2.0 Introduction

2.1 **SUMMARY OF THE PROJECT**

This Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) has been prepared by the City of Anaheim (City) and its CEQA consultant, Psomas, to evaluate the potential environmental effects that could result from the Hills Preserve Project (Project). This Draft EIR has been prepared in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA) statutes (Cal. Pub. Res. Code, Section 21000 et. seq., as amended) and implementing guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., Title 14, Section 15000 et. seq.) (collectively, CEQA). Prior to public review, this Draft EIR was extensively reviewed and evaluated by the City. This Draft EIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the City as required by CEQA.

The City is the lead agency under CEQA for the preparation of this Draft EIR.

The Project Site consists of an approximately 76-acre property (Project Site) located south of East Santa Ana Canyon Road and west of South Festival Drive in the City of Anaheim within Orange County, California.

The Project consists of the phased development of the Project Site with a maximum of 498 wrap-style, market rate, for-rent apartment units, a maximum of six single-family residences, and a maximum of 80,000 square feet of commercial land uses, along with related on- and off-site improvements to serve the Project as further described in Section 2.0, Project Description, of this Draft EIR.

2.2 <u>CEQA REQUIREMENTS</u>

An EIR is an informational document prepared by a lead agency (in this case, the City) when considering approval of a proposed project. CEQA requires the preparation of an EIR for any project that a lead agency determines may have a significant impact on the environment. According to Section 21002.1(a) of the Public Resources Code, "The purpose of an environmental impact report is to identify the significant effects on the environment of a project, to identify alternatives to the project, and to indicate the manner in which those significant effects can be mitigated or avoided." CEQA also establishes mechanisms whereby the public, other interested organizations, and decision makers can be informed about the nature of the project being proposed, and the extent and types of impacts that the project and its alternatives would have on the environment if they were to be implemented.

An EIR should analyze the environmental consequences of a proposed development based on a stable project description, identify ways to feasibly reduce or avoid the proposed project's potential environmental effects, and identify a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives to the proposed project that can avoid or reduce impacts while still achieving most of the project objectives. Pursuant to CEQA, State and local government agencies must consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority. This Draft EIR provides information to be used in the planning and

decision-making process. It is not the purpose of an EIR to recommend approval or denial of a project.

2.2.1 ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES

The basic purposes of CEQA are to accomplish the following:

- 1. Inform governmental decision makers, other interested organizations, and the public about the potential, significant environmental effects of proposed activities;
- 2. Identify the ways that environmental damage can be feasibly avoided or be significantly reduced;
- 3. Prevent significant, avoidable damage to the environment by requiring changes in projects through the use of alternatives or mitigation measures when the governmental agency finds the changes to be feasible; and
- 4. Disclose to the public the reasons why a governmental agency approved the project in the manner the agency chose if significant environmental effects are involved (Section 15002 of the State CEQA Guidelines).

Before approval of the Project, the City, as lead agency and the decision-making entity, is required to certify that this EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA, that the information in the EIR has been considered, and that the EIR reflects the independent judgment of the City.

2.2.2 SCOPING PERIOD

As part of the EIR process for this Project, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) was released on August 24, 2023 (Appendix A, Notice of Preparation), beginning the 30-day public scoping period for the EIR, which ended on September 25, 2023. The NOP was sent to interested agencies and stakeholders as well as to property owners of parcels adjacent to the Project Site pursuant to applicable notice requirements under the law. The NOP was posted at the County Clerk, on the State Clearinghouse's CEQAnet website, and on the City's website. Also, notice was posted at the physical location of the Project Site.

During the 30-day NOP scoping period leading up to publication of this Draft EIR, the City received a total of approximately 346 written comments, including five public agency comment letters and 341 comment letters from other individuals and organizations. Copies of the NOP comment letters are provided in Appendix B, Scoping Comment Letters.

During the scoping period, the City held a scoping meeting on September 7, 2023 at the East Anaheim Community Center.

To the extent required under CEQA, this Draft EIR has appropriately considered the comments received from the public and public agencies in response to the NOP in terms of the scope of the analysis contained herein. Environmental issues that have been raised during the scoping period regarding the Project are summarized below in Tables 2-1 and 2-2.

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF MAIN TOPICS RAISED BY COMMENTERS AT THE SCOPING MEETING THAT WAS HELD ON SEPTEMBER 7, 2023 AT THE EAST ANAHEIM COMMUNITY CENTER.

Topics Raised at the Scoping Meeting	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed		
Aesthetics			
Concerns were raised related to the Project's effects on views			
A meeting attendee requested that the Project be modified and/or reduced in scale given its location along a scenic corridor.			
Concerns were expressed related to the Project's design and development intensity. Some attendees stated that they believed the Project was incompatible with the area.	Section 4.1, Aesthetics		
Some residents stated that the Project would conflict with aspects of the Community Design Element of the City's General Plan.			
Concerns were raised that the Project would increase lighting			
Concerns were raised related to potential glare from new glass and other reflective surfaces proposed by the Project.			
Air Quality			
Concerns were raised related to construction air quality and dust coming from the Project Site (e.g., fugitive dust)	Section 4.2, Air Quality		
Biological Resources			
Concerns were raised related to plants and animals that would be affected by the Project, including coastal California gnatcatcher.	Section 4.3, Biological Resources		
Concerns were raised related to the loss of open space that would result from the Project and the effects that would have on wildlife.			
Geology and Soils			
Some attendees noted that there have been historic landslides in the Project vicinity.	Section 4.6, Geology and Soils		
A commenter noted that removing trees along Santa Ana Canyon Road would cause landslides.			
<u>Hydrology and Water Quality</u>			
A commenter mentioned that east of SR-57 and south of SR-91 they do not have access to groundwater, and that this should be assumed in the Draft EIR's analyses.	Section 4.9, Hydrology and Water Quality		
<u>Noise</u>			
Residents were curious how the roof deck would be operated, what its noise effects would be.	Section 4.2, Air Quality Section 4.3, Biological Resources Section 4.6, Geology and Soils Section 4.9, Hydrology and Water Quality Section 4.11, Noise Section 4.13, Public Services and		
Some residents were interested in how noise would potentially echo throughout the landscape.			
Public Services	Section 4.13, Public Services		
Some meeting attendees expressed concern that the Project would require additional police and fire services that would require these departments to expand and/or hire additional staff.	and Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems		

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF MAIN TOPICS RAISED BY COMMENTERS AT THE SCOPING MEETING THAT WAS HELD ON SEPTEMBER 7, 2023 AT THE EAST ANAHEIM COMMUNITY CENTER.

Topics Raised at the Scoping Meeting	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed	
Concerns were raised that the quality and performance of existing public service providers, including response times, would be stretched with implementation of the Project.		
Schools		
A meeting attendees discussed Project effects related to schools and suggested that the EIR include discussions and evaluations of additional enrollment that would result from the Project, the potential need for expansion of existing schools to accommodate new students generated by the Project.	Section 4.13, Public Services	
A meeting attendee pointed out that no bussing occurs in the Project Site vicinity so students would need to be driven to school or walk.		
<u>Transportation</u>		
Some meeting attendees expressed concern related to the traffic that would be generated by the Project. Some expressed concern that the roads are already busy at certain times and that the Project would worsen traffic conditions.	Section 4.15, Transportation	
Concerns were raised related to pedestrian safety along Santa Ana Canyon due to lack of sidewalks in existing conditions.		
Concerns were raised that the traffic counts that were collected for the Project were collected when schools were out.		
<u>Wildfire</u>		
Concerns were raised related to how the Project would affect the evacuation of the area, including evacuation timing.		
Concerns were raised related to how the Project would affect emergency response	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous	
A resident stated that the EIR preparers should include a discussion of research that has been conducted recently that has found that more people in the urban wildland interface leads to increased fire ignitions.	Section 4.13, Public Services; and	
Residents were concerned that the Project would not have a secondary emergency access for evacuation and for emergency responders to access the Project Site.		

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
Federal Agenci	<u>ies</u>		
9/26/2023	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service - Carlsbad FandW Office	 Stated that the Project Site is within the boundaries of the Orange County Central and Coastal Subregions Natural Community Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan (NCCP/HCP) for which the City of Anaheim is a Participating Jurisdiction. Noted that the NCCP/HCP shows the Project Site as occurring within an "Existing Use" land use designation where the NCCP/HCP did not evaluate or provide "coverage" for impacts to sensitive species and habitats. Recommended that the Draft EIR include analysis of the Project's biological impacts. Requested that the Draft EIR evaluate consistency of the Project with the NCCP/HCP, and that it identify measures that would be implemented to avoid, minimize and mitigate impacts to sensitive species and habitats. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources
State and Loca	<u>l Agencies:</u>		
9/12/2023	Orange County Sanitation District	 Stated that stormwater from parking structures are not allowed to drain to or connect to a County sewer. Stated that the City's sewer system eventually connects to OC San sewers that lead to the Reclamation Plant in Fountain Valley. Requested the opportunity to review the Project's sewer study. 	Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems
9/14/2023	California Department of Transportation	 Requested that traffic operations at Caltrans freeway ramps be evaluated in the Project's traffic study. Requested that vehicle miles traveled (VMT) be evaluated. Suggested that the Project incorporate complete streets elements that support pedestrians and bicyclists. 	Section 4.15, Transportation

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		 Suggested that bike parking be incorporated in the Project. Suggested that the topic of equity be evaluated. Noted that an encroachment permit would be required for any Project work that would be required in Caltrans right-of-way. 	
9/25/2023	California Department of Fish and Wildlife	 Stated that Crotch's bumble bee should be evaluated; Noted that impacts to biological resources should be mitigated; Provided recommendations regarding how CDFW staff believes the undeveloped portions of the Project Site should be managed in the long-term; Provided recommendations for the approaches that should be used to evaluate the existing biological conditions within the Project Site. Requested that direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to biological resources be discussed in the Draft EIR. Requested that fuel modification impacts to biological resources be discussed in the Draft EIR. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources
8/25/2023	Native American Heritage Commission	 Recommended consultation be conducted with California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the Project Site consistent with Senate Bill 18 and Assembly Bill 52. Provided recommendations regarding best practices for archaeological assessment of the Project. 	Section 4.4, Cultural Resources, and Section 4.16, Tribal Cultural Resources
9/25/2023	South Coast Air Quality Management District	 Requested that electronic versions of all emission calculation spreadsheets, modeling, and other related inputs be submitted to SCAQMD for review during the public review period for the Draft EIR. 	Section 4.2, Air Quality

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		 Provided recommendations on the methodology to be used for air quality analyses for the Project pursuant to CEQA; Provided suggestions related to the types of mitigation measures that might be appropriate for the Project. Stated that health risk reduction strategies should be evaluated in the Draft EIR. 	
Individuals an	d Organizations		
8/23/2023	James Matthews	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic: stated that Santa Canyon Road is already congested. Aesthetics: stated that the Project does not align with the current aesthetics of the neighborhood and would be an "eyesore". 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, and Section 4.15, Transportation
8/23/2023	John Erb	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Traffic and safety hazards: noted that the stretch of Santa Ana Canyon Road near the Project Site is dangerous and narrow in existing conditions, and proposed traffic signals and lanes are inadequate to address this existing issue. Resident access to the Deer Canyon Park Preserve: noted that Deer Canyon Park Preserve is one of the few parks in the area. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.14, Recreation, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
8/24/2023	Rick Clark	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Aesthetics: stated that the area surrounding the Project Site contains single family residential and the Project would be out of character. Also stated the Project would impact a scenic corridor. Air quality: noted that the increased traffic that would result from the Project would cause worse air quality. Energy and water: stated there is an ongoing drought. Noise pollution. Traffic: noted that Santa Ana Canyon Road is already gridlocked, and the Project would worsen traffic. Fire hazards. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.2, Air Quality, Section 4.5, Energy, Section 4.14, Recreation, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
8/25/2023	Jenny Stewart	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Aesthetics – stated the Project is out of character with the existing conditions. Local wildlife and habitat loss. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
8/25/2023	Joy Pickett	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		 Emergency evacuation: stated that it took two hours to get from Festival Drive to Yorba Linda during the last evacuation. Wildlife habitat loss. 	
8/25/2023	Julie Sone	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Aesthetics. Noise pollution. Light pollution: noted 24-hour lights resulting from Project would be a nuisance to residents. Wildlife habitat loss and displacement. Fire hazards. Evacuation hazards. Traffic: noted that El Rancho Charter School creates a traffic issue on Santa Ana Canyon Road already and the Project would worsen that. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
8/25/2023	Madeleine Semaan	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Aesthetics. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics and Section 4.15, Transportation.
8/25/2023	Madeleine Semaan	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic: stated the Project would cause gridlock on Santa Ana Canyon Road Fire and evacuation hazards: Project would impact residents' ability to safely evacuate during an emergency. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		 Wildlife: stated the Project would reduce and destroy available habitat for local wildlife and threaten the safety of residents and pets. Aesthetics: stated the Project does not make sense aesthetically for the neighborhood. 	
8/25/2023	Shelley Shuff	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Emergency evacuation: noted several instances of hindered ability to evacuate due to existing high traffic; one instance of complete inability to evacuate during a fire, had to sit in car for over 6 hours with family in a nearby parking lot surrounded by fires. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation and Section 4.18, Wildfire
8/26/2023	Carolyn Ikemura	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Wildlife displacement and habitat loss. Water shortages. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
8/26/2023	Joseph Owens	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic: The commenter stated that Santa Ana Canyon Road is currently used as an alternative route to bypass SR-91, resulting in high levels of existing traffic. Emergency evacuation: The commenter noted that there is only one evacuation route from their neighborhood, and the Project would significantly impact that route. Schools: The commenter stated that El Rancho Charter School, being the only middle school in the area, would not be able to accommodate the major influx of new students resulting from the Project. Wildlife: The commenter stated the Project would destroy wildlife habitats, disrupt migration routes, and fragment ecosystems. Aesthetics: The commenter stated the Project was out of character for the neighborhood; Property value: The commenter stated the Project would diminish property value. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
8/26/2023	Karla Rebel	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Traffic. Wildlife disruption. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
8/27/2023	Candy A. Ambrose	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire hazards. Traffic. Emergency evacuation. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
8/27/2023	Rick Pollgreen	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Aesthetics: noted that the original long-term plan for the area laid out mix of open space, housing, and shopping. Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife disruption and habitat loss. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
8/27/2023	Rima Perian	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Aesthetics: commenter noted that they purchased their home because of the peaceful and natural environment surrounding the area, and the commenter feels the Project would negatively impact that. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics
8/27/2023	Rouhina Mehregan	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Wildlife disruption and habitat loss: noted that wildlife in the area is struggling as is. Traffic and emergency evacuation: noted that during the last emergency evacuation it took them three hours to get down the hill from their neighborhood. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
8/28/2023	Frances D'Errico	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. "Environmental" 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.15, Transportation
8/28/2023	Gonzalo De Vera	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement and habitat loss. Water shortages. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
8/28/2023	Sujit Kabbinahally	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement and habitat loss. Water shortages. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
8/28/2023	Tim Olaerts	Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including:	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
8/29/2023	Ann Ma	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Emergency evacuation. The commenter stated that in the last fire, it took four hours to travel down Santa Ana Canyon Road. Habitat loss for wildlife such as coyotes. Community character. The commenter characterized the Project as a modern style and stated the design does not fit the current style of the city. Water supply. Also, the commenter stated that additional connections to trails are not needed, as the public can already access Deer Canyon Park Preserve. The commenter stated opposition to any rezoning of the Project Site. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
8/29/2023	Ann Grand	 Expressed opposition to the Project due to aesthetic impacts it would have on Santa Ana Canyon Road, which is a scenic corridor. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics
8/29/2023	Charles Bertocchini	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Aesthetics: commenter stated that the Project goes against what the city marketed this area as to residents decades ago. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics
8/29/2023	Heather Fenner	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Traffic. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
8/29/2023	Jana Gable	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Geological: commenter stated that faults run through the Project Site. 	Section 4.6, Geology and Soils, and Section 4.15, Transportation
8/29/2023	John Carusillo	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Aesthetics: commenter stated the Project would negatively impact the scenic nature of the area. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics
8/29/2023	Keri Prochnow	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation: noted the personal traumatizing impact of previous wildfire evacuations to emphasize the danger of adding more residents. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
8/29/2023	Lesa Thomas	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation: noted previous wildfire evacuation gridlock. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
8/29/2023	Linda Chapman	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Aesthetics. Traffic. Emergency evacuation. Displacement of wildlife. Light pollution. Noise pollution. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
8/29/2023	Linda Merrell	 Expressed opposition to the Project. 	Not applicable.
8/29/2023	Randal Massaro	 Identified himself as writing on behalf of an organization by the name of the Union Members for the Preservation of Wildlife International. Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Wildlife: Project activities would disrupt and disturb wildlife, as well as increase the threat towards residents and pets; stated that wildlife are sacred to Native American community. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Traffic: noted possible longer response time for emergency vehicles. Noise and air pollution. 	Section 4.2, Air Quality, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
8/30/2023	Mary Ellen Rooney	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic: noted that they live on Canyon Rim, across from the reservoir, on a street that has limited visibility to oncoming traffic; expressed concern over emergency vehicle response time. Schools: noted that the surrounding schools do not have the infrastructure or resources to accommodate an influx of new students. 	Section 4.13, Public Services, and Section 4.15, Transportation
8/30/2023	"mdesq1" Note: This email did not include a name for the sender.	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials,

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		 Wildlife disruption and habitat loss. Aesthetics: Stated the Project is out of character for the neighborhood; stated that lights from 24-hour rooftop bar would be disruptive. 	Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
8/30/2023	Scot Witke	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Decreased land/home values. Wildlife disruption and habitat loss. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, and Section 4.15, Transportation
8/30/2023	Tammy Witke	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
8/31/2023	Andrew Winger	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Wildfires. Emergency evacuation. 	Section 4.13, Public Services, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
8/31/2023	Ari Hamilton	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Emergency evacuation. 	Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
8/31/2023	Eric Loveng	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Aesthetics. Wildlife disruption/displacement and habitat loss. Light and noise pollution from both construction and new residents. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		 Fire hazards. Decreased property value. Emergency evacuation. Increased strain on schools. Increased strain on water and other resources. 	
8/31/2023	Hovic Perian	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Aesthetics. Wildlife disruption and habitat loss. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, and Section 4.3, Biological Resources
8/31/2023	Kim Collell	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Aesthetics: commenter stated that they have lived in the neighborhood since 1989 and chose the area due to the rural and natural environment. Traffic: noted that access to SR-91 at Weir Canyon gets backed up as far as two miles on Fridays. Wildlife disruption and habitat loss: have witnessed loss of wildlife and habitat firsthand resulting from new construction in the area over the years. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation: noted dozens of evacuations and described the most recent evacuation as chaotic and panicked. Inadequate infrastructure: stated that the area does not have sufficient resources/infrastructure to support new residents. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
8/31/2023	Kirk Newkirk	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Aesthetics: noted this type of development is out of character for the neighborhood. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Decreased property value. Wildlife displacement and habitat loss. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
8/31/2023	Linda Loveng	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Aesthetics. Wildlife disruption/displacement and habitat loss. Light and noise pollution from both construction and new residents. Fire hazards. Decreased property values. Emergency evacuation. Increased strain on schools. Increased strain on water and other resources. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.13, Public Services, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
8/31/2023	Lisa Goldstein	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation: noted that evacuations during the Canyon fire were extremely difficult due to congestion. Aesthetics. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
8/31/2023	Nancy Flores	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Noise pollution. Ecological disruption and degradation. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.11, Noise, and Section 4.15, Transportation
8/31/2023	Randall Peters	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic: SR-91 congestion and existing issues with out-of-sync traffic lights. 	Section 4.15, Transportation
8/31/2023	Joanne and Charles Shelton	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife disruption and displacement. Insufficient school infrastructure. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/1/2023	DeWayne Filppi	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire hazards. Traffic. Emergency evacuation: noted that people abandoned their cars on gridlocked Santa Ana Canyon Road during a wildfire evacuation event that occurred a few years ago. Community standards: stated that the Project would violate the General Plan. Aesthetics. Insufficient infrastructure/resources for schools. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.10, Land Use and Planning, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/1/2023	Donna Scales	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would result in increased traffic congestion. 	Section 4.15, Transportation,
9/1/2023	Doug Yount	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic: noted that Project would add to pre-existing traffic issues. 	Section 4.15, Transportation,
9/1/2023	Jyoti Gaur	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Aesthetics: noted that this type of development does not belong in this area. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/1/2023	Elizabeth and Peter Riley	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic: mentioned Serrano Road and not being able to leave the house after 3 PM. Insufficient infrastructure: noted that garbage pickup is inconsistent, and they had to establish a neighborhood watch due to increased theft and burglaries; stated that current residents are not cared for by the City and they do not need more residents. 	Section 4.13, Public Services, and Section 4.15, Transportation
9/1/2023	Spencer Puskas	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Aesthetics. Community: small town feel where people come to raise families and get away from the city. Traffic. Fire hazards. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		 Emergency evacuation: noted an evacuation event in the past where residents could not exit their neighborhood. Noise pollution. Light pollution. 	
9/1/2023	Zachary Atkinson	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Moved to the neighborhood specifically for the quiet, scenic, and natural "feel" in the area. Opposed to any alterations to the existing community such as the Project. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources
9/2/2023	Ava Berg	 Expressed opposition to the Project as well as to all other residential development on Santa Ana Canyon Road. Mentioned various topics, including: Traffic. Pollution. Higher rents. 	Section 4.2, Air Quality, and Section 4.15, Transportation
9/2/2023	Bernice Schoenberg	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Stated the Project would worsen traffic, which is already congested during certain times of day. Noted that parents block Santa Ana Canyon Road during pick up time. Wildfire evacuation. Stated the Project would delay wildfire evacuation and would impede emergency responders. Geotechnical hazards. Stated that a geotechnical study should be prepared for the Project. Stated the Project Site is susceptible to liquefaction. 	Section 4.6, Geology and Soils, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/2/2023	Dan Cress	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic: stated there is already congestion on Santa Ana Canyon Road and SR-91. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuations. Wildlife displacement and habitat loss. Water shortages. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/2/2023	Jamie Martinez	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Wildfire evacuation. Noted that there are already too many people and vehicles in the area. 	Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/2/2023	Jeff Evans	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Stated that Santa Ana Canyon Road is already at full capacity and people commuting from the Inland Empire use it to cut through Anaheim Hills and enter the SR-91 at Gypsum Canyon. Fire hazards. Stated that the Project is in the middle of an extreme fire zone and the large population of residents in the hills already have a difficult time evacuating. Biological resources. Stated that the Project would have an adverse impact on local wildlife. Schools. Mentioned that the Project and resulting increased population would threaten the safety of 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		the school children at El Rancho Charter School and community.	
9/2/2023	Jessica Esparza	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Biological resources. Stated that the Project would destroy open space and displace wildlife. Aesthetics. Stated that the Project would destroy the aesthetics of the community. Lighting: Expressed concern over the 24-hour lighting on the rooftop bar, as well as noise from the rooftop deck. Fire Risk: Stated the Project would substantially increase the fire risk in Deer Canyon and surrounding communities, and significantly hinder residents' ability to evacuate. Traffic: Expressed concern over increased traffic on Santa Ana Canyon Road Schools: Stated that the Project would result in a strain on local schools, as well as water and other resources. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/2/2023	Joseph Abbey	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated that the Project does not fit the aesthetics or values of the community. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, and Section 4.10, Land Use and Planning

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/2/2023	Kristi Tanaka	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Geology. Commenter stated that the Project could have devastating effects similar to the 1993 Santiago Landslide. Commenter attached a written statement opposing the Project and an environmental analysis of the region conducted in 2004 for the 1993 Santiago Landslide in Anaheim Hills; stated that the ridgeline that fell has the same geological makeup as the Project Site. Commenter mentioned that she is a certified horticulturist and "permaculturist" who has studied the geography, geology, hydrology, and environmental vectors of their property and surrounding areas. 	Section 4.6, Geology and Soils, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/2/2023	Linda Rima and Bill Goodale	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Stated that traffic is congested on Santa Ana Canyon Road in existing conditions, specifically between Imperial Highway and Weir Canyon Road to avoid the SR-91; stated that the Project would significantly worsen this issue between 3PM-8PM. Evacuation. Expressed concern regarding not being able to safely evacuate for emergency reasons; stated that people were trapped in the area during the last major fire due to traffic on Santa Ana Canyon Road, and that it took four hours to go three miles. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/2/2023	Liz Borrelli	 Stated that the impact to wildlife, plants, and habitat in Deer Canyon would be devastating; mentioned that the local wildlife is highly valued in the community. Expressed concern over emergency response time; stated that the local police and fire department are already strained; mentioned occurrences of human trafficking rings out of Festival Center, burglaries, and theft in the vicinity of the Project Site and is concerned about more people moving to the area. Stated that property values would decrease in the community due to the potential "inappropriate" lower cost housing. Expressed opposition to the project for the following reasons: Stated that it took 3-5 hours to evacuate during a wildfire ~5 years ago; stated that had the fire crossed over to Santiago Canyon, they would not 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
		have made it out alive. O Proposes that the city appropriately addresses solutions to the traffic issue before building anything.	
9/2/2023	Pam Kuhnlein	Expressed opposition to the Project due to traffic.	Section 4.15, Transportation
9/2/2023	Rick Moyer	 Expressed opposition to the Project for the following reasons: Stated that he has recently served on the board of the Santiago Geologic Hazard Abatement District and has insight into the "challenging geology" of the Project Site and vicinity. 	Section 4.6, Geology and Soils, and Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials,

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		 Attached three files detailing: The geological, political, and jurisdictional challenges faced during the early development of Anaheim Hills in the 1970's. Document from the City Council (1975) showing the City's adoption of contour grading for all of Anaheim Hills. Document from the City of Anaheim, after a 1993 landslide event that stated that the geologic engineering consultant was negligent in pre-development assessments. Requested to view the geotechnical report for the Project. 	
9/3/2023	Andrea Cockrell	 The commenter stated that Santa Ana Canyon becomes congested when: commuters are returning home from work; commuters bypass the SR-91; during student pick-up at El Rancho Charter School; at the end of the school day at Canyon High School. The commenter expressed concern that the Project's additional residents would adversely affect emergency evacuation. The commenter asked if traffic for the proposed veterans cemetery has been evaluated. The commenter mentioned the SR-91 (SR-57 to SR-55 Improvement Project, which she stated may lead to increased traffic on Santa Ana Canyon. The commenter expressed concern over additional vehicular trips that would be generated by the Project. 	Section 4.12, Population and Housing, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		 The commenter asked about the relationship between the current Project and a prior proposed development within a portion of the Project Site. The commenter expressed preference for new housing in previously developed areas of the City rather than on the current Project Site. 	
9/3/2023	Bob Kuhnlein	 Expressed opposition to the Project Mentioned high levels of existing traffic on Santa Ana Canyon Road. 	Section 4.15, Transportation
9/3/2023	Mark and Bonnie Van Holt	 Expressed opposition to the Project Stated the Project would worsen traffic on Santa Ana Canyon Road. Noted the high levels of daily traffic at El Rancho Charter School. 	Section 4.13, Public Services, and Section 4.15, Transportation
9/3/2023	Carol Barnes	 Expressed opposition to the Project Stated the Project would have impacts including: Plants and wildlife. Traffic on Santa Ana Canyon. Emergency evacuation with addition of more cars. Overcrowding of local schools. Character of the development not "fitting" the local area. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/3/2023	George Morcos	Expressed opposition to the Project for the following reasons:	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.10, Land Use and Planning, and Section 4.14, Recreation

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		 Stated the Project Site should be preserved due to: biodiversity; quality of life; educational value; and property values. Requested that environmental planner uses influence and authority to implement measure to protect Deer Canyon – mentioned zoning regulations, land acquisition, and collaboration with local conservation organizations. 	
9/3/2023	Jeff Walton	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Stated that rezoning the land would result in congested living and traffic; mentioned existing traffic on Santa Ana Canyon Road. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Recreational impacts. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.10, Land Use and Planning, Section 4.14, Recreation, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/3/2023	Kimberly and Richard Job	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife. Commenter expressed preference to preserve the Project Site. Recreation. Traffic. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.14, Recreation, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/4/2023	Barbara Cristiano	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would make existing traffic worse. Noted traffic is already heavy during school pick up and drop off times. 	Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		 Stated the Project would exacerbate existing emergency evacuation delays. Mentioned residents on Mohler Drive as being particularly at-risk. Stated the Project would adversely impact property values. 	
9/4/2023	Bryan Galaz	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Wildlife. Suggested the Project Site be preserved instead of being developed. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.14, Recreation Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/4/2023	Debra Slater	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Commenter stated that she is a resident and recent retiree from Running Springs Elementary school and taught there during the fires in October 2017. Mentioned that evacuations went smoothly, except for the buses travelling to Canyon High School, which were at a standstill due to traffic in Anaheim Hills. Expressed that it was frightening trying to keep the children calm while safely evacuating them and is concerned that the Project would exacerbate this issue during future fires. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/4/2023	Inez Slick	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic and gridlock on Santa Ana Canyon Road resulting from SR-91 congestion. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. No insurance coverage: The commenter stated that many residents on their block have had their 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		insurance coverage denied due to the high wildfire risk, mentioned that new residents of the Project may not be able to get insurance coverage.	
9/4/2023	Jeff Walton	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Stated that rezoning the land would result in traffic congestion; mentioned that traffic on Santa Ana Canyon Road is backed up every evening from Lakeview Avenue to Gypsum Canyon Road. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.10, Land Use and Planning, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/4/2023	Julie Jarvi	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Expressed displeasure that commenter only received notice of the Project at their personal mailbox in the Ralphs shopping center, instead of notice at their home in the area. Stated the following concerns in opposition to the Project: Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. stated that their children attended Running Springs Elementary during the fire that occurred in October 2017 and it took the school bus hours to travel five miles; noted that evacuation route signs that have since been installed by the City would not improve traffic or panic. Traffic and insufficient parking infrastructure for the new residents, leading to overflow into surrounding neighborhoods. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/4/2023	Kristin Smith	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Overcrowding of schools. Stated that schools would become even more overcrowded with the Project; mentioned that their daughter attends Crescent Elementary School and their 4th grade class had 39 students with one teacher and no teaching aids – their daughter fell behind and teacher let parents know he is spread too thin to give extra help. Traffic. Emergency evacuation. 	Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/4/2023	Lenora Yuen	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Crime. 	Section 4.15, Transportation
9/4/2023	Linda Oster	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Aesthetics. Wildlife. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, and Section 4.15, Transportation
9/4/2023	Roger Johnson	Expressed opposition to the Project.	Not applicable
9/4/2023	Yong Zhu	Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including:	Section 4.15, Transportation

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/5/2023	Breana and Robert Lopez	 Expressed opposition to the Project and re-zoning of the Project Site. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire hazards; Emergency evacuations; Wildlife; and Water supply. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17 Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/5/2023	Carla Munin	Expressed opposition to the Project.	Not applicable
9/5/2023	David A. Rosenberg	 Expressed opposition to the Project and re-zoning of the Project Site. Discussed concerns related to previous evacuation panic and traffic, stating that people's lives are at risk if the Project were to be approved. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/5/2023	John Hirai	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic congestion and safety: noted existing SR-91 and Santa Ana Canyon Road congestion; mentioned that the left turn lane from Santa Ana Canyon Road onto Weir Canyon Road is backed up past Roosevelt Road during rush hour. Aesthetics. Stated the Project does not fit in with the surrounding neighborhood. Wildlife displacement. Expressed concern that a seven-story building near a park reserve would impact bird populations. Resources: stated that the local Police are spread too thin and need more assistance, requested that resources for the Project are put towards that. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.13, Public Services, and Section 4.15, Transportation

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/5/2023	Sharon McLuckey	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Emergency evacuation. Energy and Water supply. Questioned how the City would support this new population when current residents are told to preserve their energy and water. 	Section 4.5, Energy, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/6/2023	Cindy Hauck	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Parking. Traffic. Emergency Evacuation. Wildfire Risk. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/6/2023	Julie Vanderpool	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Emergency evacuation. Increased wildfire risk for existing homes and residents. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/6/2023	Mark Balan, Ashwin Balan, Kamala Balan	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Aesthetics. Infrastructure. Quality of life. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.13, Public Services, and Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems
9/6/2023	Michelle Bohen	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Emergency evacuation. Commenter mentioned that past wildfires have prompted many people to drive 	Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		erratically on narrow and dangerous roads throughout the hills, including instances of people travelling in the wrong lane, head-on, to evacuate.	
9/6/2023	Sinnary Sam	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated that it recently took two hours to pick up daughter from Canyon High School, which is only three lights from their residence. Mentioned that existing SR-91 traffic already makes it difficult to get around. Stated that local schools are at full capacity and cannot support new students. 	Section 4.13, Public Services, and Section 4.15, Transportation
9/6/2023	Talia Nimmer from the law office of Mitchell M. Tsai Written on behalf of the Southwest Mountain States Regional Council of Carpenters (Southwest Carpenters)	Stated that the City should: Require the Project to be built using local workers. The letter includes a memorandum related to potential greenhouse gas emissions benefits that may result from local hire requirements. Impose training requirements for construction activities to prevent the spread of COVID and other diseases.	The comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
9/6/2023	Teresa Alonso	 Expressed opposition to the Project and opposition to rezoning of the Project Site. Noted traffic and fire hazards as reasoning for opposition. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/7/2023	Allison Valdivia	 The commenter stated that during a 2017 fire they were told to evacuate their home but was not able to exit their neighborhood due to traffic. The commenter asked why the scoping meeting was not recorded. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/7/2023	Bill Whetstone	 Expressed opposition to the Project Asked that the EIR evaluate biological resources. Stated that birds would be impacted by the proposed glass windows. Stated a "fire survey" is needed. Stated the Project does not blend in with the surroundings. Suggested to make the Project smaller. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/7/2023	Christie Campbell	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife. Water supply. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/7/2023	Dale and Sharon Woodward	 Expressed opposition to the Project as they were unable to attend the meeting. 	The comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
9/7/2023	Evy Washington	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated that the Project would worsen traffic issues, degrade environment and wildlife, and does not fit-in with the aesthetics of the community, 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, and Section 4.15, Transportation

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/7/2023	Fabiola Sperling	 Expressed opposition to the Project and rezoning of Project Site. The commenter listed concerns regarding traffic, fire hazards, evacuation routes, wildlife displacement, and water shortages. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/7/2023	George Fates	Expressed opposition to the Project stating it is too big.	Section 4.10, Land Use and Planning
9/7/2023	James Oppeau	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Stated that roads need to be built prior to housing to ensure infrastructure can support new population. Emergency evacuation. Increased fire hazards. Earthquakes. 	Section 4.6, Geology and Soils, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/7/2023	Jeff Schleiger	Expressed opposition to the Project for the following reasons:	Section 4.2, Air Quality, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.4, Cultural Resources, Section 4.6, Geology and Soils, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.10, Land Use and Planning, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.12, Population and Housing, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.14, Recreation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/7/2023	Jose Sanchez	 Expressed opposition to the Project due to the increased traffic that would result. Requested that multiple traffic studies be conducted. 	Section 4.15, Transportation
9/7/2023	Maria Meyer	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated that the past expansions of Serrano to Santiago have greatly increased traffic and accidents. Proposed that someone from the City observe traffic in the area to fully understand the issue. Stated that insurance companies rarely cover residences in the area due to the high fire risk. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/7/2023	Michael Bilello	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Mentioned fire hazards and the size of the Project. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/7/2023	Richard Licerio	 Expressed support for the Project due to new tax revenues that may result, as well. Stated that he has coworkers waiting to move into new development. 	
9/7/2023	Shari Jensen	Expressed opposition to the Project due to concerns about fire hazards, evacuation routes, wildlife displacement, and water shortages.	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/7/2023	William and Grace Good	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Emergency evacuation. Stated that it took them ~4 hours to drive from the corner of Oak Canyon Drive/Serrano Avenue to Imperial Highway during the 2017 fire evacuation. Community safety. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/8/2023	Francis Hu	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Emergency evacuation. Plants and wildlife. Traffic Aesthetics. Property values. Water supply. Inadequate infrastructure. Parking. Stated the Project was not proposing to provide enough parking. Noise pollution. Light pollution. Overcrowding of schools. Impacts to local businesses. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/8/2023	Gina and Ron Wilkinson	Expressed opposition to the Project due to traffic and safety impacts.	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/8/2023	Rich Fagner	 Expressed gratitude for the information following the scoping meeting. Suggested that Imperial Highway, Weir Canyon, and Serrano Avenue should be looked at for the traffic studies. 	Section 4.15, Transportation
9/8/2023	John Levi	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Concerned about evacuation routes and safety. Stated that roads cannot handle any more people. 	Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/8/2023	Julie Sone	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Aesthetics. Noise pollution. Light pollution: noted 24-hour lights resulting from Project would be a nuisance to residents., Wildlife habitat loss and displacement. Fire hazards. Evacuation hazards. Traffic: noted that El Rancho Charter School creates a traffic issue on Santa Ana Canyon Road already and the Project would worsen that. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/8/2023	Pamela Kim	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated that traffic would be significantly impacted by the Project. Stated that local schools are at full capacity already and will not be able to accommodate new students. 	Section 4.13, Public Services, and Section 4.15, Transportation
9/8/2023	Sharon Achs	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Increased traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		Wildlife displacement and habitat loss.Water shortages.	
9/8/2023	Ted Cramer	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would be a gross violation of the intentions of the Scenic Corridor. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.10, Land Use and Planning
9/8/2023	Vishal Chheda	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Increased crime. Mental health of current residents. Insufficient infrastructure and resources. Wildlife displacement. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems
9/9/2023	Dan Booth	Expressed opposition to the Project.	The comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
9/9/2023	Douglas Robbins	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire hazards. Traffic. Evacuation routes. Aesthetics. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/9/2023	Helen Scott	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Aesthetics. Noise pollution. Light pollution. Wildlife displacement. Environmental degradation. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		 Fire hazards. Evacuation routes. Traffic. Insufficient infrastructure and public resources. 	
9/9/2023	John Kennedy	Expressed opposition to the Project due to traffic concerns.	Section 4.15, Transportation
9/9/2023	Chris and Sherry Carver	 Expressed opposition to the Project but acknowledged the city's need for more housing. Requested a less intrusive and damaging project design be prepared. Suggested that the Anaheim Hills Regal Theater is developed into a "small work/live building" that would benefit the surrounding retail businesses as well. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, and Section 4.10, Land Use and Planning
9/9/2023	Sherry Mitchell	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Schools. Wildlife. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.13, Public Resources, and Section 4.15, Transportation
9/9/2023	William B. Armstrong	 Expressed opposition to the Project and noted opposition to re-zoning of the Project Site. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Increased fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife. Water supply. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/10/2023	Brenda Marquez	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Schools. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		 Emergency evacuation. Asked whether the Project would require the removal of oak trees. 	Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/10/2023	Maria Castro- Villarino	 Expressed opposition to the Project, noting the issue of traffic and congestion from commuters. Mentioned that the proposed Veteran Cemetery would add traffic that should also be considered in addition to the proposed Project. 	Section 4.15, Transportation
9/10/2023	Shannon McChurch	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Emergency evacuation. Stated that she was a teacher at Running Springs Elementary for the past 15 years and was stuck on a bus with children for hours during the 2017 evacuations. Wildfire risks. Stated that the Santa Ana winds at the top of the hill off Weir Canyon Road are significantly stronger than other regions. Traffic. Invited City staff to stay at their home and spend a day in the area with them to witness the unique traffic issues that occur in the Project Site vicinity in existing conditions. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/10/2023	Sheri Gray	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire hazards; Water supply. Parking. Traffic. Emergency evacuation. Displacement of wildlife. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.6, Geology and Soils, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		 Aesthetics. Noise pollution. Light pollution. Geology. Expressed concerns related to geology and soils. Stated that some homes in the area have recently had soil stability issues. 	
9/11/2023	Betty Kimes	 Expressed opposition to the Project Stated that Santa Ana Canyon Road is already a dangerous road. 	Section 4.15, Transportation
9/11/2023	Nathanial Booth	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Aesthetics. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/11/2023	Douglas Elliott	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/11/2023	Jeanne Gonzalves	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Overcrowding of local schools. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/11/2023	Mark and Jennifer Maguire	Expressed opposition to the Project.Stated that the Project would negatively impact traffic.	Section 4.15, Transportation

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/11/2023	Linda Ruiz	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated she has gone through three evacuations during their 25 years of residency in the Project vicinity and each incident was a nightmare. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/11/2023	Maxine Gilles	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Water supply. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/11/2023	Nasrin Rasouli	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Water supply. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/11/2023	Rebecca Booth	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Stated that during the Triangle fire, SR-91 and Serrano Avenue shut down making it impossible to evacuate. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/12/2023	Alyssa Weiner	Expressed opposition to the ProjectCommenter mentioned traffic concerns.	Section 4.15, Transportation

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/12/2023	Catherine Giangrande	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Asked why the Weir Canyon Road expansion was never completed. Expressed concerns about traffic. 	Section 4.15, Transportation
9/12/2023	Leslie Dianne Hollon	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Water supply. Landslides. Overcrowding of local schools. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.6, Geology and Soils, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/12/2023	Dianne Ostrosky	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/12/2023	Elaine and Wayne Moulden	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Aesthetics. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/12/2023	Georgette Larsen	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		Emergency evacuation.Wildlife displacement.Water supply.	and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/12/2023	Gloria Hu	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Degradation of Deer Canyon Park Preserve. Water supply. Aesthetics/Scenic corridor Parking. Stated that not enough is being provided by the Project. Overcrowding of local schools. Noise pollution. Light pollution. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.10, Land Use and Planning, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/12/2023	Joe Giangrande	Expressed opposition to the Project.Noted traffic concerns on Santa Ana Canyon Road and SR-91.	Section 4.15, Transportation
9/12/2023	Karen Azling	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Expressed concerns related to traffic and safety hazards with El Rancho Charter School nearby. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/12/2023	Larry Larsen	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/12/2023	Larry Ostrosky	 Water supply. Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/12/2023	Robert Diesto	Expressed opposition to the Project due to traffic impacts.	Section 4.15, Transportation
9/12/2023	William and Wanda Arment	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Construction activities would negatively impact the daily life of residents. Insufficient infrastructure (water, sewer, gas and electric, internet). Lacking police and fire personnel to support more people. Traffic. Overcrowding of local schools. Wildfire. Floods. Landslides. Plants and wildlife. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.6, Geology and Soils, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/13/2023	Anonymous	 This scoping comment card was received at the scoping meeting and referenced Maui ("Thin Maui"), presumably referring to the 2023 wildfire event that occurred in the weeks preceding the scoping meeting. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/13/2023	Barbara Wahlbrink	 Expressed opposition to the Project and opposition to any required zone change for the Project. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15,

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		 Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire hazards; Emergency evacuations; Wildlife; and Water supply. 	Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/13/2023	Betty Farnsworth	 Expressed opposition to the Project and opposition to any required zone change for the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Wildlife and endangered species. Water consumption. Noise Public services. Traffic. Emergency evacuation. Aesthetics. Stated a seven-story building does not fit into Scenic Corridor. Landslides. Stated the Project would be at potential risk of landslides due to the proposed grading and retaining walls. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.6, Geology and Soils, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/13/2023	Charles Bittel	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Water supply. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/13/2023	Christine Ney	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Water supply. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/13/2023	Dana Farnsworth	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Water supply. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/13/2023	James Myers	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Water supply. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/13/2023	Jeffrey Dunn	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Water supply. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/13/2023	Karen Cooper	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Water supply. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/13/2023	Karen Dunn	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Water supply. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/13/2023	Kimberly Salceda	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Water supply. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/13/2023	Larry Campbell	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Water supply. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/13/2023	Linda Lewis	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Water supply. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/13/2023	Meredith Bittel	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Water supply. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/13/2023	Nancy Bertocchini	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Water supply. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/13/2023	Nicholas Yagar	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Water supply. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/13/2023	Robert Conklin	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Aesthetics/Design. Aesthetics/Light pollution. Noise. Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Biological resources. Water supply. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/13/2023	Scott Adams	 Expressed opposition to the Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Water supply. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/14/2023	Fauzia Adams	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Water supply. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/14/2023	Kelly Jung	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Aesthetics/Design. Aesthetics/Light pollution. Noise. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		 Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Biological resources. Water supply. 	and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/14/2023	Rob Clayton	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Overcrowding of local schools. Asked why Deer Canyon Park Preserve would be developed when it is supposed to be a preserve. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.13, Public Services, and Section 4.15, Transportation
9/15/2023	Betty Farnsworth	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic and pedestrian safety. Stated that their biggest concern is the effect the Project would have on Santa Ana Canyon Road (speeding and child safety, evacuation routes). Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Stated it took them two hours to travel less than three miles on Santa Ana Canyon Road during evacuations. Aesthetics. Plants and wildlife. Water supply. Noise pollution. Light pollution. Public services and emergency response time. Landslides. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.2, Air Quality, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.6, Geology and Soils, Section 4.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/15/2023	Claudia Thielmann	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Crime/Safety. Quality of life. Air quality. Noise pollution. Light pollution. Aesthetics. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.2, Air Quality, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/15/2023	John Schreiner	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Concerned about former mayor Sidhu's role in the Project and requested that the former mayor's involvement be investigated prior to moving forward with rezoning or permitting. Expressed concerns related to the Mormon Church's role in the Project as they are providing majority of funding and are also under investigation for illegal spending of donations; requested they are investigated before moving forward. Stated that another apartment complex is proposed nearby that may make the Project unnecessary. 	Section 4.10, Land Use and Planning, Section 4.12, Population and Housing
9/16/2023	Charles Ney	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Water supply. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/16/2023	Elia Castaneda	 Requested that a fire evacuation study be conducted for the Project. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/16/2023	Marcia Zonich	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Water supply. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/16/2023	Melissa Raymond	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Plants and wildlife. Traffic. Overcrowding of schools. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.13, Public Services, and Section 4.15, Transportation
9/17/2023	Howard and Valerie Jacobs	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Crime/Safety. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/17/2023	Krystyna Kisting	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Water supply. Light pollution. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/18/2023	Eric Mendoza	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Water supply. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/18/2023	Jeannie Averill	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/18/2023	Julie Filppi	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts to emergency evacuation. Stated that the Project would impede the Know Your Way evacuation plan that was recently created. 	Section 4.10, Land Use and Planning, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/18/2023	Maria V. Bessem And Eric P. Bessem	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Stated the proposed improvements on Santa Ana Canyon Road are insufficient to accommodate the Project. Overcrowding. Wildfire risk. Evacuation routes. Aesthetics. Public transportation. Stated that existing public transport is insufficient. Public services. Stated that existing service levels are insufficient. Noise pollution. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		Light pollution.Wildlife and ecological disturbance.	
9/18/2023	Robert Conklin	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Plant and wildlife. Aesthetics. Noise pollution. Light pollution. Traffic. Fire and evacuation risk. Water shortages. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/18/2023	Wayne Westerman	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Overcrowding and traffic. Fire and evacuation risks. Wildlife displacement and habitat destruction. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/19/2023	April and Thomas Hughes	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire risk. Emergency evacuation. Stated that Santa Ana Canyon Road was a "parking lot" during the November 2008 wildfire event. Parking. Stated that the Project is not providing enough parking spaces. Plant and wildlife habitat. Aesthetics. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.10, Land Use and Planning, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/19/2023	Kathy Hines	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Aesthetics. Traffic. Wildlife displacement and ecological destruction. Fire and evacuation risks. Impacts to utilities/service systems. Asked if the power grid would be upgraded to accommodate the next residents that would result from the Project. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.5, Energy, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/19/2023	Mary Drummond	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire and evacuation hazards. Wildlife displacement. Water shortages. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/19/2023	Michelle Higgins	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Evacuation hazards. Wildlife and ecological destruction. Lack of school capacity. Water shortages. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/19/2023	Pilar Mata	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire risk Water supply. Impacts to scenic corridor. Traffic. Stated that any Project proposed under Sidhu's administration needs to be reevaluated. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.10, Land Use and Planning, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		 Stated that their residence borders Deer Canyon and that they are not able to find insurance coverage for wildfires; stated that AAA does not cover homes in that area and State Farm is declining new policies. Stated that there are not sufficient evacuation routes in existing conditions. Stated that there are only two roads out of their housing tract. Stated that Mohler Drive, connecting to Santa Ana Canyon Road, is not a safe evacuation route and other exit routes require them to travel back up though the hills onto Fairmont. Suggested that the Anaheim City Council: Work with the City of Yorba Linda to complete the Fairmont Connector to provide an additional evacuation route. Increase evacuation route signage. Contract with goat operators to put more goats in Deer Canyon, Oak Canyon, and the Project Site to reduce fire risk. 	
9/19/2023	Sharon Hlapcich	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Traffic. Public services. Displacement of wildlife. Water supply. Aesthetics. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/19/2023	Susan Boyd Wilson	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Aesthetics; land use and planning (access to Deer Canyon). Noise pollution. Population and housing (affordable housing or luxury?). Transportation/traffic. Wildfire and evacuation hazards. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.10, Land Use and Planning, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.12, Population and Housing, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/20/2023	Douglas Hill	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Wildlife displacement and ecological destruction; Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Traffic. Slope stability. Aesthetics. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.6, Geology and Soils, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/20/2023	Kelly Jung	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Plants and wildlife. Aesthetics. Impacts to views. Light pollution. Noise pollution from the proposed rooftop deck. Fire hazard. Emergency evacuation. Water supply. Noted that she had to evacuate due to a fire in 2008 and it took more than two hours until they were safely away from the fires. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		 Stated that additional traffic lanes, the size of Santa Ana Canyon Road and extending from the east end to the SR-55, would need to be added to accommodate the Project. Suggested that the City builds a small parking area south of Santa Ana Canyon Road and revitalizes the restroom and picnic areas. 	
9/20/2023	Linda Balsamo	 Expressed opposition to the Project. The commenter described an instance of being tailgated on Old Bridge Road and followed around the neighborhood but could not get help from Anaheim Police Department because no one was available. Described a time shortly after the event described above where they witnessed someone stealing from the local Rite-Aid. Stated that she does not feel safe enough to walk around and is concerned that more residents would worsen crime. Described frequent crime in the neighborhood (i.e., mail theft, car theft, burglaries, being followed). Stated that Nohl Ranch Road., Serano Avenue, and Santa Ana Canyon Road are dangerous because people speed and run red lights frequently. 	Section 4.13, Public Services, and Section 4.15, Transportation
9/20/2023	Lisa Young	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazard. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Water supply. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/20/2023	Ramona Adamson	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire and evacuation hazards. Wildlife displacement. Water shortages. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/21/2023	Adriana Sung	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Overcrowding of local schools. The commenter noted local schools were already overcrowded. The commenter stated that El Rancho Charter School has over 1,000 students and that Canyon High School has over 2,000 students. The commenter noted that classrooms at these local schools are already crowded and that teacher to student ratios are already high. Traffic. Impacts to Deer Canyon Park Preserve. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.14, Recreation, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/21/2023	Carole Anne White	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire and evacuation hazards. Wildlife displacement. Water shortages. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/21/2023	Deana Ramseyer	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire and evacuation hazards. Wildlife displacement. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		o Utilities/service systems.	and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/21/2023	Frannie D'Errico	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Aesthetics. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, and Section 4.15, Transportation
9/21/2023	Ingrid Kjellin	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire and evacuation hazards. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/21/2023	Jeanne Spence	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire and evacuation hazards. Wildlife displacement. Water shortages. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/21/2023	Jennifer Hillyer	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Habitat destruction and wildlife displacement. Aesthetics. Noise pollution. Light pollution. Traffic. Lack of school capacity. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/21/2023	Lindsey Doe	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire and evacuation hazards. Lack of school capacity. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.6, Geology and Soils, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15,

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		 Traffic. Mudslides/geology. Crime. Aesthetics. Wildlife displacement and ecological destruction. 	Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/21/2023	Lisa Morrow	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire and evacuation hazards. Lack of school capacity. Insufficient public services. Aesthetics. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/21/2023	Melody Sadowski	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire and evacuation hazards. Lack of school capacity and infrastructure. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/21/2023	Mihaela Stan	Expressed opposition to the Project.	The comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
9/21/2023	Paul Gendron	Expressed opposition to the Project.	The comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/21/2023	Rick Pollgreen	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire and evacuation hazards. Wildlife displacement. Water shortages. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/21/2023	Shai Noam and Terri Faloney	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire and evacuation hazards. Wildlife displacement. Water shortages. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/21/2023	Tina Nelissen	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Crime. Fire and evacuation hazards. Stress on public services. Wildlife displacement and habitat destruction. Water shortages. Aesthetics. Noise pollution. Light pollution. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/21/2023	Thomas Young	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire and evacuation hazards. Wildlife displacement. Water shortages. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/22/2023	Arthur Romo	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Mentioned the impacts of past fire events on residents. Noted there was panic during past fire events that led to heavy traffic. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/22/2023	Bonnie Chaffee Hays	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Emergency evacuation. Wildlife. Overcrowding of local schools. Noise from the proposed roof deck. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/22/2023	Brenda Nardolillo	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts related to traffic. 	Section 4.15, Transportation
9/22/2023	Constance Kouri	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic and congestion. Fire and evacuation hazards. Water shortages. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/22/2023	"Coral Reef" The commenter's name was not provided in the email.	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic impacts. Fire and evacuation hazards. Water shortages. Wildlife displacement and habitat loss. Stated that bicycle plans, and "connection of riding walking plans" have "disappeared" from proposal. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/22/2023	Danielle Ward	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire and evacuation hazards. Wildlife displacement. Water shortages. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/22/2023	Eileen M. Anderon	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Impacts on wildlife and local ecology. Traffic. Overcrowding schools and buses. Utilities/service system impacts. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/22/2023	Gail Canossi	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Traffic. Geology (Whittier fault) Overcrowding of local schools. Impacts to response time for public service providers. 	Section 4.6, Geology and Soils, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/22/2023	Jeanne L. Bullington	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic and congestion. Fire and evacuation hazards. Wildlife displacement. Water shortages. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/22/2023	Jeff Shimkus	 Stated he is a retired Anaheim Fire Captain with 28 years of service in the area. Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic: evacuation hazards, Santa Ana Canyon Road. is the only feasible way out. Increased strain on local infrastructure: schools, water, power, etc. Aesthetics. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/22/2023	Jorg Hesser	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire and evacuation hazards. Wildlife displacement and habitat loss. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/22/2023	Karen Carlson	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Noise pollution. Traffic. 	Section 4.11, Noise, and Section 4.15, Transportation
9/22/2023	Kristin Lasher	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Drought/water shortages. Fire and evacuation hazards. Traffic. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/22/2023	Leslie Schultz	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Aesthetics. Traffic. Fire and evacuation hazards. Water shortages. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
0 /22 /2022	Ma als Olisson	Wildlife displacement and habitat loss. Formula displacement and Project State displacement.	Continue 4.1 Anathotics Costion 4.2 Air
9/22/2023	Mack Oliver	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic impacts. Fire and evacuation hazards. Impacts to public service provider response time. No home insurance. Landslides. Noise and air pollution. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.2, Air Quality, Section 4.6, Geology and Soils, Section 4.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/22/2023	Marcia Zonich	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire and evacuation hazards. Water shortages. Aesthetics. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/22/2023	Mark Adams	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire and evacuation hazards. Noise pollution. Light pollution. Traffic and congestion. Suggested that City staff are corrupt and doing favors. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/22/2023	Michael Gonzalez	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Displacement of wildlife. Overcrowding of schools. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/22/2023	James and Misty Matz	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Overcrowding of schools. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/22/2023	Rick DuBeau	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire and evacuation hazards. Wildlife displacement and ecological destruction/habitat loss. Aesthetics. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/22/2023	Ruth Lugo	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Aesthetics/noise/light pollution. Wildlife displacement and ecological destruction/habitat loss. Fire and evacuation hazards. Overcrowding of schools. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/22/2023	Sarah Hughes	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Noise/light pollution. Air pollution. Wildlife displacement and ecological destruction/habitat loss. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.2, Air Quality, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.7, Greenhouse Gases, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		 Fire and evacuation hazards. Overcrowding of schools. Aesthetics. Lack of infrastructure (walking/bicycle lanes). Water shortages. 	4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/22/2023	Tiffany and Ryan Mueller	Expressed opposition to the Project due to traffic impacts.	Section 4.15, Transportation
9/23/2023	Andrea Phelps	 Commenter requested that a traffic study be conducted for the Project and requested that specific road segment be analyzed during specific times of day near school drop-off and pick-up times while schools are in session. The commenter requested that the Project's traffic study evaluate potential delay that would be caused to emergency evacuation by Project's new residents. The commenter requested a map showing fuel modification zones that would be required for the Project ne provided for public review. 	Section 4.15, Transportation
9/23/2023	April Bayraktar	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Aesthetics. Wildlife. The (existing) hiking trails. The "semi-rural feel of the community". Emergency evacuation and public safety during wildfire events. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.14, Recreation, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/23/2023	Brendan Bayraktar	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Wildlife habitat. Noise. Traffic. Wildfire risk. Safety of the existing residents. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/23/2023	Carolyn Baker	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire and evacuation hazards. Wildlife displacement. and habitat loss. Impacts to utilities/service systems. Water shortages. Crime. Glare from building surfaces. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/23/2023	Constance Kouri	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire and evacuation hazards. Water shortages. Wildlife displacement and habitat loss. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/23/2023	Daena Cox	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire and evacuation hazards. Water shortages. Wildlife displacement and habitat loss. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/23/2023	Dennis Oneill	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Aesthetics. Wildlife displacement and habitat loss. Noise pollution. Light pollution. Traffic. Fire and evacuation hazards. Overcrowding of schools. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/23/2023	Jeff and Linda Schleiger	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire and evacuation hazards. Wildlife displacement and habitat loss/ecological destruction. Impacts to recreation. Water shortages. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.14, Recreation, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/23/2023	Nancy Schilling	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire and evacuation hazards. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/23/2023	Paula Villmer	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic (Santa Ana Canyon Road and SR-91 with school pick up congestion). Fire and evacuation hazards (Santa Ana Canyon Road and Nohl Ranch Road gridlock). Aesthetics. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/23/2023	Sarah Bayraktar	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Aesthetics. Wildlife displacement and habitat loss/ecological destruction. Noise pollution. Light pollution. Traffic. Emergency evacuation. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/23/2023	Susan Oneill	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Aesthetics. Wildlife displacement and habitat loss/ecological destruction. Noise pollution. Light pollution. Traffic. Emergency evacuation. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/23/2023	Tom Schultz	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire and evacuation hazards. Water shortages. Aesthetics. Wildlife displacement and habitat loss/ecological destruction. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/23/2023	Tyler Baker	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire and evacuation hazards. Wildlife displacement. Impacts on local utilities/service systems. Crime. Concern about reflective surfaces. Overcrowding of schools. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/24/2023	Walter Baker	 Mentioned that Santa Ana Canyon Road and SR-91 are congested and that the Project would worsen conditions. Noted there is a high level of existing noise in the area from the truck weigh station (trucks down shifting), vehicle engines and exhaust systems, and helicopters that travel along SR-91. Stated there is a high level of existing pollution. Mentioned needing to wipe off outdoor tables to remove "auto and truck pollution". Stated that past projects within Santa Ana Canyon Road right-of-way took a long time to be completed. Stated the Project should include a fire station and a police station. Asked where water would come from for the Project. Asked if underground electric lines would be built. 	Section 4.2, Air Quality, Section 4.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 4.9, Hydrology and Water Quality, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems
9/24/2023	Butch Fitzjerrells	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Community character. Stated the Project would result in loss of rural nature of the community. Aesthetics. Degradation of the scenic corridor. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		 Biological resources through removal of habitat. Increased fire risk from more humans and vehicles adjacent to fire prone areas. Emergency evacuation routes. Overcrowding at local schools. 	
9/24/2023	Gail Lehrbass	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Suggested that the building be three stories instead of seven, as proposed. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Traffic 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/24/2023	Joni and Dean Gaynor	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Safety, fire hazards, and evacuation routes (Santa Ana Canyon Road, Monte Vista, Weir Canyon Road) Traffic and congestion (Santa Ana Canyon Road, Imperial Highway to Gypsum Canyon Road) Aesthetics, recreation, wildlife displacement, and ecologic degradation of Deer Canyon Park Preserve. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.14, Recreation, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/24/2023	Kim Cooper	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic in the area, specifically on Mohler Drive and Serrano Ave. Aesthetics. Lack of school capacity. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/24/2023	Laura Hesser	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Impacts to wildlife and plants. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Lack of school capacity. Water shortages. Noise pollution. Light pollution. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/24/2023	Lori Gutierrez	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic: stated traffic patterns have worsened in the past few years because of commuters (Santa Ana Canyon Road, Serrano Avenue, Weir Canyon Road). Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Requested that a study of fire protection and evacuation and safety exercises be provided for community. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/24/2023	Mai and Roger Hinwood	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Water shortages. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/24/2023	Margaret L. Lacox	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts related to traffic. 	Section 4.15, Transportation
9/24/2023	Mary Heistand	 Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Impacts to Deer Canyon Park Preserve. Noise pollution. Light pollution. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.14, Recreation, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/24/2023	Nancy Flores	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Landslides (slope and fault line) Lack of school capacity. Aesthetics. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.6, Geology and Soils, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/24/2023	Naren Solanki	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Traffic (El Rancho Charter School, Running Springs Elementary School, Canyon High School). Lack of school capacity. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/24/2023	Nayyar Masih	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic and accidents (two fatalities in two months, stated that Santa Ana Canyon Road is unsafe for pedestrians and bicycles in existing conditions). Noise pollution. Light pollution. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/24/2023	Nayyar Masih	 In this correspondence, the commenter provided a video of what they describe as "last big fire" that occurred in the vicinity of the Project Site. 	Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/24/2023	Nayyar Masih	 In this correspondence, the commenter provided a video of a fire that the state occurred in the vicinity of the Project site. 	Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/24/2023	Patricia Fitzjerrells	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Aesthetics/size. Traffic and proposed mitigation measures. Noise pollution. Light pollution. Wildlife displacement, habitat loss, and overall ecologic degradation. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Overcrowding of schools. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/24/2023	Rosanne Ingreso	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Water shortages. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/24/2023	Steven Quibell	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Aesthetics. Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Overcrowding of schools. Wildlife displacement and habitat loss. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/25/2023	Adam Sthay	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Biological resources. Impacts to scenic corridor. Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Night lighting. Community character. Stated the Project would adversely effect the perceived rural nature of the community. Crime. Stated the Project's residents would increase crime in nearby neighborhoods. Glare from buildings. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		 Increased usage of utilities and service systems. 	
9/25/2023	Ashley Ritzenthaler	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire hazards. Stated the Project would exacerbate existing fire hazards. Evacuation. Stated the Project would impact evacuation. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/25/2023	Becky and Greg Marchant	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Community character. Stated the Project would alter the rural character of the area. Stated the Project does not match the existing character of the other homes in the area. Overcrowding of local schools. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.12, Population and Housing, Section 4.13, Public Services, and Section 4.15, Transportation
9/25/2023	Bob Zonitch	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire hazards; Emergency evacuations; Wildlife; and Water supply. Noted opposition to re-zoning 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.10, Land Use and Planning, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/25/2023	Brenda Robbins	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire hazards; Emergency evacuations; Wildlife; and Water supply. Noted opposition to re-zoning. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.10, Land Use and Planning, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/25/2023	Brian Counter	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Emergency evacuation. 	Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/25/2023	Carol Fite	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Emergency evacuation. 	Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/25/2023	Caronyn Fares	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire hazards. Emergency evacuations. Wildlife. Water supply. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/25/2023	Chaoyin Chen	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire hazards. Emergency evacuations. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/25/2023	Charlyn Barton	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Impacts to businesses, residences, schools, and the city overall of the project. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.10, Land Use and Planning, Section 4.12, Population and Housing, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems
9/25/2023	Chris Voltarel	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic and congestion (Santa Ana Canyon Road., Serrano Avenue, Weir Canyon); requested that 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		 traffic studies be performed during peak traffic hours. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Insufficient infrastructure. 	
9/25/2023	Charles Bertocchini	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Impacts on local recreation. Aesthetics and ecological destruction. Traffic. Soil erosion. Noise pollution. Property value. Wildlife displacement and habitat loss. Strain on public services and local resources. Community fragmentation. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.6, Geology and Soils, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/25/2023	Constance Kouri	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic and congestion. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/25/2023	Dan Decker	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Overcrowding. Pollution. Crime. Traffic and accidents. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.2, Air Quality, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.12, Population and

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		 Aesthetics. Wildlife displacement, habitat loss, and ecological destruction. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Overcrowding of schools. 	Housing, Section 4.13 Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/25/2023	David Linskens	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Impacts to wildlife and landscape. Aesthetics. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.6, Geology and Soils, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/25/2023	Diane Myers	Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts related to traffic.	Section 4.15, Transportation
9/25/2023	Douglas Hill	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Impacts on wildlife and local ecology. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Traffic. Geologic instability of region. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.6, Geology and Soils, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/25/2023	Elayne O'Dowd	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic (Santa Ana Canyon Road) and proposed mitigation measures. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Crime. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		 Lack of school capacity. Insufficient local utilities/service systems. Wildlife displacement and habitat loss. Noise pollution. Light pollution. Aesthetics. 	and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/25/2023	Fred Grand	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Aesthetics. Recreation. Traffic Noise pollution. Property values. Wildlife. Public services. Utility systems. Wildfire risk. Emergency evacuation. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.14, Recreation, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/25/2023	Glenn Hoffman	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Traffic. Water shortages. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/25/2023	Jack Barton	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Insufficient infrastructure. Evacuation routes. Lack of school capacity. 	Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/25/2023	James A Sanfilippo	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Wildlife displacement. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Traffic. Makes comments about Sidhu's involvement in the Project. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/25/2023	M. Jane Kessinger	Expressed opposition to the Project.	The comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
9/25/2023	Janis Luther	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Displacement of wildlife. Water shortages. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/25/2023	Jeannie Averill	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Traffic. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/25/2023	Jeff McWilliam	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Safety. Crime. 	Section 4.13, Public Services, and Section 4.15, Transportation
9/25/2023	Jen McCool	This comment included a photo of traffic during what is assumed to be a past evacuation event in Anaheim Hills.	Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/25/2023	John Luther	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Water shortages. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/25/2023	John O'Dowd	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic (Santa Ana Canyon Road) and proposed mitigation measures. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Crime. Overcrowding of schools. Insufficient local utilities/service systems. Wildlife displacement and habitat loss. Noise pollution. Light pollution. Aesthetics. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/25/2023	Julie Miller	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Displacement of wildlife. Water shortages. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/25/2023	Bill and Karen Sullivan	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Impacts on local wildlife and plants. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Aesthetics. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/25/2023	Katherine Novich	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Noise pollution. Light pollution. Traffic. Wildlife displacement. Lack of school capacity. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/25/2023	Kerilyn Counter	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Noise pollution. Light pollution. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.14, Recreation, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		 Traffic. Wildlife displacement and habitat loss. Lack of school capacity. Lack of local recreation capacity. 	
9/25/2023	Kevin Gilette	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Evacuation routes. Lack of school capacity. Insufficient infrastructure and lack of maintenance on existing infrastructure. Traffic. Impact on wildlife. Insufficient parking spaces for Project. Property value. Aesthetics. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/25/2023	Kristine D Vargas	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts related to fire hazards and evacuation routes. Attached pictures of Nohl Ranch Road, Santa Ana Canyon Road, and Canyon Rim Road. Requested thorough analyses of traffic and evacuation plans for residents be conducted. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/25/2023	Laura V Ballinger	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Displacement of wildlife. Water shortages. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/25/2023	Linda and Jef Schleiger	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Aesthetics. Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Impacts on local recreation. Water shortages. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.14, Recreation, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/25/2023	Linda Chapman	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Requested in-depth evacuation plan for the community. Requested extensive studies on wildlife and sensitive bat population in the area. Requested extensive traffic studies and AQ. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.2, Air Quality, Section 4.6, Geology and Soils, Section 4.7, and Greenhouse Gas Emissions
9/25/2023	Loretta Zimmerman	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Water shortages. Landslides. Aesthetics. Noise pollution. Light pollution. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.6, Geology and Soils, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/25/2023	Margaret Fischer	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Water shortages. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/25/2023	Marina Joyce	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Impacts on wildlife and the environment overall. Aesthetics. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Traffic. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/25/2023	Mary Ragusa	Expressed opposition to the Project.	Not applicable
9/25/2023	Matt McConnell	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Noise. Fire hazards. Hydrology and water quality. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.9, Hydrology and Water Quality, Section 4.11, Noise, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/25/2023	Michael Zimmerman	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Water shortages. Landslides. Aesthetics. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.6 Geology and Soils, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
		Noise pollution.Light pollution.	
9/25/2023	Minh-Tri Le	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Noise pollution. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Hydrology and water quality. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.9, Hydrology and Water Quality, Section 4.11, Noise, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/25/2023	Paul Sprenger	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Recreation and hiking trails Aesthetics 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, and Section 4.14, Recreation
9/25/2023	Remington Sprenger	 Expressed opposition to the Project and voiced concerns over loss of scenery. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, and Section 4.3, Biological Resources
9/25/2023	Robert Covington	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: At-capacity infrastructure and resources; sewage lines, power grid, water. Traffic. 	Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems
9/25/2023	Ryan Hon	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement. Water shortages. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 3.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/25/2023	Sandra Cuzquen	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Wildlife. Fire hazards. Traffic. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildifre
9/25/2023	Scott Ribble	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Aesthetics. Overcrowding. Crime. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, and Section 4.12, Population and Housing
9/25/2023	Tammy Hill	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Lack of infrastructure. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Aesthetics. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/25/2023	Tony Baxter	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated various things related to Anaheim natural and human history. 	Section 4.4, Cultural Resources
9/25/2023	John and Valerie Cook	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Stated there is existing congestion on Santa Ana Canyon Road and SR-91. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Insufficient infrastructure. Aesthetics. Wildlife. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/27/23	Binh Tran	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire hazards. Fire risks resulting from additional infrastructure related to the Project. Emergency evacuation. Hindered emergency response time. Water supply. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/27/23	John O'Dowd	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic (Santa Ana Canyon Road and opposition to the proposed traffic light). Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Increased crime. Lack of school capacity. Impacts to water supply and other utilities. Wildlife displacement and habitat loss. Noise pollution. Light pollution. Aesthetics. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/27/23	Linda Bird	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic and congestion. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement and habitat loss. Water shortages. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
9/27/23	Madhavi Solanki	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic and congestion. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement and habitat loss. Water shortages. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/27/23	Tram Tran	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Delays to emergency response time. Strain on resources (i.e., water). 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/27/23	Linda Lewis	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement and habitat loss. Water supply. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
9/27/23	Linda Lewis	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Wildlife displacement and habitat loss. Water supply. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
No date	Janet Peterson	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Wildlife displacement and habitat loss. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. Water supply. Traffic. Pollution. Requested that the traffic study include evaluation of foot traffic along Santa Ana Canyon Road, as well as vehicle traffic. Expressed concern about those trying to access public transport having to walk along Santa Ana Canyon Road to the bus stop; including middle school and high school students who will not be eligible to be picked up by the school bus. Described an evacuation event that occurred in October 2017 	Section 4.2, Air Quality, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
No date	Jason Gearlds	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Wildlife. Nearby neighborhoods. Light. Sound. Evacuation. Wind. Subjacent support. City Plan. Zoning. Public Services. 	Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.10, Land Use and Planning, Section 4.11, Noise, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
No date	John Levi	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire and evacuation hazards. Wildlife displacement. Water shortages. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
No date	Lawrence Wessel	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Traffic. Fire and evacuation hazards. Preservation of Deer Canyon. Air pollution. 	Section 4.2, Air Quality, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, Section 4.15, Transportation, and Section 4.18, Wildfire
No date	Nicole	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Fire and evacuation hazards; stated that Hills Preserve is in violation of the City's fire code of having more than one fire access road. Emergency response time. Lack of school capacity. Expressed dissatisfaction with the manner by which the Project Applicant responded to concerns that were previously communicated to them by members of the community. 	Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.13, Public Services, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Date Comment Was Received	Agency/ Commenter	Topics Raised in This Comment Letter	Location in this Draft EIR Where This Topic Is Discussed
8/24/2023	Julie Filppi	 Expressed opposition to the Project. Stated the Project would have impacts including: Impacts to wildlife and threatened/endangered species inhabiting the area. Stated that the Project would be a violation of community standards outlined in the City's Land Use Plan. Fire hazards. Emergency evacuation. 	Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 4.10, Land Use and Planning, and Section 4.18, Wildfire

Upon completion of the Draft EIR, the City filed a Notice of Completion (NOC) with the State Office of Planning and Research to begin the public review period (PRC Section 21161, State CEQA Guidelines Section 15085(a) and Section 15372). Concurrent with the NOC, the City also provided the related Notice of Availability (NOA) (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15087(a)), and this Draft EIR has been distributed to responsible and trustee agencies, other affected agencies, surrounding cities, and interested parties, as well as all parties requesting a copy of the Draft EIR in accordance with Public Resources Code 21092(b).

This Draft EIR has been made available for review to the public, other interested organizations, and public agencies for the required 45-day period to provide comments on the "sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing the possible impacts on the environment and ways in which the significant effects of the Project might be avoided or mitigated". Copies of this Draft EIR and Appendices are available for public review and comment during the public review period, which runs from July 5 to August 19, 2024, at the following locations:

Anaheim Planning & Building Department 200 S. Anaheim Boulevard

Anaheim, CA 92805

Business Hours: 8 AM to 4 PM

Anaheim Central Library

500 W. Broadway Anaheim, CA 92805

Anaheim Public Library – East Anaheim Branch Canyon Hills Library 8201 E. Santa Ana Canyon Road

Anaheim, CA 92808

400 South Scout Trail Anaheim, CA 92807

The Draft Environmental Impact Report is also available for review online at: www.anaheim.net/876/Environmental-Documents.

Written comments regarding the Draft EIR must be submitted no later than August 19. 2024. During the public review period, comments from the public, organizations, and agencies regarding environmental issues analyzed in the Draft EIR and the Draft EIR's accuracy and completeness may be submitted to the City via email to NJTaylor@anaheim.net, or via mail to the following address:

> Nick Taylor, AICP, Principal Planner Planning and Building Department City of Anaheim 200 S. Anaheim Boulevard, Suite 162 Anaheim, CA 92805

Upon completion of the public review period, written responses to all significant environmental issues raised will be prepared and made available for review by the commenting agencies, organizations and public at least 10 days prior to the public hearing before the Anaheim City Council on the Project at which the certification of the EIR will be considered. Comments received and the responses to comments will be included as part of the record for consideration by decisionmakers for the Project.

As the lead agency for the Project, the City has assumed responsibility for preparing this document. The decision to consider the Project is within the purview of the Anaheim City Council. The City will use the information and analysis included in this Draft EIR as well as the Final EIR (and all appendices attached thereto) to consider potential impacts to the physical environment associated with the Project when considering approval of the Project. As set forth in Section 15021 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the City, as lead agency, has the duty to avoid or minimize environmental damage where feasible. Furthermore, in the event there are significant and unavoidable impacts, Section 15021(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines stated that:

CEQA recognizes that in determining whether and how a project should be approved, a public agency has an obligation to balance a variety of public objectives, including economic, environmental, and social factors and in particular the goal of providing a decent home and satisfying living environment for every Californian. An agency shall prepare a statement of overriding considerations as described in Section 15093 to reflect the ultimate balancing of competing public objectives when the agency decides to approve a project that would cause one or more significant effects on the environment.

In other words, pursuant to CEQA, decision-makers must balance the benefits of a project against its unavoidable environmental consequences (if any). If environmental impacts are identified as significant and unavoidable, the City may still approve the proposed project if it finds that social, economic, legal, technological or other benefits outweigh the unavoidable impacts. The City would then be required to state in writing the specific reasons for approving the proposed project, based on information in the EIR and other information sources in the administrative record. The written document that sets forth this reasoning is called a "statement of overriding considerations." (PRC Section 21081; State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093.)

In addition, the City as lead agency must adopt a Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP) describing the identified mitigation measures that are to be made enforceable conditions of project approval to feasibly avoid or mitigate significant effects on the environment (PRC Section 21081.6; State CEQA Guidelines Section 15097). The MMP is adopted at the time of project approval and is designed to ensure compliance with the EIR mitigation measures during and after project implementation. If the City decides to approve the Project, it would be responsible for verifying that the MMP for the Project is implemented. In addition, the EIR will be used by the City and responsible and trustee agencies, as relevant, during approval of any future discretionary actions and permits that are necessary to implement the Project.

2.3 EIR ORGANIZATION

This Draft EIR is organized into eight sections, each containing its own references section. A list of the Draft EIR sections and a brief description of their contents is provided below to assist the reader in locating information.

- Section 1.0, Executive Summary: Section 1.0 includes: an introduction; an overview
 of the Project's location; an abbreviated description of the Project; a summary of
 areas of controversy that the City is aware of relating to the Project; a summary of
 environmental impacts; and a summary of alternatives to the Project that the City has
 evaluated.
- **Section 2.0, Introduction:** Section 2.0 includes a summary of the Project, an overview of CEQA requirements, an overview of the scoping period, a discussion of the organization of the Draft EIR, a discussion of issues that would be addressed in the Draft EIR, and a discussion of effects not found to be significant.
- **Section 3.0, Project Description:** Section 3.0 includes a discussion of the Project's location as well as existing conditions within the Project Site. Also, Section 3.0 includes the Project's objectives, a detailed project description, construction details, and a summary of the discretionary actions that would be required for the Project.
- **Section 4.0, Impact Analysis:** This section contains subsections 4.1 through 4.18. Each subsection includes discussions on the following topics: existing conditions, regulatory setting, thresholds of significance, impact analysis, cumulative impacts, mitigation program, and significance after mitigation.
- **Section 5.0, Alternatives:** This section includes an overview of CEQA requirements for the consideration and selection of alternatives, as well as alternatives considered but rejected. This section also includes an analysis of a reasonable range of potential alternatives carried forward for consideration and a discussion of the environmentally superior alternative.
- **Section 6.0, Preparers:** This section lists the persons that directly contributed to preparation of this Draft EIR.

2.4 DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

As permitted by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15150, this Draft EIR has referenced, among other things, several technical studies, analyses, and previously certified environmental documents. Information from relevant documents, which have been incorporated by reference, has been briefly summarized in the appropriate sections of this Draft EIR, where possible or briefly described if the data or information cannot be summarized. The relationship between the incorporated part of the referenced document and the Draft EIR has also been described. Where all or part of another document is incorporated by reference, the incorporated language shall be considered to be set forth in full as part of the text of this Draft EIR. The documents and other sources that have been used in the preparation of this Draft EIR are listed in the references section of this Draft EIR.

2.5 ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED IN THE DRAFT EIR

The scope of this Draft EIR is based, in part, on the findings of the technical studies, determination by the City, and input received from the agencies, other interested organizations, and the public as part of the scoping process. Based on the City's determination, this Draft EIR addresses all environmental topics with potential to result in significant effects. The environmental topics and issues within the topics with no potential for impact are identified in below in Section 2.6, Effects Not Found To Be Significant, and focused out from further analysis in Section 4.0, Impact Analysis.

Based on, in part, the City's determination and the comments received by the City on the NOP, this Draft EIR analyzes the following environmental topics with their respective section numbers:

- Aesthetics (4.1)
- Air Quality (4.2)
- Biological Resources (4.3)
- Cultural Resources (4.4)
- Energy (4.5)
- Geology and Soils (4.6)
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions (4.7)
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials (4.8)
- Hydrology and Water Quality (4.9)

- Land Use and Planning (4.10)
- Noise (4.11)
- Population and Housing (4.12)
- Public Services (4.13)
- Recreation (4.14)
- Transportation (4.15)
- Tribal Cultural Resources (4.16)
- Utilities and Services Systems (4.17)
- Wildfire (4.18)

2.6 EFFECTS NOT FOUND TO BE SIGNIFICANT

Consistent with Section 15128 of the State CEQA Guidelines, an EIR shall contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant, and which were therefore not discussed in detail in the EIR. As discussed below, the Project would have no impacts related to the topics of agricultural and forestry resources and mineral resources. Therefore, these topics are not discussed further in Section 4.0, Impact Analysis, of this Draft EIR.

Agricultural and Forestry Resources

Would the Project:

- Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?
- Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
- Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220[g]), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104[g])?
- Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?
- Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. The Project Site is currently undeveloped land, and does not contain any agricultural, timber, or forestland resources. According to historical aerial photographs going back to 1938 and other data sources evaluated, it does not appear the Project Site has been previously developed with urban uses. It appears that the northwestern portion of the Project Site was used as an orchard and/or for other agricultural purposes from around 1938 and continuing for decades, until at least 1960 (NETR Online 2024a). The groves were subsequently removed.

According to the California Important Farmland Finder maintained by the California Department of Conservation (DOC) Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP), the Project Site is designated as "Other Land", meaning "land not included in any other mapping category. Common examples of "Other Land" include low density rural developments; brush, timber, wetland, and riparian areas not suitable for livestock grazing; confined livestock, poultry or aquaculture facilities; strip mines, borrow pits; and water bodies smaller than forty acres. Vacant and nonagricultural land surrounded on all sides by urban development and greater than 40 acres is mapped as Other Land." (DOC 2024a). Therefore, the Project Site does not contain any prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance.

According to City records, the Project Site does not contain any parcels covered by a Williamson Act Contract.

The Project Site has a mix of General Plan land use designations which consist of Estate Density Residential; Open Space, and Low Density Residential. The Project Site has a mix of zoning designations that consist of Transition (T), Open Space (OS), and Single-Family Residential (7,200 s.f. min. lot size) (RS-2) (City of Anaheim 2024a). Given that none of these land uses or zones are focused on agriculture or forestry, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural or forestry uses.

There are no parcels zoned as forest land, timberland, or as Timberland Production Zones within the Project Site. Also, the Project Site is not near any designated state, federal, or local forests (CA Lands 2024a). Furthermore, based on a review of historic aerial imagery, the Project Site does not contain any parcels devoted to and used for growing and harvesting timber, or for growing and harvesting timber and compatible uses (NETR Online 2024a). According to the Biological Resources Technical Report prepared for the Project, there are no areas within the Project Site that contain large stands of trees that could reasonably be extracted as part of a forestry operation. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with the existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

Therefore, the Project would have no impacts related to agriculture and forestry resources and no mitigation is required. As such, the topic of Agricultural and Forestry Resources does not require further analysis in this Draft EIR.

Mineral Resources

Would the Project:

- Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
- Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

No Impact. The California Geological Survey (CGS) identifies three classes of Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ). MRZ-1 is an area with no significant mineral deposits, while MRZ-2 is an area with significant mineral deposits, and MRZ-3 is an area containing known mineral occurrences of undetermined mineral significance (CGS 2024a). The Project Site is designated by the California Department of Mines and Geology as MRZ-3, which indicates likelihood of mineral resources within the Project Site (CGS 2024b).

However, according to the City's General Plan, the City only identifies three areas of the City as containing mineral resources of regional significance. These areas are known to contain aggregate sand and gravel deposits, and their locations are shown on Figure G, Mineral Resources Map, of the City's General Plan Green Element. None

of these areas overlap with or include the Project Site. Therefore, the Project Site does not contain any known mineral resources of value to the City.

Furthermore, according to data maintained by the California Geologic Energy Management Division (CalGEM), there are no existing oil, gas, or geothermal fields within or near the Project Site. The nearest well, Chevron U.S.A (Well No. 1), is located along E. Northfield Avenue, approximately 0.95 miles northwest of the Site. The well is reported to be plugged (CalGEM 2024a). According to aerial imagery, the Project Site has not been used for any sand and gravel extraction or other obvious mineral resource activities. Therefore, the Project would not displace any active mineral extraction activities.

Therefore, the Project would have no impacts related to mineral resources and no mitigation is required. As such, the topic of Mineral Resources does not require further analysis in this Draft EIR.