

From: amerigold@yahoo.com [mailto:amerigold@yahoo.com]

Sent: Tue 7/22/2008 10:23 PM

To: EIR

Cc: district1@rcbos.org

Subject: EIR Report - PSEC Rancho Carrillo Site

Comment 78

Dear Ms Mitchell,

I'm a homeowner and resident of the Rancho Carrillo community. I am absolutely against a tower in, or adjacent to this community! I signed the petition which I understand your department has already received and I fully support everything outlined in the petition letter.

I still feel it necessary to write you though. The following are some of my very personal concerns.

1. The tower location is 100 ft from the ONLY water source in this community. The tower could possibly interfere with our radio connections to the wells and pumps serving us. The tower propane tank is a hazard that could render us without water during a fire.

The tower location could prevent us from building a second or larger tank which we will inevitably need in the future. If for some reason the tower fell it could seriously damage the tank.

78-1

2. Our Private Road.

In the last year two dear friends and neighbors have been killed on this road. I believe three others have been sent to the intensive care unit with life threatening injuries.

I do not want any more traffic on this road. The burden from traffic and use (wear and tear) on the road from this project will be high for our community. It isn't worth it. Period.

While our tax dollars go to the County of Riverside, we alone as homeowners maintain this road. There is a liability here that also needs to be explored.

78-2

3. Proximity to Private Property.

The impact of this tower to the whole community is GREAT. The impact to lots 34, 35, 36, 37, 38 and 39 are IMMENSURABLE! The health concerns look very real

78-3

to me. The fact that the tower will shade the pad created for building a home on one of only 3 lots left undeveloped here is totally unreasonable. Would you Ms Mitchell, want a tower so close it cast a shadow on your house?

**78-3
(cont.)**

It's my understanding the tower will not benefit our community in any way.

78-4

Further, we are remote and isolated so I'm confused as to whom it would benefit.

We are surrounded by hundreds of acres of wilderness designated forest land. There will be no other development in this area. The tower will be a burden on this community, visually. It will burden our road. It will threaten our only source of water. It will have a drastic negative effect on our property values.

78-5

In conclusion, I hope you will look for alternative sites for the tower in this section of the county if deemed necessary such as Sitton Peak.

Sincerely,

Kelly Overholt
10615 Verdugo
Murrieta, Ca 92590

Rancho Carrillo Lot 54

Mail:
P.O. Box 1713
San Juan Capistrano, CA 92693

Phone:
H (949) 728-1195
C (909) 239-3084

Kelly Overholt (July 22, 2008)

Response to Comment 78-1

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

Response to Comment 78-2

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

Response to Comment 78-3

This comment has already been addressed in Response to Comment 22-12 and 34-4.

Response to Comment 78-4

The reader is misinformed regarding interoperability components of the proposed project. See Response to Comment 29-4, 30-1, and 30-3.

Response to Comment 78-5

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

From: jimr@cdvinc.com [mailto:jimr@cdvinc.com]
Sent: Wed 7/23/2008 10:41 AM
To: EIR
Cc: Caliva, Robert
Subject: Response to PSEC Project EIR

Comment 79

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

July 23, 2008

> cc: Bob Buster, 1st District, Riverside County Board of Supervisors
> cc: Robert Caliva, Legislative Assistant to Supervisor Buster

Re: Response to PSEC Project EIR

I would like to take this opportunity to comment on the PSEC Project EIR being circulated by the County. I am a resident of the remote community of Rancho Carrillo, located at the extreme western edge of Riverside County. A location adjacent to our community has been designated as a proposed antenna site for the PSEC project.

On behalf of our community, the Rancho Carrillo Community Association has already expressed the official community opposition to placement of an antenna at the proposed location. I agree fully with this position and incorporate their stated objections as my own.

On behalf of my own family, I would like to separately raise objections to county plans as expressed in the EIR. These objections follow.

1. Non-Responsive. On March 26, 2008, I wrote to county staff a letter a response to the circulated Notice of Project (NOP), in which numerous objections to the proposed project were raised. This letter raised economic, effectiveness, aesthetic, and land use questions that were ignored in the subsequent preparation of the EIR. In fact, instead of addressing my

objections, the county went forward with a substantially different project in the subsequent EIR, even going so far as to move the antenna site to a new location. Under CEQA, this move should have been treated as a new project. Instead, the administrative review process has progressed forward to today, denying us our right to review an comment on initial plan.

**79-1
(cont.)**

While the new project raises questions of its own, my original objections remain applicable and are incorporated here (see attachment).

2. Not Specific. The proposed location of the antenna site at Rancho Carrillo is not sufficiently specific as to allow an understanding of the county plan. The site in question appears to be located in a designated Wilderness area of Cleveland National Forest. In addition, photographs of the proposed antenna tripod that have been provided through the offices of Supervisor Buster differ dramatically from the mast described in the EIR? How is one to comment given this inconsistency?

79-2

3. Trespass. Regardless of the exact location of the site, it will be necessary for county staff to pass over my property and the property of my neighbors to access the area of the site. There is no alternate access to that area, except on foot or horseback. The EIR does not deal with this property rights problem. County should be on notice that we are not inclined to grant a right of passage over our property for the purposes of this project.

79-3

4. Efficiency and Worthiness. Despite our objection to the proposed Rancho Carrillo antenna site, we believe the goals of the overall PSEC project are worthy. Public safety and the support of police and fire personnel who take risks every day on our behalf are entitled to our best material support. PSEC does just this. However, a poorly planned project, no matter how worthy, can consume excessive County resources. The inevitable delays that result from a poor plan will put back the day when our police and fire personnel can make use of these resources.

79-4

The Rancho Carrillo site in the PSEC project is a poor plan, perhaps no plan at all. Installation of an antenna at the proposed location will require extensive Federal environmental review that could drag on for years. There is a strong likelihood that the site will never be approved. The private property rights issues raised above are similarly difficult. If it is true, as county staff have claimed, that the Rancho Carrillo site is essential to the PSEC system (a claim we dispute), then this site could result in delay to the entire project. This would be unfortunate, indeed, given the worthy goals of the project.

Sincerely,

Jim Reardon
11081 Fox Springs Road (Lot 39)
Rancho Carrillo

mail:

P.O. Box 550
San Juan Capistrano, CA 92693-0550

Telephone:
(949) 728-0558 in Rancho Carrillo
(949) 633-0834 mobile

Jim Reardon (July 23, 2008)

Response to Comment 79-1

The comment is not clear as to what specific aspects of the Draft EIR the commentor finds deficient. Therefore, the County cannot respond to the comment. The County believes that the Draft EIR accurately identifies, assesses, and presents the environmental issues associated with the project.

Response to Comment 79-2

This comment has already been addressed in Response to Comment 22-4. This Response to Comments is limited only to comments provided in the Draft EIR. The County cannot comment on information that may have been provided by others that may differ from the Draft EIR.

Response to Comment 79-3

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

Response to Comment 79-4

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 7/23/2008 11:49 AM
To: EIR
Cc: guitarman4mac@hotmail.com
Subject: Request for Comments Notice of Draft

WEB FORM SUBMISSION:

Comment 80

FULLNAME: James Crane

ZIP: 92555

COMMENTS: I support the PSEC Project. I believe our county will only benefit from the addition of communication sites and the technology that will come with the new system.

80-1

ADDRESS: 15836 Camino Real

EMAIL: guitarman4mac@hotmail.com

CITY: Moreno Valley

James Crane (July 23, 2008)

Response to Comment 80-1

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 7/23/2008 11:54 AM
To: EIR
Cc: jimandmac@hotmail.com
Subject: Request for Comments Notice of Draft

WEB FORM SUBMISSION:

Comment 81

FULLNAME: Marianne Crane

ZIP: 92555

COMMENTS: The PSEC Project is of utmost importance to Riverside County. Our first responders need to be able to communicate in their every day situations, but especially important are those times when a life - either theirs or a member of the public - is in danger. There may be people who insist "not in my backyard" when it comes to the location of the communication sites. But rest assured if they needed assistance, they would want to know the public safety personnel would be able to communicate on their behalf and for their well-being. I completely support the PSEC Project and believe it will provide the communication system that not only our first responders need, but more importantly that the public needs!

81-1

ADDRESS: 15836 Camino Real

EMAIL: jimandmac@hotmail.com

CITY: Moreno Valley

Marianne Crane (July 23, 2008)

Response to Comment 81-1

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: janem@csthq.org [mailto:janem@csthq.org]
Sent: Wed 7/23/2008 1:44 PM
To: EIR
Subject: Microwave Site

Comment 82

Dear Ms. Mitchell,

I just saw notice of preparation for a draft program regarding expanding the County of Riverside's communication system. Included in this was a mention Paradise in Norco.

We have equipment at that location.

Can you tell me what effect it will have on our communication system?

Thanks very much.

Jane McNairn

CST

(323)661-3524

82-1

Jane McNarin (June 20, 2008)

Response to Comment 82-1

The County appreciates the commentor's interest in the project. The PSEC project will operate at frequencies in the 800 MHz range, and will not impact other users operating at other frequencies. Specific engineering questions should be directed to the project engineer, listed in Section 8 of the Draft EIR.

From: EIR
Sent: Wed 7/23/2008 2:42 PM
To: EIR
Cc: jbaril@raetech.net
Subject: Request for Comments Notice of Draft

WEB FORM SUBMISSION:

Comment 83

FULLNAME: Jim Baril

ZIP: 92887

COMMENTS----

Our company, Raetech, is working with Coachella Valley USD to install wireless towers at 10 locations in the Coachella Valley. Two 80' wireless towers have been installed and the others are in various stages of design and deployment. One of the towers will be near your MECCA LANDFILL site.

We have colocation capabilities to support other uses on the towers. If the County or other agency is interested in utilizing these resources, we can be contacted at 877-282-1609 or via email above.

EMAIL: jbaril@raetech.net

ADDRESS: 22885-G Savi Ranch Pkwy

CITY: Yorba Linda

83-1

Jim Baril (July 23, 2008)

Response to Comment 83-1

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