| From: | Kellie Eldridge |
|----------|----------------------------------|
| To: | Johnston, Desmond |
| Cc: | Ford, John |
| Subject: | We Are Up updates |
| Date: | Friday, June 23, 2023 5:30:15 PM |

Caution: This email was sent from an EXTERNAL source. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments.

Hi Desmond,

I am reaching out about the We Are Up project because it has been a while and I have not heard anything. Will there be a recirculation of the IS/MND?

As I mentioned in my previous email, the CEQA document did not provide adequate disclosure of information, did not properly assess impacts to resources, nor did it adequately mitigate for the significant impacts.

Of particular concern is the special events, and the associated noise and traffic. There was no disclosure of noise impacts, nor assessment of impacts--just the assumption that a conditional use permit would exempt them from evaluating the noise impacts. These should have been considered in more detail under questions a and b in the noise section. As these events are anticipated to be essentially every other weekend, and can last an undisclosed amount of time, and are in excess of what is permitted in residential areas, this would not be an insignificant impact to existing and planned residences. Do you have any additional information on the special events and the noise exceedances they are requesting? Would it be possible to see a copy of the permit or permit application?

Also, on parking. This was not adequately assessed in the IS/MND. In the document, it claims that there would be over 215 guests, but only 35 permanent parking spaces near the events building. The other "parking areas" are over 600 feet away from this area. As mentioned in my letter, in all likelihood, people would be parking and blocking the road along Weirup. The road is not wide enough to accommodate large scale parking--it will affect residents trying to access the area, as well as emergency access. People will also likely be parking in front of and blocking existing residences on Hideaway, which already has limited parking. The roads are also privately maintained, and should not be used for public events.

Recently, We Are Up had an event the other weekend (they did not notify neighbors, but I am paying attention). They had a parking lot, which was not completely full, as well as parking at MCSD and at a lot across the street from it, and had someone directing traffic. Still, like I had mentioned in my letter, people parked along the street and inhibited access along the road. See the attached picture. This is likely what will happen if this project is approved--and these impacts were not assessed or have proposed mitigation.

In addition, as mentioned above, I did go listen in at the event. It raised a lot of concerns, as the president of We Are Up--who I would expect to know the most about the project---was providing information that was contrary to the information in the CEQA document. For example, she mentioned that the houses directly behind Hideaway Court--the ones that are of the greatest concern to me and neighbors--could potentially be two stories, while the CEQA document says they would only be one. Would they be able to make a change like this? After assessing impacts (inadequately) as one story buildings? In addition, it sounds like the

timeline could be a lot longer than proposed in the CEQA document, which would greatly affect those in the area. I had also mentioned in my letter that I was concerned about the purpose and need of the project, which is for those with autism and other disabilities, based on contradictory information in the document and what on their website. At this meeting, it sounded like this would be 1/3 for those with autism and/or I/DD needs, 1/3 students, and 1/3 seniors. This does not appear to be focusing on those with disabilities - and though this change wouldn't be a big concern, it does add weight to my question on changing the scope of the planned development.

I did have one more question. This is not an approved environmental document, and there are a lot of features proposed for this development. Should they be doing any work associated with it? I am asking because they did install fencing and the garden area, which are part of the development they are planning, but of more concern, they did remove at least one conifer (see attached) and damaged some alders at the end of May--within the nesting bird season. According to their CEQA document, this should have required, at the very least, a nesting bird survey.

Any information you can share on the development, or any changes to the plans, would be most appreciated.

Thank you, Kellie Eldridge





