

PLN180024 REGIONAL COMMERCIAL (C-3)
CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED

Board of Supervisors
September 4, 2019

August 27, 2019

Dear Supervisors,

Normally I am against development, but in the case of the proposed Pine Brothers project on Highway 101, I believe the benefits to San Benito County far outweigh the loss of this narrow strip of farm land.

The county of San Benito will gain their own Casa de Fruta, that can be utilized to publicize all the historical and commercial attractions unique to the county to the outside world. Hollister will continue to grow, much like San Jose because of its proximity to the Silicon Valley.

Historically the site is next to Sergeant Ranch, the early railroad stop for San Juan Bautista, and the stagecoach route from San Juan Bautista to Watsonville which Charlie Parkinson drove stagecoaches.

We have the Pinnacles National Park, Fremont Peak State Park, State Offroad Vehicle Park, and Cienega Wineries just to name a few of the attractions, plus the historic Mission in San Juan Bautista, a short drive away.

The benefits to the county are a win-win, considering the offset and loss of prime farm land as the county continues to grow in population.

Most sincerely

Ted Thoeny

RECEIVED
SEP 04 2019

SAN BENITO COUNTY
PLANNING & BUILDING



BETABEL RV PARK
9664 Betabel Road
San Juan Bautista, CA 95045
(831) 623-2202 Fax (831) 623-2028
betabel@betabel.com
www.betabel.com

Betabel (Sugar Beet)

August 1, 2019

To whom it may concern:

I am the General Manager of Betabel RV Park which is adjacent to the project proposed by Mr. Rider McDowell on Betabel Rd. San Juan Bautista.

We are supporting the project for the following reasons:

1. We need a fuel station in this area for not only our customers but people traveling along the 101 Hwy. People run out of fuel in this area often and come to us for help. Our customers who are staying in our RV park need fuel when leaving our park.
2. Sales tax and jobs for San Benito County would be substantial for the area who need such a thing.
3. A restaurant would be fantastic for the area for our customers also for travelers using the 101 highway for a destination stop. Stopping in this area would bring in more tourism, people would explore the area and be given an introduction to the County and what it has to offer for people to do.
4. The project is dedicated for cancer research that is always a problem that has touched so many peoples lives in one way or another.
5. The project overall, we feel fits the needs of the area and the theme of the project fits the terrain of the Country at heart.

Please Approve this important project for our area
It is in dire need.

Respectfully

Frank Paura
General Manager of Betabel RV Park

RECEIVED
AUG 23 2019

SAN BENITO COUNTY
PLANNING & BUILDING



SENT VIA EMAIL

May 14, 2019

Darryl Boyd, Planner
San Benito County
481 4th Street
Hollister, CA 95023
dboyd@cosb.us

Subject: Planning Commission Meeting – May 15, 2019
PLN180024-GPA "Livestock 101" (General Plan Amendment)
PLN180024-ZC4 "Livestock 101" (Zone Change)

Dear Mr. Boyd:

First I would like to take this opportunity to thank RMA staff for all that you do in San Benito County. As a large landowner with a long-standing business in the county, we appreciate all that you and the RMA staff do. I also want to take this opportunity to clarify, for the record, the incomplete reference to Graniterock's adjacent property just to the east of the Livestock 101 property.

Both documents in the subject line above do mention Graniterock's property to the east of the Livestock 101 property. That said, the designated Rangeland to the east of the Livestock 101 property is a permitted Overburden Placement Area (OPA) as part of the A.R. Wilson Quarry – Use Permit 460-88, State Clearinghouse# 88062818. Although there is minimal activity currently occurring in this area immediately adjacent to the Livestock 101 property, there will be substantial activity occurring within the next couple of years and will last for a number of years.

Graniterock does not have a position on the proposed General Plan Amendment or Zoning Change, but we do want to inform staff of the permitted activities that will occur immediately to the east of the above mentioned site. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (408) 574-1479 or alternatively via email at pmapelli@graniterock.com.

Sincerely,

Pat Mapelli
Land Use Manager
Graniterock/A.R. Wilson Quarry
1900 Quarry Road
Aromas, CA 95004

Mail

Calendar

Contacts

Deleted Items (817)

Drafts [15]

Inbox

Junk E-mail [35]

Sent Items

Click to view all folders

Manage Folders...

Reply

Reply All

Forward

Print

Delete

More

Opposition input to rezoning of highway 101 nodes to commercial

Melissa Beers [sibertopia@gmail.com]

You forwarded this message on 5/17/2019 7:06 AM.

Sent: Wednesday, May 15, 2019 4:04 PM

To: sbcplan

Cc: Melissa [sibertopia@sibertopia.com]

I am writing to express my opposition to the rezoning of the highway 101 nodes to commercial that is being address tonight in the San Benito County Planning Commission meeting.

First at issue, is that the entire process has followed CEQA law requiring through study to assess the impact to surrounding community.

On a more practical level, the area under discussion cannot incur further growth without significant impact to the quality of life for those of us who live near the impacted area.

Traffic in this area is already a nightmare during weekend and commute hours.

Water resources are already scarce in the region and source for water for this area will put homeowners in the area further at risk by over drawing water sources.

And it will significantly change (for the worse) the rural and Ag character for those that live here. I've long been disappointed and angry at San Benito county's out of control growth with no jobs or upgrades to infrastructure that has had a negative impact on my life over the time since I moved here over 20 years ago.

Please do not continue to make the same mistakes.

Melissa Beers
Aromas, CA

Connected to Microsoft Exchange

Darryl Boyd

From: sbcplan
Sent: Friday, May 17, 2019 7:06 AM
To: Darryl Boyd
Subject: FW: Opposition input to rezoning of highway 101 nodes to commercial

From: Melissa Beers [sibertopia@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 15, 2019 4:04 PM
To: sbcplan
Cc: Melissa
Subject: Opposition input to rezoning of highway 101 nodes to commercial

I am writing to express my opposition to the rezoning of the highway 101 nodes to commercial that is being address tonight in the San Benito County Planning Commission meeting.

First at issue, is that the entire process has followed CEQA law requiring through study to assess the impact to surrounding community.

On a more practical level, the area under discussion cannot incur further growth without significant impact to the quality of life for those of us who live near the impacted area.

Traffic in this area is already a nightmare during weekend and commute hours.

Water resources are already scarce in the region and source for water for this area will put homeowners in the area further at risk by over drawing water sources.

And it will significantly change (for the worse) the rural and Ag character for those that live here. I've long been disappointed and angry at San Benito county's out of control growth with no jobs or upgrades to infrastructure that has had a negative impact on my life over the time since I moved here over 20 years ago.

Please do not continue to make the same mistakes.

Melissa Beers
Aromas, CA

May 14, 2019

By E-Mail
Acknowledgement of Receipt Requested

Planning Commissioners
San Benito County Planning Commission
c/o San Benito County Resource Management Agency
2301 Technology Parkway
Hollister, CA 95023
sbcplan@cosb.us
dboyd@cosb.us

**Re: Zoning Code Amendment, Zone Changes, and General Plan
Amendment for proposed Commercial Nodes; PLN180024-ZA;
PLN180024-ZC1; PLN180024-ZC2; PLN180024-ZC3; PLN180024-
GPA; PLN180024-ZC4**

Dear Members of the San Benito County Planning Commission:

This office represents Preserve our Rural Communities (PORC), an incorporated nonprofit 501(c)(4) organization comprising San Benito, Monterey, and Santa Cruz County residents dedicated to protecting the rural character of the region from wasteful, poorly planned, industrial and urban development of agricultural and rural lands. On its behalf, we ask that you consider the following points with respect to the four “commercial node” entitlement approvals referenced above that are now pending before you. These approvals together create a new Regional Commercial (C-3) zoning classification, and simultaneously reclassify the four commercial node areas in question (Betabel, SR 129/Searle Road, Rocks Ranch, and Livestock 101¹) into the new C-3 district.

As explained below, the County’s proposed reliance on addendums to an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) certified in 2015 for the San Benito County 2035 General Plan is impermissible under the California Environmental Quality Act

¹ The entitlements include a proposed General Plan amendment for the 101 Livestock commercial node that is a corrective action precedent to approving the zoning changes proposed at that node. The issues raised in this letter apply equally to the proposed General Plan amendment.

(CEQA), Public Resources Code § 21000 et seq. The decision to prepare addendums to the previously certified General Plan EIR, rather than prepare a subsequent or supplemental EIR, is based on an assertion that all potentially significant, foreseeable environmental impacts associated with the zoning reclassifications were previously disclosed, evaluated, and mitigated in the earlier EIR. This assertion is inaccurate. The 2015 EIR was a Program-level EIR that necessarily evaluated in broad, generalized terms under different buildout scenarios. The 2015 EIR could not and did not evaluate impacts associated with buildout of actual regional commercial development proposals at the four commercial node locations, which now include specific parcels and land areas that were never identified in the earlier EIR.

The addendums state that no development project applications have been submitted, and that additional CEQA review will occur later when this occurs. While future environmental review will undoubtedly be necessary, the fact remains that the new C-3 zoning classification contains concrete, objective development standards that specify building heights, density, square footage, lot coverage, and parking requirements. Potential traffic, air quality, biological resources and other impacts resulting from buildout consistent with these development standards are reasonably foreseeable and therefore must be evaluated in a CEQA document. Furthermore, the record shows there are in fact specific development proposals planned for at least a subset of the commercial node areas, and that the proposed zoning changes are a necessary first step towards the entitlement of those proposals. Under these circumstances, reliance on mere addendums to the 2015 General Plan EIR would constitute improper project piecemealing in violation of CEQA.

The County Should Prepare a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR

Under Public Resources Code section 21166, a lead agency must prepare a subsequent or supplemental EIR where one or more of the following events occurs:

- (a) substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the environmental impact report;
- (b) substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is being undertaken which will require major revisions in the environmental impact report; or
- (c) new information, which was not known and could not have been known at the time the environmental impact report was certified as complete, becomes available. *See also* CEQA Guidelines, 15 C.C.R. §§ 15162, 15163.

By contrast, the agency may prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR only when “some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in [Public Resources Code section 21166 or Guidelines, sections 15162] gave occurred.” Guidelines, § 15164(a). Thus, the touchstone for evaluating whether a subsequent EIR is required or whether a mere addendum is permissible is whether and to what extent reasonably foreseeable direct and indirect environmental impacts of a project were actually evaluated in an earlier EIR.

County staff here assert that “Environmental effects resulting from implementation of the San Benito County 2035 General Plan were studied in the Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report San Benito County 2035 General Plan, State Clearinghouse No. 2011111016, certified by the San Benito County Board of Supervisors on July 21, 2015.” Each commercial node addendum correspondingly asserts that it “reviews the proposed project and examines whether, as a result of the proposed project or new information, any new or worsened impacts could occur that were not identified in the General Plan EIR. Because the proposed project is implementation of General Plan policy, the prime consideration is consistency with the General Plan, particularly in terms of how much development was assumed in the General Plan relative to how much development would be allowed under the proposed project.” Underline added.

By focusing on the zoning classifications’ facial consistency with the General Plan and the overall development envisioned at buildout, the four addenda fail to acknowledge the potential site-specific impacts that are likely to occur at the four node locations but that were never identified or disclosed in the General Plan EIR. To the contrary, the General Plan simply established Policy LU 5.3 to “encourage new neighborhood Commercial Regional (CR) nodes to be located at or near existing or future highway interchanges, major intersections, and along existing or future transit facilities,” and then identified CR node areas with red dots that do not identify the actual parcels or land areas affected. The General Plan EIR, meanwhile, identifies in pertinent part land use impact LU-1 (physically divide an established community), and traffic impacts TC-1 (conflict with an applicable traffic management plan), TC-2 (change air traffic patterns), and TC-3 (increase hazards due to design features). There is no disclosure of which parcels would be included in the CR designation, nor any analysis of trips or vehicle miles traveled (VMT) generated by the specific mix and intensity of commercial uses proposed at the node locations.

Although it estimated that as much as 4,390,000 square feet *could* be developed in all areas classified Regional Commercial, the General Plan and EIR do not state how much, or what category of commercial development would occur in each node area. The addenda assert that “capacity for all types of development would be about 943,000 square feet, or about 22 percent of the possible square footage allowed by

the General Plan development parameters. Total site area is about 326.5 acres; however, the proposed C-3 District regulations provide a total development number, rather than relying on a floor to area ratio. Therefore, although total site area exceeds the 126 acres anticipated in the General Plan EIR, total development capacity would be significantly less than the potential 4,390,000 square feet that the General Plan EIR accounted for.”

Even if the C-3 District development standards provide for fewer square feet of development than assumed in the General Plan and its EIR, this does not equate to a proportionally reduced environmental impact. Needless to say, each node area is different in terms of its stock of potentially impacted resources, its roadway and other utilities infrastructure, and its potential to generate additional vehicle trips and VMT. Furthermore, parcels have been added to the nodes since the 2015 EIR was certified, such that the allowable development is likely greater, with correspondingly greater environmental impacts.

In *City of Carmel-by-the-Sea v. Board of Supervisors* (1986) 183 Cal.App.3d 229, the court observed that when a project is a zoning amendment, few if any direct physical changes will exist. However, the court held that this does not relieve an agency from its duty to evaluate reasonably foreseeable indirect physical changes that might occur. *Id.* at p. 250 (evaluating environmental consequences of rezoning involves a focus on secondary effects). In so holding, the court rejected a developer’s argument that the zoning amendment merely brought the zoning code into conformity with a local land use plan, and “by itself made no new or expanded commitment to the use of the property,” pointedly noting that at the time the zoning change was brought before the agency for approval, “it became evident that development was planned on the [subject] property, for which the rezoning was the first step.” *Id.* at 243. The situation is plainly analogous, as the County is well aware of specific development proposals planned for the commercial node locations, for which the C-3 zoning classifications are “the first step.”

It is true the addenda acknowledge that “[a]dditional project-level environmental review will be required for development projects when applications for those projects are processed.” They do not, however, specify what form that project-level environmental review will take. The concern is that the County and/or individual developers will likewise invoke Section 15183 of the CEQA Guidelines to claim that because a specific project is consistent both with the General Plan’s land use designations approved in 2015, as well as with the zoning changes approved now, no further environmental review is required unless the public can show impacts that are peculiar or specific to a given parcel. This improperly places the burden of environmental impact investigation and disclosure on the public and is inconsistent with CEQA’s mandates.

Here, the identification of specific development standards in the proposed C-3 zoning classification, and the County's awareness of specific development proposals for the commercial nodes constitute "substantial changes" in both the project and its circumstances that will require major revisions in the 2015 EIR certified for the General Plan. It also constitutes new information that could not have been known at the time the 2015 EIR was certified. Furthermore, the Resources Agency's guidelines for implementing SB 743 require CEQA analysis to evaluate traffic impacts in terms of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in lieu of congestion levels at intersections expressed as level of service (LOS) impacts. In addition, there apparently is evidence of protected tribal resources within the boundaries of one or more of the commercial nodes. This likewise constitutes significant new information triggering a duty to prepare a subsequent EIR.

Finally, as the addenda acknowledge, since the General Plan EIR was certified, amendments to the CEQA Guidelines have been adopted by the state, including changes requiring analysis of traffic impacts in terms of VMT rather than LOS, and the addition of wildfire, energy, and new, expanded, or relocated natural gas, electric power, and telecommunications facilities as separate topics to address. These amendments themselves constitute new or changed circumstances triggering preparation of a subsequent EIR.

The County Should Avoid Improperly "Piecemealing" the Commercial Node Approvals.

Under CEQA, the term "project" refers to the whole of an action and to the underlying activity being approved, not simply to each governmental approval. Guidelines, §15378(a), (c)–(d); *Poet, LLC v State Air Resources Bd.* (2017) 12 Cal.App.5th 52, 73. This definition ensures that the action reviewed under CEQA is not the approval itself viewed in isolation, but the actual development or other activities that will result from the approval. Although an agency's legislative adoption of a truly plan-level document, such as a General Plan, can constitute a complete project under CEQA, when a project can be described as a development proposal subject to several governmental approvals, rather than as only an ordinance or regulation, the project must be described as a development proposal for the purpose of environmental analysis. 14 Cal Code Regs §15378(d).

Here, the "project(s)" for CEQA purposes comprise the commercial development proposals for the four commercial nodes that the County is already well aware of. In some cases, specific commercial use mixes and "themes" have been identified and are being pursued by landowners or developers. Under these circumstances, the County has a duty to assess all reasonably foreseeable impacts

from these proposals now, before approving the proposed zoning changes that are the “first step” towards their ultimate entitlement.

Conclusion

For these reasons, we respectfully request that the Planning Commission DECLINE to recommend approval of the zone changes discussed above until such time as a subsequent or supplemental EIR has been prepared.

Thank you for your consideration of these concerns.

Most sincerely,

M. R. WOLFE & ASSOCIATES, P.C

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'M Wolfe', with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

Mark R. Wolfe

MRW:sa

cc: Janet Slibsager, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Planning Commissioners

San Benito County Planning Commission

101 Livestock Rezoning

May 15, 2019

My name is Kelly and I live off Ricardo Dr. My road dead ends into Cole Road at the southern end of 101 Livestock. I have several concerns about adding 101 Livestock to the proposed "highway 101 nodes". Obviously I have concerns about the water that would be consumed on such a big development. 101 Livestock has some decent sized hills. By rezoning all of this land you will be opening up the likely hood of future developers leveling out the hills to make it compatible to development.

Cole Road is barely over 17 feet wide. The road itself is in horrendous condition. Gigantic potholes span from Ricardo Dr to Anzar Rd. They are speaking of diverting northbound traffic on highway 101 off onto San Juan Road to Cole Road for entrance into this future development. People realize how dangerous it will be for northbound traffic to make a u-turn at Cannon Road to access this new development, however it is just as dangerous to divert all this traffic onto Cole Road. This is a small rural county road that has a lot of foot traffic and animal traffic. There is a lady who rides her horse attached to a carriage on a regular basis. She rides to the end of Cole and turns around and comes back. There are numerous people who walk their dogs and ride horses too. Also the brave bicyclists who can handle the brutality of this road.

The road is narrow and we often have to slow down to a crawl when two vehicles approach each other. When you come to the end of Ricardo Drive there are several huge trees that completely block your view of Cole. Our STOP sign has been taken out on several occasions

from being hit by vehicles. By allowing development on this property and diverting the traffic onto this road you will be creating many future accidents for the people who live here. Having gigantic delivery trucks use this route will inevitably cause multiple accidents.

Also to mention San Juan Road is a fairly busy road. It will now be a lot harder to make a left onto San Juan Road with the huge increase of traffic this development will bring. Does the County plan on putting in a stop light there so people can safely make a left hand onto San Juan from Cole? Does the County also plan on widening the road to at least 25 feet from Ricardo Dr to the "new entrance" of 101 Livestock?

Since the opening of San Juan Road many commuters now use Anzar Road and Cole Road as a shortcut to get off the heavily congested 101. Needless to say these people are not locals and they have no clue how to drive on these back rural roads. They speed thru our roads and get highly agitated and aggressive when they have to slow down for someone hauling a horse trailer or backing a trailer onto their property. When it rains the roads get even more dangerous. At the bottom of 101 Livestock with this "new road" they just recently put in the rain causes flooding onto parts of the road until it gets to the ditch to drain away. Cole Road is a dangerous road for light traffic, imagine how bad it will be for moderate to heavy traffic. There just isn't the width capacity on this road. I can say for certain that if locals get into accidents due to this development that they will be suing the county of San Benito as well as the owner of the property for gross negligence. This road is not designed for moderate traffic.

I understand that the County needs revenues and the residents are willing to help come up with "legitimate " ideas and uses that don't endanger our way of life. 101 Livestock WAS NOT part of the original "nodes". Highway 156 was suppose to be, however the representative is San

Juan Bautista had it removed. Why? The exit off highway 101 is a safe exit making this an excellent choice for development and not to mention the open FLAT land it also has.

Rezoning 101 Livestock property is extremely negligent. There is no safe on/off exit and the majority of the land is BIG rolling hills. There is also the problem of added noise and light pollution to this rural community. Obviously you realize how far sound travels in the country??? A lot of people have moved here from Silicon Valley to have a peaceful way of life. Many of us still commute to Silicon Valley to work. We didn't move here because we couldn't afford Silicon Valley but because we could no longer tolerate the fast paced life style. We sacrifice a lot to live here with the horrible commute, however what you come home to and the peace and serenity all make it worthwhile. Now the county wants to take that away from the local residents.

There is talk of putting a motel onto 101 Livestock....are you kidding????? Who will this serve? Not the locals!!!! Will the money this revenue bring in be spent in Aromas to better our lives? I highly doubt it. It has been verified by the Aromas Water District that the owner of 101 Livestock, Jim Warren, was stealing water from the district for years. This is obviously not an honest or trustworthy person. There is also mention of truck/motorists destinations. Once again, noise, traffic and light pollution will have a HUGE impact on our way of life.

Aromas is also one of the ONLY towns in California not faced with a homeless crisis. Why is that? The only reason why we don't have tents and people living off the side of the road is because there is nothing for them. If you allow commercial development o to 101 Livestock the homeless people will come here in large groups and live in the Eucalyptus Grove that borders the ENTIRE north end of 101 Livestock. They will now have a place to panhandle and get food. They will also be having fires in the Eucalyptus Grove to stay warm. Think about that.....homeless camps in the Eucalyptus Grove. The homeless use open flames to cook their

food. There is an abundance of leaves and twigs found in the area that makes cooking with open flames a highly dangerous scenario.

San Benito County will become the next "Paradise ". Its only a matter of when, not if, that Aromas will become one of California's next big wildfire statistic if you allow commercial development of 101 Livestock. The County will be 100 percent to blame for allowing the development of 101 Livestock. The County is aware of the homeless crisis in California. The County is also aware of the habits of the homeless people and how they set up encampments in the woods. The Eucalyptus Grove is a tinder box just waiting for a match. Cannon Road is a long winding road that only has access from highway 101 or Anzar Road. If a fire were to ever break out in the Eucalyptus Grove sadly most residents will not make it out alive.

There are many VALID reasons why San Benito County should not rezone 101 Livestock. If the county wants to put a motel there than they should build it where there are already existing structures. The county should also maintain the way it is for entering/exiting off highway 101 . Just because there is land along the freeway doesn't make it a viable reason for development. 101 Livestock is way to hilly and dangerous for development.

It is the job of the County to PROTECT its residents and to seriously consider all the negative consequences that development of this land will bring. Please don't let "potential revenue" be the reason for destroying our way of life and quite possibly destroying human life. We would love to help the county find creative and successful ways to bring in revenue but rezoning 101 Livestock is a very negligent move for the County. Thank you for reading this.

Sincerely,

Kelly Force



SAN BENITO COUNTY
PLANNING & BUILDING

Preserve Our Rural Communities

<https://www.thepetitionsite.com/773/902/748/preserve-our-rural-communities/>

Author: Preserve Our Rural Communities

Recipient: San Benito County ~~residents~~ *Planning Commission & Supervisors*

Petition:

San Benito County may rezone 16 rural/agricultural locations ("nodes") to allow commercial development. The first 4 "nodes" are on Hwy. 101 (near Aromas and San Juan Bautista) and could be rezoned to allow hotels, gas stations, etc. The Planning Commission is expected to vote to rezone Hwy. 101 "nodes" on April 17.

The 16 commercial "nodes" are identified as colored dots (red, pink or candy striped) in the General Plan map below. Besides Hwy. 101, the other nodes are located on Hwy. 156 and Hwy. 25 (near Ridgemark, Tres Pinos and Paicines). The acreage of each node is undefined. Some nodes on Hwy. 101 are over 250 acres.

We demand that the Supervisors conduct the following studies, and carefully weigh the impacts, before deciding whether or not to rezone:

1. Study the impact of these commercial "nodes" on our water, sewage, roads, traffic and environment.
2. Study the economic impact of these commercial "nodes" on existing local businesses and adjacent "nodes".

The County is endangering our quality of life by ignoring good land use planning practices. They are rushing to rezone valuable agricultural and rural land before completing adequate impact analyses.

(This petition is for residents INSIDE San Benito County. Please provide your street name & town to help Supervisors see the number of folks from their district.)

	Name	From	Comments
1.	Amy Austin	Aromas, CA	
2.	Dan Austin	Aromas, CA	
3.	Sara Owen	Prunedale, CA	
4.	Coleen Garrity	watsonville, CA	
5.	Kelly Force	Aromas, CA	
6.	Todd Cushman	Aromas, CA	
7.	Sabrina Carrillo	Prunedale, CA	The Supervisors are voted in. If they rezone or trybto rezone, VOTE THEM OUT! How dare they.
8.	Erin Bane	Saratoga, CA	I moved here to be away from the congestion of Silicon Valley and to enjoy the beautiful hillsides and rangelands here. I pay hefty taxes to enjoy this beautiful area and want the area to stay rural. The area is already more congested than it was even two years ago. The impact that these construction sites will have on our water, sewage, and traffic, not to mention the wildlife, I understand has not been studied yet. That is a must!!!
9.	Charla Allen	Aromas, CA	Our area is already plagued with major traffic issues as well as water supply issues. Having more and more people coming on and off the highway will impact the traffic disaster that already exists on the weekend. There are already water issues with wells being not deemed as drinkable as well as communities in San Juan already tying into Aromas water. Having a hotel tie into our water supply will affect supply greatly. There is no reason for us to have a hotel when there are several just 10 min up the road. The community is not asking for this, nor do we need it. I live on one of the side roads and when traffic backs up, they use our road as a highway detour and treat it as such going excessive speeds. Our road is in shambles as it is and it's just getting worse. The county needs to take care of its own residents first before worrying about passerby people. Not to mention many move to the country for a reason, to get away from people and then your going to plant them right in our back yards! Not to mention the light pollution that goes with huge hotels, gas stations, and shopping malls. These big developers just come in, promise money and big revenues, then leave the residents to deal with any aftermath that the county could care less about because they got their \$ and someone got paid through the back door to get it put through. All boils down to greed and \$\$\$
10.	Amber Scribner	San Juan Bautista, CA	I live by one of the impacted areas (129) and our back Rds can not handle the extra impact of people now trying to bypass the freeway to get around traffic. We have had big rigs come down Merrill rd, Anzar rd and jackknife. They are one lane and have tight 90deg bends in them.

	Name	From	Comments
11.	Robert Robe	Aromas, CA	The locals and the travelers do not need any more restaurants, hotels, shops, gas stations or more traffic, trash, water use, light pollution in these areas. The county can get revenue from the 152 and Airport District.
12.	Rachel Wohlander	Aromas, CA	
13.	Katie Smith	San Juan Bautista, CA	
14.	Julie Russo	Prunedale, CA	Too much growth in our area already.
15.	Barbara Rubio	Hollister, CA	
16.	Sandi Austin	Aromas, CA	This directly affects my quality of life and the life of our rural flora and fauna.
17.	Steve Smith	Prunedale, CA	Already to many people in the area
18.	Ruth Snow	Aromas, CA	Where will the water source be allocated from in an already overdrated area? Secondly, A large developement, at 129 and 101, across from the Anzar High is in opposition to the Quality of Security and Safety to the Students for which is highly due to the isolated location of the school, and why they send their childern there in the first place over Watsonville or Hollister. Currently because of the isolation, parents know that their children are extremely less subject to "transient riff-raff" or accosted outside the protection of the school yard! Thank you
19.	S Davidson	Salinas, CA	We do not have the water to support this kind of development. That is the bottom line there is only so much in the water table. Wells all over the area are either out of water or the well failed testing. This seems like greed and the locals will pay the ultimate price..
20.	Sandy Patterson-Jamarck	Hollister, CA	Keep our area rural. Stop doing this for the impact fees.
21.	Ed Gluhan	Aromas, CA	
22.	jamie grossen	salinas, CA	we dont need hotels and gas stations
23.	Paula Glass	Prunedale, CA	
24.	Gloria Drake	Aromas, CA	Traffic already unbearable
25.	Tamara Turner	Prunedale, CA	
26.	Jan Saxton	Aromas, CA	
27.	stephen johnson	aromas, CA	I understand that SB County is desperate for sale and bed tax revenues. And I also thought that the California Environmental Quality Act CEQA requires that any development be studied and quantified before any action can be taken. We can demand that alternative projects also be studied and if they are not we have leverage to challenge the project. Lets make sure we know the rule and make them follow them. And the last resort is to sue them. This is a good start

	Name	From	Comments
28.	Frederick Duke	Salinas, CA	Because its Gods Country..
29.	Beth Roybal	Aromas, CA	I understand the need for economic development and more job opportunities for SBC residents. The types of commercial ventures most likely to arise in the areas being considered won't really serve that function and will take prime land out of agricultural use. Why not take the lead in trying to identify novel ways to "grow" SBC while still allowing our rural uniqueness to flourish?
30.	Toni Mackenzie	Aromas, CA	Property value Environmental impact Ensure government leaders are being held accountable and can be trusted to follow ethical city/government processes.
31.	Deborah Howey	Aromas, CA	traffic! water! road conditions and wayz around 101 that are impacting our rural life we love. we do not need hotels there are at least within 5-8 miles in either dorection and you cannot tell me they are full and used! what about wastewater/toilet, no mention there. water and traffic are major isseues to our community! i say NO! we do not need this, our community DOES NOT NEED THIS. tyr to get off fwy 101 to go to Monterey on week-end!!!! get real and forget this nonsense! go somewhere else.
32.	Joshua Allen	Aromas, CA	This is where I live. I like where I live. It is quiet and rural. The businesses this rezoning will invite to our community will tax our water supply, increase unwanted traffic on our already shabby county roads. I believe environmental and economic impact studies are a must and should be completed before and plans are approved.
33.	Alice Henault	Prunedale, CA	Traffic is already an issue. Water is an issue.
34.	Carrie Coe	San Juan Bautista, CA	Want to preserve rural communities
35.	Evelyn Rodriguez	Aromas, CA	
36.	Amanda Monteiro	Watsonville, CA	This is near a rural community, Residents of this area moved here to be away from city and businesses, we will have no rural areas left if we are constantly building cement jungles. There is plenty of city in salinas and gilroy both 20 minutes away from this building site going north or south
37.	Paul Skelton	San Juan bautista, CA	
38.	Andrea Balestrieri	San Juan Bautista, CA	We live here to enjoy the area as is. Such immediate increased growth, in addition to the new housing developments, will permanently damage and change area. If the new housing is a propelling reason, then the developers should have considered a more " city" area. Those of us here are quite happy with our small town environment.
39.	Elizabeth Grajeda	Aromas, CA	We need the county to actually plan development, we need EIRs, traffic reports, and complete groundwater reports.

	Name	From	Comments
40.	Jacob Sanderson	Salinas, CA	We don't need no more bay area libtards moving to our area. Traffic is bad and they don't know how to drive.
41.	C Keeler	Aromas, CA	Keep America green! Avoid new trash producing sites at all costs!
42.	Yesenia Leon	San juan bautista, CA	Why not work on expanding the freeway so that there are not so many traffic jams? This will surely increase traffic and not to mention they impact it will create on our small town atmosphere
43.	Sean Crawford	Prunedale, CA	
44.	Amy Orozco	Salinas, CA	
45.	Suzanne Cottle-Gavalla	Salinas, CA	1. There isn't enough water to support this 2. Traffic is already bad enough 3. Hwy 101 needs to be widened to support what traffic we already have. 3. We live in a rural area for a reason. 4. There are enough hotels in Salinas and Gilroy that we do not need more in between
46.	Barbara Sullivan	Aromas, CA	The needs of the many outweigh the greed of the few.
47.	Luis Cornejo	Salinas, CA	
48.	James Crick	Aromas, CA	Not enough water to support these places.
49.	Matjaz Bratus	Ljubljana, si	
50.	Allexus Quarante	Prunedale, CA	Traffic congestion as our two lane freeway is already at capacity. Water quality and wells affected by this. Agriculture land must stay agricultural land! It has been zoned that for a reason! Environmental impact! Traffic is already bad enough! Hwy 101 needs to be widened to support what traffic we already have. I chose to move and buy a home here because it's rural and not live in the overcrowded Bay Area! We live in a rural area for a reason. There are enough hotels in Salinas and Gilroy that we do not need more in between. We don't need the gangs, prostitution, transients, and drugs that come from adding hotels, truck stops, and businesses here. This will forever change our way of living and I do not want that! I do not want to have to worry about my safety 24/7 because of what this will bring! I don't want to have to worry about being robbed or shot at because of the wrong crowds of people this will bring to our rural life! I say NO to this! We do not need this, our community DOES NOT NEED THIS! Our wildlife DOES NOT NEED THIS! If you do not stop this then you better buy my home from me at three times its value and pay to move all my stuff because I moved here for the rural life and you will be taking that away from me! All of your studies are extremely outdated and over 10 years old. These studies are no longer valid! You need 2019 studies and you would see the detrimental impact you will cause if you allow this to proceed!! Say NO! We will NOT allow these developments!

	Name	From	Comments
51.	m smithurst	Morden, gb	
52.	June Ely	Aromas, CA	There isn't enough water to support these developments. Traffic is already bad enough in our beautiful rural area. Highway 101 needs to be widened to support what traffic we already have. There are plenty hotels in Salinas and Gilroy that we do not need more in between. The residents of our area don't want more of this unnecessary growth - let the existing cities grow if they so choose, let our rural areas survive.
53.	Leora Worthington	Salinas, CA	
54.	Patricia Naranjo	Aromas, CA	
55.	Cathy Paladini	salinas, CA	There is not enough water to support these new developments. I'm a local resident on a private well & we are aware of the water issues & current ground water sustainability issues facing our communities z
56.	Jennifer Johnson	Aromas, CA	
57.	Janice Roediger	Aromas, CA	Congestion
58.	Kareen Lindstrom	San Juan Bautista, CA	Rural history!
59.	Donna Barnett	Aromas, CA	
60.	Gina Capps	Prunedale, CA	
61.	Susan Hagio	Prunedale, CA	
62.	Kelly Campos	Aromas, CA	
63.	Debbie Quaresma	Aromas, CA	
64.	Jacob M	Aromas, CA	We do not want more pollution, traffic, and noise in our rural community.
65.	Mary Isaksen	San Juan Bautista, CA	It should be important to anyone who values places where 'progress' hasn't completely destroyed natural beauty and who choose to live in harmony with nature or near agriculture. It's about quality of life with less pollution and crowding, more connections with people and places.
66.	Michelle Noble McCain	Aromas, CA	This plan is perpetuates the urban spawl that has ruined many areas. Development should be concentrated in or adjacent to cities and towns where services can be provided. The County should enter into revenue sharing plans with incorporated areas to do its development planning. Leave the rural area rural!
67.	T Johnstone	Aromas, CA	I am very concerned about the environmental impact of these projects.
68.	nick robley	manchester, gb	
69.	Jessica Wohlander	Aromas, CA	

	Name	From	Comments
70.	Laurie Bronnar	Aromas, CA	This is a drastic change in zoning from rural to commercial. The sites are closer to Aromas, than any towns in San Benito County. The impacts of adding major developments here have not been considered, especially water, sewage, traffic, crime, and fire. Why doesn't San Benito County build along 152 or put in a big hotel near the Pinnacles or their wine region? Wouldn't that bring additional dollars into their region?
71.	Jim Osttick	San Juan Bautista, CA	Whoa, pump the brakes, slow down and do this right. We already have too many developments being approved before proper studies are done and the will of the people is considered. Is there a case to be made for these projects? Let's hear it. Don't ram it down our throats without public debate and transparent justification.
72.	DOUG DOTY	Aromas, CA	The folks running the county and city of Hollister ruined it by bringing in more and more developement. When they began developing, we moved to Aromas. Over the past 30 years, I have watched as Cal Trans and the various counties have assaulted our way of life via more and more development. Our roads are impacted by the added traffic. They are already not maintained and are now being used as hwy bypasses, complete with hwy speeds in residential areas. More developement will lead to more traffic. We already have issues with inadequate and/or polluted water. Many wells have failed, are failing or polluted. Additional developement will require water. Where will it come from? Our supply is clearly way over taxed now. The area being proposed for rezoning and consequently for developement is a migration corridor for wildlife. What are they supposed to do? I live in a neighborhood in Aromas where we clearly see the impacts to wildlife. Lots of collissions between wildlife, human and domestic animals. We see coyotes, cougars, etc... In our neighborhoods. They are being squeezed out of open land, which is critical to their survival. Additinal developement will inevitably result in more collissions, which not only endanger people, but the wildlife as well. I was born and raised in "The Valley of the Hearts Desire", a farming community with open space, now known as silicone valley. I left there years ago when it changed. I left Hollister when it chaged. Im not interested in the way of life these changes will bring. Clearly the county want the land developed to fill the cofers to build the new jail that will be leased to the city of hollister. Look dont ask us to suffer the consequences of Hollisters need for yet another new jail. Build your hotels, etc on county land ajacent to the city and leave us alone.
73.	Shannon Shaffer	Aromas, CA	
74.	Joeann Vaughn galvan	Hollister, CA	I grew up in a rural comunity, my sister is raising her babies in a rural community.

	Name	From	Comments
75.	Velma Hawkins	Aromas, CA	
76.	Elysa Olivares	San Juan Bautista, CA	I think it's important to keep
77.	Ralph Dominguez	Hollister, CA	
78.	Lara Livingston	Aromas, CA	How can they add anything when there is constant traffic and worries about water? We have been told not even a coffee shop can go in on The San Benito side of Aromas because we don't have a sewer system. So how can the area serve large development? You need to answer are questions before anything is started.
79.	Jared brusa	Prunedale, CA	This is not Salinas
80.	Andy Hsia-Coron	Aromas, CA	Developing these so called nodes along 101 will fundamentally alter this beautiful area with very little benefit to our area and our county. It is time that San Benito County develop an intelligent plan for development not based on sprawl. These areas are all ecologically sensitive and their development will only bring us ugliness and traffic.
81.	Mindi Poland	Aromas, CA	
82.	Carol Millwood	Aromas, CA	
83.	Richard Lee	Salinas, CA	
84.	Melinda Scherr	San Juan Bautista, CA	Our environment and rural way of life is already encumbered by excessive traffic, especially along Hwy 101. Keep our lovely area rural!!!
85.	Toniann Schultz	Aromas, CA	If these "nodes" are approved on April 17 and construction ensues on commercial projects without an impact statement from the Supervisors we will all live with the diminishing quality of life.
86.	JP Pawloski	Watsonville, CA	The 129 site is ON the San Andreas fault. Increased traffic for the high school also big agricultural trucking on a narrow 2 lane road. NO water.
87.	Yolanda McIntosh	Aromas, CA	We love our rural areas
88.	Terry Edwards	San Juan Bautista, CA	Let's not make more traffic.
89.	B Smith	San Juan Bautista, CA	
90.	Susan Maresco	Aromas, CA	Maintaining the natural appearance and agricultural land without commercial development is the very reason many of us live here. San Benito County Board of Supervisors, etc needs to change its thinking about their tax base and the effects of their ideas and acts on the communities they serve.
91.	Ester Giron	Aromas, CA	
92.	Sally Diggory	Aromas, CA	

	Name	From	Comments
93.	Riley Scherr	San Juan Bautista, CA	I want to preserve my rural community.
94.	Stephen Scherr	San Juan Bautista, CA	There are plenty of truck stops and hotels in Gilroy and Salinas. I do not want the rural landscape of my neighborhood to change to accommodate businesses we do not need.
95.	Elizabeth Donnelly	Aromas, CA	Major concerns re: increased traffic and water use.
96.	Anita Kane	Hollister, CA	No fast-tracking of development. The area in question is culturally & environmentally sensitive. Follow good planning strategies- once developed you can't go back.
97.	Brisn Kerbs	Aromas, CA	
98.	Kathleen Farley	Watsonville, CA	
99.	DeJa Reed	Austin, TX	
100.	William McGuire	Aromas, CA	I have seen the effects of hap-hazard developments that failed and left ugly scars on the neighborhoods where they were allowed without input from the residents that lived there, these proposals aren't being considered as a need by the residents that live in the areas that will be affected - please,,,,, no more commercial leap-frog developments
101.	Sarah Jarvis	Aromas, CA	Traffic control
102.	Brittani Hensley	Watsonville, CA	Theres already too much traffic on that highway and your just going to make it worse on top of ruining good views of nature to stores. And push coyotes and other animals farther away from their natural habitat and into our communities....
103.	Amy Green	San Juan Bautista, CA	Living in the country and having the peace it brings is why people move here, adding in traffic and more people makes it loose it's appe and spark. The roads aren't made for this much traffic
104.	Mandisa Snodey	San Juan Bautista, CA	
105.	Mary June Silva	Aromas, CA	
106.	Jackie Morris-Lopez	San Juan Bautista, CA	Is one of the most beautiful counties in California. Concerned with too much housing growth in Hollister and San Juan Bautista and this adds further insult to injury. I do not want to see our country side look like San Jose - to Morgan Hill Hwy 101 stretch of commercial building.
107.	Laura Malven	Aromas, CA	
108.	Thomas Karis	Aromas, CA	Rezoning to C3 without ensuring that a permit application for the allowed uses will lead to developer lawsuits against the county if a permit is denied to to lack of water, sewage capacity, wildlife, or traffic impact. The availability of these items must be verified before the rezoning.
109.	Frank Barron	Santa Cruz, CA	

	Name	From	Comments
110.	Irvin W Fegley	San Juan Bautista, CA	If California's agricultural and rural history is lost, it' will be gone forever- never to be recovered.
111.	Patricia Matejcek	Freedom, CA	San Benito county's agricultural lands, history, flora & fauna must not be sacrificed to sprawl. Importing water isn't sustainable + taxes and fees never cover the costs of development and employees.
112.	Sheila Smith	Salinas, CA	Water and other environmental concerns, as well as traffic.
113.	Mary Sue McClellan-Samuel	Aromas, CA	I don't want to lose our rural community.
114.	Regina Webb	Royal oaks, CA	This is where I was born and raised. I love living in the country without the worry of traffic and dealing with a bunch of people. This development would ruin that! And there is already enough development in surrounding areas. Why ruin the last piece of nature left?
115.	April Jimenez	Aromas, CA	
116.	sabine Atwell	Salinas, CA	
117.	Debra Ann Morse	Aromas, CA	
118.	Kathleen Wershiner	Aromas, CA	More pollution noise traffic what wild animals we do have here be taken away
119.	Angela Firpo	San Juan Bautista, CA	Traffic and keeping the beauty of the countryside.
120.	jill kayne	Aromas, CA	
121.	Gaye Ragan	Prunedale, CA	Open spaces and rural areas are beneficial for human wellbeing.
122.	Jennifer Galindo-Cole	San Juan Bautista, CA	I have been a resident of San Benito County my entire life. My family has been in agricultural family for over 50 years. I love our rural area. I have watched it grow with new homes yet the roads and infrastructure's are neglected. I think we need to take care of what we have now and not build new businesses/homes until we take care of the residents we have
123.	Meredith den Daas	Aromas, CA	
124.	Kimberly Jones	Aromas, tc	I love our rural area. Lived here since 1972 and 2 generations of kids attended school here.
125.	Beatrice Echols	Aromas, CA	
126.	Julie Brusa	Prunedale, CA	Lack of water for these companies, impact on wildlife, change of climate in our area and traffic.
127.	Shary Greene	Aromas, CA	
128.	Argelia Juarez	Aromas, CA	
129.	Nicky Hartman	Aromas, CA	
130.	Connie Bishop-Camuso	San Juan Bautista, CA	It's why I live here!!

	Name	From	Comments
131.	Bridget Jewell	AROMAS, CA	We live here to get away from development and don't want our area turned into a developed city.
132.	Steve Zorra	Aromas, CA	I recently moved to Ricardo and Cole. This greatly effects me and my family.
133.	Polly Goldman	San Juan Bautista, CA	Preservation of prime farmland and keeping water use to a sustainable level are more important than having a couple more places to shop.
134.	Cara Vonk	San Juan Bautista, CA	The Hwy 101/129 interchange development was floated once before with substantial local opposition. We are eroding the edges of our cultural landscape -- agricultural and rangelands. The beauty of the landscape belongs to all, including the motoring public. This is a gateway to the National Register Historic City of San Juan Bautista. The landscape sets the stage for a visitor's step back in time, providing an authentic experience in an historic 18th and 19th century community.
135.	Jason Lovell	Aromas, CA	
136.	James Leap	San Juan Bautista, CA	The proposed rezoning will have potentially significant environmental and "rural character" impacts that need to be very carefully considered moving forward.
137.	Lauren Blanchard	Aromas, CA	We live here to be away from all that this rezoning will create! We love the beauty of our landscape and changing this would be devastating not only to the people but our wildlife as well.
138.	Ana Fajnor	Aromas, CA	The traffic congestion, especially on weekends, is becoming intolerable on this stretch of 101, and I can only imagine how much more traffic there will be with additional businesses on this corridor. In addition, I am really concerned about water use and traveler pollution that will need to be disposed of in San Benito County if this development is allowed. Finally, any income from this development isn't likely to benefit San Benito County residents who sit at the western edge of the county. We will suffer all the potential pain and drop in property value and are unlikely to see any service improvements because we are a relatively small proportion of San Benito County's population. Please perform due diligence and perform the studies recommended in this petition before approving this development and potentially changing our way of life and the reason we purchased property and pay taxes in San Benito County. Thank you for your consideration.
139.	David Fajnor	Aromas, CA	Water concerns appear to already be well documented. With potential development taking place at the edge of San Benito County, will any/all tax revenues be directed to improving our roads, provide additional law enforcement, etc. in the Aromas area alone? We also don't need, or want, the additional litter produced by development along our roadsides.

	Name	From	Comments
140.	Michael Owens	Crestwood, au	Protect historic communities
141.	Candelaria Castañeda	San Juan Bautista, CA	Because I love to preserve all our wild life and trees. Also I don't want more traffic in our roads.
142.	Jane Rekedal	Aromas, CA	Increased traffic congestion along 101 and especially the new Cole Road interchange, limited water resources, noise and light pollution, and the sacrifice of wild lands habitat for wildlife.
143.	Georgina Swan	Aromas, CA	
144.	Lynette Driver	Aromas, CA	
145.	Kristy Burchard	Hollister, CA	To preserve the beautiful country side of California Central coast.
146.	Rhonda Perrotti	Hollister, CA	
147.	Travis Hill	Aromas, CA	Rezoning cannot allowed by the county until the proper Environmental Impact studies have been done. This is a legal matter, and failing to do so would put the county out of compliance with county and state law.
148.	Margaret B	Aromas, CA	The designation of "nodes" along 101 in San Benito County should have the intent of protecting those areas from over-development. I urge the Supervisors to consider protecting water quantity and quality, ensuring space and corridors for wildlife, and avoiding more traffic, and air, water and soil pollution.
149.	Felicia Britton	Aromas, CA	
150.	Paula and Roger Pittman	San Juan Bautista, CA	Traffic is already unbearable! The roads can't handle all the people, as it is! The quality of life expected, living rurally, has already been greatly diminished due to the traffic overload on our highways & local roads. It's insane to build more anything that brings in MORE TRAFFIC without FIRST widening 101 and 156 in all directions.
151.	Pedro Garibay	San Juan Bautista, CA	Too much traffic already! Also, preserve the beauty surrounding this area.
152.	Anna Egland-Sommer	San Juan Bautista, CA	San Jose used to be like our communities around here--farming, small towns and orchards. Now it's plastered from one end to the other with mindless development. It certainly started with "nodes" between those originally separate towns that seed the seeds for developing every last bit of open land in between them. That's exactly what will happen here if no one speaks up. There really isn't a great need for anything that could be put in those nodes--gas stations, hotels, mini marts that isn't available in San Juan, Gilroy, Hollister, Aromas just a few minutes down the road. There isn't a need, someone just wants to make money--the owners of the land, business owners and the county (taxes), so it's being pushed through somehow. There would be more lights taking away another dark, restful night sky--something that is becoming rare in California.

	Name	From	Comments
153.	Vernetta McGuire	AROMAS, CA	the water that would be involved with the nodes is just not available
154.	Margaret Hartman	Aromas, CA	
155.	Mistie Wilson	Prunedale, CA	I live along highway 101 and it's too congested as it is. The stretch along 101 has always been scenic and enjoyable, we have enough commercial businesses clogging our areas.
156.	Lauretta Avina	Hollister, CA	
157.	Alex Biondi	Aromas, CA	To preserve our agricultural lands, prevent urban sprawling. Reduce pollution, overpopulation and just overall preserve the beauty and integrity of our lands and habitats
158.	Shelby Jacobson	Aromas, CA	
159.	Lexie Hawkins	Aromas, CA	
160.	terrea hannah	Hollister, CA	
161.	mary anzar	aromas, CA	
162.	danii paolucci	terni, it	
163.	Kathryn McKenzie	Royal Oaks, CA	Instead of the proposed disastrous re-zoning, please consider income-generating activities that are already inline with the county's agricultural and cultural heritage, such as agritourism and ecotourism- some of the fastest growing sectors in the country. The residents of this community deserve to have all proper studies take place before any development or rezoning occurs, including studies on traffic, fiscal impact, environmental and cultural impact, and water usage. This area simply does not have the available water to sustain these developments.
164.	Rachel Wohlander	Aromas, CA	
165.	Chantal Thao	Royal Oaks, CA	Because traffic is already horrendous and these developments will create even more congestion and accidents.
166.	David Newberg	Aromas, CA	
167.	Mike Gidding	Aromas, CA	
168.	NORMA MEAD	aromas, CA	
169.	Elizabeth Hiserman	Gilroy, CA	
170.	Maria Parker	Aromas, CA	
171.	Bonny Seagraves	Aromas, CA	
172.	ken lang	Toronto, ca	I am buying a house in the proposed building area, and I don't think adding the businesses proposed in the plan would enhance the health and beauty of our community. I don't oppose development, it should just be done thoughtfully with long term effects considered in the process.
173.	Patricia Mendoza	Aromas, CA	

	Name	From	Comments
174.	Lori Abreu-Bennett	Aromas, CA	
175.	Nelson Samuels	Aromas, CA	It is our home. We don't want noise pollution and crime that come with commercial property.
176.	philippe trahin	clamecy, fr	
177.	Mary Hsia-Coron	AROMAS, CA	



SAN BENITO COUNTY
PLANNING & BUILDING

Preserve Our Rural Communities

<https://www.thepetitionsite.com/376/764/671/preserve-our-rural-communities-2/>

Author: Preserve Our Rural Communities

Recipient: San Benito County Supervisors & Planning Commission

Petition:

(This petition's for folks living outside of San Benito Co. Thanks for support!)

San Benito County may rezone 16 agricultural and rural sites ("nodes") to allow commercial development. The first 4 "nodes" are on Hwy. 101 (near Aromas and San Juan Bautista) and could be rezoned to allow hotels, gas stations, etc. The Planning Commission is expected to vote to rezone Hwy. 101 "nodes" on April 17.

The 16 commercial "nodes" are identified as colored dots (red, pink or candy striped) in the General Plan map, below. Besides Hwy. 101, the other nodes are located on Hwy. 156 and Hwy. 25 (near Ridgemark, Tres Pinos and Paicines). The acreage of each node is undefined. Some nodes on Hwy. 101 are over 250 acres.

We demand that the San Benito County Supervisors conduct the following studies, and carefully weigh the impacts, before deciding whether to rezone:

1. Study the impact of these commercial "nodes" on our water, sewage, roads, traffic and environment.
2. Study the economic impact of these commercial "nodes" on existing local businesses and adjacent "nodes".

The County is endangering our quality of life by ignoring good land use planning practices. They are rushing to rezone valuable agricultural and rural land to commercial zones

	Name	From	Comments
1.	Marian Cruz	Merced, CA	
2.	Marla Anderson	Royal Oaks, CA	I don't want to see non-stop urban development from San Jose to Salinas!!
3.	Amy Austin	Aromas, CA	
4.	Allexus Quarante	Prunedale, CA	<p>Traffic congestion as our two lane freeway is already past capacity. Water quality and wells affected by this. Agriculture land must stay agricultural land! It has been zoned that for a reason! Environmental impact! Traffic is already bad enough! Hwy 101 needs to be widened to support what traffic we already have. I chose to move and buy a home here because it's rural and not live in the overcrowded Bay Area! We live in a rural area for a reason. There are enough hotels in Salinas and Gilroy that we do not need more in between. We don't need the gangs, prostitution, transients, and drugs that come from adding hotels, truck stops, and businesses here. This will forever change our way of living and I do not want that! I do not want to have to worry about my safety 24/7 because of what this will bring! I don't want to have to worry about being robbed or shot at because of the wrong crowds of people this will bring to our rural life! I say NO to this! We do not need this, our community DOES NOT NEED THIS! Our wildlife DOES NOT NEED THIS! Our roads DO NOT NEED THIS! Our environment DOES NOT NEED THIS! If you do not stop this, then you better buy my home from me at three times it's value and pay to move all my stuff because I moved here for the rural life and you will be taking that away from me! All of your studies are extremely outdated and over 10 years old. These studies are no longer valid! You need 2019 studies and you would see the detrimental impact you will cause if you allow this to proceed!! Say NO! We will NOT allow these developments! If they want to develop then develop downtown Salinas! There are many available and abandoned buildings there! I say NO to the commercial development at/near hwy 101, 156 and 25! Listen to the voice of the people, the residents living at, near, and surrounding areas as we will all be affected by this. I drive through that area all the time and it's already terrible congestion and bumper to bumper traffic all day! Listen to us, NO we do not want this commercial developments!!! Stop these developers immediately and permanently!!</p>
5.	Sara Owen	Prunedale, CA	
6.	Lesley Noble	Royal oaks, CA	Over development, interference with nature, traffic, depleting our resources, changing the scenic undeveloped land....si much more.

	Name	From	Comments
7.	Melissa Beers	Aromas, CA	Traffic through and around this area is already terrible and existing water resources are limited. We don't need more urban sprawl.
8.	Gina Muhilly	San jose, CA	My family lives in Aromas
9.	DEWEY DUMOND	AROMAS, CA	Please preserve our rural community and the reason that we live here. Let San Jose over develop itself
10.	Cynthia San Miguel	San Jose, CA	
11.	Dr. J.C. Milrod	Prunedale, CA	
12.	Laurie Bronnar	Aromas, CA	I live less than a mile from this and was never notified. There is potential to impact Aromas Water system that I am on, and wells on my property that are drawn from the same aquifer as this project might be. My suspicion is that a new Environmental Impact Report needs to be done, and those affected
13.	Kamille Hammerstrom	Salinas, CA	I live off Hwy 101 and am already negatively impacted by the seasonal backups due to traffic heading down to Monterey. I do not want to see more traffic on 101 without some adjustment made for local residents. I also am on a private well and our aquifers in this region are overdrawn. Please do not increase development in this area.
14.	Helen Englesbeg	Royal Oaks, CA	I am opposed to the rezoning of any agricultural land in the Central Coast area. Our agricultural land needs to be preserved. I also live in a rural area that is adjacent to the "nodes" that are being considered for rezoning and am opposed to developing these sites for commercial usage.
15.	Erin Brummund	Aromas, CA	Want to keep countryside the way it is. There will be too much traffic, people, trash, homeless. There are already too much of all of those things here now. If one of these nodes is near Anzar High School, it is not a good idea because it is one of the safest schools that i know. If there are so many more people right there it might not stay that way. It is s terrible idea altogether.
16.	Patrick Tacheny	Salinas, CA	
17.	Tully Wiedman	Aromas, CA	We do not want a corridor of commercial squalor from Gilroy to Salinas
18.	Sheila Prader	Aromas, CA	Inadequately researched and investigated rezoning has the potential to negatively affect San Benito County residents, residents of neighboring counties and people traveling through the area as well as agricultural lands, water supply and quality, cultural resources and ecosystems. A complete environmental impact report should be prepared before rezoning takes place.
19.	Sandra Varela	Aromas, CA	

	Name	From	Comments
20.	Carol Lefever	Royal Oaks, CA	Enjoy the beauty, feeling of being able to breathe freely, and the historic importance of San Juan Bautista and the surrounding area
21.	Audrey McFadden	Sahuarita, AZ	
22.	Laura Malven	Aromas, CA	
23.	Nicky Hartman	Aromas, CA	
24.	Barbara Frances	AROMAS, CA	
25.	Cristie Thomas	Aptos, CA	This is a bucolic and traditionally agricultural area that should be maintained.
26.	Sandi Austin	Aromas, CA	Urban sprawl adversely affects our environment, natural resources and the native animals that call this land their home. At a time when we are in an environmental crisis with scarce water resources, pollution and wildlife threat we need to carefully plan growth with a priority to community needs, not corporate dollars and lining the pockets of the few.
27.	Pamela Scholz	royal oaks, CA	Keep our farm land as farmland once its list it ca NEVER be recovered. There is no need for any more commercial land along an already congested highway.
28.	Cindy Guess	Royal Oaks, CA	Traffic is just too crazy now. I can't imagine adding more traffic
29.	Wendy Carroll	Salinas, CA	Traffic & pollution.... CA needs to be preserved somewhat
30.	Steve Zorra	Aromas, CA	I am a resident of the area (Ricardo and Cole) and want to preserve our beautiful rural.
31.	Janet Mangan	AROMAS, CA	
32.	Diana Tork	Fresno, CA	
33.	Janette Tanouye	Aromas, CA	The commercial rezoning will bring along more traffic, concern about water, additional traffic, homeless, destruction of natural beauty of the area, impact on wildlife.
34.	Peter Slattery	Salinas, CA	Ruining a beautiful Californian landscape. Water over drafting. More unwarranted traffic.
35.	Marge Kranzfelder	San Juan Bautista, CA	Traffic and water head the list of my concerns. The major erosion of the quality of life. Police and First Responders to support this growth. Disregard for prime agricultural use. The list goes go.
36.	Jessika Mahler	Aromas, CA	Keep small communities small
37.	Sam Jimenez	Aromas, CA	
38.	Meghan Garcia	Salinas, CA	LET US OPT TO BE OUTSIDE AND SEE OUR BEAUTIFUL LANDSCAPE
39.	Cody Mahler	Aromas, CA	
40.	Rose Marchese	Aptos, CA	
41.	Lexy Deaton	Aromas, CA	

	Name	From	Comments
42.	Eunice Lopez	Chico, CA	
43.	Jeran Polockow	Aromas, CA	
44.	Maria Hummel	Prunedale, CA	
45.	Mu Mu	Aromas, CA	rock on environment
46.	David Hernandez	Aromas, CA	
47.	Sheila Mullaney	Aromas, CA	
48.	John Scirigione	Santa Cruz, CA	
49.	Cathy Paladini	salinas, CA	There is not enough ground water for more business or people. This needs to be considered for Griubd water sustainability.
50.	Susan Maresco	Aromas, CA	Desire to preserve our rural community, the reason we live here in the first place.
51.	Nicholas Tanouye	Aromas, CA	Building in this area would be environmental and socially irresponsible. I have lived here for 27 year, and I've only ever arched traffic get worse and worse over the years. Bumper to bumper from gilroy to prunedale along the 101. Highways 156 are also majorly congested too in the tourist month. This area is home to myself and many other creature, I believe this building prophecy would cause irreversible effect. Forever changing the landscape and our community.
52.	Pedro Montejano	Castroville, CA	Rural communities
53.	Linda McCue	Aromas, CA	We have a major water shortage in our area and it is doubtful that the amount of water available would support commercial development. I also feel strongly about preserving our rural environment, which is why the majority of our populace moved here.
54.	Paul Raphael	San Juan Bautista, CA	The increasing population in this area already is causing bottle necks in resources and the supporting infrastructure. Conducting impact analysis before altering zoning may result in insights; such as, HW 156's inability to support more traffic and the need for attaining alternate city Wells. San Juan Bautista has been fighting the high level of nitrogen in it's water for years. These are current issues that will only magnify with out proper planning, not to mention will take away from the life style that long time resident have built their legacy and lives around.
55.	Andrea Acosta	Salinas, CA	
56.	Gabriel Sousa	Aromas, CA	I moved out here to get away from San Jose!!!!
57.	Tracy Brooks	Aromas, CA	
58.	Anthony Bocanegra	AROMAS, CA	Lets not ruin San Benito county.
59.	Micaela Bocanega	Aromas, CA	To continue and preserve a peaceful landscape, let's avoid destroying our beautiful San Benito County!!!!

	Name	From	Comments
60.	Jacklin Jackson	Aromas, CA	I live in Aromas and i chose this area because of the small rural town. I commute to Santa Clara everyday. I do not want morr traffic, trash, pollution or water shortage.
61.	Nancy Guzman	Aromas, CA	
62.	Cheryl Gidding	Aromas, CA	
63.	Jacque Schwarzenbach	Saratoga, CA	It is a beautiful untouched natural area. We have enough hotels. Please leave this gorgeous land natural. Thank you
64.	Margaret Hartman	Aromas, CA	
65.	Jeannie Echenique	Royal Oaks, CA	
66.	Amy Orozco	Salinas, CA	Just one more thing that makes me think perhaps I should move out of California after 60 years.
67.	Raelynn Suess	Royal Oaks, CA	
68.	Jayette Wilkerson	Salinas, CA	
69.	Kristy Kensill	Castroville, CA	I grew up in San Jose. I watched it go from a beautiful garden city to Silicon Valley. Very sad. Don't want to see that happen here.
70.	Roberta Ross	Royal Oaks, CA	
71.	Debra Ann Morse	Aromas, CA	
72.	Elizabeth Lee	SALINAS, CA	Because I live in this beauty area
73.	Jesus Galvan	Aromas, CA	