
Form C

05/19/2015

Estefania Arteaga

estefania_arteaga@yahoo.com

1812 Trinity Ave apt 313, Walnut Creek, Ca 94596

Expanding off-road vehicle use into the 3,100 acre western portion of Carnegie SVRA, an area commonly known as Tesla, makes no sense. Carnegie SVRA is not even mitigating for their current impacts on the environment in the area they're operating in now, and are not proposing any mitigation for the expansion. The wholesale destruction of natural resources in the current use area, even in zones that are classified as "Limited Recreation" and subject to the highest level of resource protection, proves that the OHMVR Division's claim that no significant environmental impacts will occur and that therefore no mitigation is required, is absurd. The dEIR is wholly inadequate. Many more people would benefit from Tesla as a scenic, hiking, wildlife viewing and cultural destination than would benefit from its destruction as an off-road use area. State Parks' own data show that Carnegie SVRA attracted less than a third of Mount Diablo State Parks' approximately 350,00 visitors in FY '13-'14, and brought in only a quarter of its more than \$1.2 million in revenue. State Parks would touch more people, bring in more revenue and protect more resources if the Tesla area were protected as a typical nature park rather than an off-road area. I oppose the expansion of off-road/off-highway use into the Tesla area (3,100 acre western portion of Carnegie SVRA) and I urge you to not expand off-road/off-highway uses into the area, oppose the expansion and pursue Tesla's potential as a beautiful park."

05/19/2015

Juan Arteaga

j.j.arteaga@sbcglobal.net

950 Detroit Ave. Suite #7 Concord CA 94518

“Expanding off-road vehicle use into the 3,100 acre western portion of Carnegie SVRA, an area commonly known as Tesla, makes no sense. Carnegie SVRA is not even mitigating for their current impacts on the environment in the area they’re operating in now, and are not proposing any mitigation for the expansion. The wholesale destruction of natural resources in the current use area, even in zones that are classified as “Limited Recreation” and subject to the highest level of resource protection, proves that the OHMVR Division’s claim that no significant environmental impacts will occur and that therefore no mitigation is required, is absurd. The dEIR is wholly inadequate. Many more people would benefit from Tesla as a scenic, hiking, wildlife viewing and cultural destination than would benefit from its destruction as an off-road use area. State Parks’ own data show that Carnegie SVRA attracted less than a third of Mount Diablo State Parks’ approximately 350,00 visitors in FY ’13-’14, and brought in only a quarter of its more than \$1.2 million in revenue. State Parks would touch more people, bring in more revenue and protect more resources if the Tesla area were protected as a typical nature park rather than an off-road area. I oppose the expansion of off-road/off-highway use into the Tesla area (3,100 acre western portion of Carnegie SVRA) and I urge you to not expand off-road/off-highway uses into the area, oppose the expansion and pursue Tesla’s potential as a beautiful park.”

05/19/2015

Jason Baskett

jbaskett@pacbell.net

44 Barbara Road, Orinda, CA 94563

Expanding off-road vehicle use into the 3,100 acre western portion of Carnegie SVRA, an area commonly known as Tesla, makes no sense. Carnegie SVRA is not even mitigating for their current impacts on the environment in the area they're operating in now, and are not proposing any mitigation for the expansion. The wholesale destruction of natural resources in the current use area, even in zones that are classified as "Limited Recreation" and subject to the highest level of resource protection, proves that the OHMVR Division's claim that no significant environmental impacts will occur and that therefore no mitigation is required, is absurd. The dEIR is wholly inadequate. Many more people would benefit from Tesla as a scenic, hiking, wildlife viewing and cultural destination than would benefit from its destruction as an off-road use area. State Parks' own data show that Carnegie SVRA attracted less than a third of Mount Diablo State Parks' approximately 350,00 visitors in FY '13-'14, and brought in only a quarter of its more than \$1.2 million in revenue. State Parks would touch more people, bring in more revenue and protect more resources if the Tesla area were protected as a typical nature park rather than an off-road area. I oppose the expansion of off-road/off-highway use into the Tesla area (3,100 acre western portion of Carnegie SVRA) and I urge you to not expand off-road/off-highway uses into the area, oppose the expansion and pursue Tesla's potential as a beautiful park."

05/19/2015

Larry Loomer

larylloomer@yahoo.com

1316 Chimneywood Court, Concord, 94521

“Expanding off-road vehicle use into the 3,100 acre western portion of Carnegie SVRA, an area commonly known as Tesla, makes no sense. Carnegie SVRA is not even mitigating for their current impacts on the environment in the area they’re operating in now, and they are not proposing any mitigation for the expansion. The wholesale destruction of natural resources in the current use area, even in zones that are classified as “Limited Recreation” and subject to the highest level of resource protection, proves that the OHMVR Division’s claim that no significant environmental impacts will occur and that therefore no mitigation is required, is absurd. The dEIR is wholly inadequate. Many more people would benefit from Tesla as a scenic, hiking, wildlife viewing and cultural destination than would benefit from its destruction as an off-road use area. State Parks’ own data show that Carnegie SVRA attracted less than a third of Mount Diablo State Parks’ approximately 350,000 visitors in FY ’13-’14, and brought in only a quarter of its more than \$1.2 million in revenue. State Parks would touch more people, bring in more revenue and protect more resources if the Tesla area were protected as a typical nature park rather than an off-road area. I oppose the expansion of off-road/off-highway use into the Tesla area (3,100 acre western portion of Carnegie SVRA) and I urge you to not expand off-road/off-highway uses into the area, to oppose the expansion and to pursue Tesla’s potential as a beautiful park.”

05/19/2015

Lorena Rodriguez

sunlighttravelsfast@gmail.com

865 Grenola Dr. Concord, CA 94518

“Expanding off-road vehicle use into the 3,100 acre western portion of Carnegie SVRA, an area commonly known as Tesla, makes no sense. Carnegie SVRA is not even mitigating for their current impacts on the environment in the area they’re operating in now, and are not proposing any mitigation for the expansion. The wholesale destruction of natural resources in the current use area, even in zones that are classified as “Limited Recreation” and subject to the highest level of resource protection, proves that the OHMVR Division’s claim that no significant environmental impacts will occur and that therefore no mitigation is required, is absurd. The dEIR is wholly inadequate. Many more people would benefit from Tesla as a scenic, hiking, wildlife viewing and cultural destination than would benefit from its destruction as an off-road use area. State Parks’ own data show that Carnegie SVRA attracted less than a third of Mount Diablo State Parks’ approximately 350,00 visitors in FY ’13-’14, and brought in only a quarter of its more than \$1.2 million in revenue. State Parks would touch more people, bring in more revenue and protect more resources if the Tesla area were protected as a typical nature park rather than an off-road area. I oppose the expansion of off-road/off-highway use into the Tesla area (3,100 acre western portion of Carnegie SVRA) and I urge you to not expand off-road/off-highway uses into the area, oppose the expansion and pursue Tesla’s potential as a beautiful park.”

05/19/2015

Maria Rodriguez

izzyspanish@yahoo.com

1076 Carol Lane Lafayette CA 94549

“Expanding off-road vehicle use into the 3,100 acre western portion of Carnegie SVRA, an area commonly known as Tesla, makes no sense. Carnegie SVRA is not even mitigating for their current impacts on the environment in the area they’re operating in now, and are not proposing any mitigation for the expansion. The wholesale destruction of natural resources in the current use area, even in zones that are classified as “Limited Recreation” and subject to the highest level of resource protection, proves that the OHMVR Division’s claim that no significant environmental impacts will occur and that therefore no mitigation is required, is absurd. The dEIR is wholly inadequate. Many more people would benefit from Tesla as a scenic, hiking, wildlife viewing and cultural destination than would benefit from its destruction as an off-road use area. State Parks’ own data show that Carnegie SVRA attracted less than a third of Mount Diablo State Parks’ approximately 350,00 visitors in FY ’13-’14, and brought in only a quarter of its more than \$1.2 million in revenue. State Parks would touch more people, bring in more revenue and protect more resources if the Tesla area were protected as a typical nature park rather than an off-road area. I oppose the expansion of off-road/off-highway use into the Tesla area (3,100 acre western portion of Carnegie SVRA) and I urge you to not expand off-road/off-highway uses into the area, oppose the expansion and pursue Tesla’s potential as a beautiful park.”

05/19/2015

Susan Stuart

stuart.susan@gmail.com

1027 Malbec Ln. Brentwood, CA 94513

“Expanding off-road vehicle use into the 3,100 acre western portion of Carnegie SVRA, an area commonly known as Tesla, makes no sense. Carnegie SVRA is not even mitigating for their current impacts on the environment in the area they’re operating in now, and are not proposing any mitigation for the expansion. The wholesale destruction of natural resources in the current use area, even in zones that are classified as “Limited Recreation” and subject to the highest level of resource protection, proves that the OHMVR Division’s claim that no significant environmental impacts will occur and that therefore no mitigation is required, is absurd. The dEIR is wholly inadequate. Many more people would benefit from Tesla as a scenic, hiking, wildlife viewing and cultural destination than would benefit from its destruction as an off-road use area. State Parks’ own data show that Carnegie SVRA attracted less than a third of Mount Diablo State Parks’ approximately 350,00 visitors in FY ’13-’14, and brought in only a quarter of its more than \$1.2 million in revenue. State Parks would touch more people, bring in more revenue and protect more resources if the Tesla area were protected as a typical nature park rather than an off-road area. I oppose the expansion of off-road/off-highway use into the Tesla area (3,100 acre western portion of Carnegie SVRA) and I urge you to not expand off-road/off-highway uses into the area, oppose the expansion and pursue Tesla’s potential as a beautiful park.”

05/19/2015

Mike Weiss

weiss_mike925@yahoo.com

138 Warwick Drive #78, Benicia, CA 94510

“Expanding off-road vehicle use into the 3,100 acre western portion of Carnegie SVRA, an area commonly known as Tesla, makes no sense. Carnegie SVRA is not even mitigating for their current impacts on the environment in the area they’re operating in now, and are not proposing any mitigation for the expansion. The wholesale destruction of natural resources in the current use area, even in zones that are classified as “Limited Recreation” and subject to the highest level of resource protection, proves that the OHMVR Division’s claim that no significant environmental impacts will occur and that therefore no mitigation is required, is absurd. The dEIR is wholly inadequate. Many more people would benefit from Tesla as a scenic, hiking, wildlife viewing and cultural destination than would benefit from its destruction as an off-road use area. State Parks’ own data show that Carnegie SVRA attracted less than a third of Mount Diablo State Parks’ approximately 350,00 visitors in FY ’13-’14, and brought in only a quarter of its more than \$1.2 million in revenue. State Parks would touch more people, bring in more revenue and protect more resources if the Tesla area were protected as a typical nature park rather than an off-road area. I oppose the expansion of off-road/off-highway use into the Tesla area (3,100 acre western portion of Carnegie SVRA) and I urge you to not expand off-road/off-highway uses into the area, oppose the expansion and pursue Tesla’s potential as a beautiful park.”

05/21/2015

Jill Dresser

jilldresser@yahoo.com

124 SYLVAN RD

Expanding off-road vehicle use into the 3,100 acre western portion of Carnegie SVRA, an area commonly known as Tesla, makes no sense. Carnegie SVRA is not even mitigating for their current impacts on the environment in the area they're operating in now, and are not proposing any mitigation for the expansion. The wholesale destruction of natural resources in the current use area, even in zones that are classified as "Limited Recreation" and subject to the highest level of resource protection, proves that the OHMVR Division's claim that no significant environmental impacts will occur and that therefore no mitigation is required, is absurd. The dEIR is wholly inadequate. Many more people would benefit from Tesla as a scenic, hiking, wildlife viewing and cultural destination than would benefit from its destruction as an off-road use area. State Parks' own data show that Carnegie SVRA attracted less than a third of Mount Diablo State Parks' approximately 350,00 visitors in FY '13-'14, and brought in only a quarter of its more than \$1.2 million in revenue. State Parks would touch more people, bring in more revenue and protect more resources if the Tesla area were protected as a typical nature park rather than an off-road area. I oppose the expansion of off-road/off-highway use into the Tesla area (3,100 acre western portion of Carnegie SVRA) and I urge you to not expand off-road/off-highway uses into the area, oppose the expansion and pursue Tesla's potential as a beautiful park.

05/21/2015

Norwel Gordon

ngordon@coralwave.com

P.O. Box AB20421, Marsh Harbour, Abaco Bahamas

Please consider this:

Expanding off-road vehicle use into the 3,100 acre western portion of Carnegie SVRA, an area commonly known as Tesla, makes no sense. Carnegie SVRA is not even mitigating for their current impacts on the environment in the area they're operating in now, and are not proposing any mitigation for the expansion. The wholesale destruction of natural resources in the current use area, even in zones that are classified as "Limited Recreation" and subject to the highest level of resource protection, proves that the OHMVR Division's claim that no significant environmental impacts will occur and that therefore no mitigation is required, is absurd. The dEIR is wholly inadequate. Many more people would benefit from Tesla as a scenic, hiking, wildlife viewing and cultural destination than would benefit from its destruction as an off-road use area. State Parks' own data show that Carnegie SVRA attracted less than a third of Mount Diablo State Parks' approximately 350,00 visitors in FY '13-'14, and brought in only a quarter of its more than \$1.2 million in revenue. State Parks would touch more people, bring in more revenue and protect more resources if the Tesla area were protected as a typical nature park rather than an off-road area. I oppose the expansion of off-road/off-highway use into the Tesla area (3,100 acre western portion of Carnegie SVRA) and I urge you to not expand off-road/off-highway uses into the area, oppose the expansion and pursue Tesla's potential as a beautiful park.



Carnegie DEIR Comments <carnegiedeircomments@gmail.com>

Tesla land use

Tom Jones <jomntan@yahoo.com>

Sat, May 23, 2015 at 10:56 AM

To: "carnegiedeircomments@gmail.com" <carnegiedeircomments@gmail.com>

Expanding off-road vehicle use into the 3,100 acre western portion of Carnegie SVRA, an area commonly known as Tesla, makes no sense. Carnegie SVRA is not even mitigating for their current impacts on the environment in the area they're operating in now, and are not proposing any mitigation for the expansion. The wholesale destruction of natural resources in the current use area, even in zones that are classified as "Limited Recreation" and subject to the highest level of resource protection, proves that the OHMVR Division's claim that no significant environmental impacts will occur and that therefore no mitigation is required, is absurd. The dEIR is wholly inadequate. Many more people would benefit from Tesla as a scenic, hiking, wildlife viewing and cultural destination than would benefit from its destruction as an off-road use area. State Parks' own data show that Carnegie SVRA attracted less than a third of Mount Diablo State Parks' approximately 350,00 visitors in FY '13-'14, and brought in only a quarter of its more than \$1.2 million in revenue. State Parks would touch more people, bring in more revenue and protect more resources if the Tesla area were protected as a typical nature park rather than an off-road area. I oppose the expansion of off-road/off-highway use into the Tesla area (3,100 acre western portion of Carnegie SVRA) and I urge you to not expand off-road/off-highway uses into the area, oppose the expansion and pursue Tesla's potential as a beautiful park."

