

**Draft Responses to Comment Letter M**

**Individual  
Mary Kay Borchard  
March 11, 2013**

	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response to Comment</b>
<b>M -1</b>	As an Alpine resident and property owner, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the SEIR for FCI Lands in the Japatul Valley, more specifically, the properties on or near Japatul Lane.	This comment is introductory in nature and does not raise a significant environmental issue for which a response is required.
<b>M -2</b>	I write in support of the RL20 designations for the Japatul Valley areas, as not only do they abide by the Guiding Principles of the General Plan, but also as a property owner I appreciate your consideration. One size does not fit all in the homogenized attempt to place all semi-rural/rural areas of the FCI into one designation. Our area is unique in topography, economically connected to Alpine, and is a healthy, viable, self-sustaining, and ecologically conscious area. 20 years from now, geographically and demographically it needs to remain as such, and the RL-20 designation and planning affords such sustainability.	<p>The Rural Lands 20 (RL-20) designation is consistent with the Draft Plan / SEIR Proposed Project. However, it should be noted that County staff will be recommending to the Planning Commission a lower density designation of Rural Lands 40 (RL-40) for the Japatul Valley area. For reference, this Area of Consideration has been named “AL-8” in the staff report and has been highlighted as an area for discussion during the upcoming public hearing process.</p> <p>The County staff working group that formulated the staff recommendation for AL-8 found that the RL-40 designation was more appropriate for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The subject area is virtually surrounded by National Forest lands.</li> <li>b. Many of the parcels in this area are only accessible by dead-end roads that exceed County Fire Code standards.</li> <li>c. Additional development would require construction of new roads through steep terrain (slopes greater than 25%) to existing roads approximately 1.6 miles apart.</li> <li>d. Further improvement of infrastructure in the subject</li> </ol>

**Draft Reponses to Comments**

	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response to Comment</b>
		<p>area, including utilities and road access, would have an adverse impact on wilderness values and would increase the need for fuel management for fire safety.</p> <p>e. The RL-40 density is consistent with how the General Plan land use map applies the RL-40 designation in remote areas with large parcelization outside the County Water Authority boundary.</p> <p>While County staff will be recommending the lower density of one dwelling unit per 40 acres for Alpine AL-8, the final determination will ultimately be made by the County Planning Commission and County Board of Supervisors.</p>
<b>M -3</b>	<p>After countless community meetings, sub-committee meetings, and committee meetings, the RL-20 designations for these properties have been heard and approved by the Alpine Community Planning Group. And your SEIR acknowledges that the SEIR is "...based on community planning and sponsor group endorsed land use maps".</p>	<p>The County appreciates this comment and acknowledges that the community planning group recommendation is a major factor when considering what designation to apply to a given area General Plan land use map. The proposed Project in the draft SEIR was based primarily on community planning group input.</p>
<b>M -4</b>	<p>The County has now in place numerous ordinances that limit and restrict development: water availability, 2nd dwelling units, traffic and mobility, habitats, open space, to name an applicable few. Presumably there will be many more to come over the timeline of this plan.</p>	<p>The County acknowledges that many regulations are in place to protect natural resources from development. This comment is not inconsistent with the existing content of the draft SEIR.</p>
<b>M -5</b>	<p>It is regrettable that the present ordinances were not so restrictive as to inhibit the spread of the Sunrise Powerlink towers across our vistas, severely impacting our property values and increasing other costs to us, as property owners.</p>	<p>The County acknowledges the commenter's concern with impacts resulting from the Sunrise Powerlink. The County's regulations were not applicable to the Sunrise Powerlink project.</p>
<b>M -6</b>	<p>We live here, pay our taxes, and raise our families here. We live here because we enjoy and appreciate the Japatul Valley and the Alpine area. As such we have been and remain the invested stewards of this land, and we are asking for the</p>	<p>The County acknowledges and appreciates this comment. Please see response to comment M-2 above regarding the status of the land use mapping designation for the subject area.</p>

## Draft Reponses to Comments

---

	Comment	Response to Comment
	RL20.  Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions. Thank you for your favorable consideration.	

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK