

**From:** [Elena Thompson](#)  
**To:** [Johnston, Kevin](#)  
**Subject:** 1-18-18 PSRs GPA EIR comment and PSR DS24 opposition comment- Borrego Springs  
**Date:** Thursday, January 18, 2018 7:52:01 AM

---

To Whom It May Concern,

**Our stance regarding Ocotillo Heights and Rudyville remains unchanged. We are in opposition to any re-zoning of this property for the following reasons, stated yet again:**

I8-1

1. **This is an ancient and fragile, beautiful Ocotillo Forest** and should not be touched (under no circumstances should ancient Ocotillos be removed in this sparse and fragile desert environment)

I8-2

2. **It is located in a flood zone**, subject to intense 100 year flooding (there are many other far more suitable places to re-zone, plan to build)

I8-3

3. **The town of Borrego Springs has dire and unresolved water issues, is in a state of critical over-draft without any near term resolution.** No re-zoning should be done until this critical matter can be resolved. Elected officials must consider the water requirements of desert sand for purposes of re-zoning and subdividing building pads when there is ample AG land already available should be a non-starter.

I8-4

4. **There is an over-abundance of other suitable former AG land to build upon throughout the valley.** Therefore, there is no need to decimate (and water) virgin land given the oversupply of land already (last public meeting spoke to the number of available lots to build on).

I8-5

5. **It is somewhat unsavory that this re-zone is being requested from a former government staff member.** The question of impropriety is burdensome to even the most naïve. Therefore, any rezoning should be denied for this reason alone.

I8-6

**Based on the above, we would hereby request denial of any re-zoning of Ocotillo Heights/Rudyville in Borrego Springs.**

Respectfully,

**John & Elena Thompson**  
**Borrego Springs, CA.**

## Response to Comment Letter I8

**John and Elena Thompson**

**January 18, 2018**

**I8-1** The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the proposed change to General Plan Land Use Designation for Property Specific Request Analysis Area DS24. This comment also states ancient ocotillos should not be removed.

Please refer to the response to comment I5-2 above for additional relevant information.

**I8-2** This comment states the property is located in a flood zone, subject to intense flooding.

Section 2.8, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft SEIR includes a programmatic analysis of potential impacts related to flooding. Table 2.8-5 shows that approximately 109 acres within DS24 are located within the 100-year FEMA Floodplain. As discussed in Section 2.8.3.6, DS24 is one of the PSR Analysis Areas that would potentially increase land use intensity with a 100-year flood hazard area, and a potentially significant impact associated with housing within a 100-year flood hazard area (Impact HY-6) was identified. As discussed in Section 2.8.3.7, DS24 is one of the PSR Analysis Areas that would potentially place structures that would impede flood flows, and a potentially significant impact (Impact HY-7) was identified. As presented in Section 2.8.5.6 and 2.8.5.7, implementation of General Plan policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures were determined to reduce Impacts HY-6 and HY-7 to a level below significant.

**I8-3** This comment states Borrego Springs is in critical overdraft and no re-zoning should be done until water issues can be resolved.

Please refer to responses to comments I5-4 and I6-4 above for information relevant to this comment.

**I8-4** This comment states there is an abundance of other suitable land in Borrego Valley upon which to build. Although, this comment does not raise concerns regarding the adequacy of the Draft SEIR, there is a discussion regarding the number of legal lots that are presently estimated to exist that are undeveloped in Borrego Valley. Please see pages 2.8-9 and 2.8-10 of the Draft SEIR.

**I8-5** This comment expresses the opinion of the commenter and does not raise concerns regarding the adequacy of the Draft SEIR, therefore, no further response is required.

**I8-6** The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the proposed change to the General Plan land use designation for DS24.