To: EIR
Cc: d_penry@yahoo.com
Subject: Request for Comments Notice of Draft

Comment 65

WEB FORM SUBMISSION:

FULLNAME: Diane & Charles Penry

ZIP: 92241

COMMENTS: Yes, we agree this would be great to have an emergency tower available to our area, there is alot of room here in Riverside County (Sky Valley) to place something of this type in our area.

65-1

EMAIL: d_penry@yahoo.com

ADDRESS: 18-950 Vee Bee Rd.

CITY: Sky Valley

Diane & Charles Penry (July 6, 2008)

Response to Comment 65-1

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: RDavis@mazdausa.com [mailto:RDavis@mazdausa.com]
Sent: Mon 7/7/2008 7:39 AM
To: EIR
Cc: district1@rcbos.org
Subject: PSEC project NOP relating to Rancho Carrillo Community

County of Riverside

Comment 66

Department of Facilities Management

Attn: Ms. Ashley Mitchell

PO Box 789

Riverside CA 92502-0789

July 4, 2008

Subject: Response to PSEC Project NOP

Dear Ms. Mitchell,

As you know many members of the community of Rancho Carrillo Community are opposed to the construction of the proposed radio tower in our community. We would like to join that list of residents that do not agree with the current proposal. While you have received many letters outlining environmental, aesthetic, wildlife, easement, and property value concerns our opposition is based on common sense. Given the proposed tower would not serve the needs of the residents of our community or add value to the county overall why invest in the project? Given today's economic climate, we are sure that county, state or federal resources can be put to use in higher value projects.

Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to a common sense resolution to this issue and a better use of our tax dollars.

Best Regards,

66-1

Robert and Bonnie Davis

10580 Verdugo Road

Lot #7

Mailing Address:

31103 Rancho Viejo Road

Suite D2310

San Juan Capistrano CA 92675

P) 949.728.1504

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

Robert & Bonnie Davis (July 7, 2008)

Response to Comment 66-1

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: sylviah@yahoo.com [mailto:sylviah@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tue 7/8/2008 10:14 AM
To: EIR
Subject: PSEC Project

Comment 67

Re: Project SCH 2008021126

As residents of Rancho Carrillo for over 30 years, we wish to voice our grave concern over the proposed construction of a radio tower within the perimeter of our community. We live in the Federal wilderness area so to have our homes surrounded by a natural environment. The proposed tower would have many negative effects to all of us. You note that the visual element would be out of character with the existing environment and land use. This is an extremely important impact. Also the idea of a beacon within view so to interfere with the night sky would be a tragedy. We pay taxes to Riverside and ask for very little since Orange County is our first response for emergencies. We see no positive value to this location and ask that you please reconsider this proposed site. I would appreciate a response from someone in your office that you have received this public comment. We hope that you will see fit to place this tower in a location that will not have such a negative impact on Rancho Carrillo and its homeowners.

67-1

Sincerely,

Mike & Sylvia Huber
10725 Quail Springs Rd
Rancho Carrillo

Mike & Sylvia Huber (July 8, 2008)

Response to Comment 67-1

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: franou@music.greencafe.com [mailto:franou@music.greencafe.com]
Sent: Wed 7/9/2008 8:48 PM
To: EIR
Cc: teresa_idl@riverside.lib.ca.us
Subject: Public Safety Enterprise Communication System

Comment 68

Public Safety Enterprise Communication System.

At <http://psec.co.riverside.ca.us/notice-deir.html>, the list of locations where the draft EIR may be reviewed does not include the Idyllwild library

Please have the Draft EIR available at the Idyllwild Library as soon as possible

Regards,

Francoise Frigola
P.O. Box 1953
Idyllwild, CA

68-1

Francoise Frigola (July 9, 2008)

Response to Comment 68-1

The Draft EIR was made available at all County-operated libraries. It was also made available on the internet. The County appreciates the commentor's interest in the project. 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).