To:   Attached Distribution List

Date:   September 13, 2006

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report

Lead Agency:

CITY OF CORONA
Planning Department
400 South Vicentia Avenue
Corona, CA 92882-2187
(951) 736-2262

Contact: Terri Manuel, AICP

Consulting Firm Preparing the Draft EIR:

LSA ASSOCIATES, INC.
1500 Iowa Avenue, Suite 200
Riverside, CA 92507
(951) 781-9310

Contact: Ray Hussey, AICP

The City of Corona will be the Lead Agency to prepare an Environmental Impact Report for the project identified below. We need to know the views of your agency as to the scope and content of the environmental information that should be included in the Environmental Impact Report. If you represent an agency, we are particularly interested in information germane to your statutory responsibilities. If you are a public agency, you may need to use the Environmental Impact Report prepared by our agency when considering your permit or other approval for the project.

This Notice of Preparation contains the location, background, and description of the project. An initial study has not been prepared for the proposed project, as the City has determined that all of the environmental issues found on the City’s environmental checklist will be addressed in the Environmental Impact Report. These issues are:

- Land Use Planning
- Population and Housing
- Geologic Problems
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Air Quality
- Transportation/Traffic
- Biological Resources
- Mineral Resources
- Hazards/Hazardous Materials
- Noise
- Public Services
- Utilities
- Aesthetics
- Cultural Resources
- Agricultural Resources
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

The proposed project is considered a project of statewide, regional, or areawide significance. The proposed project will affect highways or other facilities under the jurisdiction of the State Department of Transportation (Caltrans). The scoping meeting was held at 6:00 p.m. on July 27, 2006, at the City of Corona Multi-Purpose Room located at 400 South Vicentia Avenue.

Due to the time limits mandated by State law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date, but not later than 30 days after receipt of this notice.

Please send your response to Terri Manuel, Planning Manager, at the City of Corona address shown above. Please include the name, phone number, and address of a contact person in your response.
Project Title: Arantine Hills Specific Plan

Location: The Arantine Hills Specific Plan (proposed project) is located in the Bedford Canyon area of the Santa Ana Mountain foothills in the north end of the Temescal Valley and in the southeastern portion of Corona. Figures 1 and 2 show the regional location and site vicinity of the proposed project. Interstate 15 (I-15) traverses the northeastern portion of the Specific Plan area. West of the freeway, Eagle Glen Parkway and the Eagle Glen Specific Plan area surround the project site on the north and west, and the Clevelend National Forest is to the south. Rural residential development within unincorporated Riverside County is located to the southeast. The remainder of the proposed project east of the freeway is bordered by commercial development to the north and industrial property to the east, and Temescal Canyon Road farther east.

Background: Historically, the proposed project site was not developed and has been in active agricultural production. Currently, a productive grapefruit orchard occupies approximately two-thirds of the proposed project site, west of I-15.

Description: The proposed Specific Plan will guide development within the approximately 510-acre (rounded) project area, resulting in a mix of land uses including:

- Single-Family Residential (251 acres) with a maximum of 824 units;
- Commercial (25 acres) with retail, office, entertainment, and employment;
- Agriculture [Commercial Reserve] (49 acres);
- Parkland (13 acres) with one 8-acre active use park and one 5-acre passive use park;
- Open space, trails, and roads (145 acres); and
- Age Restricted Community (26 acres) with a maximum of 392 units.

Approximately half (49%) of the Specific Plan would be developed with single-family homes; approximately 5 percent with commercial uses; approximately 10 percent held in reserve for commercial uses for future entitlement under a subsequent amendment; approximately 3 percent with parks; approximately 28 percent with open space, trails and roads and approximately 5 percent with an age restricted community. The illustrative site plan (Figure 3) shows the location of the Specific Plan land uses by Planning Area (PA) and land use quantities by PA.

Date: September 15, 2006

Signature: 

Name: Terri Manuel, AICP
Title: Planning Manager
# Distribution List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robin Zimpfer, Director</td>
<td>Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority</td>
<td>Michelle Ouellette, Best, Best &amp; Krieger Mission Square Bldg., 3750 University Avenue, #400, Riverside, CA 92501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside County EDA</td>
<td>1115 Spruce Street, Riverside, CA 92507-2428</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Coast Air Quality Management District</td>
<td>Southern California Association of Governments 818 W. Seventh Street, 12 Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90007-3435</td>
<td>Fred Franzia, Southern California Edison Co. 1351 E. Francis Street, Ontario, CA 91761-5796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Loew, AICP</td>
<td>Southern California Gas Company Attn: John Groot 1981 W. Lugonia Avenue, Redlands, CA 92374</td>
<td>Riverside County Clerk &amp; Recorder 2724 Gateway Drive, Riverside, CA 92502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Co. Regional Park &amp; Open Space District</td>
<td>4600 Crestmore Road, Riverside, CA 92509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Municipal Water District</td>
<td>P.O. Box 5286, Riverside, CA 92517-5286</td>
<td>Ted Rozzi – Facilities Corona Norco Unified School Dist. 2820 Clark Avenue, Norco, CA 91760, Governor's Office of Planning &amp; Research P.O. Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95814-3044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trabuco Ranger Station</td>
<td>1147 E. Sixth Street, Corona, CA 92879</td>
<td>City of Chino Hills Community Development Dept. 2001 Grand Avenue, Chino Hills, CA 91709, George Spiliotis, Riverside Co. Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) 3850 Vine Street, Ste. 110, Riverside, CA 92507-4225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attn: R. Schweers Pacific Telephone Company</td>
<td>3939 E. Coronado, Anaheim, CA 92807</td>
<td>Riverside County Flood Control &amp; Water Conservation Dist. 1995 Market, Riverside, CA 92501-1770, Riverside County Planning 4080 Lemon Street, P.O. Box 1409, Riverside, CA 92502-1409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Regional Water Quality Control Board Santa Ana Region</td>
<td>3737 Main Street, Ste. 500, Riverside, CA 92501-3339</td>
<td>Riverside County Transportation Dept. Attn: Juan Perez 4080 Lemon Street, Riverside, CA 92505, Sheri McFarland, California Energy Commission 1516 Ninth Street, Room 200, Sacramento, CA 95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.D.A. Natural Resources Conservation Riverside Field Office</td>
<td>4500 Glenwood Drive, Riverside, CA 92501</td>
<td>Office of Land Conservation Department of Conservation 801 K Street, MS 13-70, Sacramento, CA 95814, Dean Lucke, Dept. of Forestry, Room 1515-2 P.O. Box 944246, Sacramento, CA 94244-2460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann Karrer Dept. of Hsg. &amp; Comm. Dev.</td>
<td>1800 Third Street, Room 430, P.O. Box 952053, Sacramento, CA 95814</td>
<td>Carol Gauthart, Native American Heritage Comm. 915 Capitol Mall, Room 228, Sacramento, CA 95814, Anthony Largo, Ramona and of Cahuilla Indians P.O. Box 391670, Anza, CA 92539</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Riverside Transit Agency  
Mike McDonald, Director of Planning  
1825 Third Street  
Riverside, CA 92507

Environmental Section  
Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Mark DeBie  
California Waste Mgmt. Board  
8800 Cal Center Drive  
Sacramento, CA 95826

Ms. Linda Grimes  
IGR/CEQA Development Review  
464 W. Fourth Street, 6th Floor, MS726  
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400

State Water Resource Control Board  
Division of Water Quality  
P.O. Box 100  
Sacramento, CA 95801

Tim Neely, Manager  
Env. Planning Services Division  
P.O. Box 4048  
Santa Ana, CA 92702-4048

Michael Giusti  
California Dept. of Fish & Game  
330 Golden Shore Drive, Ste. 50  
Long Beach, CA 90802

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
P.O. Box 2711  
Los Angeles, CA 90053

Robert L. Soltz  
Metropolitan Water District  
P.O. Box 54153  
Los Angeles, CA 90054

Division Manager  
AT & SF Railway Co.  
740 E. Carnegie Drive  
San Bernardino, CA 92408-3571

California Dept. of Fish & Game  
Inland Desert/Eastern Sierra Region  
Attn: Leslie MacNair  
3602 Inland Empire Blvd, Ste. C-220  
Ontario, CA 91764

AT & T Cable Maintenance Center  
17200 S. Vermont Avenue, #422B  
Gardena, CA 90247-5835

California Dept. of Toxic Substances Control  
Attn: Ken Chiang  
1011 N. Grandview Avenue  
Glendale, CA 91201

San Bernardino County Museum  
Development Monitoring Commission  
Attn: Kathleen Springer  
2024 Orange Tree Lane  
Riverside, CA 92374

Waste Management  
800 Temescal  
Corona, CA 92879

Regional Water Quality Control Board  
#8 CEQA Review Santa Ana Basin Region  
3737 Main Street, Suite 500  
Riverside, CA 92501-3348

Cathy Bechtel  
Riverside County Transportation Commission  
4080 Lemon Street, 3rd Floor  
Riverside, CA 92502

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Services  
Carlsbad Field Office  
2730 Loker Avenue West  
Carlsbad, CA 92008

Northwest Mosquito & Vector Control  
1966 Compton Avenue  
Corona, CA 92879

Pacific Bell  
Attn: Mary Ann Cassady  
3939 E. Colorado, 2nd Floor  
Anaheim, CA 92807

South Coast Air Quality Mgmt. Dist  
Attn: Steve Smith  
21865 E. Copley Drive  
Diamond Bar, CA 91765-4182

State of California  
Department of Fish & Game  
1416 Ninth Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Ruthanne Taylor Berger  
WRCOG  
3880 Lemon Street, Ste. 300  
Riverside, CA 92501

Reed Reisner  
Pacific Bell  
4025 E. La Palma Ave, 1st Floor  
Anaheim, CA 92807

Jim King  
The Gas Company  
196 E. 3rd Street  
Pomona, CA 91766-1806

Ken Hansen  
AT & T Broadband  
2320 Pomona Rincon Road  
Corona, CA 92880

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Los Angeles District-Regulatory Branch  
Attn: Crystal L. Marquez  
911 Wilshire Blvd.  
Los Angeles, CA 90017
City of Chino Hills
Planning Department
2001 Grand Avenue
Chino, CA 91709

City of Norco
Planning Department
2870 Clark Road
Norco, CA 91760

Sally White
8015 Weirick Road
Corona, CA 92883

City of Norco
Planning Department
2870 Clark Road
Norco, CA 91760

Doug Knapp
8600 Glen Road
Corona, CA 92883

Terry Morairity
8145 Weirick Road
Corona, CA 92883

Young Bae
4244 Castlepeak Drive
Corona, CA 92883

Aaron Hake
Riverside County Transportation Commission
4080 Lemon Street
Riverside, CA 92502

Sara Duong
Empire Companies
5636 Concourse
Ontario, CA 91764

Brian Skvarca
8022 N. Weirick
Corona, CA 92883

Christine Barba
4030 El Dorado Drive
Corona, CA 92883

Linda Barba Nassen
201 Jason Court, #B
Corona, CA 92879

Manny and Candy Sousa
8580 Glen Road
Corona, CA 92883

Jerry and Judy Chappelle
8335 Glen Road
Corona, CA 92883

Michelle Randall
12401 Dawson Canyon Road
Corona, CA 92883

Morgan Lloyd
4292 Castlepeak Drive
Corona, CA 92883

Anne Smith
4077 El Dorado Road
Corona, CA 92883

Mark Young
4007 El Dorado Road
Corona, CA 92883

Mary Wickam
8170 Greg Alan Court
Corona, CA 92883

Lyle and Mary McKee
8265 Gambier Court
Corona, CA 92883

Khalid and Nijib Taufiq
4273 Castlepeak Drive
Corona, CA 92883

Josue and Carmen Ramirez
934 W. Olive Street
Corona, CA 92882

Felecia Ivezzy
8220 Greg Alan Court
Corona, CA 92883

Mario and Alina Betancourt
8640 Glen Road
Corona, CA 92883

Weirick Road
Neighborhood Watch Group
8145 Weirick Road
Corona, CA 92883

William Kourkos
19810 Evelyn Street
Corona, CA 92883

Diane Dunbar
7860 Weirick Road
Corona, CA 92883

Robert and Sharon Miller
8405 Glen Road
Corona, CA 92883

Sandeep Moulson
8180 Weirick Road
Corona, CA 92883
September 18, 2006

To: Reviewing Agencies
Re: Arantine Hills Specific Plan
SCH# 2006091093

Attached for your review and comment is the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Arantine Hills Specific Plan draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Responsible agencies must transmit their comments on the scope and content of the NOP, focusing on specific information related to their own statutory responsibility, within 30 days of receipt of the NOP from the Lead Agency. This is a courtesy notice provided by the State Clearinghouse with a reminder for you to comment in a timely manner. We encourage other agencies to also respond to this notice and express their concerns early in the environmental review process.

Please direct your comments to:

Terri Manuel  
City of Corona  
400 S. Vicentia Avenue  
Corona, CA 92882

with a copy to the State Clearinghouse in the Office of Planning and Research. Please refer to the SCH number noted above in all correspondence concerning this project.

If you have any questions about the environmental document review process, please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan  
Senior Planner, State Clearinghouse

Attachments  
cc: Lead Agency
**Project Title**  Arantine Hills Specific Plan

**Lead Agency**  Corona, City of

**Type**  NOP  Notice of Preparation

**Description**  The proposed project is a Specific Plan that will guide development on approximately 510 acres within the Specific Plan Area, resulting in a mix of land uses that will include 824 single family residential units of 251 acres; retail, office, entertainment, and employment uses on approximately 25 acres; an age restricted community with a maximum of 392 units on 26 acres; agricultural (commercial reserve) on 49 acres; parkland of 13 acres; and open space including trails and roads on 145 acres.

**Lead Agency Contact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Terri Manuel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>City of Corona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>(951) 736-2262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>400 S. Vicentia Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Corona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip</td>
<td>92882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Riverside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Corona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Streets</td>
<td>Cajalco Road/I-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proximity to:**

- **Highways**  I-15
- **Airports**  Bedford Canyon Wash
- **Railways**  
- **Waterways**  Historically, the proposed project site was not developed and has been in active agricultural production. Currently, a productive grapefruit orchard occupies approximately two-thirds of the proposed site. The Arantine Hills site is designated as "Agriculture/Possible Future Urban Use" on the General Plan and zoned "Agricultural". A General Plan Amendment will be concurrently processed to convert this site to the "Specific Plan" designated to allow for development of the Arantine Hills Specific Plan.
- **Schools**  
- **Land Use**  

**Project Issues**  Aesthetic/Visual; Agricultural Land; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Drainage/Absorption; Economics/Jobs; Flood Plain/Flooding; Geologic/Seismic; Minerals; Noise; Population/Housing Balance; Public Services; Schools/Universities; Sewer Capacity; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Solid Waste; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Vegetation; Water Quality; Water Supply; Wetland/Riparian; Wildlife; Growth Inducing; Landuse; Cumulative Effects

**Reviewing Agencies**  Resources Agency; Department of Conservation; Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; Department of Fish and Game, Region 6; Department of Health Services; Native American Heritage Commission; California Highway Patrol; Department of Housing and Community Development; Caltrans, District 8; Air Resources Board, Transportation Projects; Department of Toxic Substances Control; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 8

**Date Received**  09/18/2006  **Start of Review**  09/18/2006  **End of Review**  10/17/2006

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.
### NOP Distribution List

#### Resources Agency
- Resources Agency
  - Nadeil Gayou
- Dept. of Boating & Waterways
  - David Johnson
- California Coastal Commission
  - Elizabeth A. Fuchs
- Colorado River Board
  - Gerald R. Zimmerman
- Dept. of Conservation
  - Roseanne Taylor
- California Energy Commission
  - Paul Richins
- Dept. of Forestry & Fire Protection
  - Allen Robertson
- Office of Historic Preservation
  - Wayne Donaldson
- Dept. of Parks & Recreation
  - Environmental Stewardship Section
- Reclamation Board
  - DeeDee Jones
  - Steve McAdam
- Dept. of Water Resources
  - Resources Agency
    - Nadeil Gayou
  - Conservancy

#### Other Departments
- Food & Agriculture
  - Steve Shaffer
  - Dept. of Food and Agriculture
- Depart. of General Services
  - Public School Construction
  - Robert Slepy
  - Environmental Services Section
- Dept. of Health Services
  - Veronica Malloy
  - Dept. of Health/Drinking Water

#### Independent Commissions/Boards
- Delta Protection Commission
  - Debbi Eddy
- Office of Emergency Services
  - Dennis Castrillo
- Governor’s Office of Planning & Research
  - State Clearinghouse
- Native American Heritage Comm.
  - Debbie Treadway

#### County: Riverside
- Public Utilities Commission
  - Ken Lewis
- State Lands Commission
  - Jean Sarino
- Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA)
  - Cherry Jacques

#### Business, Trans & Housing
- Caltrans - Division of Aeronautics
  - Sandy Hesnard
- Caltrans - Planning
  - Terri Pencovic
- California Highway Patrol
  - Shirley Kelly
  - Office of Special Projects
- Housing & Community Development
  - Lisa Nichols
  - Housing Policy Division

#### Dept. of Transportation
- Caltrans, District 1
  - Rex Jackman
- Caltrans, District 2
  - Marcelino Gonzalez
- Caltrans, District 3
  - Jeff Pulverman
- Caltrans, District 4
  - Tim Sable
- Caltrans, District 5
  - David Murray
- Caltrans, District 6
  - Marc Bimbau
- Caltrans, District 7
  - Cheryl J. Powell
- Caltrans, District 8
  - Dan Kopulsky
- Caltrans, District 9
  - Gayle Rosander
- Caltrans, District 10
  - Tom Dumas
- Caltrans, District 11
  - Mario Orso
- Caltrans, District 12
  - Bob Joseph

#### Cal EPA
- Air Resources Board
  - Airport Projects
    - Jim Lerner
    - Transportation Projects
      - Ravi Ramalingam
    - Industrial Projects
      - Mike Tolstrup
- California Integrated Waste Management Board
  - Sue O'Leary
- State Water Resources Control Board
  - Jim Hockenberry
  - Division of Financial Assistance
- State Water Resources Control Board
  - Student Intern, 401 Water Quality Certification Unit
    - Division of Water Quality
- State Water Resources Control Board
  - Steven Hember
  - Division of Water Rights
- Dept. of Toxic Substances Control
  - CEQA Tracking Center
- Department of Pesticide Regulation

#### Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
- RWQCB 1
  - Cathleen Hudson
  - North Coast Region (1)
- RWQCB 2
  - Environmental Document Coordinator
  - San Francisco Bay Region (2)
- RWQCB 3
  - Central Coast Region (3)
- RWQCB 4
  - Teresa Rodgers
  - Los Angeles Region (4)
- RWQCB 5
  - Central Valley Region (5)
- RWQCB 5F
  - Central Valley Region (5)
  - Fresno Branch Office
- RWQCB 6R
  - Central Valley Region (5)
  - Redding Branch Office
- RWQCB 6
  - Lahontan Region (6)
- RWQCB 6V
  - Lahontan Region (6)
  - Victorville Branch Office
- RWQCB 7
  - Colorado River Basin Region (7)
- RWQCB 8
  - Santa Ana Region (8)
- RWQCB 9
  - San Diego Region (9)
- Other

---

Last Updated on 04/28/06
September 20, 2006

Terri Manuel, Planning Manager
City of Corona
400 South Vicentia Avenue
Corona, CA 92882-2187

Ray Hussey, AICP
LSA Associates, Inc.
1500 Iowa Avenue, Suite 200
Riverside, CA 92507

SUBJECT: NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT: ARANTINE HILLS SPECIFIC PLAN

Thank you for the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for Arantine Hills Specific Plan. The City of Chino Hills has no comment at this time.

Sincerely,

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Zal Abu Bakar
Assistant Community Dev. Director – Development Services
City of Chino Hills
2001 Grand Avenue
Chino Hills, CA 91709
(909)364-2751
E-mail: zabubakar@chinohills.org
Facsimile Information Page

Please Deliver To: Planning
Attn: Tom Manuel

Fax#: (951) 279-3556

From: PCRC

Total Number of Pages Sent Including this Page: 5

NOTICE: If You Do Not Receive Legible Copies of All the Pages, Please Call (951) 308-9295 ASAP and Ask For the Sender.

SENT BY: Stephanie Cavan

DATE SENT: 10/5/06

RE:

Aramis Hills SP

This transmission is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or photocopying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us IMMEDIATELY by telephone, and return the original message to us at the above address via the U.S. Postal Service. Thank you.

COMMENTS: Have copy call follow in mail

ORIGINAL: WILL ______ WILL NOT ______ SEND

CONFIRM RECEIPT: YES ______ NO ______
September 29, 2006

SENT VIA FAX SIMILE AND E-MAIL

Terri Manuel, Planning Manager
City of Corona
Planning Department
400 South Vicentia Avenue
Corona, CA 92882-2187

Re: Comments on Arantine Hills Specific Plan

Dear Ms. Manuel:

This comment letter is submitted by the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians (hereinafter, "Pechanga Tribe"), a federally recognized Indian tribe and sovereign government. The Pechanga Tribe is formally requesting, pursuant to a State law entitled the Traditional Tribal Cultural Places law (also known as SB18) (Cal. Govt. C. § 65352.3). The Tribe is requesting consultation with the City as required pursuant to SB18.

We request that this letter and all of the Tribe's comments be part of the official record for the approval of this Project. So that the Tribe may engage in meaningful consultation, we also request that the City of Corona provide us with copies of all archeological studies, reports, site records, proposed testing plans, and proposed mitigation measures, and conditions as soon as they become available. We are also requesting that the Tribe be on the mailing list for this Project so that we receive all notices, public documents, and hearing notices pertaining to this Project.

Lead Agency Consultation with the Pechanga Tribe Required Pursuant to
Cal. Govt. C. §§ 65351, 65352, 65352.3 and 65352.4
(Senate Bill 18- Traditional Tribal Cultural Places Law)

As this declaration includes a Specific Plan the Lead Agency is required to consult with the Pechanga Tribe pursuant to a State law entitled Traditional Tribal Cultural Places (also known as SB18) (Cal. Govt. C. § 65352.3). Such consultation shall be for the purposes of identifying any Native American sacred places and any geographical areas which could potentially yield sacred places, identifying proper means of treatment and management of such places, and to ensure the protection and preservation of such places through agreed upon mitigation (Cal. Govt. C. 65352.3: SB18, Chapter 905, Section 1(4)(b)(3)). All official consultation shall be government-to-government, meaning they shall be directly between the Tribe and the Lead Agency; and seeking agreement where feasible (Cal. Govt. C. § 65352.4; SB18, Chapter 905, Section 1(4)(b)(3)). Lastly, any such information conveyed to the Lead Agency concerning Native American sacred places shall

Sacred Is The Duty. Trusted Enter Our Care. And With Honor We Rise To The Need.
be confidential in terms of the specific identity, location, character and use of those places and associations features and objects. Such information shall not be subject to public disclosure pursuant the California Public Records Act (Cal. Govt. C. 6254(r)).

As such, the Pechanga Tribe officially requests consultation with the City of Corona and the Project Applicant. Further, the Tribe requests that this consultation be an in person government-to-government consultation as well as considering this letter part of the official record for SB 18 purposes and CEQA purposes.

PROJECT IMPACTS TO CULTURAL RESOURCES:

The Pechanga Tribe is not opposed to this development project. The Pechanga Tribe’s primary concerns stem from the project’s likely impacts on Native American cultural resources. The Pechanga Tribe is concerned about both the protection of unique and irreplaceable cultural resources, such as Luiseño village sites and archaeological items which would be displaced by ground-disturbing work on the project, and on the proper and lawful treatment of cultural items, Native American human remains and sacred items likely to be discovered in the course of the work. The Tribe would also like to point out that a preferred method of treatment for archaeological sites according to the CEQA is avoidance (California Public Resources Code §21063.1), and that this is in agreement with the Tribe’s practices and policies concerning cultural resources.

The Pechanga Tribe asserts that the Project area is part of the Pechanga Tribe’s aboriginal territory, as evidenced by the existence of Luiseño place names, rock art pictographs, petroglyphs and extensive artifact records found in the vicinity of the Project. In addition, this project falls within the Bedford Wash, which increases the possibility of cultural resources being located within this area. Historically, Luiseño villages were located near or along waterways in order to accommodate the daily functions of the people. Given this threshold for the scope of Pechanga traditional territory, the Pechanga Tribe is concerned about the potential impacts to Luiseño/Pechanga resources which may occur throughout the Project area. Given all the information, there is a very strong likelihood of locating subsurface resources during ground disturbing activities. Furthermore, the Pechanga Tribe’s cultural knowledge of the continuous occupation of the Luiseño people in this geographical area for thousands of years, through their stories and songs, is additional evidence that subsurface sites may exist in this Project area.

Given that Luiseño cultural resources will likely be affected by the Project, the Pechanga Tribe must be allowed to be involved and participate with the Lead Agency and the Project Applicant in developing all monitoring and mitigation plans for the duration of the Project. Further, given the potential for archaeological resources within the Project area, it is the position of the Pechanga Tribe that Pechanga tribal monitors should be required to be present prior to and during all ground-disturbing activities conducted in connection with the project, including any archeological testing performed. It is further the position of the Pechanga Tribe that an Agreement regarding appropriate treatment of cultural resources be drafted and entered into.

Pechanga Cultural Resources • Temecula Band of Luiseño Mission Indians
Post Office Box 2183 • Temecula, CA 92593

Sacred Is The Duty Trusted Unto Our Care And With Honor We Rise To The Need
Further, the Pechanga Tribe believes that if human remains are discovered, State law would apply and the mitigation measures for the permit must account for this. According to the California Public Resources Code. § 5097.98, if Native American human remains are discovered, the Native American Heritage commission must name a “most likely descendant,” who shall be consulted as to the appropriate disposition of the remains. Given the Project’s location in Pechanga territory, the Pechanga Tribe intends to assert its right pursuant to California law with regard to any remains or items discovered in the course of this project. Accordingly, the Pechanga Tribe further requests that the Lead Agency work with the Tribe to draft an agreement which would address any inadvertent discoveries of cultural resources, including human remains.

PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES

Below are the Tribe’s preliminary comments on the proposed mitigation measures for this Project. As the Tribe has not had the opportunity to review the archeological reports for this Project, we reserve the right to submit additional mitigation measures for consideration by the Lead Agency.

1. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Project Applicant/Developer is required to enter into a Treatment Agreement with the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians. This Agreement will address the treatment and disposition of cultural resources and human remains that may be uncovered during construction as well as provisions for tribal monitors.

2. Tribal monitors from the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians shall be allowed to monitor all grading, excavation and ground-breaking activities, including further surveys, to be compensated by the Project Applicant/Developer. The Pechanga Tribal monitors will have the authority to temporarily stop and redirect grading activities to evaluate the significance of any archaeological resources discovered on the property in conjunction with the archeologist and the Lead Agency.

3. If human remains are encountered, all activity shall stop and the County Coroner must be notified immediately. All activity must cease until the County coroner has determined the origin and disposition of said remains. The Coroner shall determine if the remains are prehistoric, and shall notify the State Native American Heritage Commission if applicable. Further actions shall be determined by the desires of the Most Likely Descendent.

4. The landowner agrees to relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including all Luiseño sacred sites, burial goods and all archeological artifacts that are found on the Project area to the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians for proper treatment and disposition.

5. All sacred sites within the Project area are to be avoided and preserved.

The Pechanga Tribe looks forward to working together with the City of Corona Planning Department and other interested agencies in protecting the invaluable Luiseño cultural resources.
found in the Project area. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (951) 308-9295. Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Gordin
Cultural Analyst

Cc: Pechanga Legal Department
October 16, 2006

Ms. Terrie Manuel  
City of Corona  
Planning Department  
400 South Vicentia Avenue  
Corona, California 92882-2187

Dear Ms. Manuel:

*Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for Arantine Hills Specific Plan*

The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (Metropolitan) has received a copy of the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) for the Arantine Hills Specific Plan (Project). The city of Corona (City), acting as Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act, proposes the Specific Plan to guide development within the approximately 510-acre Project area, resulting in mix of land uses including: single-family residential (251 acres) with a maximum of 824 units; commercial (25 acres) with retail, office, entertainment, and employment; agriculture (commercial reserve) (49 acres); parkland (13 acres) with one 8-acre active use park and one 5-acre passive use park; open space, trails, and roads (145 acres); and age restricted community (26 acres) with a maximum of 392 units. The proposed Project is located in the Bedford Canyon area of the Santa Ana Mountain foothills in the north end of Temescal Valley and in the southeastern portion of Corona. Interstate 15 traverses the northeastern portion of the proposed Project area and continues west of the freeway, and southeast of Eagle Glen. This letter contains Metropolitan’s response to the NOP as a potentially affected public agency.

Metropolitan does not own or operate any facilities within the footprint of the proposed Project. However, Metropolitan has plans for a future facility called the Central Pool Augmentation (CPA) Project, which is within the limits of the proposed Arantine Hills Specific Plan. Metropolitan certified the Final EIR for the CPA Project in 1995. The general alignment for the CPA Project within the Arantine Hills footprint generally follows Bedford Canyon Creek, along the north bank of the creek, from I-15 to Bedford Canyon. The width required for construction of the CPA would be 250 feet. Metropolitan requests that the Draft EIR for the proposed Project identify the CPA Project and assess any impacts to the future CPA Project associated with implementation of the Arantine Hills development.

Metropolitan also requests that the City analyze the consistency of the proposed Project with the growth management plan adopted by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Metropolitan uses SCAG’s population, housing, and employment projections to determine future water demand.
Additionally, Metropolitan encourages projects within its service area to include water conservation measures. Water conservation, reclaimed water use, and groundwater recharge programs are integral components to regional water supply planning. Metropolitan supports mitigation measures such as using water efficient fixtures, drought-tolerant landscaping, and reclaimed water, to offset any increase in water use associated with the proposed Project.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide input to your planning process and we look forward to receiving a copy of the Draft EIR. If we can be of further assistance, please contact me at (213) 217-6217.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Delaine W. Shane
Interim Manager, Environmental Planning Team

LIM/lim
(Public Folders/EPU/Letters/12-OCT-06Adoc – Terri Manuel)
NOTICE OF PREPARATION
Draft Environmental Impact Report

DATE: January 19, 2010
LEAD AGENCY: City of Corona
PROJECT TITLE: Arantine Hills Specific Plan
PROJECT APPLICATIONS: General Plan Amendment 09-005; Specific Plan 09-001; and Agriculture Preserve Cancellation 09-002
APPLICANT: Bluestone Communities

The City of Corona will be the Lead Agency in preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project identified herein. We need to know the views of your agency as to the scope and content of the environmental information that is germane to your agency’s statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. If applicable, your agency will need to use the EIR prepared by our agency when considering your permit or other approval for the project. The project description and location are discussed in the following pages.

The proposed project features a General Plan Amendment (GPA09-005) which will change the current designation of Agriculture on 278 acres west of Interstate 15, southwest of Cajaico Road, to a range of land uses to accommodate General Commercial (GC), Mixed Use-Commercial Residential (MU-1); Mixed Use – Commercial Business Park; Low Density Residential; Medium Density Residential; High Density Residential; Parks; and Open Space. The accompanying Specific Plan (SP09-001) will establish a master plan for the same 278 acres establishing corresponding land use designations to the General Plan Amendment. A cancellation of an existing Agricultural Preserve (APC09-002) on the site accompanies the plan.

This Notice of Preparation contains the location, background, and description of the project. An Initial Study has not been prepared for the proposed project as the City has determined that all of the environmental issues found on the City’s environmental checklist will be addressed in the Environmental Impact Report. These issues are:

- Land Use Planning
- Population and Housing
- Geologic Problems
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Air Quality
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Transportation/Traffic
- Biological Resources
- Mineral Resources
- Hazards/Hazardous Materials
- Noise
- Public Services
- Utilities
- Aesthetics
- Cultural Resources
- Agricultural Resources
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

The proposed project is considered a project of statewide, regional, or area-wide significance because of its size and because it will require a General Plan amendment. A public information and scoping session will be held to take input from the public regarding the potential environmental impacts to be discussed in the Environmental Impact Report for the proposed project. This meeting will not evaluate the merits of the project but rather will focus only on potential environmental impacts.

SCOPING SESSION

DATE: Thursday, February 11, 2010
TIME: 7:00 p.m.
LOCATION: Wilson Elementary School
1750 Spyglass Drive
Corona, California 92883

Due to the time limits mandated by State law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date but not later than 30 days after receipt of this notice.
Your response must be sent at the earliest possible date but not later than 30 days after receipt of this notice. Please include the name, phone number, and address of a contact person in your response. Responses should be sent to:

CITY OF CORONA
Community Development Department
Contact: Terri Manuel, Planning Manager
400 South Vicentia Avenue
Corona, California 92882-2187
(951) 736-2262
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1. PROJECT LOCATION AND SURROUNDING LAND USES

The City of Corona is located in western Riverside County, near the boundaries of Orange and San Bernardino Counties. The City is south of the City of Norco, southwest of the City of Riverside, and north of the Cleveland National Forest. An unincorporated area of Riverside County borders the City along the majority of the eastern and southern extents. The Arantine Hills Specific Plan (proposed project) is located in the Bedford Canyon area of the Santa Ana Mountain foothills in the southeastern portion of Corona. Figure 1 shows the regional location of the site and Figure 2 shows the project area and vicinity. The Specific Plan area is located on the western side of Interstate 15 (I-15), southwest of Cajalco Road. Eagle Glen Parkway and the Eagle Glen Specific Plan area border the project site on the north and west, and the Cleveland National Forest is to the south. Rural residential development within unincorporated Riverside County is located to the southeast.

2. PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

The proposed project is a 274.8-acre Specific Plan that will guide the development of a master-planned community including residential, general commercial, mixed use (retail, office, business park, research and development, light industrial and multifamily residential), open space and park land uses. In total, the project supports 1,621 residential units with densities ranging from 3 units per acre to 35 units per acre, 745,300 square feet of commercial space, four public parks totaling 15 acres, 37 acres of open space, and roadway and other infrastructure improvements. Table A provides a summary of the land uses proposed in the Arantine Hills Specific Plan. Figure 3 shows the project site plan.

There are three residential land use categories: Low Density Residential (0-3 du/ac) in Planning Areas 1 and 2; Medium Density Residential (6-15 du/ac) in Planning Areas 4, 5, 7, 10, and 11; and High Density Residential (15-36 du/ac) in Planning Areas 6 and 16. This Specific Plan includes 129.6 acres of detached and attached residences for a total yield of 1,170 dwelling units excluding mixed use residential.

High Density Planning Area 16 may build out as either market rate housing for families or as an age-qualified community to help provide housing options for the region’s growing population of seniors. Up to 475 High Density Residential units are proposed for this planning area on 26.4 acres. If this area develops as age-qualified housing, then up to 660 dwelling units are proposed. High Density Planning Area 16 is located adjacent to the commercial development in Planning Area 15.

Planning Area 15 provides approximately 38.3 acres to accommodate a wide mix of neighborhood, community, and regional serving commercial uses including retail, restaurants, services, entertainment, lodging, and office. The commercial area may also provide additional sites for community services such as daycare, emergency medical, and others. Up to 396,400 square feet of commercial uses are proposed in Planning Area 15.

There are two mixed-use planning areas within the Arantine Hills Specific Plan. Mixed Use District 1 (MU-1) in Planning Area 13 and Mixed Use District 2 (MU-2) in Planning Area 14. Mixed Use District 1 consists of approximately 19.9 acres and is intended to allow for a mix of retail, office, and multifamily residential uses. Up to 451 dwelling units are planned for Planning Area 13 at a density of approximately 36.0 dwelling units per acre. The intent of the MU-1 district is to allow for up to 118,000 square feet of retail and office used integrated in to the same building and or the same site as residential uses. The MU-2 district in Planning Area 14 consists of approximately 18.6 acres and is intended to allow for approximately 230,900 square feet of office, business park, research and development, and light industrial uses. No residential uses will be permitted in the MU-2 District.

The project includes four parks totaling 15.0 acres including one 11-acre Neighborhood Park, one 2-acre special use park, and two 1-acre mini parks. All four parks will be available for use by the general public. Bicycle and pedestrian travel among all of the parks will be convenient and connected via the community sidewalk, bike lane, and off-street trail system. A class 1 bike trail system is planned for the Bedford Canyon Wash area.
Table A: Proposed Project Land Use Summary by General Plan Land Use Designation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Proposed Land Use</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Target Density</th>
<th>Target Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mixed-Use I</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mixed-Use II</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>General Commercial</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Planned Roadways</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>274.8</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
<td><strong>1,621</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximately 37 acres of open space land will be preserved along Bedford Canyon Wash in Planning Areas 17, 18, and 19. This open space area will include some of the bluffs that abut the southern edge of the wash. Except where flood control channel improvements are planned for Bedford Canyon Wash or where portions require maintenance to comply with the recommendations of the City of Corona Fire Department and any future fuel modification plans, the remaining open space areas will be preserved in a natural condition to protect habitat and existing drainage courses where feasible. The open space area also incorporates into the project aesthetically while providing natural buffers for the residential, commercial, and mixed use planning areas.

3. INTENDED USE OF THE EIR AND ANTICIPATED PUBLIC AGENCY ACTIONS

In accordance with Section 15121 of the CEQA Guidelines, the purpose of this EIR is to identify all potentially significant effects of the project on the physical environment, to determine the extent to which those effects can be reduced or avoided, and to identify and evaluate feasible alternatives to the project as proposed. The City of Corona, responsible (if applicable), and trustee (if applicable) agency decision-makers will then use this information to take appropriate action on the project. The EIR will not determine whether the proposed project will be approved.

a. Lead Agency: The City of Corona serves as the Lead Agency for the Project Agencies that may use this EIR in their decision-making process for the project. These include, but are not limited to, the City of Corona Community Development Department, Redevelopment Agency of the City of Corona, Corona Department of Water and Power, and the Department of Public Works.

b. Responsible Agency: A “Responsible Agency,” as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15381, is a public agency other than the Lead Agency that has discretionary approval power over a project. The Responsible Agencies for this project include, but are not limited to, the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (Santa Ana Region), the California Department of Fish and Game, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
c. **Trustee Agencies:** A "Trustee Agency," as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15386, is a state agency having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by a project. The Trustee Agencies for this project include the California Department of Fish and Game.

d. **Reviewing Agencies:** Reviewing Agencies include agencies that do not have discretionary powers, but may review the environmental document for adequacy and accuracy. Potential Reviewing Agencies include, but are not limited to, Caltrans and the County of Riverside Flood Control and Water Conservation District.

e. **Required Discretionary Approval and Permits:** Various permits, approvals, and actions by the City and other responsible agencies will be required in order to implement the proposed project. Required discretionary approvals and permits may include, but are not limited to:

- General Plan Amendment approval;
- Specific Plan approval;
- Master Tentative Tract Map approval;
- Development Agreement approval;
- Cancellation of Williamson Act Contract; and
- Certification of the Environmental Impact Report.

Other non-discretionary actions anticipated to be taken by the City at the staff level as part of the proposed project include:

- Approval of improvement plans after the approval of Master Tentative Tract Map, such as approval of subsequent parcel and tentative tract maps water, sewer, grading, and street widening plans.
- Approval of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to mitigate site runoff during construction and a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) to mitigate for post-construction runoff flows.

In addition, several permits may be required by several agencies outside of the City including:

- Federal Clean Water Act Section 404 discharge permit by the Army Corps of Engineers;
- Federal Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board; and
- California Fish and Game Code Section 1600 Streambed Alteration agreement by the California Department of Fish and Game.
January 20, 2010

To: Reviewing Agencies

Re: Arantine Hills Specific Plan
SCH# 2006091093

Attached for your review and comment is the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Arantine Hills Specific Plan draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Responsible agencies must transmit their comments on the scope and content of the NOP, focusing on specific information related to their own statutory responsibility, within 30 days of receipt of the NOP from the Lead Agency. This is a courtesy notice provided by the State Clearinghouse with a reminder for you to comment in a timely manner. We encourage other agencies to also respond to this notice and express their concerns early in the environmental review process.

Please direct your comments to:

Terri Manuel
City of Corona
400 S. Vicentia Avenue
Corona, CA 92882

with a copy to the State Clearinghouse in the Office of Planning and Research. Please refer to the SCH number noted above in all correspondence concerning this project.

If you have any questions about the environmental document review process, please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Acting Director

Attachments
cc: Lead Agency
**SCH#** 2006091093  
**Project Title** Arantine Hills Specific Plan  
**Lead Agency** Corona, City of

**Type** NOP Notice of Preparation  
**Description** The proposed project is a 274.8 acre Specific Plan that will guide the development of a master-planned community including residential, general commercial, mixed use (retail, office, business park, research and development, light industrial and multifamily residential), open space and park land uses. In total, the project supports 1,621 residential units with densities ranging from 3 units per acre to 35 units per acre, 745,300 square feet of commercial space, four public parks totaling 15 acres, 37 acres of open space, and roadway and other infrastructure improvements.

**Lead Agency Contact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Terri Manuel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>City of Corona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>(951) 736-2262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>400 S. Vicentia Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Corona</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Riverside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Corona</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cross Streets** Cajaico Road/I-15  
**Lat / Long** 33° 48' 14" N / 117° 31' 53" W  
**Parcel No.** 279-190-045-5, 279-240-018-5  
**Township** 4S  
**Range** 6W  
**Section** 16,17  
**Base** SBB&M

**Proximity to:**

- **Highways** I-15  
- **Airports**  
- **Railways**  
- **Waterways** Bedford Canyon Wash  
- **Schools** Woodrow Wilson ES  
- **Land Use** Vacant Agricultural (Possible Future Urban Use)

**Project Issues** Aesthetic/Visual; Agricultural Land; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Biological Resources; Drainage/Absorption; Economics/Jobs; Flood Plain/Flooding; Forest Land/Fire Hazard; Geologic/Seismic; Minerals; Noise; Population/Housing Balance; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Schools/Universities; Septic System; Sewer Capacity; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Solid Waste; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Vegetation; Water Quality; Water Supply; Wetland/Riparian; Growth Inducing; Landuse; Cumulative Effects

**Reviewing Agencies** Resources Agency; Department of Conservation; Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; Department of Fish and Game, Region 6; CA Department of Public Health; Native American Heritage Commission; Department of Health Services; California Highway Patrol; Department of Housing and Community Development; Caltrans, District 8; Department of Toxic Substances Control; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 8

**Date Received** 01/20/2010  
**Start of Review** 01/20/2010  
**End of Review** 02/18/2010

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources Agency</th>
<th>County:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Boating &amp; Waterways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Sotelo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Coastal Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth A. Fuchs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado River Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald R. Zimmerman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Conservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Salazar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Energy Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Knight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Fire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen Robertson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Historic Preservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Donaldson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Parks &amp; Recreation Environmental Stewardship Section</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley Flood Protection Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Herota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve McAdam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Water Resources Resources Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadell Gayou</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish &amp; Game Region 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Drongasen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish &amp; Game Region 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Armor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish &amp; Game Region 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Vance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish &amp; Game Region 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Chadwick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Conservation Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish &amp; Game Region 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabina Gatchel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Conservation Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish &amp; Game Region 6 IM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Henderson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inyo/Mono, Habitat Conservation Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Fish &amp; Game M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Isaac</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Departments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Shaffer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Food and Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of General Services Public School Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of General Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Garbey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Services Section</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Public Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgette Binning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Health/Drinking Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Commissions, Boards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta Protection Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Fleck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Emergency Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Castrillo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor's Office of Planning &amp; Research State Clearinghouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Heritage Comm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Treadway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo Giambellino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica Bay Restoration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guanyu Wu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Lands Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Brand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Jacques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans, District 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Kopusky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans, District 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayle Rosander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans, District 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Dumas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans, District 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans, District 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Herre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal EPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Resources Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Lerner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglass Ito</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Tollstrup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Department of Resources, Recycling &amp; Recovery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue O'Leary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board Regional Programs Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Financial Assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Intern, 401 Water Quality Certification Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Water Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board Steven Herreras</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Water Rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Toxic Substances Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA Tracking Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Pesticide Regulation CEQA Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH# 2006091093</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathleen Hudson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Coast Region (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Document Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Bay Region (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coast Region (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa Rodgers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Region (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB 55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley Region (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB 5F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley Region (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno Branch Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB 5R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley Region (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redding Branch Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahontan Region (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB 6V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahontan Region (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorville Branch Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado River Basin Region (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana Region (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Region (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Last Updated on 01/04/2010
February 8, 2010

Ms. Terri Manuel
Planning Manager
City of Corona
400 South Vicentia Avenue
Corona, California 92882-2187
teri.manuel@ci.corona.ca.us

RE: SCAG Comments on the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Arantite Hills Specific Plan [120100030]

Dear Ms. Manuel,

Thank you for submitting the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Arantite Hills Specific Plan [120100030] to the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) for review and comment. SCAG is the authorized regional agency for Inter-Governmental Review of Programs proposed for federal financial assistance and direct development activities, pursuant to Presidential Executive Order 12372 (replacing A-95 Review). Additionally, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083(d) SCAG reviews Environmental Impact Reports of projects of regional significance for consistency with regional plans per the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines, Sections 15125(d) and 15206(a)(1). SCAG is also the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency and as such is responsible for both preparation of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) under California Government Code Section 65080 and 65082.

SCAG staff has reviewed this project and determined that the proposed project is regionally significant per California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Sections 15125 and/or 15206. The proposed project is a 275-acre Specific Plan that will guide the development of a master-planned community including residential, general commercial, mixed use (retail, office, business park, research and development, light industrial and multifamily residential), open space and park land uses.

Policies of SCAG’s Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Compass Growth Visioning (CGV) that may be applicable to your project are outlined in the attachment. The RTP, CGV, and table of policies can be found on the SCAG web site at: http://scag.ca.gov/rgr. For ease of review, we would encourage you to use a side-by-side comparison of all SCAG policies with a discussion of the consistency, non-consistency or non-applicability of the policy and supportive analysis in a table format (example attached).

The attached policies are meant to provide guidance for considering the proposed project within the context of our regional goals and policies. We also encourage the use of the SCAG List of Mitigation Measures extracted from the RTP to aid with demonstrating consistency with regional plans and policies. When available, please send environmental documentation ONLY to SCAG’s main office in Los Angeles and provide a minimum of 45 days for SCAG to review. If you have any questions regarding the attached comments, please contact Bernard Lee at (213) 236-1895 or leeb@scag.ca.gov. Thank you.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jacquie Lieb, Manager
Assessment, Housing & EIR

DOCS# 155608
COMMENTS ON THE NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF A
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE
ARANTINE HILLS SPECIFIC PLAN [I20100030]

PROJECT LOCATION

The Arantine Hills Specific Plan (proposed project) is located in the Bedford Canyon area of the Santa Ana Mountain foothills in the southeastern portion of the City of Corona. The Specific Plan area is located on the western side of Interstate 15 (I-15), southwest of Cajalco Road. Eagle Glen Parkway and the Eagle Glen Specific Plan area border the project site on the north and west, and the Cleveland National Forest is to the south. Rural residential development within unincorporated Riverside County is located to the southeast.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project is a 274.8-acre Specific Plan that will guide the development of a master-planned community including residential, general commercial, mixed use (retail, office, business park, research and development, light industrial and multifamily residential), open space and park land uses. In total, the project supports 1,621 residential units with densities ranging from 3 units per acre to 35 units per acre, 745,300 square feet of commercial space, four public parks totaling 15 acres, 37 acres of open space, and roadway and other infrastructure improvements.

CONSISTENCY WITH REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Regional Growth Forecasts

The DEIR should reflect the most current SCAG forecasts, which are the 2008 RTP (May 2008) Population, Household and Employment forecasts. The forecasts for your region, subregion, and county are as follows:

**Adopted SCAG Regionwide Forecasts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>19,418,344</td>
<td>20,465,830</td>
<td>21,468,948</td>
<td>22,395,121</td>
<td>23,255,377</td>
<td>24,057,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>6,086,986</td>
<td>6,474,074</td>
<td>6,840,328</td>
<td>7,156,645</td>
<td>7,449,484</td>
<td>7,710,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>8,349,453</td>
<td>8,811,406</td>
<td>9,183,029</td>
<td>9,546,773</td>
<td>9,913,376</td>
<td>10,287,125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adopted WRCOG Subregion Forecasts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>1,735,426</td>
<td>1,918,962</td>
<td>2,096,544</td>
<td>2,262,992</td>
<td>2,414,256</td>
<td>2,550,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>546,047</td>
<td>609,219</td>
<td>671,933</td>
<td>727,622</td>
<td>780,743</td>
<td>828,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>588,523</td>
<td>691,260</td>
<td>797,626</td>
<td>901,163</td>
<td>1,005,923</td>
<td>1,098,233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adopted City of Corona Forecasts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>150,177</td>
<td>154,631</td>
<td>157,556</td>
<td>161,749</td>
<td>165,260</td>
<td>167,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>45,222</td>
<td>46,304</td>
<td>46,773</td>
<td>47,575</td>
<td>48,434</td>
<td>49,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>70,054</td>
<td>77,460</td>
<td>84,006</td>
<td>90,657</td>
<td>97,751</td>
<td>105,046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The 2008 RTP growth forecast at the regional, subregional, and city level was adopted by the Regional Council in May 2008. City totals are the sum of small area data and should be used for advisory purposes only.
The 2008 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) also has goals and policies that are pertinent to this proposed project. This RTP links the goal of sustaining mobility with the goals of fostering economic development, enhancing the environment, reducing energy consumption, promoting transportation-friendly development patterns, and encouraging fair and equitable access to residents affected by socio-economic, geographic and commercial limitations. The RTP continues to support all applicable federal and state laws in implementing the proposed project. Among the relevant goals and policies of the RTP are the following:

Regional Transportation Plan Goals:
RTP G1  Maximize mobility and accessibility for all people and goods in the region.
RTP G2  Ensure travel safety and reliability for all people and goods in the region.
RTP G3  Preserve and ensure a sustainable regional transportation system.
RTP G4  Maximize the productivity of our transportation system.
RTP G5  Protect the environment, improve air quality and promote energy efficiency.
RTP G6  Encourage land use and growth patterns that complement our transportation investments.
RTP G7  Maximize the security of our transportation system through improved system monitoring, rapid recovery planning, and coordination with other security agencies.

GROWTH VISIONING

The fundamental goal of the Compass Growth Visioning effort is to make the SCAG region a better place to live, work and play for all residents regardless of race, ethnicity or income class. Thus, decisions regarding growth, transportation, land use, and economic development should be made to promote and sustain for future generations the region's mobility, livability and prosperity. The following "Regional Growth Principles" are proposed to provide a framework for local and regional decision making that improves the quality of life for all SCAG residents. Each principle is followed by a specific set of strategies intended to achieve this goal.

Principle 1: Improve mobility for all residents.
GV P1.1  Encourage transportation investments and land use decisions that are mutually supportive.
GV P1.2  Locate new housing near existing jobs and new jobs near existing housing.
GV P1.3  Encourage transit-oriented development.
GV P1.4  Promote a variety of travel choices

Principle 2: Foster livability in all communities.
GV P2.1  Promote infill development and redevelopment to revitalize existing communities.
GV P2.2  Promote developments, which provide a mix of uses.
GV P2.3  Promote "people scaled," walkable communities.
GV P2.4  Support the preservation of stable, single-family neighborhoods.

Principle 3: Enable prosperity for all people.
GV P3.1  Provide, in each community, a variety of housing types to meet the housing needs of all income levels.
GV P3.2  Support educational opportunities that promote balanced growth.
GV P3.3  Ensure environmental justice regardless of race, ethnicity or income class.
GV P3.4  Support local and state fiscal policies that encourage balanced growth.
GV P3.5  Encourage civic engagement.
Principle 4: Promote sustainability for future generations.
GV P4.1 Preserve rural, agricultural, recreational, and environmentally sensitive areas.
GV P4.2 Focus development in urban centers and existing cities.
GV P4.3 Develop strategies to accommodate growth that uses resources efficiently, eliminate pollution and significantly reduce waste.
GV P4.4 Utilize “green” development techniques

CONCLUSION

As the clearinghouse for regionally significant projects per Executive Order 12372, SCAG reviews the consistency of local plans, projects, and programs with regional plans. This activity is based on SCAG’s responsibilities as a regional planning organization pursuant to state and federal laws and regulations. Guidance provided by these reviews is intended to assist local agencies and project sponsors to take actions that contribute to the attainment of regional goals and policies.

All feasible measures needed to mitigate any potentially negative regional impacts associated with the proposed project should be implemented and monitored, as required by CEQA. We recommend that you review the SCAG List of Mitigation Measures for additional guidance, and encourage you to follow them, where applicable to your project. The SCAG List of Mitigation Measures may be found here: http://www.scag.ca.gov/igr/documents/SCAG_IGRMMRP_2008.pdf
SUGGESTED SIDE BY SIDE FORMAT - COMPARISON TABLE OF SCAG POLICIES

For ease of review, we would encourage the use of a side-by-side comparison of all SCAG policies with a discussion of the consistency, non-consistency or not applicable of the policy and supportive analysis in a table format. All policies and goals must be evaluated as to impacts. Suggested format is as follows:

The complete table can be found at: http://www.scag.ca.gov/igr/
- Click on "Demonstrating Your Project's Consistency With SCAG Policies"
- Scroll down to "Table of SCAG Policies for IGR"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCAG Regional Transportation Plan Goals and Compass Growth Visioning Principles</th>
<th>Regional Transportation Plan Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal/ Principle Number</td>
<td>Policy Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP G1</td>
<td>Maximize mobility and accessibility for all people and goods in the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP G2</td>
<td>Ensure travel safety and reliability for all people and goods in the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP G3</td>
<td>Preserve and ensure a sustainable regional transportation system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td>Etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 24, 2010

VIA FAXSIMILE (951) 279-3550
Ms. Terri Manuel, Planning Manager
City of Corona
400 South Vicentia Avenue
Corona, CA 92882-2187

Subject: Notice of Preparation for the Arantine Hills Specific Plan (General Plan Amendment 09-005; Specific Plan 09-001; and Agriculture Preserve Cancellation 09-002) - SCH# 2006091093

Dear Ms. Manuel:

The Department of Conservation's (Department) Division of Land Resource Protection (Division) has reviewed the Notice of Preparation for the Arantine Hills Specific Plan (General Plan Amendment 09-005; Specific Plan 09-001; and Agriculture Preserve Cancellation 09-002). The Division monitors farmland conversion on a statewide basis and administers the California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act and other agricultural land conservation programs. We offer the following comments and recommendations with respect to the proposed project's potential impacts on agricultural land and resources.

Project Description:

The Arantine Hills Specific Plan (proposed project) is located in the Bedford Canyon area of the Santa Ana Mountain foothills in the southeastern portion of the City of Corona. More specifically, the proposed project is located on the western side of Interstate 15 (I-15), southwest of Cajalco Road. Eagle Glen Parkway and the Eagle Glen Specific Plan area border the project site on the north and west, and the Cleveland National Forest is to the south. Rural Residential development within unincorporated Riverside County is located to the southeast. An aerial photo shows the project site is primarily being used for agriculture.

The proposed project is a 274.8-acre Specific Plan that will guide the development of a master-planned community including residential, general commercial, open space, park land uses, and mixed uses including retail, office, business park, research and development, light industrial, and multifamily residential. It includes a General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan approval, a Master Tentative Tract Map, Development Agreement, and cancellation of two Williamson Act contracts of 36.65 acres and 187.73 acres, for a total of 224.38 acres. The General Plan Amendment will change the current...
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designation of Agriculture on 278 acres west of Interstate 15, southwest of Cajalco Road, to accommodate the proposed project.

**Division Comments:**

The Division recommends that the Draft EIR for the Arantine Hills Specific Plan address the following items to provide a comprehensive discussion of potential impacts of the project on agricultural land and activities:

**Agricultural Setting of the Project**

- Location and extent of Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, and other types of farmland in and adjacent to the project area.
- Current and past agricultural use of the project area. Please include data on the types of crops grown, crop yields, and farm gate sales values.

To help describe the full agricultural resource value of the soils on the site, the Department recommends the use of economic multipliers to assess the total contribution of the site's potential or actual agricultural production to the local, regional and state economies. Two sources of economic multipliers can be found at the University of California Cooperative Extension Service and the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA).

**Project Impacts on Agricultural Land**

When determining the agricultural value of the land, the value of a property may have been reduced over the years due to inactivity, but it does not mean that there is no longer any agricultural significance. The *inability* to farm the land for agriculture, rather than the choice not to do so, is what could constitute a reduced agricultural value. The Division recommends the following discussion under the Agricultural Resources section of the Draft EIR:

- Type, amount, and location of any farmland conversion (Prime, Statewide, Unique, or Local Importance, per the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program maps provided by the Department of Conservation) to a non-agricultural use through project implementation and growth inducement, respectively.
- Impacts on current and future agricultural operations; e.g., land-use conflicts, increases in land values and taxes, etc.
- Incremental project impacts leading to cumulative impacts on agricultural land. This would include impacts from the proposed project, as well as impacts from past, current, and likely projects in the future.
Under California Code of Regulations §15064.7, impacts on agricultural resources may be both quantified and qualified by use of established thresholds of significance. The Division recommends the California Land Evaluation Site Assessment (LESA) model, which is a semi-quantitative rating system for establishing the environmental significance of project-specific impacts on farmland. However, it was noted that the Yolo County Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model, which was designed as a potential planning tool to assist in making decisions concerning the relative significance of agricultural land resources, was suggested as an alternative. Either model may be used as a tool to rate the relative value of any project site. The LESA Model is available on the Division’s website at: http://www.consrv.ca.gov/DLRP/qh_lea.htm

**Mitigation Measures**

The loss of agricultural land represents a permanent reduction in the State's agricultural land resources. As such, the Department recommends the use of permanent agricultural conservation easements on land of at least equal quality and size as partial compensation for the direct loss of agricultural land. If growth inducing or cumulative agricultural impacts are involved, the Department recommends that this ratio of conservation easements to lost agricultural land be increased. Mitigation for the loss of Prime Farmland is suggested at a 2:1 ratio due to its importance to the State of California.

Conservation easements will protect a portion of those remaining land resources and lessen project impacts in accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guideline §15370. The Department highlights this measure because of its acceptance and use by lead agencies as an appropriate mitigation measure under CEQA and because it follows an established rationale similar to that of wildlife habitat mitigation.

Mitigation via agricultural conservation easements can be implemented by at least two alternative approaches: the outright purchase of easements or the donation of mitigation fees to a local, regional or statewide organization or agency whose purpose includes the acquisition and stewardship of agricultural conservation easements. The conversion of agricultural land should be deemed an impact of at least regional significance. Hence, the search for replacement lands should be conducted regionally or statewide, and need not be limited to lands within the project's surrounding area. Of course, the use of conservation easements is only one form of mitigation that should be considered. Any other feasible mitigation measures should also be considered.

**The Williamson Act and CEQA**

Under CEQA (California Code of Regulations Section 15206(b)(3)), a project is deemed to be of statewide, regional or area-wide significance if it would result in the cancellation of a Williamson Act contract for any parcel of 100 or more acres. The Department
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recommends that the following information be provided and/or discussed in the Draft EIR:

- A map detailing the location of agricultural preserves and contracted land within each preserve. The Draft EIR should also tabulate the number of Williamson Act acres, according to land type (e.g., prime or non-prime agricultural land), which will be impacted directly or indirectly by the project.
- A discussion of Williamson Act contracts that may be terminated in order to implement the project. The Draft EIR should discuss the probable impacts on nearby properties resulting from the termination of any Williamson Act contracts.
- An agricultural preserve is a zone authorized by the Williamson Act and established by the local government to designate qualified land to be placed under the Williamson Act’s 10-year contracts. The Draft EIR should discuss any proposed general plan designation or zoning changes within agricultural preserves and how they will be affected by the project.

**Termination of Williamson Act Contracts**

This project includes the cancellation of a Williamson Act contract. To approve a tentative contract cancellation, the City must make specific findings that are supported by substantial evidence (GC§51282), and the landowner must pay a cancellation fee equal to 12.5 percent of the unrestricted, current fair market valuation of the property. Once the final cancellation is recorded, the contract is terminated immediately. When cancellation is proposed, the Department recommends that a discussion of the required findings be included in the Draft EIR.

Government Code §51284.1 requires a separate notice for a petition of cancellation of a contract to be sent to the Director of the Department of Conservation as soon as the cancellation application is deemed complete, but not less than 30 (thirty) days prior to the scheduled action by the Council. The Council must consider any comments from the Department when making its findings. The petition of cancellation must be mailed to:

Bridgett Luther, Director  
Department of Conservation  
C/o Division of Land Resource Protection  
801 K Street MS 18-01  
Sacramento, CA 95814-3528
Annexation

Government Code §51243.5 specifies when a city can exercise its option not to continue a Williamson Act contract, and only if certain conditions are met. The contracted land must be within one mile of a City boundary for a contract which was executed prior to January 1, 1991 (originally created between the County and the landowner), and the option to discontinue the contract must be approved by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO).

LAFCO must notify the Department within 10 days of a city's proposal to annex land under a contract (Government Code §56753.5). Additionally, LAFCO must not approve a change to a sphere of influence or annexation of contracted land to a city unless certain conditions are met (see Government Code §§51296.3, 56426, 56426.5, 56749 and 56856.5).

If, however, the contract was created between the City and a landowner, the City must follow the cancellation procedures outlined in Government Code §51282 through 51285.

The Williamson Act contract will remain in effect if the contract is not terminated correctly; therefore, any development could be considered a breach of the contract, and potentially a material breach.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Preparation for the Arantine Hills Specific Plan. Please provide this Department with the Draft EIR, the date of any hearings for this particular action, and any staff reports pertaining to it. If you have questions regarding our comments, or require technical assistance or information on agricultural land conservation, please contact Meri Meraz, Environmental Planner, at 801 K Street, MS 18-01, Sacramento, California 95814, or by phone at (916) 445-9411.

Sincerely,

Dan Otis
Program Manager
Williamson Act Program

cc: State Clearinghouse
February 24, 2010

Attn: Terri Manuel, Planning Manager
City of Corona
400 South Vicentia Avenue
Corona, CA 92882

Re: Proposed Arantine Hills Specific Plan Project, City of Corona, Riverside County, California

The Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians appreciates your observance of Tribal Cultural Resources and their preservation in your project. The information provided to us on said project has been assessed through our Cultural Resource Department, where it was concluded that although it is outside the existing reservation, the project area does fall within the bounds of our Tribal Traditional Use Areas. This project location is in close proximity to known village sites and is a shared use area that was used in ongoing trade between the Luiseño and Cahuilla tribes. Therefore it is regarded as highly sensitive to the people of Soboba.

Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians is requesting the following:

1. **Government to Government** consultation in accordance to SB18. Including the transfer of information to the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians regarding the progress of this project should be done as soon as new developments occur.

2. Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians continues to be a lead consulting tribal entity for this project.

3. Working in and around traditional use areas intensifies the possibility of encountering cultural resources during the construction/excavation phase. For this reason the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians requests that Native American Monitor(s) from the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians Cultural Resource Department to be present during any ground disturbing proceedings. Including surveys and archaeological testing.

4. Request that proper procedures be taken and requests of the tribe be honored (Please see the attachment)

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Joseph Ontiveros
Soboba Cultural Resource Department
P.O. Box 487
San Jacinto, CA 92581
Phone (951) 654-5544 ext. 4137
Cell (951) 663-5279
jontiveros@soboba-nsn.gov
E. The term "human remains" encompasses more than human bones because the Soboba Band’s traditions periodically necessitated the ceremonial burning of human remains. Grave goods are those artifacts associated with any human remains. These items, and other funerary remnants and their ashes are to be treated in the same manner as human bone fragments or bones that remain intact.

**Coordination with County Coroner’s Office.** The Lead Agencies and the Developer should immediately contact both the Coroner and the Soboba Band in the event that any human remains are discovered during implementation of the Project. If the Coroner recognizes the human remains to be those of a Native American, or has reason to believe that they are those of a Native American, the Coroner shall ensure that notification is provided to the NAHC within twenty-four (24) hours of the determination, as required by California Health and Safety Code § 7050.5 (c).

**Non-Disclosure of Location Reburials.** It is understood by all parties that unless otherwise required by law, the site of any reburial of Native American human remains or cultural artifacts shall not be disclosed and shall not be governed by public disclosure requirements of the California Public Records Act. The Coroner, parties, and Lead Agencies, will be asked to withhold public disclosure information related to such reburial, pursuant to the specific exemption set forth in California Government Code § 6254 (r).

Ceremonial items and items of cultural patrimony reflect traditional religious beliefs and practices of the Soboba Band. The Developer agrees to return all Native American ceremonial items and items of cultural patrimony that may be found on the project site to the Soboba Band for appropriate treatment. In addition, the Soboba Band requests the return of all other cultural items (artifacts) that are recovered during the course of archaeological investigations. Where appropriate and agreed upon in advance, Developer’s archaeologist may conduct analyses of certain artifact classes if required by CEQA, Section 106 of NHPA, the mitigation measures or conditions of approval for the Project. This may include but is not limited or restricted to include shell, bone, ceramic, stone or other artifacts.

Cc: Victoria Avalos, LSA Archaeologist
February 25, 2010

VIA E-MAIL and USPS

Ms. Terri Manuel
Planning Manager
City of Corona Community Development Dept
400 South Vicentia Avenue
Corona, California 92882-2187

Re: Pechanga Tribe Comments on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Arantine Hills Specific Plan

Dear Ms. Manuel:

Thank you for inviting us to submit comments on the above named Project. This comment letter is written on behalf of the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians (hereinafter, “the Tribe”), a federally recognized Indian tribe and sovereign government. These comments are not being submitted in lieu of formal consultation under SB 18, which will be required for this Project.

The Tribe formally requests, pursuant to Public Resources Code §21092.2, to be notified and involved in the entire CEQA environmental review process for the duration of the above referenced Project (the “Project”). If you have not already done so, please add the Tribe to your distribution list(s) for public notices and circulation of all documents, including environmental review documents, archaeological reports, and all documents pertaining to this Project. The Tribe further requests to be directly notified of all public hearings and scheduled approvals concerning this Project. The Tribe also requests that these comments be incorporated into the record of approval for this Project as well.

The Tribe submits these comments concerning the Project’s potential impacts to cultural resources in conjunction with the environmental review of the Project. The Tribe reserves the right to fully participate in the environmental review process, as well as to provide additional comment on the Project’s impacts to cultural resources and potential mitigation for such impacts. Further, the Tribe reserves the right to participate in the regulatory process and provide comment on issues pertaining to the regulatory process and Project approval.
THE CITY OF CORONA MUST INCLUDE INVOLVEMENT OF AND CONSULTATION WITH THE PECHANGA TRIBE IN ITS ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

It has been the intent of the Federal Government\(^1\) and the State of California\(^2\) that Indian tribes be consulted with regard to issues which impact cultural and spiritual resources, as well as other governmental concerns. The responsibility to consult with Indian tribes stems from the unique government-to-government relationship between the United States and Indian tribes. This arises when tribal interests are affected by the actions of governmental agencies and departments. In this case, it is undisputed that the Project lies within the Pechanga Tribe’s traditional territory. Therefore, in order to comply with CEQA and other applicable Federal and California law, it is imperative that the City of Corona consult with the Tribe in order to guarantee an adequate basis of knowledge for an appropriate evaluation of the Project effects, as well as generating adequate mitigation measures.

LEAD AGENCY CONSULTATION WITH THE PECHANGA TRIBE REQUIRED PURSUANT TO CAL. GOVT. C. §§ 65351, 65352, 65352.3, AND 65352.4 (SENATE BILL 18 – TRADITIONAL TRIBAL CULTURAL PLACES LAW)

In the event that a General Plan, General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan or Specific Plan Amendment will be processed on this Project, the Lead Agency is required to consult with the Pechanga Tribe pursuant to a State law entitled Traditional Tribal Cultural Places (also known as SB 18; Cal. Govt. C. § 65352.3). The purpose of consultation is to identify any Native American sacred places and any geographical areas which could potentially yield sacred places, identify proper means of treatment and management of such places, and to ensure the protection and preservation of such places through agreed upon mitigation (Cal. Govt. C. 65352.3; SB18, Chapter 905, Section 1(4)(b)(3)). Consultation must be government-to-government, meaning directly between the Tribe and the Lead Agency, seeking agreement where feasible (Cal. Govt. C. § 65352.4; SB18, Chapter 905, Section 1(4)(b)(3)). Lastly, any information conveyed to the Lead Agency concerning Native American sacred places shall be confidential in terms of the specific identity, location, character and use of those places and associated features and objects. This information is not subject to public disclosure pursuant the California Public Records Act (Cal. Govt. C. 6254(r)).

PECHANGA CULTURAL AFFILIATION TO PROJECT AREA

The Pechanga Tribe asserts that the Project area is part of Luiseño, and therefore the Tribe’s, aboriginal territory as evidenced by the existence of Luiseño place names, tóota yixéval

---

1 See Executive Memorandum of April 29, 1994 on Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments and Executive Order of November 6, 2000 on Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments.
2 See California Public Resource Code §5097.9 et seq.; California Government Code §§65351,65352,65352.3 and 65352.4
(rock art, pictographs, petroglyphs), and an extensive Luiseño artifact record in the vicinity of the Project. This culturally sensitive area is affiliated with the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians because of the Tribe’s cultural ties and traditional knowledge of this area as well as extensive history in the area.

The Pechanga Tribe’s knowledge of our ancestral boundaries is based on reliable information passed down to us from our elders; published academic works in the areas of anthropology, history and ethno-history; and through recorded ethnographic and linguistic accounts. Of the many anthropologists and historians who have presented boundaries of the Luiseño traditional territory, most have included the Corona area in their descriptions (Sparkman 1908; Kroeber 1925; White 1963; Harvey 1974; Smith and Freers 1994), and such territory descriptions correspond with that communicated to the Pechanga people by our elders. While historic accounts and anthropological and linguistic theories are important in determining traditional Luiseño territory, the most critical sources of information used to define our traditional territories are our songs, creation accounts, and oral traditions.

Luiseño history originates with the creation of all things at ‘éxva Teméeku, the present day City of Temecula, and dispersing out to all corners of creation (what is today known as Luiseño territory). It was at Temecula that the first human Wuyóot lived and taught the people, and here that he became sick, finally expiring at Lake Elsinore. Many of our songs relate the tale of the people taking the dying Wuyóot to the many hot springs at Elsinore, where he died (DuBois 1908). He was cremated at ‘éxva Teméeku. It is the Luiseño creation account that connects Elsinore to Temecula, and thus to the Temecula people who were evicted and moved to the Pechanga Reservation, and now known as the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Mission Indians (the Pechanga Tribe). From Temecula, the people spread out, establishing villages and marking their territories. The first people also became the mountains, plants, animals and heavenly bodies.

Many traditions and stories are passed from generation to generation by songs. One of the Luiseño songs recounts the travels of the people to Elsinore after a great flood (DuBois 1908). From here, they again spread out to the north, south, east and west. Three songs, called Montlivol, are songs of the places and landmarks that were destinations of the Luiseño ancestors, several of which are located near the Project area. They describe the exact route of the Temecula (Pechanga) people and the landmarks made by each to claim title to places in their migrations (DuBois 1908:110). Further, the story of Táawkwish and Tukupar includes place names for events from the Idyllwild area to the Glen Ivy/Corona area (Kroeber 1906), which encompasses the Project area. In addition, Pechanga elders state that the Temecula/Pechanga people had usage/gathering rights to an area extending from Rawson Canyon on the east, over to Lake Mathews on the northwest, down Temescal Canyon to Temecula, eastward to Aguanga, and then along the crest of the Cahuilla range back to Rawson Canyon. The Project area is located within the central area of this culturally affiliated territory. The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHIC) Most Likely Descendent (MLD) files substantiate this habitation and migration record from oral tradition. These examples illustrate a direct correlation between the oral tradition and
the physical place; proving the importance of songs and stories as a valid source of information outside of the published anthropological data.

_Tóota yixélval_ (rock art) is also an important element in the determination of Luiseño territorial boundaries. _Tóota yixélval_ can consist of petroglyphs (incised) elements, or pictographs (painted) elements. The science of archaeology tells us that places can be described through these elements. Riverside and Northern San Diego Counties are home to red-pigmented pictograph panels. Archaeologists have adopted the name for these pictograph-versions, as defined by Ken Hedges of the Museum of Man, as the San Luis Rey style. The San Luis Rey style incorporates elements which include chevrons, zig-zags, dot patterns, sunbursts, handprints, net/chain, anthropomorph or (human-like) and zoomorphic (animal-like) designs. Tribal historians and photographers inform us that some design elements are reminiscent of Luiseño ground paintings. A few of these design elements, particularly the flower motifs, the net/chain and zig-zags, were sometimes depicted in Luiseño basket designs and can be observed in remaining baskets and textiles today.

An additional type of _tóota yixélval_, identified by archaeologists also as rock art or petroglyphs, are cupules. Throughout Luiseño territory, there are certain types of large boulders, taking the shape of mushrooms or waves, which contain numerous small pecked and ground indentations, or cupules. Cupule rocks and both painted and pecked _tóota yixélval_ are located within the vicinity of the Project. Additionally, according to historian Constance DuBois:

When the people scattered from Ekvo Temeko, Temecula, they were very powerful. When they got to a place, they would sing a song to make water come there, and would call that place theirs; or they would scoop out a hollow in a rock with their hands to have that for their mark as a claim upon the land. The different parties of people had their own marks. For instance, Albañas’s ancestors had theirs, and Lucario’s people had theirs, and their own songs of Munival to tell how they traveled from Temecula, of the spots where they stopped and about the different places they claimed (1908:158).

Our songs and stories, as well as academic works and recorded archaeological/cultural sites, demonstrate that the Luiseño people who occupied the Project area are ancestors of the present-day Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians, and as such, Pechanga is the appropriate culturally affiliated tribe for projects that impact this geographic area.

The Tribe has a history of working with the City of Corona and being the Lead Tribe on Projects within the City and its sphere of influence. Projects that the Tribe has worked on include the Retreat and Eagle Glen residential developments that are adjacent to the proposed Project; the Serrano Specific Plan industrial development and the adjacent commercial proposals, various Glen Ivy developments, the Corona North Main Apartments project, Eagle Valley and the Mulligan-Allen Villages.
The Tribe welcomes the opportunity to meet with the City of Corona to further explain and provide documentation concerning our specific cultural affiliation to lands within your jurisdiction.

**PROJECT IMPACTS TO CULTURAL RESOURCES**

The proposed Project is located in a highly sensitive region of Luiseño territory and the Tribe believes that the possibility for recovering cultural resources during ground-disturbing activities is high. The Tribe has over thirty-five (35) years of experience in working with various types of construction projects throughout its territory. The combination of this knowledge and experience, along with the knowledge of the culturally-sensitive areas and oral tradition, is what the Tribe relies on to make fairly accurate predictions regarding the likelihood of subsurface resources in a particular location.

The Tribe is aware of cultural resources that were recorded during development of the adjacent residential projects and are concerned that similarly related resources could be identified on the proposed Project. To date, the Tribe has not received any environmental documentation for review on the Project. The Tribe requests to be involved and participate with the City in assuring that an adequate environmental assessment is completed for the entirety of the Project including off-site impacts and in developing all monitoring and mitigation plans and measures for the duration of the Project. Because of the sensitivity of the area, we request a thorough archaeological study be conducted for the Project by a Riverside County qualified archaeologist. It is further the position of the Pechanga Tribe that Pechanga tribal monitors be required to be present during all cultural resource surveys, and archaeological and ground-disturbing activities conducted in connection with the Project, including any additional archaeological excavations performed. The Tribe also requests that all analysis of impacts to cultural resources for this Project area must necessarily include all cultural resources in the vicinity, even if such complexes exist adjacent to or nearby the Project area.

Given the sensitivity of the area, inadvertent discoveries are foreseeable impacts and thus need to be appropriately mitigated for within the confines of the Project. It is imperative that adequate cultural resources assessments be performed in conjunction with the Project approval and environmental review process. The identification of surface resources during an archaeological survey should not be the sole determining factor in deciding whether mitigation measures for inadvertent discoveries are required. The cultural significance of the area, provided in consultation with the Pechanga Tribe, should play a large part in determining whether specifications concerning unanticipated discoveries should be included.

**REQUESTED TRIBAL INVOLVEMENT AND MITIGATION**

The proposed Project is on land that is within the traditional territory of the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians. The Pechanga Band is not opposed to this Project. The Tribe’s primary concerns stem from the Project’s proposed impacts on Native American cultural
resources. The Tribe is concerned about both the protection of unique and irreplaceable cultural resources, such as Luiseño village sites, sacred sites and archaeological items which would be displaced by ground disturbing work on the Project, and on the proper and lawful treatment of cultural items, Native American human remains and sacred items likely to be discovered in the course of the work.

The CEQA Guidelines state that lead agencies should make provisions for inadvertent discoveries of cultural resources (CEQA Guidelines §15064.5). As such, it is the position of the Pechanga Tribe that an agreement specifying appropriate treatment of inadvertent discoveries of cultural resources be executed between the Project Applicant/Developer and the Pechanga Tribe.

The Tribe believes that adequate cultural resources assessments and management must always include a component which addresses inadvertent discoveries. Every major State and Federal law dealing with cultural resources includes provisions addressing inadvertent discoveries (See e.g.: CEQA (Cal. Pub. Resources Code §21083.2(i); 14 CCR §1506a.5(f)); Section 106 (36 CFR §800.13); NAGPRA (43 CFR §10.4). Moreover, most state and federal agencies have guidelines or provisions for addressing inadvertent discoveries (See e.g.: FHWA, Section 4(f) Regulations - 771.135(g); CALTRANS, Standard Environmental Reference - 5-10.2 and 5-10.3). Because of the extensive presence of the Tribe's ancestors within the Project area, it is not unreasonable to expect to find vestiges of that presence. Such cultural resources and artifacts are significant to the Tribe as they are reminders of their ancestors. Moreover, the Tribe is expected to protect and assure that all cultural sites of its ancestors are appropriately treated in a respectful manner. Therefore, as noted previously, it is crucial to adequately address the potential for inadvertent discoveries.

Further, the Pechanga Tribe believes that if human remains are discovered, State law would apply and the mitigation measures for the permit must account for this. According to the California Public Resources Code, § 5097.98, if Native American human remains are discovered, the Native American Heritage Commission must name a “most likely descendant,” who shall be consulted as to the appropriate disposition of the remains. Given the Project's location in Pechanga territory, the Pechanga Tribe intends to assert its right pursuant to California law with regard to any remains or items discovered in the course of this Project.

PROJECT MITIGATION MEASURES

The Pechanga Tribe will itself be engaging in further assessment of the Project area, in consultation with tribal elders, to identify more specific information about this culturally sensitive area. The Tribe understands that an Initial Study and an Environmental Impact Report still must be prepared for this Project. The Tribe requests that the City, Project Applicant and Project Archaeologist work directly with the Tribe to thoroughly evaluate and assess potential impacts to the Project Area, including any proposed off-site impacts. Moreover, the Tribe possesses necessary information about the archaeological and cultural sensitivity that an archaeological survey alone will not reveal, and should be consulted with at the earliest possible
stage of the environmental review to assist in identifying and mitigating the cultural resources impacts for this Project. The Tribe also requests to be included in any site visits and surveys to assist the Project Archaeologist in assessing impacts to cultural resources in the Project area.

Once that process is completed, the Tribe may submit suggested mitigation to specifically address impacts to any sites or resources found during the archaeological site assessments. For the present time, the City asks that, at a minimum, the City include the following mitigation measures in its environmental assessment documents:

**MM 1** Prior to beginning Project construction, the Project Applicant shall retain a Riverside County qualified archaeological monitor to monitor all ground-disturbing activities in an effort to identify any unknown archaeological resources. Any newly discovered cultural resource deposits shall be subject to a cultural resources evaluation.

**MM 2** At least 30 days prior to beginning Project construction, the Project Applicant shall contact the Pechanga Tribe to notify the Tribe of grading, excavation and the monitoring program, and to coordinate with the City of Corona and the Tribe to develop a Cultural Resources Treatment and Monitoring Agreement. The Agreement shall address the treatment of known cultural resources, the designation, responsibilities, and participation of Native American Tribal monitors during grading, excavation and ground disturbing activities; Project grading and development scheduling; terms of compensation; and treatment and final disposition of any cultural resources, sacred sites, and human remains discovered on the site.

**MM 3** Prior to beginning Project construction, the Project Archaeologist shall file a pre-grading report with the City of Corona (if required) to document the proposed methodology for grading activity observation. Said methodology shall include the requirement for a qualified archaeological monitor to be present and to have the authority to stop and redirect grading activities. In accordance with the agreement required in MM 2, the archaeological monitor's authority to stop and redirect grading will be exercised in consultation with the Pechanga Tribe in order to evaluate the significance of any archaeological resources discovered on the property. Tribal monitors shall be allowed to monitor all grading, excavation and groundbreaking activities, and shall also have the authority to stop and redirect grading activities in consultation with the Project archaeologist.

**MM 4** If human remains are encountered, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the Riverside County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Further, pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(b) remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and
disposition has been made. If the Riverside County Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission must be contacted within 24 hours. The Native American Heritage Commission must then identify the “most likely descendant(s)” within 48 hours of receiving notification of the discovery. The most likely descendant(s) shall then make recommendations, and engage in consultations concerning the treatment of the remains as provided in Public Resources Code 5097.98 and the Treatment Agreement described in MM 2.

MM 5

The landowner shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including sacred items, burial goods and all archaeological artifacts that are found on the Project area to the Pechanga Tribe for proper treatment and disposition.

MM 6

All sacred sites, should they be encountered within the Project area, shall be avoided and preserved as the preferred mitigation, if feasible.

MM 7

If inadvertent discoveries of subsurface archaeological resources are discovered during grading, the Project Applicant, the Project Archaeologist, and the Tribe shall assess the significance of such resources and shall meet and confer regarding the mitigation for such resources. If the Project Applicant and the Tribe cannot agree on the significance or the mitigation for such resources, these issues will be presented to the City of Corona Community Development Director for decision. The City shall make the determination based on the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act with respect to archaeological resources and shall take into account the religious beliefs, customs, and practices of the Pechanga Tribe.

The Pechanga Tribe looks forward to working together with the City of Corona in protecting the invaluable Pechanga cultural resources found in the Project area. Please contact me at 951-308-9295 X8104 once you have had a chance to review these comments so that we might address the issues concerning the mitigation language. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Anna Hoover
Cultural Analyst

Cc Pechanga Office of the General Counsel
March 3, 2010

Terri Manuel, AICP, Planning Manager
City of Corona
400 South Vicentia Avenue
Corona, CA 92882

RE: Proposed Arantine Hills Specific Plan Project
LSA Project No. CCR0901

Dear Ms. Manuel:

Thank you for contacting the Cahuilla Band of Indians concerning the above referenced project. We presently have no knowledge of any cultural resources within the plan project; however, although the project area is outside the Cahuilla Indian Reservation territory, it is not outside the Traditional Use Area for the Cahuilla Band of Indians and we are requesting copies of archeological and/or cultural resource documentation if any.

Finally, working in and around traditional use areas intensifies the possibility of encountering cultural resources during the construction/excavation phase. For this, the Cahuilla Band of Indians requests Cultural Resource Monitor(s) to be present during any ground disturbing proceedings. The Cahuilla tribe does have trained and certified Native American Monitors who are qualified to monitor construction and archaeological activities. Please contact the Cahuilla Tribal Environmental Protection Office (CTEPO) for proposed monitoring.

Sincerely,

Yvonne L. Markle
Cahuilla Environmental Office Manager
Cahuilla Tribal Environmental Protection Office
P.O. Box 391741
Anza, CA 92539
951-763-2631
environmentalofficer@cahuilla.net

cc: Victoria Avalos, Archaeologist
    LSA Associates, Inc.
March 8, 2010

Terri Manuel
City of Corona Community Development Dept.
400 South Vicentia Avenue
Corona, CA 92882-2187

NOTICE OF PREPARATION (INITIAL STUDY PENDING) FOR ARANTINE HILLS SPECIFIC PLAN DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, BEDFORD CANYON WASH WEST OF INTERSTATE 15, CITY OF CORONA, SCH# 2006091093

Dear Ms. Manuel:

Staff of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region (Regional Board) have reviewed the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Arantine Hills Specific Plan (Project), a proposed 278-acre residential development in the Santa Ana Mountains foothills west of Interstate 15 and southwest of Cajalco Road/Eagle Glen Parkway. The NOP proposes construction of commercial buildings and more than 1,700 dwelling units. The comment period for this NOP has recently ended, but we ask you to please consider incorporation of the following comments in order for the Project to best protect water quality standards (water quality objectives and beneficial uses) contained in the Water Quality Control Plan for the Santa Ana River Basin (Region 8 Basin Plan, 1995, as amended):

1. The southern portion of the proposed Project site is bisected by the western portion of Bedford Canyon Wash (BCW). The DEIR should discuss how each of the Intermittent beneficial uses listed in the Basin Plan for BCW may be impacted by the Project: Groundwater Recharge (GWR), Water Contact Recreation (REC1), Non-Contact Water Recreation (REC2), Warm Freshwater Habitat (WARM), and Wildlife Habitat (WILD). Further, the NOP states that the Specific Plan would cancel the existing Agricultural Preserve designation at this site, where an orange grove along BCW has already been removed in apparent anticipation of this construction. Therefore, we note that any remaining agricultural uses are apparently being removed before project approval, which should be clarified.

2. The NOP states (on p. 7 and on Figure 3) that approximately 37 acres of open space will be planned for the general avoidance of the natural bed and embankments of BCW (Planning Areas 17, 18, and 19). Permits will be applied for pursuant to federal Clean Water Act (CWA) Sections 404/401 and Section 1600 of the California Fish and Game Code, partly because of a proposed bike trail and potential drainage improvements (if any channel armoring is contemplated, please describe). A jurisdictional study and delineation of impacted riparian acreage should be included with DEIR hydrology/biology discussions. The DEIR should
propose a preliminary mitigation program, to comply with the projected CWA Section 401 Water Quality Certification to be issued by the Regional Board.

3. We request that the DEIR specifically address how the Project would protect the BCW channel integrity using proposed floodplain land to buffer the channel from the development. The Project will increase stormwater flow volume to the BCW from new impervious surfaces, which may hydromodify the BCW channel and/or impair existing mitigation sites (for other projects) downstream near the BCW confluence with Temescal Canyon Wash. Further, the BCW must not act as a stormwater filtration system for the Project; instead, Best Management Practices (BMPs) are required, by State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and Regional Board stormwater runoff permits, to capture and treat tributary flows before they enter the BCW channel. The Project's BMPs must comply with the implementation and Water Quality Management Plan requirements of Order No. R8-2010-0033, NPDES Permit No. CAS 618033, adopted January 29, 2010.

4. The DEIR should encourage the utilization of low-impact development (LID) Best Management Practices (BMPs) that retain and infiltrate stormwater on each lot, in accordance with Order No. R8-2010-0033. LID is among the Ahwahnee Water Principles for Resource Efficient Land Use (enclosure), adopted in 2005 by the Local Government Commission (LGC) and supported by the SWRCB to encourage a comprehensive, community-wide system for protecting water quality standards. These principles are intended to reverse the trend of increasingly paved and constructed areas that alter the rate/volume of surface water runoff, groundwater recharge, and hydromodification. LID makes use of project-level features such as grassed paseos to conserve water while managing urban runoff quantity/quality.

5. We request that the DEIR evaluate any proposed crossings and alternatives that will avoid dredge/fill, and other disturbances, to Project site drainages. Any crossings over drainages should take the form of bridges or arched open-bottomed culverts, so as to retain the BCW riparian wildlife movement corridor between the Santa Ana Mountains and Temescal Canyon Wash.

If you have any questions, please contact Glenn Robertson at (951) 782-3259, grobertson@waterboards.ca.gov, or me at (951) 782-3234, or madelson@waterboards.ca.gov

Sincerely,

Glenn Robertson, for
Mark G. Adelson, Chief
Regional Planning Programs Section

Enclosure – Ahwahnee Principles

Cc w/encl: State Clearinghouse
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles – Jason Lambert
California Dept. of Fish and Game, Ontario- Michael Flores

1 Waste Discharge Requirements for the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, The County of Riverside, and the Incorporated Cities of Riverside County within the Santa Ana Region, Areawide Urban Runoff Management Program (also known as "Riverside County Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit")
The Ahwahnee Water Principles
For Resource Efficient Land Use

Preamble

Cities and counties are facing major challenges with water contamination, storm water runoff, flood damage liability, and concerns about whether there will be enough reliable water for current residents as well as for new development. These issues impact city and county budgets and taxpayers. Fortunately there are a number of stewardship actions that cities and counties can take that reduce costs and improve the reliability and quality of our water resources.

The Water Principles below complement the Ahwahnee Principles for Resource-Efficient Communities that were developed in 1991. Many cities and counties are already using them to improve the vitality and prosperity of their communities.

Community Principles

1. Community design should be compact, mixed use, walkable and transit-oriented so that automobile-generated urban runoff pollutants are minimized and the open lands that absorb water are preserved to the maximum extent possible. (see the Ahwahnee Principles for Resource-Efficient Communities)

2. Natural resources such as wetlands, flood plains, recharge zones, riparian areas, open space, and native habitats should be identified, preserved and restored as valued assets for flood protection, water quality improvement, groundwater recharge, habitat, and overall long-term water resources sustainability.

3. Water holding areas such as creek beds, recessed athletic fields, ponds, cisterns, and other features that serve to recharge groundwater, reduce runoff, improve water quality and decrease flooding should be incorporated into the urban landscape.

4. All aspects of landscaping from the selection of plants to soil preparation and the installation of irrigation systems should be designed to reduce water demand, retain runoff, decrease flooding, and recharge groundwater.

5. Permeable surfaces should be used for hardscape. Impervious surfaces such as driveways, streets, and parking lots should be minimized so that land is available to absorb storm water, reduce polluted urban runoff, recharge groundwater and reduce flooding.

6. Dual plumbing that allows grey water from showers, sinks and washers to be reused for landscape irrigation should be included in the infrastructure of new development.
7. Community design should maximize the use of recycled water for appropriate applications including outdoor irrigation, toilet flushing, and commercial and industrial processes. Purple pipe should be installed in all new construction and remodeled buildings in anticipation of the future availability of recycled water.

8. Urban water conservation technologies such as low-flow toilets, efficient clothes washers, and more efficient water-using industrial equipment should be incorporated in all new construction and retrofitted in remodeled buildings.

9. Ground water treatment and brackish water desalination should be pursued when necessary to maximize locally available, drought-proof water supplies.

**Implementation Principles**

1. Water supply agencies should be consulted early in the land use decision-making process regarding technology, demographics and growth projections.

2. City and county officials, the watershed council, LAFCO, special districts and other stakeholders sharing watersheds should collaborate to take advantage of the benefits and synergies of water resource planning at a watershed level.

3. The best, multi-benefit and integrated strategies and projects should be identified and implemented before less integrated proposals, unless urgency demands otherwise.

4. From start to finish, projects and programs should involve the public, build relationships, and increase the sharing of and access to information. The participatory process should focus on ensuring that all residents have access to clean, reliable and affordable water for drinking and recreation.

5. Plans, programs, projects and policies should be monitored and evaluated to determine if the expected results are achieved and to improve future practices.
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