

---

**From:** ffotine@hotmail.com [mailto:ffotine@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thu 7/10/2008 2:56 PM  
**To:** EIR  
**Subject:** Public Safety Enterprise Communication System

**Comment 69**

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.

**69-1**

Regards,

Fotine Fahouris  
PO Box 996  
Idyllwild, CA 92549

---

Need to know now? Get instant answers with Windows Live Messenger.  
[http://www.windowslive.com/messenger/connect\\_your\\_way.html?ocid=TEXT\\_TAGLM\\_WL\\_messenger\\_072008](http://www.windowslive.com/messenger/connect_your_way.html?ocid=TEXT_TAGLM_WL_messenger_072008)

**Fotine Fahouris (July 10, 2008)**

***Response to Comment 69-1***

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).

---

**From:** EIR  
**Sent:** Fri 7/11/2008 12:36 PM  
**To:** EIR  
**Cc:** Rugby4NeilMat@netscape.net  
**Subject:** Request for Comments Notice of Draft

**Comment 70**

WEB FORM SUBMISSION:

FULLNAME: Neil Mathews

ZIP: 92507

COMMENTS: I support the PSEC project and urge the approval of the draft EIR and hope the project will proceed as proposed. PSEC fulfills three vital goals here is Riverside County: public safety, employee safety, and economic stimulus. The PSEC project ensures better response time in the event of an emergency, safer response for personnel and the general public, and brings much needed revenue back into the County coffers by the unique partnership between government and private industry.

**70-1**

EMAIL: Rugby4NeilMat@netscape.net

ADDRESS: 2442 Iowa St. R-14

CITY: Riverside

**Neil Matthews (July 11, 2008)**

***Response to Comment 70-1***

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:** krwarren@earthlink.net [mailto:krwarren@earthlink.net]  
**Sent:** Mon 7/14/2008 9:52 AM  
**To:** EIR  
**Cc:** district1@rcbos.org  
**Subject:** Response to PSEC project (SCH 2008021126)

**Comment 71**

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

July 14, 2008

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

Response to PSEC project (SCH 2008021126)

I would like to take this opportunity to comment on the PSEC project (SCH 2008021126) notice. I am a resident of the remote community of Rancho Carrillo, located at the extreme western edge of Riverside County. Rancho Carrillo has been designated as a proposed antenna site for the SEC project.

On behalf of my family, I would like to express opposition to County intentions expressed in the MOP. Here is the basis for our opposition:

1. Economic I am opposed to the placement of SEC facilities in our area, because the proposed location will not serve our community. Rancho Carrillo is the only populated area in the extreme western portion of the county, and our population is around 60 families. The community is within a 160 acre area known as Verdugo Potrero. The community is completely surrounded by the San Mateo Canyon National Wilderness Area, as part of the Cleveland National Forest, preventing further development. Thus, an expensive long-range facility in this area, makes no economic sense. Another radio tower will need to be placed on Saddle back to reach the proposed antenna site at Rancho Carrillo. There is no direct way to link Rancho Carrillo with Riverside due to the mountains, and our location on the other side of the Santa Ana

**71-1**

mountains.

2. Ineffective. Radio propagation maps provided to our community by members of the SEC 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 our access road to our community from Ortega Highway. Further, representatives of the SEC project team could not offer any improvement in communication with Orange County Fire Authority, California Highway Patrol, and Orange County Sheriffs' Department (all of whom presently respond to incidents in our community). Thus, we believe the system to be ineffective and thus does not warrant consideration for the accommodation in our community.

**71-2**

3. Land Use and Planning. I do not think that the SEC project has followed the federal guidelines that require an NEPA environmental impact study to be completed first. The proposed siting of the antenna, 100 feet from our existing 320,000 gallon water tank could put our water supply in possible danger. The proposed pad will contain a 2000 propane tank for a backup generator. In case of a wildfire, this is in the direct line of most fires in the past, driven by Santa Ana winds. If the tank would explode, it could take out our source of drinking water and fire water protection. The proposed pad will be placed where our main water line runs to our community. If a fire comes through and causes the propane tank to catch fire, our volunteer fire department and the Orange County Fire Authority would be called upon to put out the fire. I wonder if a tank this size is appropriate in the wild land interface.

**71-3**

4. Access Road. There is only one road in and out of our community. The road leading to our community is a private road, with limited access with a private gate at Ortega highway. Our community alone pays for the maintenance of this road. Our road is not maintained to public highway levels, that permit us to allow use by non-residents. We have easements from Mission Viejo Ranch, Caspers Park, Cleveland National Forest, to provide access to our community.

**71-4**

The requirements of the National Environmental Protection ACT (NEPA) are applicable to any project located on Federal and Wilderness land, where the proposed site is.

**71-5**

Sincerely,

Keith R. Warren  
10700 Quail Springs Road (lot 60)  
Rancho Carrillo

Mail

P.O. Box 135  
San Juan Capistrano CA 92693

Telephone  
(949) 7628-0159  
Keith Warren  
krwarren@earthlink.net  
EarthLink Revolves Around You.

**Keith Warren (July 14, 2008)**

***Response to Comment 71-1***

This comment has already been addressed in Response to Comment 30-1.

***Response to Comment 71-2***

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

***Response to Comment 71-3***

Discussion of the NEPA process and its application to the Rancho Carrillo site is presented in Response to Comment 22-13. Discussion regarding other aspects of this comment is presented in Response to Comment 22-9, 22-15, and 22-16.

***Response to Comment 71-4***

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

***Response to Comment 71-5***

Discussion of the NEPA process and its application to the Rancho Carrillo site is presented in Response to Comment 22-13.

---

**From:** mwofff20@cox.net [mailto:mwofff20@cox.net]  
**Sent:** Fri 7/18/2008 9:39 AM  
**To:** EIR  
**Cc:** district1@rcbos.org; jfrodriquez@fs.fed.us; vmink@fs.fed.us  
**Subject:** Comments on Draft EIR - Riverside County PSEC Project

Department of Facilities Management  
P.O. Box 789  
Riverside, CA 92502-0789  
Attn: Ashley Mitchell

**Comment 72**

July 18, 2008

Dear Ms. Mitchell,

My name is Michael Wolff. My wife, Genevieve Wall, and I are submitting the following comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the County of Riverside PSEC project. We own two private parcels of land adjoining the community of Rancho Carrillo, the location of one of the proposed tower sites for the PSEC project. We do not oppose the PSEC project in general, but strongly oppose the construction of a communications tower at Rancho Carrillo for the reasons outlined in our comments below. As members of the affected community, we look forward to a dialogue on the issues that we are raising with our comments. I have included contact information at the end of this email so that I may be added to your mailing list for this project.

Our comments are as follows:

Comment 1 - DEIR Section 1 - Executive Summary, and Section 2 - Introduction

The DEIR addresses the need for the project only on an overall program level, and does not address the need for individual project components; thus, insufficient information is presented to enable reviewers of the document to determine the necessity of individual tower sites. This oversight results in a failure to provide adequate review and assessment of environmental impacts at specific locations because the impacts cannot be weighed against the need for the respective specific tower

**72-1**



site.

Comment 2 - DEIR Section 1 - Executive Summary

The DEIR states: "Some of the sites are located on federal land, and in those cases, separate environmental assessments (EAs) in compliance with the National

Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) will be conducted. Information contained in the Program EIR will be used to prepare the EAs." (DEIR p 1-2).

72-2

The information contained in the present program DEIR is insufficient to permit adequate preparation of site-specific EAs under NEPA because NEPA requires that the need for the "project" be addressed as part of the analysis. The need for individual tower sites is not analyzed within the present program DEIR.

Comment 3 - DEIR Section 1 - Executive Summary, and Section 2 - Introduction

The DEIR provides no information to justify the need for a tower at the Rancho Carrillo tower site location. The Rancho Carrillo tower site is proposed to be located on National Forest land immediately adjoining the Rancho Carrillo community, an isolated rural community at the edge of Riverside County. The Rancho Carrillo community is accessible by road only from Orange County, and all telephone service to the community is within the 949 area code; thus, any emergency 911 calls are routed to Orange County emergency response dispatchers, and it is Orange County emergency responders who typically provide emergency response services to the community. There are no other Riverside County communities in close proximity to Rancho Carrillo.

72-3

During presentations to the Rancho Carrillo community by the project proponents, the community was advised that the Riverside County PSEC system will not have interconnectivity with Orange County's emergency communications system. Thus, the Rancho Carrillo tower site will provide no tangible benefit to the Rancho Carrillo community, but it will impose substantial environmental impacts including aesthetic impacts, diminution of property values, and a substantial fire hazard impact (see Comments 5 and 6 below).

Comment 4 - DEIR Section 2 - Introduction

The Introduction identifies the document as a draft "Program" environmental impact report (DEIR). As such, the report focuses on impacts of the overall program rather than focusing on the impacts of individual project components such as tower sites. The geographic reach of the PSEC project is sufficiently large that reliance on a program DEIR alone without having complementary focused DEIRs on individual project component sites risks giving short shrift to important issues at specific sites. This is inappropriate and violates the intent of a CEQA "program" environmental impact report. The program DEIR is a good start, but complementary focused EIRs on specific sites or groups of similar sites are also needed to meet the intent of CEQA. Since some of the sites are on federal land, and thus will require preparation of individual environmental assessments required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), focused assessment of certain individual sites will be needed in any case.

72-4

The DEIR states: "Section 15168(a) of the CEQA Guidelines states that a Program EIR is appropriate for projects which are ". a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project and are related either:

1. Geographically;

2. A logical part in the chain of contemplated actions;  
3. In connection with issuance of rules, regulations, plans or other general criteria to govern the conduct of a continuing program; or  
4. As individual activities carried out under the same authorizing statutory or regulating authority and having generally similar environmental effects which can be mitigated in similar ways."  
(DEIR pp 2-1, 2-2)

**72-4  
(cont.)**

The PSEC project consists of approximately 50 different sites scattered across diverse environmental settings throughout Riverside County and adjoining counties. This is simply too large and environmentally diverse an area to be adequately addressed in a single DEIR. The DEIR effectively acknowledges this by stating: "The County encompasses approximately 7,400 square miles of diverse topography, from low-lying valleys lying below sea level to towering mountains approaching two miles in height." (DEIR p 1-1). Therefore, the program DEIR needs to be supplemented by focused EIRs for specific sites to meet the intent of CEQA.

Comment 5 - DEIR Section 1 - Executive Summary, and Section 4.1 - Aesthetics

The Rancho Carrillo tower site will cause significant negative aesthetic impacts that are unavoidable and for which no feasible mitigation exists. DEIR Section 1.6.1 states in part:

"Section 15123 (b) (2) of the CEQA Guidelines requires a discussion of "areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency including issues raised by agencies and the public." Accordingly, the PSEC project requires several actions that could be considered controversial:

\* Introduction of telecommunication structures into areas where such structures may be inconsistent with the existing visual setting (aesthetic impacts).

\* The potential of telecommunication wireless voice and data sites to diminish the monetary value of adjacent properties." (DEIR p 1-49)

These two factors would result in extreme negative consequences at the Rancho Carrillo tower site, a pristine rural area with a magnificent natural visual setting, where all electric and telephone lines have been installed underground to preserve the feeling of this natural setting. The residents of this community have paid very high prices for their properties in order to escape the negative aesthetic impacts of urban settings. The presence of an excessively large communications tower looming over the community, which provides no tangible benefit to the community (see Comment 2 above), imposes substantial and irreversible harm on community residents.

**72-5**

The DEIR acknowledges that these types of impacts are "significant" (DEIR Table 4.1-2, p 4.1-23). Section 4.1 concludes: "Therefore, the only possible finding in regards to aesthetic resources is that the project will result in a significant and unavoidable impact. Should the County desire to approve and implement the project, a Statement of Overriding Considerations will be required." (emphasis added)(DEIR p 4.1-29)

In other words, the County must decide whether or not to force a huge, unsightly, unwanted, and unnecessary tower upon the community of Rancho Carrillo - a tower that serves no purpose that benefits the community of Rancho Carrillo and that will dwarf the homes in Rancho Carrillo. By imposing this unnecessary and oppressive tower on the community, the County will be choosing to permanently impair the visual setting and

economic value of the properties in the community, all for no benefit to the community.

Comment 6 - DEIR Section 4.7 - Hazards and Hazardous Materials  
The EIR fails to adequately evaluate and propose realistic mitigation measures for the fire hazard posed by the proposed Rancho Carrillo tower site as required by CEQA. Specifically, EIR Section 4.7.3(h) states that CEQA requires that the following question (among others) be evaluated: [Would the project] "Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?" (EIR p 4.7-5).

The Rancho Carrillo community is surrounded by the Cleveland National Forest, and has been impacted by disastrous wildfires in the National Forest several times since its founding in the 1960s. These wildfires typically originate within the National Forest and sweep through the National Forest towards the community of Rancho Carrillo with little to stop them. In order to partially mitigate this risk, the community has implemented a volunteer fire department which relies upon a water storage tank for firefighting purposes. Virtually all of the National Forest Land surrounding the community is designated as the San Mateo Canyon Wilderness, and brush clearing and removal are strictly prohibited by the United States Forest Service (USFS). Therefore, adequate clearing of brush to provide defensible space for firefighting around structures adjoining National Forest land is not permitted.

The Rancho Carrillo tower site, including a proposed 2,000 gallon propane tank, is proposed to be located on National Forest land adjacent to the water storage tank that serves as the Rancho Carrillo community's sole source for potable water and firefighting water storage. Though brush clearing may occur immediately surrounding the tower and propane tank coincident with construction of the tower, further clearing to provide adequate defensible firefighting space will not be possible owing to the designation of the adjacent land as protected wilderness. Thus, the presence of a 2,000 gallon propane tank adjacent to the sole source of potable and firefighting water for the community poses an extreme hazard during a wildfire, since explosion of the propane tank during a fire, or at any other time, would likely severely damage or destroy the adjacent water tank.

The DEIR fails to address these concerns and instead attempts to sidestep the issue by lumping all sites and providing the following generic analysis: "Existing regulations require the maintenance of fuel modification zones and defensible space around any structure that is located in a fire-prone area. Typically, this requires the trimming or removal of fuels (i.e., combustible vegetation) from a specified area around a structure. These fuel modification zones are designed to provide for defensible space around structures and to allow for their protection in the event that an advancing wildfire should attempt to encroach upon them. Adequate defensible space denies fuel to the fire in the area surrounding a structure, and also provides fire protection personnel with a buffer in which to work and defend the structure." (EIR pp 4.7-9, 4.7-10). This broad-brush statement ignores the obviously hazardous conditions pertinent to the Rancho Carrillo tower site, and ignores the constraints on removal of combustible vegetation imposed by the wilderness designation. Issues like these may possibly apply to other specific sites as well. The generic statements in the DEIR clearly amount to an inadequate analysis of the fire hazard issue, and therefore do not meet the intent of the CEQA requirement.

72-6

Further evidence of the inadequacy of the DEIR analysis of the fire hazard issue appears in the following statement: "At a minimum, all sites will be held to the standards of the California Fire Code." (DEIR p 4.7-10). All California codes are available online through a searchable database at <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/calaw.html>. A cursory online search of this database did not identify any regulatory document with the title "California Fire Code." It appears that fire protection regulations are covered in the California Health and Safety Code. This reference should be corrected. Moreover, an adequate analysis should include at a minimum identification and discussion of specific requirements required by applicable codes at individual tower sites, and whether it is even possible to comply with the code requirements at a problematic location like the Rancho Carrillo tower site.

**72-6  
(cont.)**

End of comments.

Please add us to the list of interested parties to receive notices of all future developments and actions regarding this project.

Michael Wolff  
Michael Wolff, Inc.  
27068 La Paz Rd., No. 152  
Aliso Viejo, CA 92656  
Email: mwolff20@cox.net

Respectfully Submitted,  
Michael Wolff  
Genevieve Wall

cc  
Bob Buster - Riverside County Supervisor, District 1  
Virgil Mink - Special Uses Administrator - USFS Trabuco Ranger District  
Jacob Rodriguez - Recreation and Lands Officer - USFS Trabuco Ranger District

**Michael Wolff (July 18, 2008)**

***Response to Comment 72-1***

This comment has already been addressed in Response to Comment 22-3 and 22-4.

***Response to Comment 72-2***

This comment has already been addressed in Response to Comment 22-3 and 22-13.

***Response to Comment 72-3***

The reader is misinformed regarding interoperability components of the proposed project. See Response to Comment 29-4 and 30-3. Discussion as to purpose and need of the proposed project is contained in Response to Comment 22-1 and 22-2.

***Response to Comment 72-4***

Discussion as to the suitability of a Program EIR for the proposed project is contained in Response to Comment 22-3. Discussion of the NEPA process and its application to the Rancho Carrillo site is presented in Response to Comment 22-13.

***Response to Comment 72-5***

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

***Response to Comment 72-6***

This comment has already been addressed in Response to Comment 22-9, 22-15, and 22-16.

---

**From:** rleveret@earthlink.net [mailto:rleveret@earthlink.net]  
**Sent:** Sun 7/20/2008 9:04 AM  
**To:** EIR  
**Subject:** Rancho Carrillo Tower

**Comment 73**

Co. of Riverside  
Dept. of Facilities Management  
Attn: Ms Ashley Mitchell

My husband and I are 25 year residents of Rancho Carrillo. We moved here and built our own home to have the rural, quiet atmosphere of Riverside Co. We strongly protest the proposed tower behind our home. It will affect the nature of our community and will be a detriment to our future lives. Please reconsider the location as we do not need this, and definitely do not want this near us.

Sincerely,  
Richard and Lynne Everett  
11165 Verdugo Rd.  
Murietta, CA

**73-1**

**Richard & Lynne Everett (July 20, 2008)**

***Response to Comment 73-1***

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:** loneranger529@yahoo.com [mailto:loneranger529@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Sun 7/20/2008 4:48 PM  
**To:** EIR  
**Subject:** Fw: RE: Rancho Carrillo radio tower

**Comment 74**

--- On Sun, 7/20/08, Kirk R <loneranger529@yahoo.com> wrote:

From: Kirk R <loneranger529@yahoo.com>  
Subject: RE: Rancho Carrillo radio tower  
To: EIR@riverside.ca.us  
Date: Sunday, July 20, 2008, 4:44 PM

To Ashely Mitchell

In regards to the current proposal to build a radio / relay tower adjacent to our community I wish state my opposition to this project. Before you can consider any forward move I believe this proposed site should be surveyed to mark the exact locations of the actual tower footprint and any accompanying structures. The site marked roughly on a map appears to restrict our ONLY access to our single water supply tank. The inability to properly service, replace or expand our water storage facility would be a detriment to our entire community. In addition, this is our sole source of water for structure and wildfire protection. I believe the danger of inadequate water supply to any firefighter, volunteer or professional, outweighs any benefit used to support this tower.

Furthermore, the proposed radio service is area is

1) unpopulated wilderness (large cost to NOT cover population and

**74-1**

**74-2**



structures)

2) does not interface with Orange county support services

3) uses our privately funded & maintained access road with no compensation for damage

4) each howowner owns the section of road abutting their property and will not grant

easment access

5) constant excess traffic during construction using a narrow road with large

equipment causing access problems for local residents

6) unkown number of personal accessing our gated community with unkown

consequences to residents

7) potential accidents from people unfamiliar with our road and travel procedures

8) it will be an eyesore in a widerness area that people haved moved to for privacy

and a rural setting with out towers

In conclusion for these reasons and others still unknown, at this time, this tower location should be deleted and another location chosen. Sitton Peak, with its exisitng towers may be a preferable location.

**74-3**

**74-4**

**74-5**

**74-6**

Respectfully,

Russell

Carrillo Rd.

Carrillo

Kirk & Judy

38605

Lot 9  
Rancho

**Kirk & Judy Russell (July 20, 2008)**

***Response to Comment 74-1***

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

***Response to Comment 74-2***

This comment has already been addressed in Response to Comment 30-1.

***Response to Comment 74-3***

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

***Response to Comment 74-4***

This comment has already been addressed in Response to Comment 22-5, 22-22, and 29-5.

***Response to Comment 74-5***

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

***Response to Comment 74-6***

This comment has already been addressed in Response to Comment 22-23.

---

**From:** EIR  
**Sent:** Mon 7/21/2008 3:34 PM  
**To:** EIR  
**Cc:** motcomm19@yahoo.com  
**Subject:** Request for Comments Notice of Draft

WEB FORM SUBMISSION:

**Comment 75**

FULLNAME: Aaron Fritzingler

ZIP: 92582

COMMENTS----

As a citizen residing in the city of San Jacinto in Riverside County, I am glad to hear that the County is finally improving its Public Safety communications system.

I have many friends and family members in the Riverside County Law Enforcement community that have been dealing with less than adequate radio communications in the last few years, and its refreshing to see that is going to be addressed. The County is continually growing and the population and housing has obviously outgrown the current radio system, as well as technology becoming outdated.

I think all the citizens of Riverside County will be much better served with this new radio system.

Aaron Fritzingler

-----  
EMAIL: motcomm19@yahoo.com

ADDRESS: 730 Grassy Meadow Drive

CITY: San Jacinto

**75-1**

**Aaron Fritzingler (July 21, 2008)**

***Response to Comment 75-1***

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:** Tue 7/22/2008 7:59 AM  
**To:** EIR  
**Cc:** dt.wenker@verizon.net  
**Subject:** Request for Comments Notice of Draft

WEB FORM SUBMISSION:

**Comment 76**

FULLNAME: David Wenker

ZIP: 92570

COMMENTS: This upgrade is long over due. I have family in law enforcement and the number 1 complaint I hear at family gatherings is the poor or no coverage the current system has. Officer safety should be our top priority.

**76-1**

EMAIL: dt.wenker@verizon.net

ADDRESS: 1400 North A Street

CITY: Perris

**David Wenker (July 22, 2008)**

***Response to Comment 76-1***

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).

County of Riverside  
Department of Facilities Management  
Attn: Ms. Ashley Mitchell  
P.O. Box 789  
Riverside, California 92502-0789

**Comment 77**

Dear Ms. Mitchell:

My wife and I are residents of Rancho Carrillo, a remote community on the edge of Riverside County, which is accessed from a private road leading to the community from Riverside Community. I am also presently on the Boards of Directors of the Rancho Carrillo Homeowners' Association and the Rancho Carrillo Mutual Water Company. I write in response to a request for comments made by the County of Riverside to the Draft EIR for the County's proposed PSEC Project. In particular, I write to comment on the proposed tower to be placed on the edge of the Rancho Carrillo community as part of the PSEC Project.

First of all, please let me say that I am not opposed to the PSEC Project and its general purpose and goals. Certainly everyone understands the need for good communications for emergency services. However, it is my belief that the significant negative impact of placing a tower site as proposed on the edge of the community of Rancho Carrillo merits the County considering other alternative sites that would still meet the County goals without the negative impact on our community. Below are a few of the issues that are not adequately addressed in the Draft EIR, or perhaps were not even considered.

1. Aesthetic Impacts: The EIR admits that the negative aesthetics cannot be mitigated. While this may seem insignificant to some, for the community of Rancho Carrillo, this is very significant. The residents moved to this community to enjoy a remote community surrounded by undisturbed wilderness. The proposed tower will be an eyesore and cause noise and light pollution that will ruin the character of our community. **77-1**
2. Hazard to Water Supply: The community's water supply for drinking and fire suppression depends entirely on a large water tank located uphill from the proposed tower site. The tower site will have to consider the significant grading and retaining wall issues required to make sure the extremely large and heavy water tank's foundation is not disturbed. The EIR does not address this issue. In addition, the propane tank adds a dimension of a hazard from wildfires coming through the area, which could damage the tank. Earthquakes are another concern. In short, the possibility of any damage or disturbance to the Water Tank would be catastrophic to the community, which would lose all of its water supply. **77-2**
3. Private Easement Issues: The road up to the community is maintained by the community members as a private road. The County would need to have access across the private property of approximately forty different homeowners, who will not give their consent to such a project because it will add traffic and noise to the road. **77-3**
4. Impact versus Service: While not technically a CEQA issue, I am concerned that our community's services for fire and safety are provided primarily by the County of Orange, yet our community is being asked to bear the brunt of the negative impact of this tower location. It appears also that the alleged improved communications sought by this particular location will not only not help the community, but will increase coverage for a mostly uninhabited area. This being the case, an alternative site should be considered, or the EIR should explain why an alternative site with fewer negative impacts was not considered. The Draft EIR does not do this. **77-4**

I would be happy to discuss any of these issues with County representatives. I can say that in my role on the two Boards of Directors in the Community that the Community is unequivocally opposed to the location of this tower site on the edge of our community. Alternative locations should be considered.

Thank you.

Byron B. Mauss and Deborah K. Mauss

**Byron & Deborah Mauss (July 23, 2008)**

***Response to Comment 77-1***

This comment has already been addressed in Response to Comment 22-9. 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 77-2***

This comment has already been addressed in Response to Comment 22-9, 22-15, and 22-16.

***Response to Comment 77-3***

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

***Response to Comment 77-4***

The reader is misinformed regarding interoperability components of the proposed project. See Response to Comment 29-4, 30-1, and 30-3. A discussion of alternative sites has already been presented in Response to Comment 22-23.