

From: Patricia Alfaro [mailto:orafla@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, June 25, 2018 8:19 AM

To: Bailey, Rusty <RBAiley@riversideca.gov>; Gardner, Mike <MGardner@riversideca.gov>; Melendrez, Andy <ASMelendrez@riversideca.gov>; Soubirous, Mike <msoubirous@riversideca.gov>; Conder, Chuck <CConder@riversideca.gov>; MacArthur, Chris <CMacArthur@riversideca.gov>; Perry, Jim <JPerry@riversideca.gov>; Adams, Steven <SAdams@riversideca.gov>; Nicol, Colleen <CNicol@riversideca.gov>
Subject: [External] PLANNING CASE P14-1033 & P14-1034

Honorable Mayor and Council

Planning Case P14-1033 & P14-1034 Warehouse project is wrong for the Northside's neighborhood, the Trujillo Adobe and will hurt Riverside's social capital. Elected leaders should look at the negative impacts this warehouse can do to this neighborhood and region.

Please support the property rights of the individual residents who call this home and invest in the Northside Specific Plan. Support creating a cultural center around the Trujillo Adobe, without warehouses and truck traffic.

--

Mrs Patricia Alfaro
orafla@gmail.com

cc: Mayor
City Council
City Manager
City Attorney
ACMs
Interim CE&D Director

April 4, 2018

To: Riverside City Planning Commission

Via contact planner Brian Norton

From: Friends of Riverside's Hills

Re: April 5, 2018 meeting Agenda Item 2: PLANNING CASES P14-1033 (DR), P14-1034 (LL), Center Street Commerce Building Project

Honorable Chair and Members of the Commission:

Friends of Riverside's Hills, a non-profit public benefit corporation based in the City of Riverside and devoted to protecting the local environment, opposes approval of this project, based on violations of CEQA and other laws, as discussed in some detail below. While others have commented extensively on the project, we believe some of the details mentioned, in particular some of the data we present here, has not been previously brought to the City's attention for this project. We regret that this letter is being sent so close to the actual Hearing, but much of the voluminous relevant material on which it is based was only posted on the City's website within recent days, and work such as these comments can only be done in our spare time.

As shown below, the project's environmental analyses for air quality, greenhouse gas, traffic, noise and biology omit required information that relates to the project's potentially significant environmental impacts. Thus those analyses preclude informed decision-making by the lead agency or informed participation by the public, and therefor are inadequate as a matter of law.

Inadequate project description

An inaccurate or incomplete project description renders the analysis of significant environmental impacts inherently unreliable. One of the ways in which the City's environmental analyses failed to comply with CEQA is that it failed to acknowledge that the project is explicitly designed NOT for manufacturing but for high-volume intermodal distribution warehousing use, and therefore failed to disclose the environmental impacts of the "whole of [the] action" (CEQA Guidelines, Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14 ("Guidelines"), § 15378(a)). As case law shows, when the MND's environmental analyses fail to disclose the "true scope" of a

project because it “concealed, ignored, excluded, or simply failed to provide pertinent information” regarding the reasonably foreseeable consequences of the project, then the MND is inadequate as a matter of law.

The Draft IS/MND describes the project, stating

“construction of a 308,000-square foot building ... The building could be used for any number of commercial or light industrial uses as permitted in the BMP zone; however, end users have not been identified at this time, as such, specific details about the future operation of the facility are not currently available. ... up to 167 passenger vehicle parking stalls, 237 truck trailer stalls, and 62 loading docks.”

The Project’s Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) (Exhibit 1D) also describes the project stating “The approximately 16 acre project site is proposed to be developed with 308,000 square feet of manufacturing”.

However, the City knew, or should have known, that the project was NOT designed to allow manufacturing. Indeed, the City’s zoning code, Table 19.580.060, requires 1 parking space per 350 square feet of floor area for Manufacturing (industrial zones, or about for this building $308,000/350 = 880$ parking spaces, far above the number of parking spaces proposed, with no Variance being considered. (A belated attempt to take account of that is made in some added comments in the current Report to the Planning Commission, with an “alternate plan” to possibly use only part of the building for manufacturing so as to reduce the number of parking spaces needed, but that alternative is not analyzed in the IS/MND nor in any of its appendices, in particular, the Air Quality and Traffic studies).

The project’s Air Quality and Climate Change Assessment’s Project Description states

“There is no tenant for the proposed building, thus, the operational components of the project are speculative at this time. The City of Riverside recommended consideration of a “manufacturing” use as a worst-case, conservative approach to assessing operational impacts. The building has been treated as such herein, consistent with the project traffic impact analysis and health risk assessment.”

This claim that manufacturing is a worst case, conservative approach, relied on in the Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas, Traffic and Noise analyses, is simply false as regards air quality, greenhouse gas, traffic and noise. Actually, the IS/MND appears to contradict itself on the planned use when it find it convenient to do so, as when stating in its Population and Housing section: “Based on average employees per square foot of warehouse in Riverside County, the proposed project is estimated to generate 530 new employees in the area.” and in the Kunzman response to a Caltrans comment where the project’s TIA consultant calls the project a “high cube warehouse distribution center”.

Traffic

A principal operational impact of the project on air quality and traffic will come from the number of truck trips involved and the distance they travel. In discussing the number of such truck trips, the claimed potential uses of the building can be divided into three categories: manufacturing, local distribution, and intermodal transit hub. Here, local distribution involves truck deliveries to and from sites in the Southern California, with temporary storage in the Building, or a distribution center for a single company (or a small number of companies); while intermodal transit hub involves truck deliveries to and from the site (e.g., to or from the Ports) with transfer to or from rail cars or long-distance truck shipping. In the breakdown of uses as described in the SCAQMD’s “High-Cube Warehouse Vehicle Trip Generation Analysis”, of the uses listed there, with corresponding parking and loading dock features, the Center Street project, with its very high ratio of loading docks (over 0.2 per 1,000 gross square feet, so a ratio of less than 1:5,000 GSF) and high ration of truck trailer parking spaces to loading docks, does not correspond to any of the classifications used there (Transload Facility, Fulfillment Center, Parcel Hub, etc.) although Parcel Hub comes closest, with its “Very high truck parking ratios to dock positions, often 2:1 or more”; for the Center Street project that ratio is 237/62 : 1 = 3.8:1, so extremely high. In Table 5 of that SCAQMD document, “Weighted Average for Daily Trips per 1,000 GSF”, for Parcel Hubs it lists respectively 10.638 for All Vehicles, 6.631 for Cars, 4.007 for Trucks, and 0.982 for 5+ Axle Trucks. Multiplying any of those figures by 308 (since the building will have 308,000 GSF) gives average daily trip numbers for the project that are far higher than the estimates given in the project’s TIA.

It is obvious that manufacturing, where the trucking is for incoming materials and outgoing manufactured products, involves far fewer heavy truck trips than either local distribution or intermodal transit hubs, and that the latter, involving quick transfer of goods from one mode to another, will involve the greatest number of truck trips. Evidence that the project, as designed, will accommodate the worst-case use, namely, intermodal transit hub use with its very large number of truck trips, is the fact that the project design includes 237 truck trailer stalls, and 62 loading docks. If it were for local distribution use (much less for manufacturing use) it wouldn't need nearly so many truck trailer stalls and loading docks. Those 237 truck trailer stalls, about 53 feet by 10 feet each, will occupy about 530×237 square feet = 125,601 square feet = 2.9 acres, not counting driveways, so quite a significant portion of the whole site.

The 237 truck trailer stalls and 62 loading docks imply the ability for the project to be used as an intermodal hub. A lower case turnover for such use is 2 to 4 hours per truck, so with 62 loading docks it is not unreasonable to expect say 300 trucks coming in and 300 trucks going out on a busy 24-hour day.

The Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA), only posted on the City website with this agenda item, and, as noted above wrongly basing its estimates on manufacturing use, in its "Table 2, Project Trip Generation" in its "Traffic Generation in Vehicles" lists

Daily: Passenger Car 875, 2 Axle Truck 99, 3 Axle Truck 54, 4+ Axle Truck 148, Total Truck 301, Total 1,176

And for "Traffic Generation in PCE's" (passenger car equivalent) it lists:

Daily: Passenger Car 875, 2 Axle Truck 149, 3 Axle Truck 108, 4+ Axle Truck 444, Total Truck 701, Total 1,576

(based on a PCE ratio of 1.50, 2.00 and 3.00 respectively for trucks with 2, 3 and 4 or more axle).

The TIA figures just quoted, with so many passenger cars and so few large trucks, is obviously based on the use of the project being manufacturing as indeed claimed in the TIA Project Description. With the appropriate estimates for a worst case use, namely, intermodal transit use, the figure for passenger car and small truck use would be much lower and the figure for heavy truck use would be much higher. Thus, as indicated above, with a reasonable figure of 600 heavy trucks per

day (300 in and 300 out) that alone would constitute 1,800 PCE's per day, so the total PCE's would be far higher than the 1,576 total in the TIA (plus, aside from traffic impacts, the fact that diesel trucks are far more polluting, and noisier, than passenger cars).

The TIA for a different warehouse project (750 Marlborough warehouse, done by a different consultant), has a footnote stating "Per the Truck Trip Generation Study, City of Fontana, for the Manufacturing Category, 38.8% of the project trips calculated are to represent truck traffic generated by the project.", so it appears that the TIA for the Center Street project used something like that figure in its calculation of project trips. But of course, as noted above, the Center Street project will not be in the Manufacturing Category, and the TIA analysis for it, by falsely claiming it is for a manufacturing use, is invalid.

Aside from the total amount of Traffic Generation claimed in the TIA, the morning and evening peak hour traffic figures claimed there are correspondingly far too low.

The City's allowing or even encouraging air quality and traffic analyses to be falsely based on a manufacturing use, and even claiming that that represents a worst-case scenario for such analyses, is an abuse of the CEQA process.

But there is another aspect of the TIA where it gets it wrong. The TIA is dated January 10, 2016, and analyzes traffic conditions for "Opening Year (2017) Without Project" and "Opening Year (2017) With Project", whereas the opening year will surely not be before 2019, and thus the TIA analysis ignores other projects which have or will come to fruition in the meantime. Notably, this includes the Columbia Business Center, with three warehouse buildings totaling nearly 1.5 million square feet on Palmyrita and Michigan a bit over 2 miles east (and a bit south) of the Center Street project, approved by the City in October 2015 with litigation settled a few months later, and with construction recently observed by us to be nearly complete, so needing to be considered by the project TIA for an updated opening year. The substantial portion of the heavy truck traffic from the Columbia Business Center that is not headed toward or coming from the south will likely take the most direct route to and from the freeway I-215, going to the freeway at East LaCadena Drive at Highgrove Place/I-215 Freeway NB Ramp (TIA intersection #7) or coming from the freeway at West

LaCadena Drive at Stephens Avenue/I-215 Freeway SB Ramp (TIA Intersection #6), so significantly impacting those two major intersections analyzed in the TIA. Similarly needing to be taken into account in an updated opening year projection is the traffic from the approximately 1,500 new homes now nearing-completion in the Spring Mountain Ranch development by KB homes in the unincorporated area a couple of miles east of the Center Street site, for which most of the freeway traffic from the homes will enter and leave the freeway at the just mentioned ramps, and with some of it going on Center Street past the project site, and similarly for the large number of apartments currently being approved in the Highgrove area, as well as other construction in the area. And as anyone driving the Inland Empire highways knows, traffic (including truck traffic) has gotten much worse in the last couple of years.

Thus the TIA's opening year 2017 traffic projections are invalid for what would be the actual opening year of 2019 or later, and the projections for opening year traffic need to be updated, including to take account of the traffic from the new projects that are already or will be in operation when the Center Street project comes into operation.

Also, the impact of a single truck on a city street pavement is estimated to be the equivalent of five cars. Thus, more trucks means the streets will deteriorate faster and will have to be repaired more often than if the streets are used by passenger vehicles. The MND fails to consider this.

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas

The Air Quality Impact Analysis (AQIA) is also deeply flawed by using inappropriate assumptions on operations. It states (at its p. 33)

“Trip generation (3.82 daily trips per 1,000 SF) is based on the trip generation rates provided in the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual (9th Edition). Passenger vehicles will consist of 74.4 percent of the fleet mix, light-duty trucks will consist of 8.4 percent of the fleet mix, medium-heavy duty trucks will consist of 4.6 percent of the truck trips, and heavy-heavy duty truck trips consist of 16.6 percent of the fleet mix. CalEEMod defaults were used for trip length, prime and no-prime trip percentages, and trip purpose in light of the proposed project being

assessed as manufacturing use. It was assumed that the facility will use five forklifts and one generator set during operations.”

So the AQIA is based on the assumption of the project “being assessed as manufacturing use”, which is improper for air quality analysis since it fails to consider appropriate numbers of truck trips involved with warehouse use, and diesel trucks are principal emitters of pollutants in the area. Since 3.82 (daily trips) times 308 (1,000 SF) = 1,176, the AQIA is basing its number of daily trips and fleet mix on the figures claimed in the TIA, which as noted above is way off for the worst-case warehouse use, with in particular the 16.6 percent heavy-heavy duty truck trips being far too low. Also, the AQIA assumption of just five forklifts and one generator set might be appropriate for manufacturing use, but is ridiculously low for a facility with 62 loading docks.

By assuming such a low number of heavy-heavy duty truck trips, and ignoring the fact that the much larger number of heavy-heavy duty truck trips will be traveling long distances, the AQIA fails to properly consider potential impacts.

In neither the AQIA nor the TIA can we find any consideration of the length of truck trips to and from the Project, with the concomitant impact on air quality and greenhouse gas. According to the SCAQMD for another warehouse distribution-type project in the Inland Empire, “[m]ost warehouses, distribution centers, and industrial land use projects would be hauling consumer goods, often from the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles as well as to destinations outside of SCAQMD boundaries.” See <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/defaultsource/ceqa/comment-letters/2015/january/mndwaterman.pdf> (incorporated by reference herein).

For the present Project, the approximate distances from the Project site to various destinations include:

- Project site to Port of Los Angeles/Long Beach: 70 miles
- Project site to Banning Pass: 40 miles
- Project site to downtown Los Angeles: 60 miles

There must be an analysis of average trip length to take into account the long distances that will be traveled by trucks going to and from the Project and the

associated amounts of pollutants generated. The Project analysis is defective in not providing such an analysis. Without knowing these facts, the MND cannot state that air quality impacts have been mitigated to a level of insignificance.

CEQA requires a lead agency to make a “good-faith effort” to “describe, calculate, or estimate the amount of [GHG] emissions resulting from a project.” CEQA Guidelines § 15064.4(a). As with the air quality impacts, the project’s Greenhouse Gas Emissions must be re-analyzed after the proper traffic volumes, especially heavy-heavy truck volumes, traffic travel distances, and on-site outdoor engine use have been revealed and analyzed.

Noise

The projects operational activities will necessarily involve a great deal of moving truck trailers by moving power equipment (“yard dogs”), with concomitant potential air quality and noise impacts. In particular, the movement in reverse gear of trucks and yard dogs will involve very loud backup beeping. Yet the IS/MND, while it calls for a Mitigation Measure (N-1) for construction noise, proposes no Mitigation Measure for operational noise, and none for Air Quality except for AQ-1, requiring future analysis for any proposed refrigerated use (which appears to be a violation of the CEQA prohibition on segmentation of a project).

Neither the AQIA nor the project’s Noise Study (Appendix G of the IS/MND) consider potential impacts of the equipment moving (often in reverse) on site outside the building. The Noise Study states

“Operational Noise

The increase in vehicular traffic on area roadways will not result in noise levels exceeding the 65 dBA exterior noise standard established by the City of Colton to the north. The exterior noise levels under the Without and With project scenarios exceed allowable exterior noise levels at the residential uses to the northwest, northeast, and southeast of the project site. However, the project does not cause the exterior noise levels to exceed the 55 dBA residential threshold for receptors that are currently below the allowable noise levels. In addition, the proposed project will not result in a noticeable increase in noise levels. Therefore, no substantial

impacts will occur. ... Operationally, the proposed project will result in periodic landscaping and other occasional noise generating activities. These activities are common in urban uses and do not represent a substantial increase in periodic noise in consideration that the project site is located in an industrialized area.”

That might be valid for a manufacturing use, but with a worst-case scenario of intermodal transit hub use (or even with local distribution use), there will be frequent and penetrating operational noise from the back-up alarms of the trucks and “yard dogs” moving about the exterior of the building, frequently in reverse, at night as well as day. A typical back-up beeper runs at 97-112dBa.

The Noise Study is invalid in failing to even consider such noise, and the AQIA is invalid in failing to consider the potential pollution of equipment moving on site outside the building.

Thus the City failed to call for even such obvious mitigation measures as requiring “yard dogs” to be powered by electric batteries instead of gas engines, putting some control on the level of backup alarm decibels (particularly at night), requiring electric hookups at the loading docks to reduce the amount of truck idling, etc.

Biology.

The IS/MND, dated Nov. 2017, and the Biological Resource Assessment note the “potential for ground-, tree-, and shrub-nesting birds to establish nests on the project site”, and call for Mitigation Measure BIO-2: If there are active nests on the site, “no grading or heavy equipment activity shall take place within 300 feet of sensitive bird nests and 500 feet of raptor nests, or as determined by a qualified biologist.”

However, there is no scientific evidence (and the IS/MND and Biological Resource Assessment cite none) that the 300 or 500 foot radii are sufficient to avoid impacts.

Denial of Public Participation and Brown Act Violation

The Development Review Committee, which approved this project, is not merely a “recommending body” but rather the final decision-maker (subject to very

expensive appeal) on projects such as this one that need approval from the City. The City's Zoning Code, in Table 19.650.020, "Approval Authority", list the DRC as "final approval authority" (subject to appeal) for several types of decision, including design review.

Therefore members of the public must appeal – and pay the \$2,529.00 appeal fee – to have public review and public comment on a project. This interferes with the public process and is anathema to public participation, as required by CEQA. Further, the regularly scheduled DRC meetings appear to be meeting covered by the Brown Act, and preclusion of the public would therefore be a violation of the Brown Act.

The Brown Act, in section 54952(b), says that the term "legislative body" includes "A commission, committee, board, or other body of a local agency, whether permanent or temporary, decisionmaking or advisory, created by charter, ordinance, resolution, or formal action of a legislative body." which clearly applies to the DRC as established in the Zoning Code enacted by the City Council. Moreover, the section's exclusion for certain advisory committees does not apply, one reason being that the DRC is not merely advisory but makes final decisions (even if those are subject to an expensive appeal). Thus the DRC, contrary to the City's response to a comment, is a legislative body governed by the Brown Act just as much as the Planning Commission itself is, and its closed meetings are a violation of the Brown Act.

Thank you for your consideration.

Friends of Riverside's Hills

By its Legal Liaison Officer Richard Block, 424 Two Trees Rd, Riverside CA 92507

From: Walter Elliot [mailto:Elliotone@icloud.com]

Sent: Tuesday, June 26, 2018 9:31 AM

To: Bailey, Rusty <RBailey@riversideca.gov>; Gardner, Mike <MGardner@riversideca.gov>; Melendrez, Andy <ASMelendrez@riversideca.gov>; Soubirous, Mike <msoubirous@riversideca.gov>; Conder, Chuck <CConder@riversideca.gov>; MacArthur, Chris <CMacArthur@riversideca.gov>; Perry, Jim <JPerry@riversideca.gov>; Adams, Steven <SAdams@riversideca.gov>; Nicol, Colleen <CNicol@riversideca.gov>
Subject: [External] PLANNING CASE P14-1033 & P14-1034

Honorable Mayor and Council

Planning Case P14-1033 & P14-1034 Warehouse project is wrong for the Northside's neighborhood, the Trujillo Adobe and will hurt Riverside's social capital. Elected leaders should look at the negative impacts this warehouse can do to this neighborhood and region.

Please support the property rights of the individual residents who call this home and invest in the Northside Specific Plan. Support creating a cultural center around the Trujillo Adobe, without warehouses and truck traffic.

--

Ms Walter Elliot
Elliotone@icloud.com

cc: Mayor
City Council
City Manager
City Attorney
ACMs
Interim C&ED Director

June 25, 2018

Chris Mac Arthur, Chairman
Land Use Committee of the Riverside City Council
3900 Main Street
Riverside, California 92522

RE: Center Street Commerce Center Project
Planning Cases P14-1033 (DR) & P14-1034 (LLA)
Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

Dear Mr. Mac Arthur and Committee Members:

I deeply regret the decision made by the Planning Commission on April 5, 2018 in regards to the Center Street Commerce Center Project. My reasons for regret are as follows, but not limited to:

1. First and foremost, as a member of the City of Riverside's Cultural Heritage Board I begin by observing the vast cultural and historical impacts to the immediate surrounding areas of the proposed site.
 - a) The 1862 Trujillo Adobe is only footsteps away from the proposed site. It is absolutely accurate that an increase in truck traffic and heavy machinery will perpetuate the degradation of an already extremely fragile structure.
 - b) The City of Riverside's Northside is the oldest neighborhood with a vast history. It is in the city's best interest to preserve that history and tell the story of the Northside. That unique history cannot be told without the preservation of open lands and public realms.
2. As a member of the Northside Improvement Association I find the City of Riverside's haphazard relationship with the Northside profoundly concerning.
 - a) The City of Riverside has created a bait and switch with the issuance of a \$2.5 million Northside Specific Plan still in the drafting stages and out for community review and feedback while allowing a large portion of Northside land to be developed prematurely.
 - b) Disregarding an in-progress specific plan to allow a developer to consolidate four parcels to build a monstrous 308,000 square foot warehouse will continue to sow seeds of distrust between the Northside and the City of Riverside.
3. Finally, as a resident of the City of Riverside I reject the current form of community and economic development.
 - a) The City of Riverside cannot continue to bend to the will of any developer. This city is much more than a place for developers to find cheap land and we must expect more from those coming to develop in our city.
 - b) Riverside residents have stated time and time again that we do not wish to see warehouse developments in our city. Warehouse projects are land intensive, job poor, and environmental hazards and are not welcome in the City of Riverside.

For the above reasons I, along with 702 of my Ward 1 neighbors that have signed petitions, sincerely ask that you vote against the development of the Center Street Commerce Center Project.

Respectfully,


Philip J. Falcone

cc: Mayor
City Council
City Manager
City Attorney
ACMs
Interim C&ED Director

From: Donatella Galella [<mailto:donatellagalella@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, June 26, 2018 10:27 AM
To: Nicol, Colleen <CNicol@riversideca.gov>
Subject: [External] RE: Center Street Warehouse

Dear Colleen Nicol,

I hope that this e-mail finds you well.

I'm writing to urge the Riverside city council to overturn the Planning Commission's decision regarding the Center Street Warehouse and instead uphold the Springbrook Heritage Alliance's appeal. We don't need more mediocre jobs and more air pollution. I have regularly received Google updates in the past week warning me about poor air quality in this area. I already have horrible allergies and need to take antihistamines every single day. Please do not approve this warehouse and do not exacerbate our current conditions.

Regards,
Donatella Galella
92506

Donatella Galella, PhD
Assistant Professor
Theatre, Film, and Digital Production
University of California, Riverside

"You're lecturing me about Asian representation?" -David Henry Hwang in *Soft Power*

cc: Mayor
City Council
City Manager
City Attorney
ACMs
Interim C&ED Director

From: George Hague [<mailto:gbhague@gmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, April 04, 2018 11:34 PM

To: Norton, Brian <BNorton@riversideca.gov>

Cc: Andrade, Frances <FANDRADE@riversideca.gov>; Nicol, Colleen <CNicol@riversideca.gov>

Subject: [External] Sierra Club comments on PLANNING CASES P14-1033 (DR), P14-1034 (LL): An appeal, on behalf of the Springbrook Heritage Alliance,

NorthsidePlan.com website.

Riverside-Colton Specific Plan

Good morning Planning Commissioners,

RE: PLANNING CASES P14-1033 (DR), P14-1034 (LL): An appeal, on behalf of the Springbrook Heritage Alliance, of an approval by the Development Review Committee for a proposal by Art Day of Transition Properties, L.P. for a Design Review to construct a 308,000 square foot warehouse building, a Lot Line Adjustment to consolidate four parcels into one parcel, and related Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. The project site is located at 3705-3667 Placentia Lane, on the south side of Center Street, north of Placentia Lane, between Orange and Main Streets, in Ward 1.

The Sierra Club is very concerned about this project and the inadequacy of the environmental review that is provided to the public and decision makers. Tiering off the City's General Plan doesn't justify using only a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) and doesn't provide the necessary analysis/information to evaluate all the impacts this project will bring to the the area and region.

We believe a full EIR must be required to give the pubic the knowledge they should have for the project's impacts on noise, traffic, greenhouse gas, air quality, biological as well as impacts to historical and Native American resources. The MND doesn't do justice to cumulative and growth inducing impacts of this project. It also doesn't provide a range of alternatives. Several of those alternatives should have been those proposed in the Riverside-Colton Specific Plan for the Northside Plan's alternatives for this project site. Failing to do this makes the current environmental review inadequate for this project.

Since the project could significantly impact the historic Trujillo Adobe and many land uses that supported the adobe, why hasn't the City's own Cultural Heritage Board as well as State and County Historical commissions/boards been more involved in providing the public information/opinions about the impacts of this project. The Sierra Club believes a full EIR would do a better job of reaching out to these groups as well as more local Native American groups to provide the necessary input prior to decision makers' votes.

The Sierra Club would hope each Planning Commissioner makes a request that this project needs a full EIR to give not only the public but themselves the information necessary to make an informed decision.

Please keep the Sierra Club informed of all future meetings and documents related to this project by using this email address and the address below my name. Impacts to historic sites and to air quality and greenhouse gas needs to be a concern to everyone and not limited to those who live within a particular jurisdiction.

Sincerely,

George Hague

Sierra Club
Moreno Valley Group
Conservation Chair

26711 Ironwood Ave
Moreno Valley, CA 92555

From: Isabel Leon [mailto:Isabel.diaz04@yahoo.com]

Sent: Monday, June 25, 2018 7:34 AM

To: Bailey, Rusty <RBailey@riversideca.gov>; Gardner, Mike <MGardner@riversideca.gov>; Melendrez, Andy <ASMelendrez@riversideca.gov>; Soubirous, Mike <msoubirous@riversideca.gov>; Conder, Chuck <CConder@riversideca.gov>; MacArthur, Chris <CMacArthur@riversideca.gov>; Perry, Jim <JPerry@riversideca.gov>; Adams, Steven <SAdams@riversideca.gov>; Nicol, Colleen <CNicol@riversideca.gov>
Subject: [External] PLANNING CASE P14-1033 & P14-1034

Honorable Mayor and Council

Planning Case P14-1033 & P14-1034 Warehouse project is wrong for the Northside's neighborhood, the Trujillo Adobe and will hurt Riverside's social capital. Elected leaders should look at the negative impacts this warehouse can do to this neighborhood and region.

Please support the property rights of the individual residents who call this home and invest in the Northside Specific Plan. Support creating a cultural center around the Trujillo Adobe, without warehouses and truck traffic.

--

Ms Isabel Leon

Isabel.diaz04@yahoo.com

cc: Mayor
City Council
City Manager
City Attorney
ACMs
Interim CE&D Director

From: Sharon Mateja [mailto:smateja@earthlink.net]

Sent: Monday, December 18, 2017 8:05 PM

To: 'Karen Renfro' <k.a.renfro7@gmail.com>; Bailey, Rusty <RBailey@riversideca.gov>; Gardner, Mike <MGardner@riversideca.gov>; Melendrez, Andy <ASMelendrez@riversideca.gov>; Soubirous, Mike <msoubirous@riversideca.gov>; Conder, Chuck <CConder@riversideca.gov>; MacArthur, Chris <CMacArthur@riversideca.gov>; Perry, Jim <JPerry@riversideca.gov>; Adams, Steven <SAdams@riversideca.gov>; 'Mark Acosta' <macosta@scng.com>; Media-rhagen@scng.com <rhagen@scng.com>

Cc: Russo, John A. <jrusso@riversideca.gov>; Marysheva, Marianna <MMarysheva@riversideca.gov>; Zelinka, Al <azelinka@riversideca.gov>; Nguyen, Alexander <ANguyen@riversideca.gov>; Geuss, Gary <GGeuss@riversideca.gov>; Nicol, Colleen <CNicol@riversideca.gov>; Guzman, Rafael <RGuzman@riversideca.gov>; 'erin snyder' <epolcene@juno.com>; 'Wohlgemuth Family' <pjdnw@yahoo.com>; 'Nancy Melendez' <nancy.melendez@icloud.com>; 'John Krick' <john.krick@alvordschools.org>; 'Marisa Yeager' <marisayeager@gmail.com>; 'ponnech' <ponnech@att.net>; 'Tom Donahue' <tjdonahue53@att.net>; 'Sycamore Highlands Action Group' <sycamorehighlands@yahoo.com>; 'John W. Hiscock' <ostamgr@gmail.com>; 'Paul Ostapuk' <postapuk@gmail.com>; 'Alexander King' <avking@live.com>; 'Cecelia Peña' <ceceliapena@hotmail.com>; 'Vicki Felmlee' <info@tcsmsg.com>; 'Henry James Vásquez' <HJVsqzIMISA@sbcglobal.net>; RiversideTamaleFestival@gmail.com; 'Riverside County Heritage Association' <rivcoheritageassoc@gmail.com>; mtrubidoux@aol.com; NorthsideIA@yahoogroups.com

Subject: [External] RE: DRC AGENDA 12-13-17

Dear Karen, etal,

The wishes of residents for the development of their own neighborhoods, wards and city appear to be secondary to the few in the city who have the power to make decisions for the many.

Northside is battling for quality of life and preservation of their historical community. As you pointed out, the historical significance has potential for appropriate development to fit your; if done creatively, I agree with you that there can also be "a vibrant economic future"; example: Old Town San Diego, for one.

Sycamore Canyon did battle to preserve the quality of life for their neighborhoods, UNA has battled (and I think is still battling) for preservation of their neighborhoods and quality of life, the Westside is also embroiled in a struggle to maintain our residential zoning....WHY must residents do battle with a city, and with electeds; let's work together for a Better Riverside.

There is a huge chasm between the resident's vision of Riverside in 10, 20 or 30 years and that of the few who are changing what Riverside is, has been and envisions being. Our leaders, in my opinion, need an open meeting, with open dialogue, where residents can share in the development of "our" city....my opinion.

Thank you Mike Gardner for filing the appeal for the benefit of the Northside residents.

Respectfully,

Sharon Mateja
Resident/Homeowner/Stakeholder

From: George North [mailto:spiritofthenorth@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, June 26, 2018 1:27 PM
To: Bailey, Rusty <RBailey@riversideca.gov>; Gardner, Mike <MGardner@riversideca.gov>; Melendrez, Andy <ASMelendrez@riversideca.gov>; Soubirous, Mike <msoubirous@riversideca.gov>; Conder, Chuck <CConder@riversideca.gov>; MacArthur, Chris <CMacArthur@riversideca.gov>; Perry, Jim <JPerry@riversideca.gov>; Adams, Steven <SAdams@riversideca.gov>; Nicol, Colleen <CNicol@riversideca.gov>
Subject: [External] PLANNING CASE P14-1033 & P14-1034

Honorable Mayor and Council

Planning Case P14-1033 & P14-1034 Warehouse project is wrong for the Northside's neighborhood, the Trujillo Adobe and will hurt Riverside's social capital. Elected leaders should look at the negative impacts this warehouse can do to this neighborhood and region.

Please support the property rights of the individual residents who call this home and invest in the Northside Specific Plan. Support creating a cultural center around the Trujillo Adobe, without warehouses and truck traffic.

--

Mr George North
spiritofthenorth@sbcglobal.net

cc: Mayor
City Council
City Manager
City Attorney
ACMs
Interim C&ED Director

From: info@springbrookheritagealliance.org [<mailto:info@springbrookheritagealliance.org>]

Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2018 1:48 PM

To: Andrade, Frances <FANDRADE@riversideca.gov>

Cc: Guzman, Rafael <RGuzman@riversideca.gov>; Brenes, Patricia <PBrenes@riversideca.gov>; Norton, Brian <BNorton@riversideca.gov>; Watson, Scott <SWatson@riversideca.gov>; Gardner, Mike <MGardner@riversideca.gov>; Diaz, Sergio <SDiaz@riversideca.gov>; Moore, Michael <MMoore@riversideca.gov>; Martinez, Kris <KMARTINEZ@riversideca.gov>; Cruz, Adolfo <AdCruz@riversideca.gov>; Kennon, Tonya <TKennon@riversideca.gov>; Peterson, Robyn <RPeterson@riversideca.gov>; Jorgenson, Todd <TJorgenson@riversideca.gov>; epolcene@yahoo.com; pjdnw@yahoo.com; nancy.melendez@icloud.com; john.krick@alvordschools.org; darlene.elliott@gmail.com; osta.aguamansa@gmail.com; ponnech@att.net; tjdonahue53@att.net; smateja@earthlink.net; Nicol, Colleen <CNicol@riversideca.gov>; Murray, David <DMurray@riversideca.gov>; macosta@scng.com; Media-rhagen@scng.com <rhagen@scng.com>; highgrovenews@roadrunner.com

Subject: [External] PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING APRIL 5, 2018: CENTER STREET COMMERCE CENTER PROJECT P14-1033 & P14-1034

March 21, 2018

Maartin Rossouw, Chairman
Riverside Planning Commission
City of Riverside
3900 Main Street
Riverside, California 92522
CC: Members of the Planning Commission

CENTER STREET COMMERCE CENTER PROJECT
Planning Cases P14-1033 & P14-1034, Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

Honorable Chairman and Members of the Riverside Planning Commission:

This letter is written on behalf of Springbrook Heritage Alliance, a multi-jurisdictional community group dedicated to saving the treasures of the Springbrook Arroyo Watershed which runs from the top of Pigeon Pass to the Santa Ana River and from Blue Mountain and La Loma Hills to Box Springs Wilderness Park and Mt. Rubidoux. The area was once rural and agricultural, but in the past twenty-five years has been undergoing a painful and poorly-guided transition to industrial and urban development,

We are appealing the decision of the Developmental Review Committee to approve the Center Street Commerce Center because the site selected is just plain wrong for a project of this nature. It is wrong for a number of reasons, only some of which we are able to include in this letter.

A project of this size--308,00 sq.-ft., quarter-mile-long and 45-ft.-high building on a 15.9-acre site in the open-space recreational area of a long-established rural residential community in the Santa Ana River flood plain--is inherently unsuitable for the location. Because of the sensitive nature of the location, most other development would be equally unsuitable.

The consequences of ignoring limitations imposed by nature are inescapable and it is the responsibility of government to exercise good judgment in the course of their decisions. To do this, it is necessary to take the long view--something that requires looking back beyond our own lifetimes.

That the DRC's decision was made on the basis of exceedingly deficient and faulty Environmental Impact Studies and conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration should be a source of shame for the City of Riverside, as it makes a laughingstock of our city government and its operations.

We ask that you reject the Initial Study and MND, and deny the application altogether.

Our other reasons for appealing the DRC's decision include violations of the following:

- California CEQA laws
- Ralph M. Brown Act
- State and local laws regarding actual and potential historical sites and landmarks
- Riverside City Charter
- Riverside Municipal Code
- Riverside Good Neighbor Warehouse Policy
- Riverside General Plan 2025 Northside Land Use Policy and Design Guidelines

The project site is also located within the Northside Specific Plan Study Area. The study is being undertaken not only to comply with State law, but at the request of Northside Neighborhood residents and businesses who for the past twenty-five years have been asking the City for a land use policy that is beneficial to the neighborhood. A warehouse like the one in question would in no way be beneficial for the people and businesses that are already here. Such a warehouse would most certainly degrade a neighborhood that has potential for land uses of lesser impact to the environment and higher value to the community.

Currently, the NSP Team is working on an Environmental Impact Report as part of the specific plan process. It makes no sense to consider the Center Street Commerce Center warehouse before the NSP is finalized and we know what future land uses will be established for the site. The DRC's approval of the warehouse is not just premature, it is a conflict of interest leaving the City of Riverside vulnerable to lawsuits by aggrieved parties.

Now, Springbrook Heritage Alliance is not opposed to warehouses, just opposed to a warehouse anywhere in the Northside. This neighborhood is not a wasteland, nor should its economic future be limited to industrial, commercial and/or any other large-scale urban development. In fact, the area north of Columbia to the other side of La Loma Hills in Colton and from La Cadena to the river is the oldest permanent settlement east of Los Angeles county. It was established as "La Placita de los Trujillos" in 1843 by New Mexican pioneers and has a unique and colorful history, with a heritage that lives on in the greater Northside area today. The neighborhood should be a source of pride for our city.

The 15,000 men, women and children who live, work and go to school here; and scores of companies that do business here; and the dozens of sports organizations that make the publically-owned recreational facilities at Reid Park, Ab Brown Sports Complex and Riverside Championship Cross Country Course their headquarters love the Northside, especially the area in and around the warehouse site.

Attached is a map of Springbrook Arroyo & Environs, encompassing its watershed. The arroyo and its watershed are major geographical features of the communities of Riverside, Colton, Highgrove and Grand Terrace. Many of the places identified on this map are of geological, geographical, historical and cultural interest. Many more are not so marked. The history of this special place is still being written even as the places where it occurred are disappearing out from under us.

Once lost, they cannot be replaced. We want them to be saved for the benefit and pleasure of the people who live in the Springbrook Arroyo communities, and the people who work here, and the people who visit.

These places are mentioned in the Springbrook Heritage Alliance handout entitled "Heritage of the Springbrook Arroyo Watershed" which we are sending you in a separate email. The handout serves as an outline of only some of the major places and events significant to the very long history of this irreplaceable feature of our landscape. The Arroyo runs from the top of Pigeon Pass to the Santa Ana River, and its watershed includes all the hills, peaks, and lower Pigeon Pass from the escarpment to the river, on both sides as far out as Colton, Grand Terrace and the 60 freeway in Riverside.

Springbrook Arroyo, a dotted blue-line stream on the U.S.G.S. Map of the San Bernardino South Quadrangle (1967, revised 1980), is located a quarter-mile to the south of the warehouse site. If the

warehouse were to be constructed, it would be visible from every vantage point along the arroyo from just above Orange Street to the other side of Main Street. It should be restored to its natural condition as an irreplaceable community treasure. This is a Quality of Life issue for the people who live here and much wildlife. And a blue-line stream on a U.S.G.S. map should be restored to its natural state.

In 2015 the City of Riverside adopted its first major initiative, "Springbrook Wash Arroyo Nature Trail at Fairmount Park", calling for restoration of the Arroyo from the Santa Ana River to Lake Evans. We are grateful to those who initiated this project and supported their proposal because our Alliance has been working toward a land use policy that would continue a restoration through the Northside and up to the city limits in Pigeon Pass

The westernmost section of the Springbrook Arroyo Watershed, where the Center Street warehouse is to go, is not only the location of the oldest permanent settlement in the Inland Empire, it was a favorite destination for seasonal visits by native peoples since ancient times. The borderlands of the Cahuilla, Tongva, Serrano and sometimes Luiseno and Chemehuevi used to come together in this neighborhood, same as our jurisdictional boundaries do now. Their tribal borderlands became our own. We learned this from a former curator of the Riverside Metropolitan Museum, Sean Milanovich, a scholar of local native culture who put together that wonderful "Cahuilla Connection" exhibit in 2015.

Among the things we learned from him are that the hot springs that once flowed in the Northside's flood plain here considered sacred to local native peoples, a sign to them from the Creator that they were to be at peace if they encountered one another here.

From the Roquet Ranch Draft Environmental Impact Report SCH No. 2016061056 we learned there are prehistoric rock shelters, milling stones and female fertility symbols on La Loma Hills--located within a mile of the Center Street Commerce Center site.

By putting our information together, it is possible to conclude--at least tentatively--that the entire La Loma Hills-flood plain area was not merely a place of seasonal blessings for hunter-gatherers returning to a pocket camp to reap what nature had sown, but to a special place for ceremonial and spiritual reasons, too. Native artifacts have been found in the Northside's flood plain, at Elliotta Springs in 1870 by Riverside's founders (cited in Tom Patterson's *A Colony for California* and other sources), and there is every reason to believe there are more lying hidden beneath the surface virtually anywhere and everywhere around here.

There are rules governing places like these, meant to protect irreplaceable artifacts from destruction by development. Applicants are not supposed to disturb the soil until they have done their due diligence with an archeological survey and an onsite observer from a local native tribe. However, long before the warehouse project had completed their first draft Initial Study and MND, they had allowed the site to be graded by heavy earth-moving equipment. This we reported to the city, but the damage was done.

The Northside deserves better.

In the Fall of 2014 Springbrook Heritage Alliance proposed a new land use policy called *Springbrook Heritage Parklands & Walking Trails* that would, if adopted, enable such a restoration of the arroyo and future development based on the city's 2025 General Plan design Guidelines for the Northside, Northside Community Plan of 1991 and the vision of Spanish Town Heritage Foundation. We are forwarding this plan to you under separate email. Our proposal is endorsed by a number of organizations, including Northside Improvement Association, Spanish Town Heritage Foundation, Friends of Blue Mountain, Friends of Fairmount Park, University Neighborhood Association, Casa Blanca Community Action Group, Academy of Living History Performing Arts, Riverside Woman's Club, and hundreds of residents and friends of the Northside.

When we first proposed our plan, Springbrook Arroyo had long been troubled by intermittent disruption from industrial, commercial, residential and infrastructure development. But, for nearly one hundred years it was a beloved natural feature that handled a great deal of run-off water from the thousands of acres of citrus groves that once populated Pigeon Pass. Even now it is still open and natural in many places. In some places the arroyo is ten, even fifteen or more feet deep, and even wider than that above the freeway. Along the former golf course, now a favorite CIF Championship Cross Country Course next to Reid Park, it used to be six-to-twelve feet deep. But, no more. The forces of nature and the folly of

man conspired to fill it with some of the most beautiful sand you ever laid eyes on, a fact that has bearing on the warehouse case.

The June 2017 Northside Specific Plan Baseline Report asserts that Springbrook Arroyo--a natural feature that has been handling hundreds of millions of acre feet of run-off water for a very, very long time--is incapable of handling the least little bit of run-off. The report suggests it be turned into a cement flood control channel. To do such a thing runs contrary to the wishes of Northside residents, our Parklands proposal and government policy relating to natural waterways.

Fortunately, the report is mistaken. As it turns out only the section from West La Cadena to Lake Evans is silted up. How this happened should be a lesson to us all:

In the Summer of 2013, the County of Riverside caused the removal of vegetation on a site along Springbrook Arroyo. The property was graded so thoroughly only a few large trees remained. Plants that once held the banks of the arroyo in place were bulldozed out. Then, on Aug. 29, before the topsoil could settle, there was a terrible hurricane-force thunderstorm that dropped two inches of rain and hail in one hour on the Northside. The deluge washed all the loose topsoil into the waterway, filling it up so that in most places it is only one to three feet deep. We informed the NSP Team of this. We briefed them on the history of the arroyo and directed them to the Riverside County and City Arroyo Watershed Committee Report and City of Riverside Council Reports of Sept. 9, 2007 and Dec. 19, 2006.

Two years ago we submitted our Parklands proposal to the Northside Specific Plan Team with a request that it be included in the Northside Specific Plan. This year we submitted it to the Park & Recreation Department for inclusion in the Park & Recreation Master Plan. It is our hope that Riverside City Council will adopt it as part of the city's commitment to a Family-Friendly Green community.

Industrial and other heavy-impact development of any kind would require Springbrook Arroyo to be contained in a cement channel, even covered, contrary to the best interests of the people who live and work in the neighborhood, play in the many ballfields next to it, and visit the parklands for occasional special events and their always tranquil atmosphere. It would be contrary to the federal, state and local laws that are supposed to protect us. Warehouses can be built elsewhere, and are, but the old La Placita-Northside neighborhood cannot be moved. Its history is in the people who live here, on the land on where we live, and in the unrecognized natural and cultural landmarks we identify with.

We have already mentioned that the Center Street Commerce Center warehouse site is located in the Santa Ana River flood plain, just north of the Ab Brown Sports Complex on Center and west of the Trujillo Adobe. This is a fact of great significance that needs to be examined closely. Historically, the high-water line of major floods (1862, late 19th-early 20th century, 1939, 1969, etc.) runs along North Orange Street. We know this because of eyewitness accounts from many generations of Northside residents, visitors and newspaper articles.

Following the great Flood of 1969, which not only breached certain sections of Orange Street but damaged or washed away several bridges across river, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers completed a section of the Santa Ana River levee that spans the mouth of Pigeon Pass between La Loma Hills and Mt. Rubidoux. It is believed by many people, including government officials, that this area of Riverside's Northside is now fully protected by that levee from all but the most disastrous flooding.

However, this is not really what the levee does.

While it is true that the levee keeps the river from flowing into North Riverside, it does not prevent rainfall and run-off water from accumulating on the flood plain during moderate to heavy rain storms. \$Even before the levee was built, rainfall and run-off water cannot drain into the river because there is nowhere for it to go, so it backs up until the rain stops. The water piles up as far as the grade allows it to go. Some of it seeps into the ground, but most drains out to the river when the level of the river falls below the opening of the drain-pipes. Flood control channels, while marring the landscape considerably, would do nothing to prevent this kind of flooding. This has been established simply by watching what happens before, during and after a rainstorm.

The NSP Baseline Report of June 2017 states that the Santa Ana River levee is deteriorating (see page 20). But, the Center Street Commerce Center Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration does not address this issue. It most certainly should be a reason for concern regarding any new development in

the flood plain on either side of the river. Thousands of lives and much property are at stake if the levee were to fail when it is needed most. It should remind us that development in any river flood plain should be minimal.

Worst-case scenario: a giant warehouse in full operation, with scores of heavy trucks and hundreds of cars, means hundreds of human beings who would of necessity need to leave the area in a hurry. They would find the roads crowded with residents, businessmen, working people, sports enthusiasts and other people all trying to leave the area in a hurry.

Because it is in the flood plain, lower elevations such as the Center Street Commerce Center warehouse site are subject to flooding during the afore-mentioned storms. This can be easily documented and should be to make any study of the site complete. At such times, it is not unusual for cars and trucks to be unable to pass through from Orange Street to Main along Center or Placentia Lane. This also can be documented. It is a continual source of amusement for Northsiders who find existing land use policy lacking.

Until the 1990s when the City and County Redevelopment Agencies rezoned the northernmost undeveloped rural properties of Riverside to Industrial-BMP, people did not build in the flood plain. Sharon Trujillo-Kasner, a descendant of La Placita's founders who grew up in the neighborhood of the warehouse site, submitted a letter to the City of Riverside two years ago stating that it has been the custom of her family never to have a house below Orange Street because of the danger of flooding during heavy rains.

The flood plain in the Northside is on top of an underground water reservoir called the "Riverside-North Basin", a main source of drinking water for Riverside Public Utilities. RPU also has a well across Placentia from the warehouse site and other locations nearby which would be harmed by heavy truck traffic and whatever industrial use might occupy the property.

Then there is also the question of the underground channel of the Santa Ana River, which flows through the Northside flood plain, changing its hidden course from time to time. The soil through which it flows is inherently unstable. Aquifers feed seasonal springs which dot the landscape during periods of even lighter-than-usual rainfall. Rainy periods cause pools to form in the flood plain, attracting waterfowl and other wildlife. It should be classified as some kind of wetlands, even though during periods of drought like we are experiencing presently seem to indicate otherwise.

In 1852, during a period of dry years, residents of La Placita de los Trujillos and Agua Mansa, whose twin villages were located on either side of the river where a southern branch of the Old Spanish Trail from Cajon Pass to the Santa Ana River meets La Loma Hills, built a an adobe chapel on the east-side of the river. When they attempted put the roof on, the little structure disappeared into the ground. It was rebuilt on high ground on the other side. This story is mentioned in Joyce Carter Vickery's *Defending Eden* (UCR History Department and Riverside Municipal Museum, 1977) based on archival material and Trujillo Family oral tradition that is easily referenced at the RMM. it is interesting to note that there is no mention of an earthquake or rainfall in conjunction with this notable event.

The map of the Southern California Colony Association Ten-Acre Tracts filed with the San Bernardino Co. Recorder's Office in 1871 describes the area where the Center Street Commerce Center warehouse site is located as "Open Bottom Land", with Willows and Agua Mota Brush covering the flood plain below the Table Land. A map of Jurupa Rancho filed with the U.S. Surveyor General's Office in 1878 described the same as "bottomland". According to the Tenth Edition of Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, since 1728, the term *bottomland* has been used in the United States to refer to "low-lying land along a river course". The 1828 Noah Webster's *Dictionary of the American Language* says one meaning of the word "bottom" refers to the lowest-possible point of anything.

This means that neither the levee and nor any amount of new or improved flood control channels, or any other "improvement" devised by the hand of man, are sufficient to prevent the forces of nature from undermining or destroying our efforts to overcome them. There is no way to prevent the inevitable, or mitigate against the worst-case scenario. We bring this up in the hopes that the developer will realize that the chosen site for their warehouse is not in their best interests, either.

We are also aware that if one giant warehouse is built in this neighborhood, it opens the door for a second one, and a third, and so on until the irreplaceable and lovely open-space charm of the city's oldest

neighborhood is displaced entirely by industrial parks and hard surfaces, the underground water reservoirs and the river polluted with industrial-related toxins, the air made unbreathable by the truck traffic, the background noise ruining what is otherwise usually a very quiet place to be and neighborhood residents are driven away by the certain destruction to their Quality of Life.

We are sorry that this letter cannot include every point we wish to make--that would require more time than we have to get this to you in time to be included in your agenda packet. But, we will be making additional points for your consideration in the days to come.

Of particular concern to us is the fact that the DRC made its decision in a meeting that was closed to the public in violation of the State's Open Meetings laws, the Riverside Municipal Code and the local Transparency in Government policy.

Please see the map attached below.

We are not opposed to warehouses. But, we *are* opposed to warehouses in the Northside Specific Plan Study Area in *general* and to a warehouse at the Placentia Lane site in *particular*. There is no mitigation that would make this project acceptable to the members of our Alliance.

Please save the city's oldest and most historic neighborhood! We ask you uphold our Appeal and overturn the DRC's approval of the Center Street Commerce Center warehouse.

Thank you for considering our Appeal.

Respectfully yours,


Karen Renfro, Co-founder
Springbrook Heritage Alliance
3064 Lime Street
Riverside, California 92501
(951)787-0617
k.a.renfro7@gmail.com
info@springbrookheritagealliance.org
<https://www.facebook.com/springbrookheritagealliance>

CC:
CEDD Director
Planning Division
Historical Preservation Office
Councilman Mike Gardner
City Clerk
Chief of Police
Fire Chief
Public Works Director
Park, Recreation & Community Services Director
Head Librarian
Riverside Metropolitan Museum Director
Northside Specific Plan Project Manger
Riverside Public Utilities
Northside Improvement Association
Spanish Town Heritage Foundation
CIF Cross Country
Riverside Tamale Festival
OSTA - Agua Mansa Chapter
LULAC
Downtown Area Neighborhood Association
Press Enterprise
Highgrove Happenings

Map of SPRINGBROOK ARROYO & ENVIRONS · 2015

Riverside, California

APPROX. SCALES
 0 1/4 1/2



MAP NOT FOR SALE
 Map by Karen Renfro
 Copyright © 2009, 2014, 2015, 2016
 Published as a public service
 by PASS IT ON!
 *NOT A GOVERNMENT PUBLICATION

From: Karen Renfro [<mailto:k.a.renfro7@gmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, April 04, 2018 6:42 PM

To: sstosel@ibew47.org; omarzaki@allstate.org; maartin@mjinsurance.com; richardrubio@gmail.com; smill@wfgtitle.com; dbkirby@att.net; kparker@ttgcorp.com; judygt@att.net

Cc: Gardner, Mike <MGardner@riversideca.gov>; Russo, John A. <jrusso@riversideca.gov>; Zelinka, Al <azelinka@riversideca.gov>; Nguyen, Alexander <ANguyen@riversideca.gov>; Geuss, Gary <GGeuss@riversideca.gov>; Nicol, Colleen <CNicol@riversideca.gov>; Guzman, Rafael <RGuzman@riversideca.gov>; Brenes, Patricia <PBrenes@riversideca.gov>; Watson, Scott <SWatson@riversideca.gov>; erin snyder <epolcene@juno.com>; Wohlgemuth Family <pjdnw@yahoo.com>; Nancy Melendez <nancy.melendez@icloud.com>; Marisa Yeager <marisayeager@gmail.com>; christophersutton.law@gmail.com; Mark Acosta <macosta@scng.com>; Media-rhagen@scng.com <rhagen@scng.com>; Susan Shelley <Susan@susanshelley.com>; Michael Cruz <mcruz@scng.com>; colton@citynewsgroup.com; highgrovenews@roadrunner.com; ponnech@att.net>

Subject: [External] PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA ITEM #2: APPEAL BY SPRINGBROOK HERITAGE ALLIANCE OF DRC APPROVAL OF CENTER STREET COMMERCE CENTER PROJECT

SPRINGBROOK HERITAGE ALLIANCE

*Saving the treasures of the Springbrook Arroyo Watershed
for the benefit & pleasure of the people*

**RIVERSIDE - COLTON - HIGHGROVE - GRAND TERRACE
California, U.S.A.**

April 4, 2018

Maartin Rossouw, Chairman
Planning Commission
City of Riverside
3900 Main Street
Riverside, California 92522

AGENDA ITEM #2:
Center Street Commerce Center Project
P14-1033 (DR) & P14-1034 (LLA)
November 2017 Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

Honorable Chairman and Members of the Riverside Planning Commission:

We are appealing the Developmental Review Committee's approval of a proposal by Art Day of Transition Properties for a Design Review to construct a 308,000 sq.-ft., 47-ft. high, quarter-mile long warehouse building at 3667-3705 Placentia Lane (P14-1033), a Lot Line Adjustment (P14-

1034), and related Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the following reasons:

- The warehouse is wrong for the location. The chosen site is part of Riverside city and county's oldest residential neighborhood, now known as the Northside, whose history is an irreplaceable heritage for the Springbrook Arroyo Watershed communities of Riverside, Colton, Highgrove and Grand Terrace. Thousands of men, women and children call this neighborhood home. We believe that new development should benefit the people who are already here, not harm them. The warehouse will most certainly cause a great deal of harm to them all.
- The Initial Study and MND (both the August 2016 and November 2017 editions) are so seriously flawed they altogether fail to provide the City of Riverside with adequate data and reliable conclusions on which to base an informed decision. These flaws include a multitude of various kinds of factual errors, deficiencies, omissions, unsupported claims and other mistakes that call into question its veracity as a CEQA document, some of which we were able to bring to the attention of the applicant during the 2016 comment period. However, many of these were still not corrected for the 2017 edition. The City's response to this point of our Appeal, as stated on page 5 of the staff report before you, is that "the MND and technical studies were prepared in compliance with all applicable local and State regulations, including the CEQA Guidelines." Which turns the entire planning process into a game of charades.
- A project so large it requires a Lot Line Adjustment to comply with the current Industrial-BMP zoning designation should be required to submit a full Environmental Impact Report. We believe a properly-prepared report will show numerous negative impacts that cannot be mitigated sufficiently to protect the people who live, work, play and visit this very special part of the Northside, and none which would be acceptable to any reasonable person.

We ask that you deny the staff recommendation to uphold the DRC's decision to approve the project. Instead, we ask the Planning Commissioners to uphold our Appeal. We hereby present to you our petition opposing the warehouse project. It is signed by 772 people--including homeowners and residents of the Northside, many former residents, many descendants of the neighborhood's founding generation, and others who value its heritage for its own sake and want to save it.

In addition, we submit the following evidence in support of our Appeal:

Historical Considerations:

1. On pages 45 and 46, the MND claims there is nothing historically or archeologically significant about the Center Street Commerce Center site or its immediate environs because their research did not turn up anything significant to them. This is not surprising, since whoever did the research seems to have gone out of their way to avoid coming into contact with a wealth of local and regional resources that could have corrected their view. It is also puzzling, since we pointed this out to them in our comments on the 2016 Initial Study/MND, carefully itemizing as many items as possible within the limited time and space available to us.
2. If they were looking for information on the history and archeology of the territorial borderlands of the Cahuilla, Tongva, Serrano and Luiseno tribes; the 1771 Mission San

Gabriel ranch holdings; the establishment of the Old Spanish Trail as a trade-route from Santa Fe, New Mexico to Los Angeles, California; 1838 Jurupa Rancho; 1844 village of La Placita de los Trujillos; the 1850 California Statehood; the 1852 establishment of Los Angeles Co.; the 1853 establishment of the Township of San Salvador de Jurupa and founding of San Bernardino Co.; the 1870 founding of the Township of Riverside and unofficial renaming of La Placita to Spanish Town; the 1883 incorporation of the City of Riverside; the 1893 incorporation of Riverside County; the 1905 establishment of Pellisser Ranch; 1912 formation of the Northside Improvement Association; and the 1990 rezoning the city and county Redevelopment Agencies of the northern-most section of old La Placita from rural-agricultural and residential to Industrial-BMP; they would have discovered more material than they could process for one MND.

3. And, if they were looking in for everything available in the Riverside Public Library's Local History Department, the Riverside Metropolitan Museum, the UCR History and Archeology departments, Colton Public Library, Colton Local History Museum, San Bernardino County Hall of Records Archives, San Bernardino County Library, San Bernardino County Museum, A.K. Smiley Public Library Local History Department, Los Angeles County Public Library, San Diego County Public Library, Riverside Historical Society, Spanish Town Heritage Association, San Bernardino Historical Society, the Old Spanish Trail Association, American Institute of Archeology, and so forth, they would still be taking notes on the many historical people and events related to the immediate neighborhood of the warehouse site that would qualify as significant to a competent CEQA study.
4. One of the most startling flaws in the MND's historical assessment is absence of Joyce Carter Vickery's classic historical study of the La Placita-Spanish Town community, *Defending Eden* (1977, UCR History Department and Riverside Municipal Museum). Her book was written to accompany the opening of a permanent RMM exhibit on the Trujillo Adobe. It is *the* most comprehensive chronicle of the people and events associated with this neighborhood from the 1842 when a group of one hundred Hispanicized native men, women and children from Abiquiu, New Mexico, a slave-class called *Genizaros* lead by Lorenzo Trujillo and Hipolito Espinoza, came a thousand miles on a footpath known as the Old Spanish Trail to the San Bernardino Valley. We pointed this out in our 2016 comments but the 2017 Initial Study/MND does not even list her book in their references.
5. As for other significant people and events, one need go no further than Vickery's book. She tells the tale of the founding of the twin villages of La Placita and Agua Mansa (1844-45) and the Township of San Salvador (1853)--the first permanent settlement in the Inland Empire. In exchange for protection from horse-thieves and cut-throats who used to come down Cajon Pass on nights of the full moon and raid the Californio ranches, then spirit the stolen livestock out through the canyons to San Gorgonio Pass and on to Nevada where the animals would be sold to the highest bidder. The pioneers received a grant of land from Juan Bandini, owner of Jurupa Rancho. Jurupa Rancho was the first land grant given after Alta California came under Mexican control. The Bandini Donation was handled by Benito Wilson, Bandini's agent, who divided it up into strips of land with 500-feet of frontage on the Santa Ana River at one end for farming and a piece of table-land for grazing their animals, recording the transfer of the title-deeds to each head of household. The Genizaros were the first natives to own real estate in California. And Lorenzo Trujillo's sons defeated one of the worst outlaw bands at the Battle of Pigeon Pass. After that victory, life around the San Bernardino Valley became peaceful and other pioneers came to settle here, too. And, following the famous Flood of 1862, one his sons rebuilt the family homestead on higher ground where its remains standing to this day. The MND makes no mention of this.

6. In paragraph 1 on page 45, the MND claims that by 1905, "the Spanish-speaking community of La Placita had lost much of its separate community character." But, this is incorrect. And at the end of her book, on page 86, Vickery writes: "Their pioneer days over by 1890, the people of La Placita and Agua Mansa continued to live a life rich in the heritage of their forefathers. A belief in the values of personal responsibility, business initiative, hospitality, and courage, combined with a strong loyalty to family and Church, continued to dominate their lives. *To a great extent, this pattern remains evident to this day...*" [emphasis ours]. One of the unique characteristics of old La Placita, which has spread throughout the entire present-day Northside, is that despite the racial and ethnic diversity of its residents--many of whom are descended from the original pioneers from Abiquiu--the neighborhood has not been plagued with racial tensions or conflict. That is because of the legacy of Lorenzo Trujillo and La Placita's founding generation.
7. The 2016 MND did not mention that the Trujillo Adobe had been declared Historical Landmark #130 by the City of Riverside in 2015. We pointed this out in our comments on the MND. And in paragraph 4 on page 46 the 2017 MND correctly mentions the nearby Trujillo Adobe as Riverside County Landmark RIV009 (1967), State of California Point of Interest P-75 (1968) and City of Riverside Historical Landmark #130 [no date]. But in the previous paragraph the MND states that the Adobe is "currently being evaluated by the City for historic status and potential preservation." By the time the November 2017 Initial Study/MND was published, the Trujillo Adobe had been a landmark for almost two years and the Trujillo family was already in the first stages of a restoration study.
8. On pages 46 the MND states that the abandoned Spanish-eclectic style single-family residence, ca. 1920s--which is a particularly pretty example of a simple one-story home--is not architecturally or historically significant because their research discovered no individuals or events of importance related to the warehouse site. They do not consider the building to be of particular interest as it post-dates the La Placita-Spanish Town period. In fact, although the architectural style is common in many old Southern California communities, it is not common in the Northside. And, among other things, the list of occupants includes a descendant of Lorenzo Trujillo, yet the research did not include oral history archival material available through the Trujillo Family Association and the RMM.

Archeological Considerations:

1. The MND concludes that it is unlikely that anything significant archeologically will turn up during construction of the warehouse. This is based on responses from the several native tribal associations that were notified of project. However, in the CEQA Cultural Study for the Roquet Ranch Project proposed for La Loma Hills about half a mile away to the northeast of the warehouse site, the archeological study turned up evidence of dozens of native artifacts--most from pre-European times. These include rock shelters, milling stones and petroglyphs depicting a female fertility symbol--which indicates people came to the area to work and possibly hold coming-of-age ceremonies for young women. These artifacts are within the one-mile radius of the warehouse site and are significant to the study and possible conclusions.
2. Because most of the 19th-century La Placita village houses were up on the alluvial fan below La Loma Hills and after the Flood of 1862 few people built homes on the flood plain below Orange Street, one would not expect to find artifacts from any period. However, the old Evans Ditch, a post Civil-War era irrigation improvement featured on the 1888 water

resources map (Rumsey) that made farming possible on the parcels it served, appears to run across the warehouse site at the western boundary. This should be verified before approval of this project is even considered.

3. Because of archeological discoveries made in 1870 and the 20th centuries (Elliotta Springs on Strong, Trujillo Adobe, Roquet Ranch, etc.) and the fact that repeated floods and the various people who came and went over the years, it is highly possible, even probable that there could be an archeological discovery of significance on the warehouse site. Such a possibility demands a thorough EIR before consideration of this project.

Riverside General Plan/Zoning:

1. Riverside Municipal Code Chapter 19.130 states that Industrial Zone designations are established "to implement the Business/Office Park and Industrial land use categories of the General Plan. The purpose of the industrial zones is to provide areas appropriate for a wide variety of industrial, manufacturing, and support uses that have the potential to provide jobs and general services in Riverside...The purpose of each of the industrial zones is as follows:...A. The Business and Manufacturing Zone is established to provide a district for low-intensity and low-impact industrial, office, and related uses. Typical uses include research and development facilities and laboratories; administrative, executive and professional offices; *small-scale warehouse*, light manufacturing, and support commercial." [Emphasis ours]. The Code does not define small-scale. The City's Good Neighbor Policy applies only to warehouses of 400,000 sq. ft. or more--which is why it doesn't apply in this case. However, the industry standard set by the Institute of Transportation Engineers in 2016 gives the threshold for small-scale warehouses at 200,000 square feet. The Center Street Commerce Center warehouse violates accepted industry standards meant to protect communities from intrusions by inappropriate and harmful development.
2. The Project violates the Riverside General Plan 2025 Land Use Objective LU-72 which calls for new development in the Northside to "provide for steady change and improvement to an upgraded model community." A 308,000 sq.-ft. warehouse in the middle of otherwise undeveloped land that could be allocated for higher value and beneficial projects is not an appropriate use.
3. This Project would also violate the General Plan Provision LU-74 by not serving to promote and preserve the lower-density charm of the Northside.
4. Apparent conflicts between these provisions and others in the same section ought to be resolved by favoring the least invasive option.
5. The applicant has not specified what the warehouse is intended for, including whether it will even be a BMP-zone use as defined in the RMC. That makes most of the technical findings useless as a guide for evaluating the project's impact on the environment.

Traffic:

1. The Project calls for 62 loading docks plus additional parking spaces for trucks or their trailers and a large number of passenger vehicles. Any reasonable estimation would cite hundreds of trucks per day, a number that most certainly yield serious impacts to traffic. Yet on page 13 the MND reports estimated trip generation for the warehouse at zero based on a

Kunzman study that isn't even in the document. It even alerts us to the fact that the study is missing.

2. A high-cube warehouse will put more traffic on an already impacted road and ingress/egress for existing freeway access. Necessarily, the trucks and other traffic would be travelling through residential streets.
3. Access to Center Street for the 110 single-family residential houses on both sides of the street would be impeded. Yet there is no attempt in the MND to resolve this issue, although we do not believe it can be adequately resolved given the obstacle to any reasonable resolution.
4. The MND does not take into consideration other projects proposed for the immediate neighborhood of the Center Street Commerce Center warehouse, which include the small-scale Campbell warehouse on North Orange near Center, the 104-unit mobile home park at Center near Orange Street, and the 1,050-unit single-family residential project on La Loma Hills facing La Cadena Drive, Center Street and Pellissier Ranch. Serious traffic problems already exist in this area primarily because Caltrans has never been able to figure out how to resolve ingress/egress from the I-215 to surrounding surface streets. Adding even a few dozen heavy trucks to the mix would tie up traffic for longer periods than it already is. Widening the streets that connect to Center is not an option because except for Main past Placentia, they are all residential.

Air Quality:

1. The 2016 ITE defines "high-cube" warehouses as having at least 200,000 sq.-ft. of floor area and a high-level of on-site automation and logistics management. These facilities process goods very quickly and efficiently. That would mean a larger number of trucks could be loaded and unloaded than in conventional warehousing. In 2012 the AQMD Mobile Source Committee developed default data for use in calculating high-cube warehouse trip-generation which should be used when there is no data from the potential tenant.
2. The Soil, Water and Air Protection Enterprise Study submitted for this Project argues that at least a part of the Center Street Commerce Center Project should have been treated as refrigerated storage, which involves a higher level of emissions because of truck idling. Refrigerated storage is reasonably foreseeable. The MND's calculations are not related to a realistic assessment of future use for the building.
3. The MND contains no data on estimated diesel trips to and from the Project. If it does not contain necessary information, how can the document be in compliance with CEQA?
4. Unless the building remains empty for its entire lifetime, a high-cube warehouse across Placentia Lane from the AYSO-operated Ab Brown soccer fields will most certainly have a negative impact on Air Quality, and therefore the health and comfort of the children who play there, their parents, their coaches, and AYSO-staff. Diesel fumes rise straight up into the air several hundred feet, then spread over a radius of about 1,000 yards, or three thousand feet. The MND reports that this project could be expected to generate enough fumes to cover a radius of 1,300 yards. This distance goes well beyond the soccer fields onto Garner Road and the north end of Reid Park and the Riverside Championship Cross Country Course, and the Trujillo Adobe which is less than 1,000 feet away. The fumes would, in fact, spread into the single-family residential areas above Orange Street, on both sides of Center Street, and past Main Street to the Santa Ana River Trails and Bikeway. Thousands of men, women and children would be exposed to these fumes every day, all day, and for years on end. Yet, on

page 32 the MND declares that Air Quality in this neighborhood would have a "Less than Significant Impact" on "sensitive receptors" exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations. The sensitive receptors in question refer to children.

5. The Riverside General Plan EIR Section 5.3 concludes that despite mitigation measures, air pollution levels in our City will continue to exceed SCAQMD thresholds of significance. This means it is not sound land use policy to allow more warehouse development in the city, particularly near parks and playing fields where children come every day to play. The MND for this Project is in conflict with the General Plan assessment of air quality issues for our City.
6. The Trujillo Adobe can be considered a sensitive receptor in its own right, as adobe buildings are adversely affected by air pollution. The warehouse would make a restoration an exercise in futility.

Noise and Vibration:

1. Noise from the additional trucks at the warehouse, and coming and going, and at traffic stops would be heard long distances in a neighborhood like this part of the Northside. The constant revving of engines and rumbling of the vehicles through a normally-quiet community would have grave health impacts on all residents, businesses, park-visitors and sports enthusiasts, including children. The MND reports this would cause no significant negative impacts based on an unvalidated estimate of additional truck traffic.
2. Vibration will not only cause damage to occupied buildings, but to the Trujillo Adobe. The finding there will be no significant negative impacts conflicts with other authorities.
3. Vibration and use by heavy truck traffic on infrastructure has been grossly underestimated by the MND. Cost of continual requirements for maintenance and repair of the roads and freeways along which these trucks would travel would be astronomical, and it would be shifted to local taxpayers because surface streets would be hit the hardest.

Aesthetics:

1. This three-story, 47-ft.-high, quarter-mile long building would block the vista from the Ab Brown Sports Complex to La Loma Hills and the mountains beyond. It would block views of nearby hills across the Santa Ana River from Orange Street, the houses above this old country road, and from Reid Park and its many playing fields. It would block the view looking north from the Riverside Championship Cross Country Course. It would impede views of the San Gabriel and San Bernardino Mountains from many directions. It would loom large on the horizon from the houses on Columbia, the Springbrook Park apartments at Columbia and Orange, and other locations. This is in violation of the Riverside 2025 General Plan Northside Land Use Policy and Design Guidelines which call for preserving viewsapes in this neighborhood.
2. The presence of a building so incompatible with the uses around it, and the history and heritage of the neighborhood would cast a pall over the entire area.

Water:

1. The location of the warehouse site is on very low elevation compared to its surroundings despite appearances to the contrary. Even a moderate rainfall of half an inch in less than 12 hours can cause flooding that covers parts of the site and neighboring properties. If it is a heavy rain, vehicles travelling on Center and Placentia cannot proceed to Main Street.
2. Hydrologic and hydraulic studies (including a project-specific Water Quality Management Plan and a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan) to assess on-site and off-site flows have not been submitted yet because the City does not require applicants to do so until they apply for a grading permit. Yet, these two studies are *required* by the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). It makes little sense to approve a project if the subsequent compliance plans cannot be met. The MND's conclusions are based in part on these unformulated compliance plans. This seems to conflict with the staff response to our Appeal, which was that the applicant had complied with CEQA requirements. Does CEQA law not concern itself with the contents of studies done in order to comply with the law? If it doesn't, then the City of Riverside should do so anyway as a matter of policy.
3. A project-specific Water Quality Management Plan, an NPDES requirement, is provided but contains several errors. (This plan is not the one we referred to above.) In the Infiltration Feasibility Table D1, it states that no Drainage Management Areas (DMA) are located within 100 feet of a water supply well. However, just across Placentia Lane from the warehouse site are two active Riverside Public Utilities wells: Garner Well-B and Garner Well-D.
4. The WQMP also uses a design storm for infiltration and run-off of 0.65 inches in 24 hours. This is ridiculously small and will easily be exceeded nearly every year, overwhelming the Infiltration Basin proposed for the project. The MND supposes city officials will believe that the proposed Infiltration Basin will contain all the run-off (and pollution) from the new impervious surfaces on the project site.
5. Finally, a Geotechnical Report is required to confirm the present and past site characteristics that may affect the use of Infiltration Best Management Practices. However, the Geotechnical Report for this project we are supposed to find in Appendix 3 is not there.
6. The Great Flood of 1862 is thought to be a 100-year flood. The river washed over Pellissier Ranch, destroyed everything in its path, and left about a foot of soil and other debris behind. The original Trujillo Adobe was destroyed, then rebuilt on higher ground in its present location. Other cataclysmic floods, such as 1939 and 1969, brought floodwaters up to and across Orange Street at certain locations.
7. A levee was constructed along the river between La Loma Hills and Mt. Rubidoux which is supposed to protect the Northside from 100-year floods. It does not, however, protect the Northside from rainfall and run-off water. As the elevation in the flood plain is very low, water collects and remains for a time until it sinks into the ground on the undeveloped parklands and vacant industrial properties. The Northside Specific Plan Baseline Constraints and Opportunities report (2017) reports a finding that the levee is deteriorating.

Soils and Land Stability:

1. The Initial Study/MND states that the potential for liquefaction during an earthquake or other seismic disturbance is low, citing a Geotechnical Investigation/Geotechnical Infiltration Report in Appendix E which is missing.
2. However, an authoritative source is available to city officials in the form of the the Riverside General Plan 2025 Public Safety Element. This land use policy document includes a map of

regional Liquefaction Zones (Figure PS-2) as part of the Plan's own EIR. In case of an earthquake or other seismic disturbance, structures built on moderate to high liquefaction zones are indeed in danger of collapsing.

3. Liquefaction can occur without the aid of a seismic disturbance or precipitation, as evidenced by the collapse of the little Church of San Salvador in 1852 which sank into the ground during construction. As the exact location of that first building is not certain, it could be that the warehouse site contains its remains under the surface somewhere.
4. Groundwater levels in the flood plain vary according to rainfall and other factors. During our current period of drought, it is reported to be 30 feet down. However, during rainy periods groundwater can rise to only 15 feet below the surface, or even higher.
5. The Santa Ana River has an underground channel that sometimes flows through this part of the Northside.

Cumulative Effects:

1. Individually, these foregoing points are appalling enough, but taken together along with the other development projects proposed for the same area which we mentioned above, they exceed impacts covered by a Mitigated Negative Declaration.
2. There is no mitigation for these cumulative effects that would be acceptable to a reasonable person.

Conflict with the Northside Specific Plan:

1. The site of the warehouse project, located within the Northside Specific Plan Study Area boundaries, is in conflict with the stated goals of the NSP, which is to create a land use policy that will benefit the neighborhood and prevent harmful development from occurring. For this reason, we think a decision on the warehouse project should be postponed until the impending NSP is finalized.
2. It makes more sense to adopt a comprehensive neighborhood plan with community engagement than continue approving projects on a piecemeal basis, especially as there are three other development projects that are also pending.
3. Failure to do this would result in a neighborhood whose future would most certainly be more warehouses. Such a fate would mean the end of the special heritage of old La Placita, and the end of most of its potential as a special historic Spanish Town Village District (Columbia to La Loma Hills, La Cadena to the river) as outlined in the Springbrook Heritage Parklands & Walking Trails plan.

Brown Act:

1. The staff response to our Appeal claims that the DRC is covered by the Ralph M. Brown Act because it is a "legislative body". However, the Brown Act (Section 54952) defines legislative body as a "governing body of a local agency or any other local body created by State or Federal statute", including "a commission, committee, board or other body of a local agency whether permanent or temporary, decision-making or advisory, created by charter, ordinance, resolution or formal action of a legislative body". [Emphasis ours]

2. The Brown Act (Section 54951) defines a "local agency" as a county, city, whether general law or chartered, *"or any board, commission or agency thereof, or other local public agency"*.
3. The Riverside Municipal Code (19.910.050) defines "Developmental Review Committee" as a recommending body. Since the RMC was created by ordinance enacted by the City of Riverside under local, state authority, including the Constitution of the State of California, Planning & Zoning Law (California Government Code Section 65000 et seq.), CEQA (California Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.) and California Health & Safety Code (Ord. 6966, Section 1,2007).
4. The DRC's meetings, which are closed to the public, are held at regularly-occurring intervals in violation of the Brown Act.

Conclusion:

Based on this evidence, upholding the DRC's decision would leave the City of Riverside liable for any harm that comes to the people because of the deficiencies of the Center Street Commerce Center project's MND. We ask that you reject both recommendations in the staff report.

Thank you for considering our Appeal.

Respectfully yours,

Karen Renfro, Co-Founder and Chairman
Springbrook Heritage Alliance
P.O. Box 745
Riverside, California 92502
(951)787-0617
k.a.renfro7@gmail.com
info@springbrookheritagealliance.org
<https://www.facebook.com/springbrookheritagealliance>

CC:

Councilman Mike Gardner
Office of the City Manager
Office of the City Attorney
Office of the City Clerk
CEDD Director
Planning Division Manager
Historic Preservation Manager
Northside Improvement Association
Spanish Town Heritage Foundation
OSTA-Agua Mansa Chapter
Law Office of Christopher Sutton
Press Enterprise
San Bernardino County Sun
Colton City News

Dec. 18, 2017

The Honorable
William R. "Rusty" Bailey III,
Mayor of Riverside
3900 Main Street
Riverside, California 92522

TRANSPARENCY IN GOVERNMENT, TIMING OF MEETING, AND PUBLIC RECORDS REQUEST:
DEVELOPMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE AGENDA FOR DEC. 13, 2017
Planning Case P14-1033 & P14-1034 -- Center Street Commerce Center Project
See attachment below

Honorable Mayor and Members of the Riverside City Council:

For the past several years I have been following the progress of this 308,000 sq.-ft. warehouse proposed--inappropriately so in my opinion--for a 15-acre site across Placentia Lane from the popular Ab Brown Sports Complex (1980) not far down Center from the renowned and historic Trujillo Adobe (1862).

Current Industrial-BMP zoning for this area was approved against the wishes of Northside residents, many whose homes are close to the site. The fact that this new zoning is on the unstable soil of the Santa Ana River floodplain in the old village of La Placita de los Trujillos (est. ca. 1843-44), shares a history with the Old Spanish Trail (now a national parks project) and nearby La Loma Hills with its prehistoric artifacts makes it all the more objectionable. These are all irreplaceable.

The warehouse case is highly controversial because of these and other issues of concern to local residents, businesses, visitors, as well as sports and cultural organizations. People are coming from far distances to our treasured old neighborhood because of the significance of its community assets to their wide and inter-related interests. Opposition to this project, including my own, is intense.

I am part of a citizens' alliance that includes Northside Improvement Association, Spanish Town Heritage Foundation and Springbrook Heritage Alliance. Our common goal is to save the natural and cultural heritage of the Springbrook Arroyo communities of Riverside, Colton, Highgrove and Grand Terrace for our own and future generations. We think the heritage of old Spanish Town holds the key to a vibrant economic future. Warehouses would render our vision unattainable.

There are issues regarding the recent decision by Riverside's Developmental Review Committee to approve the warehouse that I wish to present to you. They may have bearing on the case.

TRANSPARENCY IN GOVERNMENT:

Because the project is less than 400,000 sq. ft. it is considered an administrative matter to be decided by the Developmental Review Committee instead of the Planning Commission. Although the committee invites public comment on all the matters that come before them, their meetings are closed to the public. For projects of this size that makes no rational sense whatsoever. As you probably already know, I have opposed this project since it first came to my attention in Winter of 2015.

For a long time now, my name has been on the list to receive automatic email notices of the Developmental Review Committee meetings. These are sent out two weeks in advance to all who need to know or have requested notification. When a planner is ready to take a planning case to the DRC for review, the application must be turned into the committee secretary a full week before that for inclusion on the next DRC meeting.

Decisions used to be made by the Zoning Administrator (formerly the CEDD director or his designee with input from city staff) but are now made by a vote of city staff members whose responsibilities include oversight of various aspects of pending planning cases. I question the wisdom of this arrangement as it combines legislative authority with administrative authority, and these should not be identical in any way. It also makes possible to push projects through that should be aired in a public forum as a matter of course.

Because of my interest in this case and several others affecting the Northside and Downtown, I look at every DRC agenda as soon as it arrives in my inbox. Since I know they are sent at two-week intervals I know when to expect them. I was expecting the DRC agenda during the last week of November--right after Thanksgiving.

I have memories of checking over the Nov. 29 DRC agenda which arrived in the middle of the month before the Springbrook Heritage Alliance meeting, and being relieved that the Thanksgiving holiday was not going to be ruined. I remember telling the Nov. 16 SHA meeting that all we had to do now was keep watch for the two December DRC meeting agendas. I now recall looking at a DRC agenda for Dec. 13th after Thanksgiving weekend. However, the one I received, attached below, does not show Planning Case P14-1033 and P14-134. You can see for yourself. There was nothing on it that I needed to deal with.

And actually, being somewhat preoccupied with a multitude of other matters and befuddled by a virus, I even forgot that an agenda for the 13th had been sent. By the first week of December I thought it odd I'd received no agenda for a DRC meeting in the middle of the month, so I contacted Planning to find out. Strangely, I was unable to reach anyone who would know (Associate Planner Brian Norton and the DRC secretary) and the only person I spoke to was unable to help me. I did not pursue the matter after a certain point, but somehow I came to the conclusion the case would not be going anywhere during December.

Two weeks later, during the week of the Dec. 13th DRC meeting, I received the Dec. 27 DRC agenda and was relieved to see the case would not be reviewed then, either.

I was offline for most of that week trying to rest and recuperate. I did not see Councilman Mike Gardner's Dec. 14 email notifying us that the warehouse had been approved by the DRC at that meeting until Saturday, Dec. 16th. I could not believe my eyes. This should not have happened! I went back and checked to see if I had missed something, looking for the missing agenda and found nothing. Not even in my Trash. So, it appeared to me I had not received anything at all. But, I wasn't sure, it seemed to me I had seen something, but I could not imagine seeing an agenda with the warehouse case on it and forgetting *that*. On the other hand, maybe I was losing my mind.

This morning, just to make sure I didn't miss anything, I went back and checked all my emails for the past month or so, including files where I thought that agenda might be. To my surprise, I found it right away--the one you will find attached below. You will see the Dec. 13 DRC agenda I received does not include the Center Street warehouse project. Then I remembered having seen this before. So, no, I am not losing my mind.

The facts boil down to this:

- I did receive a DRC agenda for the Dec. 13th meeting;
- I did not receive a notice that Planning Case P14-1033 & P14-1034 was on it.

These two facts raise a number of questions in my mind, including:

1. Was this Dec. 13 DRC agenda that I received created for me alone, or did it have a wider audience?

2. How many people were sent a Dec. 13th DRC agenda that did include the warehouse project and who were they?
3. Who is the staff person responsible for oversight of the DRC, did they know there were two agendas, and if so, when, or if not, why not?
4. What agenda was sent to the developer and/or their agent, and when was it sent to them?
5. Was the developer or their agent present at the meeting?
6. Which staff members are involved in this case, and how are they involved?
7. Were they all in attendance, did any of them comment on the item, and if so, what did they say, or if not, why not?
8. Was any material presented that relates to the errors and weaknesses of the warehouse CEQA Study, including comments from the public?
9. Was the developer's response to the public comment on the CEQA Study discussed, and if so, what did they say, or if not, why not?
10. Which staff members voted on this case, and how did they vote?

TIMING OF THE MEETING:

Knowing from past experience that the Thanksgiving through Twelfth Night holiday season has been a favorite time for city governments to hold hearings and meetings on important or controversial matters, I had a hunch the case would be brought up in December. And so it was--during a time when most people are trying to avoid getting sick while preparing for a pleasant time with their families and friends, too. Many are even out of town for weeks at a time.

This puts too many stakeholders at a serious and unfair disadvantage. It gives the appearance of partiality by city administrators and staff. The decision to take the case to the DRC this month after such a strenuous year for everyone shows a callous disregard for the well-being of the people. It is possible city staff whose responsibility includes oversight of this case were not able to attend this meeting, and their input may have affected the outcome.

The ill-will generated by this incident will have lasting repercussions. One of them is that I am unable anymore to assure anyone that Riverside city officials and staff have our best interests in mind.

PUBLIC RECORDS REQUEST:

On Dec. 14, Associate Planner Brian Norton sent out an email with electronic documents relating to the warehouse project and the Dec. 13th DRC meeting, which I did not see until Saturday, Dec. 16th. These documents are in the form of PDFs and others that are unfamiliar to me.

I am unable to access the documents. They seem to be infected with a virus and my security software warns me not to open them. I tried anyway, and discovered I could not open them. They are not accessible to me in this form.

As I am interested in seeing everything in the Community & Economic Development Department files on the Center Street Commerce Center project, I am requesting the following:

- A list of all the items they contain;
- How many discs would be needed to create a complete set of all items available for public review;
- What the charges would be at the usual rate of \$3 per disc.

CONCLUSION:

It is my wish to see this resolved in a way that does not make matters worse. I will be pleased to talk to you, please feel free to contact me at your convenience. Thank you for whatever you can do to mend this breach of the public trust.

With great disappointment, I remain yours respectfully,

Karen Renfro
(951)787-0617 voice only
k.a.renfro7@gmail.com business hours

CC:
Riverside City Council
City Manager's Office
City Attorney's Office
City Clerk's Office
Community and Economic Development Director
Press Enterprise
Springbrook Heritage Alliance
Northside Improvement Association
Spanish Town Heritage Foundation
Old Spanish Trail Association



DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE AGENDA

APPLICATION

SUBMITTAL DEADLINE: November 20, 2017

MEETING DATE: December 13, 2017

Lrg. Conf. Room – 3rd Floor

Time	Case #	Applicant / Site Address / Phone # / E-mail	C/A*	Planner
9:30 - 10:00 a.m.	P17-0883 (DR), P17-0884 (VR)	Greg Lukosky & Alan Robertson / 3490 Madison Street 949-723-9500 / greg@prpdevelopment.com Proposal by Greg Lukosky and Alan Robertson of HFC/PRP Madison, LLC to consider the following entitlements: 1) Design review of project plans for the construction of a 17,889 square foot grocery store and an 8,065 square foot retail shops building; and 2) a Variance to allow a reduced separation requirement from any existing residential dwelling or property zoned for residential uses. The subject site consists of 3 parcels, totaling 8.57 acres, located at 3530 Madison Street, situated on the northwest corner of Madison Street and SR-91 Freeway, in the CR - Commercial Retail Zone and CR-S-2-X - Commercial Retail, Building Stores (Maximum of 2 stories), and Building Setback (Minimum setback of 15-feet from Madison Street and 50-feet from adjacent residential properties) Overlay Zones, in Ward 3. Contact Planner: Candice Assadzadeh, Associate Planner, (951) 826-5667, cassadzadeh@riversideca.gov .	C	Candice
10:00 - 11:00 a.m.	P17-0890 (CDR)	Craig Mazzara / 9501 Lincoln Avenue 951-354-2121 / cmazzara@vandaele.com Proposal by Van Daele Development Corp. for a Conceptual Development Review to consider the construction of a 180 unit multiple-family residential development, on 5.34 acres, located at 9501 Lincoln Avenue, situated on the west side of Van Buren Boulevard and north of Lincoln Avenue, in the RE – Residential Estate Zone, in Ward 5. Contact Planner: Judy Egüez, Associate Planner, 951-826-3969, jeguez@riversideca.gov	C	Judy
11:00 – 11:30 a.m.	P17-0896 (DR), P17-0898 (VR)	Al Aguirre / 4149 Chestnut Street 951-684-4222 / aguirre2222@sbcglobal.net Proposal by Al Aguirre of A.K.A. Associates, Inc. to consider the following entitlements: 1) Design Review for the construction of a 2,684 square foot office building; and 2) a Variance to a reduced front yard setback. The subject site consists of a vacant 0.18 acre parcel, located at 4149 Chestnut Street, between 11 th Street and 12 th Street, in the DSP-AS - Downtown Specific Plan – Almond Street District, in Ward 1. Contact Planner: Alyssa Berlino, Planning Technician, 951-826-5628, aberlino@riversideca.gov .	C	Alyssa
11:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.	P17-0894 (VR)	Max McDermott / 3750 Santa Fe Avenue 714-368-1300 / mmcdermott7@sbcglobal.com Proposal by Max McDermott of Secured Income Group, Inc. to consider a Variance to allow a decorative wall within the front yard setback higher than allowed by the Zoning, located at 3750 Santa Fe Street,	C	Danielle

Time	Case #	Applicant / Site Address / Phone # / E-mail	C/A*	Planner
		situated on the east side of Santa Fe Avenue, between University Avenue and Mission Inn Avenue, in the CR-SP-CR – Commercial Retail, Specific Plan (Marketplace) and Cultural Resource (City Landmark CHL-100) Overlay Zones, Ward 2. Contact Planner: Danielle Harper-Scott, Planning Technician, 951-826-5933, dharper-scott@riversideca.gov .		
12:00 – 1:30 p.m.		LUNCH		
1:30 – 2:00 p.m.	P17-0881 (DR), P17-0882 (VR)	James Broeske / 1575 Omaha Court 951-300-1866 ext. 225 / jlb@broeskearchitects.com Previously approved by City Council on 4/12/13, Planning Cases P13-0238 (DR) and P13-0239 (VR). Proposal by James Broeske of Broeske Architects and Associates to consider the following entitlements for the construction of six, twelve foot diameter, 60-foot tall silos: 1) Design Review of project plans; and 2) a Variance to exceed the maximum building height allowed by the Zoning Code. The subject site is located at 1575 Omaha Court at the western terminus of Omaha Court, west of Atlanta Avenue, in the BMP - SP - Business and Manufacturing Park and Specific Plan (Hunter Business Park) Overlay Zones, in Ward 1. Contact Planner: Sean P. Kelleher, Associate Planner, 951-826-5712, skelleher@riversideca.gov .	C	Sean
Miscellaneous Items:				
		No items for review		

*Completeness Review (C) or Final Action Review (A)

Welcome Letter & Comments due to Applicant: December 20, 2017

On Fri, Mar 9, 2018 at 8:48 AM -0800, "Karen Renfro" <k.a.renfro7@gmail.com> wrote:

SPRINGBROOK HERITAGE ALLIANCE

P.O. Box 745
Riverside, California 92502
info@springbrookheritagealliance.org

March 9, 2018

Councilman Mike Gardner
City of Riverside
3900 Main Street
Riverside, California 92522

CENTER STREET COMMERCE CENTER
Planning Cases P14-1033(DR) & P14-1034 (LLA)

Dear Councilman Gardner:

As this project would drastically alter the long-established rural residential character of the old La Placita/Spanish Town area & environs to the detriment of many thousands of people who have a personal interest in their neighborhood, we are requesting that the April 5 public hearing on the Center Street Commerce Center warehouse project cited above be changed from daytime to evening.

We know you are already aware that most residents and other interested parties cannot take time off from work to attend a daytime hearing, even though their future well-being depends upon their being present and able to participate. It would be a shame if, after all that has happened with this case in the past few months, the public hearing we have been anticipating was inaccessible to us anyway.

Thank you for your kind consideration and assistance with our request.

If I can be of service, please let me know. I can be reached at the numbers below.

Respectfully yours,

Karen Renfro, Chairman
Springbrook Heritage Alliance
(951)787-0617
k.a.renfro7@gmail.com
info@springbrookheritagealliance.org

CC:
Community and Economic Development Director
Office of the City Clerk
Northside Improvement Association
Spanish Town Heritage Foundation

From: Karen Renfro [<mailto:k.a.renfro7@gmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, April 25, 2018 3:06 PM

To: MacArthur, Chris <CMacArthur@riversideca.gov>; Soubirous, Mike <msoubirous@riversideca.gov>; Gardner, Mike <MGardner@riversideca.gov>

Cc: McDougal, Lee <LMcDougal@riversideca.gov>; Marysheva, Marianna <MMarysheva@riversideca.gov>; Zelinka, Al <azelinka@riversideca.gov>; Nguyen, Alexander <ANguyen@riversideca.gov>; Geuss, Gary <GGeuss@riversideca.gov>; Nicol, Colleen <CNicol@riversideca.gov>; Diaz, Sergio <SDiaz@riversideca.gov>; Moore, Michael <MMoore@riversideca.gov>; Martinez, Kris <KMARTINEZ@riversideca.gov>; Cruz, Adolfo <AdCruz@riversideca.gov>; Kennon, Tonya <TKennon@riversideca.gov>; Peterson, Robyn <RPeterson@riversideca.gov>; Jorgenson, Todd <TJorgenson@riversideca.gov>; Guzman, Rafael <RGuzman@riversideca.gov>; Brenes, Patricia <PBrenes@riversideca.gov>; Norton, Brian <BNorton@riversideca.gov>; Murray, David <DMurray@riversideca.gov>; Brian Mooney <bmooney@rickengineering.com>; Brian Stephenson <bstephenson@rickengineering.com>; Richard O'Neill <roneill@rickengineering.com>; Michiko Morisaki <mmorisaki@rickengineering.com>; Joan Isaacson <jisaacson@kearnswest.com>; awells@designworkshop.com; Eva Yakutis <evayakutis@gmail.com>; citycounciloffice@ci.colton.ca.us; Mark Tomich <mtomich@coltonca.gov>; Springbrook Heritage Alliance <info@springbrookheritagealliance.org>; Wohlgemuth Family <pjdnw@yahoo.com>; erin snyder <epolcene@juno.com>; Nancy Melendez <nancy.melendez@icloud.com>; Marisa Yeager <marisayeager@gmail.com>; Hanni Bennett <hannibee2015@gmail.com>; Pat Stewart <patsiann@pacbell.net>; Gurumantra <gkhalsa@nutritionnews.com>; bruce.carver <bruce.carver@armoryband.org>; Riverside Woman's Club <rwomansclub@gmail.com>; REGAFFAIRS@aol.com; Steve <riversidehistoricalsociety@gmail.com>; Riverside County Heritage Association <rivcoheritageassoc@gmail.com>; sbhistoricalsociety@mac.com; Mike Murphy <markiowner@aol.com>; marianmurphy@aol.com; Museum Administrator <malkimuseummail@gmail.com>; crlesh@heritageedu.com; Media-rhagen@scng.com <rhagen@scng.com>; Michael Cruz <macruz@scng.com>; colton@citynewsgroup.com; highgrovenews@roadrunner.com; danariversidechair@gmail.com; Alexander King <avking@live.com>; OSTA SoCal <ostasocal@gmail.com>; osta.aguamansa@gmail.com; John W. Hiscock <ostamgr@gmail.com>; Cecelia Peña <ceceliapena@hotmail.com>; Tom Sutak <ostarescom@gmail.com>; Rachael Hamilton <RHamilton@riversandlands.org>

Subject: [External] CENTER STREET COMMERCE CENTER PROJECT -- RIVERSIDE CITY COUNCIL LAND USE COMMITTEE MEETING MAY 14, 2018

This email's attachments were cleaned of potential threats by The City of Riverside's Security Gateway. Click [here](#) if the original attachments are required (justification needed).

SPRINGBROOK HERITAGE ALLIANCE

*Saving the treasures of the Springbrook Arroyo Watershed
for the benefit and pleasure of the people*

RIVERSIDE - COLTON - HIGHGROVE - GRAND TERRACE

April 25, 2018

Councilman Chris Mac Arthur, Chairman
City Council Land Use Committee
City of Riverside
3900 Main Street
Riverside, California 92522
CC: Members of the Committee

CENTER STREET COMMERCE CENTER PROJECT
P14-1033 & P14-1034/Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

Honorable Chairman and Members of the Land Use Committee:

It has long been our intention to introduce you to the irreplaceable community assets of the Springbrook Arroyo Watershed, most of which is located within the City of Riverside. To that end we have been preparing an informational packet that begins with the attached map. Although we have much more work to do before we complete our project, it is time to begin presenting what we have learned so far. This will be the first of several installments.

There is a common misconception that because the Northside was declared blighted by Riverside and San Bernardino officials more than 25 years ago it is a wasteland suitable only for industrial development with nothing to recommend it. But, that decision was arrived at over the strenuous protests of the neighborhood--the city's oldest--and nothing could be further from the truth. The site proposed for the warehouse project in question is part of a larger community with a unique and fascinating heritage, a place of great worth to many people. It is, in fact, the oldest permanent settlement east of Los Angeles, founded in 1843/4 as "La Placita de los Trujillos".

You will note that Springbrook Arroyo is a central feature of the more famous Pigeon Pass. The Pass, the Arroyo and the arroyo Watershed are connected to the Santa Ana River, the River Trails, Box Springs Mountains Wilderness Park, Upper Pigeon Pass, Blue Mountain, La Loma Hills and Mt. Rubidoux. There is a lot of history in these hills and the Pass below. For the past several years we have been compiling an account of significant people, places and events that tell the story of this special place. In the days to come we will be telling that story to this Committee.

Our map is hand-drawn and parts of it are not to scale, but its purpose is to show the relationship of individual elements on the map to one another, the way the locals know them. One thing the map does not show is the relationship of the Springbrook Arroyo to the Santa Ana River Watershed. In fact this arroyo is located in the geographical center of the river's watershed. The history of the Springbrook Arroyo neighborhood revolves around that relationship.

Thank you for your consideration of our appeal of the Planning Commission's decision. We are looking forward to presenting our case at the May 14 Land Use Committee meeting.

Respectfully yours,

Karen Renfro, Chairman

P.O. Box 745

Riverside, California 92502-0745

(951)787-0617

k.a.renfro7@gmail.com

info@springbrookheritagealliance.org

<https://www.facebook.com/springbrookheritagealliance>

CC:

Office of the City Manager

Office of the City Attorney

Office of the City Clerk

Riverside Police Department

Fire Department

Public Works Department

Parks, Recreation and Community Services

Riverside Public Library

Riverside Metropolitan Museum

Riverside Public Utilities

Community and Economic Development Department

Northside Specific Plan Team

City of Colton

Springbrook Heritage Alliance

Northside Improvement Association

Spanish Town Heritage Foundation

Old Spanish Trail Association - Agua Mansa Chapter

Friends of Blue Mountain

Friends of Fairmount Park

University Neighborhood Association

Casa Blanca Community Action Group

Downtown Area Neighborhood Alliance

Academy of Living History Performing Arts

Riverside Woman's Club

Friends of Riverside Hills

Santa Ana Rivers and Lands Conservancy

Riverside Historical Society

Riverside County Heritage Association

San Bernardino Pioneer and Historical Society

Colton Historical Society

Native American Historical Society

San Bernardino County Museum
Malki Museum
Sherman Indian Museum
Archeological Institute of America - Riverside and Inland Southern California Society
Press Enterprise
San Bernardino County Sun
Colton City News
Highgrove Happenings
Law Office of Christopher Sutton




Virus-free. www.avg.com

Map of SPRINGBROOK ARROYO & ENVIRONS · 2015

Riverside, California

APPROX. SCALES
 0 1/4 1/2



MAP NOT FOR SALE
 Map by Karen Renfro
 Copyright © 2009, 2014, 2015, 2016
 Published as a public service
 by PASS IT ON!
 *NOT A GOVERNMENT PUBLICATION

From: SHCAG [<mailto:sycamorehighlands@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2017 2:55 PM

To: Sharon Mateja <smateja@earthlink.net>

Cc: Karen Renfro <k.a.renfro7@gmail.com>; Bailey, Rusty <RBailey@riversideca.gov>; Gardner, Mike <MGardner@riversideca.gov>; Melendrez, Andy <ASMelendrez@riversideca.gov>; Soubirous, Mike <msoubirous@riversideca.gov>; Conder, Chuck <CConder@riversideca.gov>; MacArthur, Chris <CMacArthur@riversideca.gov>; Perry, Jim <JPerry@riversideca.gov>; Adams, Steven <SAdams@riversideca.gov>; Mark Acosta <macosta@scng.com>; Media-rhagen@scng.com <rhagen@scng.com>; Russo, John A. <jrusso@riversideca.gov>; Marysheva, Marianna <MMarysheva@riversideca.gov>; Zelinka, Al <azelinka@riversideca.gov>; Nguyen, Alexander <ANguyen@riversideca.gov>; Geuss, Gary <GGeuss@riversideca.gov>; Nicol, Colleen <CNicol@riversideca.gov>; Guzman, Rafael <RGuzman@riversideca.gov>; erin snyder <epolcene@juno.com>; Wohlgemuth Family <pjdnw@yahoo.com>; Nancy Melendez <nancy.melendez@icloud.com>; John Krick <john.krick@alvordschools.org>; Marisa Yeager <marisayeager@gmail.com>; ponnech <ponnech@att.net>; Tom Donahue <tjdonahue53@att.net>; John W. Hiscock <ostamgr@gmail.com>; Paul Ostapuk <postapuk@gmail.com>; Alexander King <avking@live.com>; Cecelia Peña <ceceliapena@hotmail.com>; Vicki Felmlee <info@tcsmsg.com>; Henry James Vásquez <HJVsqzIMISA@sbcglobal.net>; RiversideTamaleFestival@gmail.com; Riverside County Heritage Association <rivcoheritageassoc@gmail.com>; mtrubidoux@aol.com; NorthsideIA@yahoogroups.com

Subject: [External] Re: DRC AGENDA 12-13-17

In my opinion, our City leaders unfortunately have no grand vision for the future of Riverside. Riverside is instead developed piecemeal with no common sense as to land compatibility or aspiration as to future possibility. A historic old town with connection to the downtown business district, hotels, convention center is to me the kind of grand vision that the City should be striving toward.

But I have little hope our City leadership, including our development and planning departments, are able to move in this direction. They have in recent years shown only a willingness to think in the very short term.

Alec

From: "epolcene@juno.com" <epolcene@juno.com>

Date: March 12, 2018 at 5:27:50 PM PDT

To: <RGuzman@riversideca.gov>, <CNicol@riversideca.gov>

Subject: [External] P14-1033 and P14-1034 Center Street Warehouse

Regarding the Planning commission public hearing for the Center Street Warehouse appeal scheduled for Apr. 5. We are requesting the meeting be scheduled in the evening as many of the concerned citizens are working during the day. Your assistance in this matter would be greatly appreciated.

Thank you so much,

Erin Snyder
1645 Mathews St.
Riverside, C 92507
951-682-9128
EPolcene@juno.com

"Teachers open the door, you enter by yourself."
- Old Chinese Proverb

From: epolcene@juno.com [<mailto:epolcene@juno.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, April 04, 2018 12:41 AM

To: Andrade, Frances <FANDRADE@riversideca.gov>; sstosel@ibew47.org; omarzaki@allstate.com; maartin@mjrinsurance.com; richardrrubio@gmail.com; smill@wfgtitleco.com; dbkirby@att.net; kparker@ttgcorp.com; judygt@att.net

Cc: pjdnw@yahoo.com; ponnech@att.net; k.a.renfro7@gmail.com; Norton, Brian <BNorton@riversideca.gov>; Gardner, Mike <MGardner@riversideca.gov>; Nicol, Colleen <CNicol@riversideca.gov>

Subject: [External] Center St. Warehouse

Dear Riverside Planning Commission,

I'm writing to ask you to reconsider the Development Review Committee's approval of the proposed Center St. Warehouse. The DRC process denies the public the opportunity to comment on development proposals. Requiring a filing fee for an appeal seems to be another way of eliminating public involvement. The community has gone to great efforts for this opportunity of public comment, please seriously consider the comments you receive on Apr. 5. I may not be able to get off work to attend so I am attaching my comment letter here. The mitigated negative declaration indicates that environmental impacts are not significant but there are many points where this is not justified. Additionally, the city has committed 2.5 million dollars to a Northside Specific Plan that would be wasted if this project is approved. I realize that the proposal is in compliance with the zoning for the area but just because you can do something doesn't mean you should. This warehouse is the wrong project in the wrong place. Please deny approval or at least delay it until the specific plan is complete.

Thank you for your consideration,

Erin Snyder
1645 Mathews St.
Riverside, CA 92507
Northside Improvement Association
Vice-President.

"Teachers open the door, you enter by yourself."
- Old Chinese Proverb

Maartin Rossouw, Chairman
Riverside Planning Commission
City of Riverside
3900 Main Street
Riverside, California 92502

I am writing in support of the appeal of the Riverside Development Review Committee approval of Planning Cases P14-1033 and P14-1034. We are asking you not to adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and not to uphold the Development Review committee approval of the proposed warehouse.

The determination of a mitigated negative declaration instead of an environmental impact report is my first major concern. The city of Riverside states that “although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent.” I question that the proposed mitigations will lessen the significant effect on the environment. You will hear from others how some mitigation isn’t even planned yet, some are not adequate, and some we just don’t know because documents that should have been there, weren’t included. The purpose of the Environmental Impact Report is to fully identify all impacts. Until that’s done mitigation is speculative. The intent of the California Environmental Quality Act as shared in the Initial Study for this project is not being met in my opinion. The intention of the state legislation is to provide and maintain a high quality, healthy, pleasing environment and ecological system for the general welfare of the people. The proposed project proponents declare that there is no or less than significant impacts aesthetically. I think 4.1 a,b and d should be rated at potentially significant impact. The views across the project, onto the project site from any side would definitely be negatively impacted. The view of the La Loma Hills from the Ab Brown Soccer fields would be greatly impacted the views from the N. orange street residences would be impacted and the outdoor lighting will impact the whole area. The only reason 4.1 c can be rated no impact is because it’s not within site of a state highway. The justification for the less than significant impact rating is that the project site is zoned for and surrounded by industrial uses. While the area is zoned BMP/industrial, the adjacent properties are not involved in those uses. The zoning forced on the area as part of a redevelopment zone in the 1990s did not lead to industrial redevelopment but did lead to conflict between the zoning, the general plan and the neighborhood vision. The declaration also states, “Furthermore, the General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR) found that impacts to scenic vistas would be less than significant with implementation of General Plan’s policies supporting a balance between development interests and broader community preservation objective.” A compromise in favor of development it sounds like. The declaration

explains tiering (using previous, broader EIRs) as acceptable documentation but there are none for this area and the general plan EIR cannot cover all areas of the city. In fact, a supposed outcome of the Northside Specific Plan project is a PEIR, an EIR for the northside area which would be much more likely to identify specific local environmental impacts.

The next disagreement I have with the mitigated negative declaration is 4.2, Agriculture and Forest resources. While it is true that this land has not been in recent cultivation that is the only thing that keeps it from being classified as prime farmland. It has previously been classified as such by the USDA, and currently still has that potential. This potential would be greatly impacted by this project. This land has never been developed or paved over. There are no paved properties between North Orange St. and Main St. along Center St./Placentia Ave. Most of the occupied properties have porous surfaces and are tow/storage meant to have a temporary footprint on the land. None of them have the permanent developed facility that the proposed project would have. The declaration documentation as I've previously pointed out, implies that surrounding land is "urban and built-up land..... surrounded on all size by urban development." (typo is from document). This is not an accurate description of the property. The USDA classification of "other land" could be agricultural land designated for development. Current zoning and development focus does not eliminate he potential this and adjoining lands have for reverting to previous agricultural uses. The emphasis of local agriculture and food systems supported by the city's Grow Riverside initiative would seem to advocate for the preservation of this potential.

Air Quality, 4.3 is determined to be less than significantly impacted as a result of this project. How can that be possible if there is no tenant/user proposed? Without knowing the operation that will be using the site how can the air quality impacts be determined. Others have submitted arguments that show that the findings of this report are inaccurate or inadequate in respect to the possible air quality impacts of a project like this. This region is already negatively impacted by poor air quality. CALEPA identifies this area as environmentally disadvantaged in many critical areas, air quality significantly. Any operation involving hundreds of additional vehicles will undoubtedly impact air quality for all of us. "Long-term criteria air pollutant emissions will result from the operation of the proposed project," according to the report. The modeling and estimation data used appears inaccurate and based on minimum possible numbers rather than maximum and again without knowing what's going in there for sure how can we know what the fleet mix would be? Mitigation if the addition of refrigerated trucks occurs, would be a new assessment of Air Quality. We know the air quality would be negatively impacted so how is assessing that going to mitigate for it? The "default" numbers used for the current assessment seem AQMD in Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook says "for the purpose of estimating vehicle trip generation, it may be as important to know the tenant as much as other facility factors." They also report that distribution centers should not

be within 1000 of children and their activities. (AIR QUALITY AND LAND USE HANDBOOK: A COMMUNITY HEALTH PERSPECTIVE 2005) Air quality standards are already unattainable in the area, adding more than 300 truck trips and 400 cars every day will greatly impact the air quality of this region identified by CalEPA as environmentally disadvantaged.

4.5a Historic.....No disturbance to Trujillo Adobe, again basing no impact based on current zoning, "Moreover, the proposed project site is located more than a quarter mile from the adobe and is zoned for Business and Manufacturing uses and is not designated in the City's General Plan as a location of recognized historical significance. As such, impacts will be less than significant." Field surveys usually look at surface sites only. Knowing the original La Placita settlement was flooded in 1862 the chance of buried artifacts is significant.

4.6 geology and soils. The General Plan EIR identifies the site to be in a high to moderate liquefaction zone. The MND says there's less than significant impact.

4.7 GHG The Riverside Carbon Action Plan considers the reduction of the city's carbon footprint. This land is currently sequestering carbon in its soil and vegetation. That environmental benefit is lost when the land is paved over and GHG emissions are drastically increased with 500 vehicle trips per day so the carbon producing offset is great.

4.9 Hydrology and water quality-the soils on site are well drained sandy loams. They are porous and greatly increase infiltration to the aquifer. Turning 15+ acres of permeable land to impervious would not produce equal levels of groundwater recharge as reported in the MND. Reducing the amount of porous land reduces the amount of water soaking into the aquifer.

4.9d and e are determined to be less than significant impact. However, in 2.8 Grading and Drainage of the presented staff report identifies Placentia and Center as "partially improved" roads. These streets do not have storm drains. The project description states it will complete curbs and gutters on Center Street and provide an onsite drainage to move excess street water across the property to Placentia. Center Street was built through to connect to Placentia some years ago to facilitate redevelopment. Prior to that the land was usually underwater during rain events geographically this is a low area prior to the river levies in the 1960s the Santa Ana River often flowed across this land and regularly flooded it. Center Street did not historically go through because it was always marshy. Relatively recently when it was built through, no storm drains were built but due to the curbs and gutters water is now confined to the roadway in many places and regularly floods in even minimal $1/2''$ rains. Draining this water across the project to Placentia will just spread this impact onto 2 city streets. Who is responsible for the infrastructure and maintenance of these streets? Has that added expense been included in city budgets that are already impacted? Additionally, onsite infiltration basin will be located SE corner but the property flows toward the SW (2.8, 2.10) 4.9 I, determines less than significant

impacts regarding flooding in particular if a levee were to fail. This site is prone to flooding already in even a minimal rain storm.

4.10 a –Land Use, the MND indicates no impact by physically dividing a community but approving this project in the middle of the proposed Northside Specific Plan would negate that process. A major public concern is the apparent disregard and destruction of the NSP process. The NSP is supposed to investigate and resolve zoning changes, that were forced through as part of a previous redevelopment zone, and are inconsistent with the General Plan and 40 years of neighborhood vision. The NSP is supposed to include a Project EIR that thoroughly study the area and come to findings that could be used for individual projects moving forward. The city is spending more than 2 million dollars for the NSP. How does it make sense to approve this current project that is in no way appropriate or desired for this community before completing the NSP? 4.10 b, sites some general plan land use criteria but not all. The project would be in violation of General Plan 2025 land use objectives LU70, LU72.8 and LU74.5 (see Staff Report). Study does not address LU 72 and LU 74: the project is no steady change to an upgraded community. Riverside Municipal code (Chapter 9, section 130.100) says Business Manufacturing Park uses can include “small scale warehousing” and other uses generally not intended to draw customers from a large area. ITE study defines “high cube” as anything over 200K sq. ft. The proposed project would not be small scale warehousing but high cube warehousing.

4.12 Noise and vibration impacts may not be usually perceptible according to the document, however, neighbors in the area are already experiencing vibration damage from truck traffic on Columbia Ave. We know it happens even if it’s not usual. According to the National Park Service, Vibroacoustic Studies for NPS Resource Impact Assessment, peak vector sums for vibrations of archeological sites is .05 in/sec not the .10 reported in the MND.

4.14 e lists impact to other services as not significant but the need for storm drain would seem to impact public works services.

Transportation and Traffic, 4.16, Table 20 shows already heavily impacted intersections and freeway on/offramps therefore determines the additional impacts from the project are insignificant. In other words it already doesn’t work so it doesn’t matter if we add more. That hardly makes sense. The freeway access currently is at unacceptable levels. How can we justify adding more traffic to unacceptably impacted roadways.

Utilities and service systems 4.17c, storm drain systems are currently not in place at this site or the surrounding area and as previously noted the proposed project does not deal with storm water runoff other than moving from one side of the site to the other and dumping it on city streets.

4.18 b considers if there are cumulative effects that should be considered together and I suggest there are and there are enough cumulative impacts to require an EIR instead of a MND.

This is the wrong project in the wrong place. Just because it's currently compliant with zoning doesn't mean it should be approved. A full Environmental Impact Report is needed. A delay should be imposed to allow the Northside Specific Plan process to proceed. Consideration of the thirty years of neighborhood visioning should be made. Misinformation and inaccurate information should be corrected. The excuse that it's zoned for this and additional impacts are not significant because of existing negative impacts does not justify the MND. More time is needed for full review of submitted reports, studies and supporting documents. Forty five days are not enough for public non-professional citizens to review and respond to an almost 1000 page document, much of which has not been available for review due to incomplete files or inaccessible files, (the discs of documents received were not complete. I don't know why the pdfs seemed to not render after about 100 pages.

Please take the communities comments into your considerations.

Sincerely,
Erin Snyder
1645 Mathews St.
Riverside, CA 92501

From: Derek Trujillo [mailto:derek_trujillo@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, June 26, 2018 7:49 AM
To: Bailey, Rusty <RBailey@riversideca.gov>; Gardner, Mike <MGardner@riversideca.gov>; Melendrez, Andy <ASMelendrez@riversideca.gov>; Soubirous, Mike <msoubirous@riversideca.gov>; Conder, Chuck <CConder@riversideca.gov>; MacArthur, Chris <CMacArthur@riversideca.gov>; Perry, Jim <JPerry@riversideca.gov>; Adams, Steven <SAdams@riversideca.gov>; Nicol, Colleen <CNicol@riversideca.gov>
Subject: [External] PLANNING CASE P14-1033 & P14-1034

Honorable Mayor and Council

Planning Case P14-1033 & P14-1034 Warehouse project is wrong for the Northside's neighborhood, the Trujillo Adobe and will hurt Riverside's social capital. Elected leaders should look at the negative impacts this warehouse can do to this neighborhood and region.

Please support the property rights of the individual residents who call this home and invest in the Northside Specific Plan. Support creating a cultural center around the Trujillo Adobe, without warehouses and truck traffic.

--

Ms Derek Trujillo
derek_trujillo@comcast.net

cc: Mayor
City Council
City Manager
City Attorney
ACMs
Interim C&ED Director

From: Sandra Trujillo-Langdon <Santrujillo@gmail.com>

Date: June 25, 2018 at 8:42:50 PM PDT

To: <rbailey@riversideca.gov>, <mgardner@riversideca.gov>, <asmelendrez@riversideca.gov>, <msoubirous@riversideca.gov>, <cconder@riversideca.gov>, <cmacarthur@riversideca.gov>, <jperry@riversideca.gov>, <sadams@riversideca.gov>, <cnicol@riversideca.gov>

Subject: [External] PLANNING CASE P14-1033 & P14-1034

Honorable Mayor and Council

Planning Case P14-1033 & P14-1034 Warehouse project is wrong for the Northside's neighborhood, the Trujillo Adobe and will hurt Riverside's social capital. Elected leaders should look at the negative impacts this warehouse can do to this neighborhood and region.

Please support the property rights of the individual residents who call this home and invest in the Northside Specific Plan. Support creating a cultural center around the Trujillo Adobe, without warehouses and truck traffic.

--

Ms Sandra Trujillo-Langdon
Santrujillo@gmail.com

cc: Mayor
City Council
City Manager
City Attorney
ACMs
Interim C&ED Director

From: Mary VALENZUELA [mailto:Mvarela864@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 26, 2018 7:27 AM
To: Bailey, Rusty <RBailey@riversideca.gov>; Gardner, Mike <MGardner@riversideca.gov>; Melendrez, Andy <ASMelendrez@riversideca.gov>; Soubirous, Mike <msoubirous@riversideca.gov>; Conder, Chuck <CConder@riversideca.gov>; MacArthur, Chris <CMacArthur@riversideca.gov>; Perry, Jim <JPerry@riversideca.gov>; Adams, Steven <SAdams@riversideca.gov>; Nicol, Colleen <CNicol@riversideca.gov>
Subject: [External] PLANNING CASE P14-1033 & P14-1034

Honorable Mayor and Council

Planning Case P14-1033 & P14-1034 Warehouse project is wrong for the Northside's neighborhood, the Trujillo Adobe and will hurt Riverside's social capital. Elected leaders should look at the negative impacts this warehouse can do to this neighborhood and region.

Please support the property rights of the individual residents who call this home and invest in the Northside Specific Plan. Support creating a cultural center around the Trujillo Adobe, without warehouses and truck traffic.

--

Ms Mary VALENZUELA
Mvarela864@hotmail.com

cc: Mayor
City Council
City Manager
City Attorney
ACMs
Interim CE&D Director

From: Frances J Vasquez [mailto:francesjvasquez@gmail.com]

Sent: Sunday, June 24, 2018 6:57 AM

To: Bailey, Rusty <RBailey@riversideca.gov>; Gardner, Mike <MGardner@riversideca.gov>; Melendrez, Andy <ASMelendrez@riversideca.gov>; Soubirous, Mike <msoubirous@riversideca.gov>; Conder, Chuck <CConder@riversideca.gov>; MacArthur, Chris <CMacArthur@riversideca.gov>; Perry, Jim <JPerry@riversideca.gov>; Adams, Steven <SAdams@riversideca.gov>; Nicol, Colleen <CNicol@riversideca.gov>
Subject: [External] PLANNING CASE P14-1033 & P14-1034

Honorable Mayor and Council

Planning Case P14-1033 & P14-1034 Warehouse project is wrong for the Northside's neighborhood, the Trujillo Adobe and will hurt Riverside's social capital. Elected leaders should look at the negative impacts this warehouse can do to this neighborhood and region.

Please support the property rights of the individual residents who call this home and invest in the Northside Specific Plan. Support creating a cultural center around the Trujillo Adobe, without warehouses and truck traffic.

--

Ms Frances J Vasquez
francesjvasquez@gmail.com

cc: Mayor
City Council
City Manager
City Attorney
ACMs
Interim CE&D Director

----- Forwarded message -----

From: "**Ed Von Nordeck**" <vonnordeck-ed@sbcglobal.net>

Date: Sun, Mar 11, 2018 at 3:38 AM -0700

Subject: [External] Northside Warehouses

To: "Gardner, Mike" <MGardner@riversideca.gov>

Seems a bad deal for Riverside all around. I just do not see Warehouses being of value for its employment numbers and I wonder if it has an advantage for the tax base. Seems other use would offer better tax value for the long term.

Do not need the trucks on Center or Main Street !

Ed Von Nordeck
P O Box 2768
Riverside CA 92516-2768

Chris MacArthur, Chairman
Riverside City Council, Land Use Committee
City of Riverside
3900 Main Street
Riverside, California 92502

Re: Planning Cases P14-1033 and P14-1034 to build a 308,000 sq. ft. warehouse on Center Street in the Northside Neighborhood

Dear Land Use Committee,

The Land Use Committee and the Riverside City Council should oppose the proposed Center Street Commerce Center Project and overturn the Planning Commission's project approval for the following reasons:

- The project would violate the Riverside 2025 General Plan provisions LU-72 (providing for steady change and improvement on the Northside to an upgraded model community) and LU-74 (to preserve and promote the lower density charm of the Northside Community). A giant warehouse is not in the best interests of a revitalized Northside.
- Although the landowners do have the right to develop their land, this does not mean they can do so to the detriment of the surrounding community. With proper mitigation, the proposed project could just as easily be a toxic waste dump. A warehouse has only slightly less onerous consequences.
- The Mitigated Negative Declaration supporting this project has many internal inconsistencies, errors of fact, and glaring omissions that cast doubt on the accuracy and the veracity of the report as a whole. For instance, the proposed project site is in the 100-year floodplain of the Santa Ana River, the proposed project is within 100 feet of existing water supply wells (both Garner 'B' Well and Garner 'D' well), and the MND's own map shows the area to be in a zone of moderate to high liquefaction potential in the event of a seismic disturbance (all too common here in southern California).
- The MND report mentions several subsequent compliance plans that will be generated as part of this project (a Stormwater Runoff Management Plan, a Noise Mitigation Plan, and a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan). In large part, the MND is based on the performance of these yet unformulated plans. However, these compliance plans should be included as part of the report in order to justify a determination of a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

- Appendix 3 in the updated CEQA document, purporting to show critical Soils Information (including infiltration rates), is still blank. This renders the mandatory Water Quality Management Plan null and void.
- Some of the data presented in the MND report are actual measurements, but some are derived from model outputs. In both cases, there is no way to independently verify the accuracy and/or authenticity of these values. If models are used, there is no way to know if input parameters truly reflect the onsite conditions or if the model outputs are reasonable. The sources and assumptions surrounding all of these values should be stated explicitly so decision makers will know that the numbers were not just fabricated.
- All of the issues surrounding the MND (some of them fatal) argue powerfully that a full-blown Environmental Impact Report should be required for this proposed project.

Meanwhile, the Northside Specific Plan is on the horizon. Considering these foregoing points, a decision on this proposed project should be postponed until the impending Northside Specific Plan is finalized. It makes much more sense to develop the Northside Neighborhood in accordance with a Specific Plan with community engagement than piecemeal on a project-by-project basis.

Thank you.

Peter M. Wohlgemuth
686 Forest Park Drive
Riverside, CA 92501

cc: Mayor
City Council
City Manager
City Attorney
ACMs
Interim C&ED Director

From: Robert Workman [mailto:rworkman1@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, June 26, 2018 10:48 AM

To: Bailey, Rusty <RBailey@riversideca.gov>; Gardner, Mike <MGardner@riversideca.gov>; Melendrez, Andy <ASMelendrez@riversideca.gov>; Soubirous, Mike <msoubirous@riversideca.gov>; Conder, Chuck <CConder@riversideca.gov>; MacArthur, Chris <CMacArthur@riversideca.gov>; Perry, Jim <JPerry@riversideca.gov>; Adams, Steven <SAdams@riversideca.gov>; Nicol, Colleen <CNicol@riversideca.gov>

Subject: [External] PLANNING CASE P14-1033 & P14-1034

Honorable Mayor and Council

Planning Case P14-1033 & P14-1034 Warehouse project is wrong for the Northside's neighborhood, the Trujillo Adobe and will hurt Riverside's social capital. Elected leaders should look at the negative impacts this warehouse can do to this neighborhood and region.

Please support the property rights of the individual residents who call this home and invest in the Northside Specific Plan. Support creating a cultural center around the Trujillo Adobe, without warehouses and truck traffic.

--

Mr Robert Workman
rworkman1@gmail.com

cc: Mayor
City Council
City Manager
City Attorney
ACMs
Interim C&ED Director



T 510.836.4200
F 510.836.4205

410 12th Street, Suite 250
Oakland, Ca 94607

www.lozeaudrury.com
richard@lozeaudrury.com

March 6, 2018

VIA E-MAIL and US MAIL

Mike Gardner (mgardner@riversideca.gov)
Andy Melendrez (asmelendrez@riversideca.gov)
Mike Soubirous (msoubirous@riversideca.gov)
Chuck Conder (cconder@riversideca.gov)
Chris MacArthur (cmacarthur@riversideca.gov)
Jim Perry (jperry@riversideca.gov)
Steve Adams (SAdams@RiversideCA.gov)
Riverside City Council
3900 Main St.
Riverside, CA 92501

Re: Notice of Support for Center Street Project ("Project")

Honorable City Councilmembers:

Laborers International Union of North America, Local Union No. 1184 ("LIUNA") has voiced concerns on the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the Center Street Project ("Project"), proposed by Transition Properties, L.P. ("Transition").

LIUNA is pleased to announce that they have reached an agreement with Transition to resolve LIUNA's concerns. Pursuant to our agreement, Transition has agreed to implement measures to protect the environment.

In consideration of these measures, LIUNA is pleased to support the Project. LIUNA believes that the construction and operation of the Project will benefit the City. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Richard Drury", is written over a light blue horizontal line.

Richard Drury
Counsel for LIUNA Local 1184

From: Karen Renfro <k.a.renfro7@gmail.com>
Date: February 20, 2018 at 2:01:44 PM PST
To: "Guzman, Rafael" <RGuzman@riversideca.gov>, "Brenes, Patricia" <pbrenes@riversideca.gov>, "Norton, Brian" <bnorton@riversideca.gov>, "Assadzadeh, Candice" <CAssadzadeh@riversideca.gov>
Cc: "Bailey, Rusty" <rbailey@riversideca.gov>, "Gardner, Mike" <mgardner@riversideca.gov>, "Melendrez, Andy" <asmelendrez@riversideca.gov>, "Soubirous, Mike" <msoubirous@riversideca.gov>, "Conder, Chuck" <cconder@riversideca.gov>, "MacArthur, Chris" <cmacarthur@riversideca.gov>, "Perry, Jim" <jperry@riversideca.gov>, <sadams@riversideca.gov>, "Russo, John A." <jrusso@riversideca.gov>, "Marysheva, Marianna" <MMarysheva@riversideca.gov>, "Zelinka, Al" <azelinka@riversideca.gov>, "Nguyen, Alexander" <anguyen@riversideca.gov>, <gguess@riversideca.gov>, "Nicol, Colleen" <cnicol@riversideca.gov>, <araymond@riversideca.gov>, "Enriquez, Edward" <EEenriquez@riversideca.gov>, Chief Diaz <sdiaz@riversideca.gov>, <mmoore@riversideca.gov>, "Martinez, Kris" <kmartinez@riversideca.gov>, "Cruz, Adolfo" <adcruz@riversideca.gov>, <tkennon@riversideca.gov>, <rpeterson@riversideca.gov>, <tjorgenson@riversideca.gov>, "FERENCE, Cathy" <cference@riversideca.gov>, "Christopoulos, Chris" <CChristopoulos@riversideca.gov>, "Merk, Gary" <gmerk@riversideca.gov>, Erin Gettis <egettis@riversideca.gov>, <citycounciloffice@ci.colton.ca.us>, <NorthsideIA@yahoogroups.com>, <RiversideTamaleFestival@gmail.com>, <osta.aguamansa@gmail.com>, OSTA SoCal <ostasocal@gmail.com>, Leonard Trujillo <lennytrujillo51@aol.com>, <mtrubidoux@aol.com>, Hanni Bennett <hannibee2015@gmail.com>, Pat Stewart <patsiann@pacbell.net>, "Riverside Neighborhood Partnership (RNP)" <1rnpinfo@gmail.com>, Riverside Woman's Club <rwomansclub@gmail.com>, Steve <riversidehistoricalsociety@gmail.com>, <crlesh@heritageedu.com>, "Susan Shelley" <Susan@susanshelley.com>, Mark Acosta <macosta@scng.com>, Ryan Hagen <rhagen@scng.com>, City News <news@citynewsgroup.com>, Ardie Barnett <highgrovenews@roadrunner.com>, Springbrook Heritage Alliance <info@springbrookheritagealliance.org>, <hssc@thehssc.org>
Subject: [External] DEVELOPMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING FEB. 21, 2018 -- PLANNING CASE P14-1033 & P14-1034: CENTER STREET COMMERCE CENTER PROJECT

CC: Developmental Review Committee Members

Northside Improvement Association Spanish Town Heritage Foundation

Springbrook Heritage Alliance

February 20, 2018

Rafael Guzman, Chairman
Developmental Review Committee
Community and Economic Development Department
City of Riverside
3900 Main Street
Riverside, California 92522

CENTER STREET COMMERCE CENTER PROJECT
Planning Case P14-1033 (DR) & P14-1034 (LLA)

Dear Mr. Chairman and Members of the Developmental Review Committee:

We have reviewed the material related to this case, including the corrected Initial Study and Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration dated November 2017. We find it necessary to bring a number of matters to your attention. A detailed list is outlined below.

Although many errors and omissions discovered during the public comment period for the August 2016 version of this document appear to have been addressed, there remain others that need to be resolved before your committee considers this case.

Most importantly, as the timing of the application coincides with the Northside Specific Plan process, it makes no sense for the City to discuss the 308,000 sq.-ft. warehouse proposed for an undeveloped area in a predominantly rural single-family residential neighborhood while at the same time spending several million dollars on a Specific Plan intended to protect that same neighborhood.

We ask that you reject the application altogether, or postpone it until after the NSP has been finalized. Our reasons include but are not limited to the following:

1. Many valid comments submitted by the public during the CEQA review period were summarily dismissed by the developer as "not applicable" without any supportive documentation. This makes a mockery of the law and calls into question to legitimacy of the City's approval process;
2. A warehouse so large it requires parcel consolidation to grant a permit in the middle of otherwise undeveloped land that could be allocated for higher value is not an appropriate use. Most certainly a warehouse in that location would limit the potential of a Specific Plan to achieve any of the goals of the General Plan guidelines or the desires of the primary stakeholders--the Northside

residents themselves. These plans are intended to support the neighborhood, not turn it into an industrial jungle;

3. The project violates Provision LU-72 of Riverside's 2025 General Plan guidelines for the Northside which calls for steady change and improvement to an upgraded model community. The current Industrial-BMP zoning was adopted by the City and County Redevelopment Agencies in 1990 against the wishes of the people of the Northside. To assure Northsiders that their neighborhood would be protected from incompatible development, the two jurisdictions worked with them on the Northside Community Plan of 1991 which guided land use policy there until the new General Plan Guidelines for the Northside were adopted a decade ago. This provision, and the one following, were based on the neighborhood community plan;
4. The project violates Provision LU-75 of the same General Plan guidelines which calls for promotion and preservation of the lower-density charm of the Northside neighborhood. If the project is adopted, the NSP will conflict with the wishes of Northside residents. The final document will be a waste of time, money and effort on the part of many people who are acting in good faith;
5. For the Hydrologic and Hydraulic components to assess onsite and offsite flows, the Mitigated Negative Declaration bases its conclusions on the results of compliance plans that have not yet been conducted (including a Water Quality Management Plan and a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan). We think it makes little sense to consider approving a project if subsequent compliance plans cannot be met;
6. The MND is based largely on these yet unformulated plans. No proper evaluation can take place until these studies are completed;
7. Appendix 3 in the corrected CEQA, which purports to show critical Soils information, is still blank. This oversight calls into question the validity of the entire document and sets a bad precedent for the City's land use policy administration.

We believe that under the circumstances approval of this project before the above issues are resolved would leave the City open to legal challenges that could easily be avoided.

It goes without saying that this application is of great concern to us because the neighborhood in question is Riverside's oldest, with a rare legacy that deserves to be protected and nurtured for the benefit of our own generation and the generations of Riversiders to come. Once lost, that heritage will be gone forever.

Thank you for considering our request.

Respectfully,

Pete Wohlgenuth, President
Northside Improvement Association

701 North Orange Street
Riverside, California 92501
(951)961-7511
NorthsideYahooGroup@yahoo.com

Nancy Melendez, President
Spanish Town Heritage Foundation
3643 University Avenue
Riverside, California 92501
(951)235-3586
nancy.melendez@icloud.com

Karen Renfro, Chairman
Springbrook Heritage Alliance
P.O. Box 745
Riverside, California 92502
(951)787-0617
info@springbrookheritagealliance.org
<https://www.facebook.com/springbrookheritagealliance>

CC:

Office of the Mayor
Riverside City Council
Office of the City Manager
City Attorney
City Clerk
Finance Department
Chief of Police
Fire Chief
Public Works Department
Park, Recreation and Community Services Department
Library
Museum
Riverside Public Utilities Department
Community and Economic Development Department
City of Colton
Northside Improvement Association
Spanish Town Heritage Foundation
Springbrook Heritage Alliance
Old Spanish Trail Association - Agua Mansa Chapter
Old Spanish Trail Association - Southern California
Trujillo Family Association
Friends of Mt. Rubidoux
Friends of Blue Mountain
Friends of Fairmount Park
Riverside Neighborhood Partnership

Riverside Woman's Club
Riverside Historical Society
Colton Historical Society
Historical Society of Southern California
AIA - Riverside Chapter
Press Enterprise
City News Group
Highgrove Happenings




Virus-free. www.avg.com

Map of SPRINGBROOK ARROYO & ENVIRONS · 2015

Riverside, California

APPROX. SCALES
 0 1/4 1/2

to Belltown
 Church of San Salvador



MAP NOT FOR SALE
 Map by Karen Renfro
 Copyright © 2009, 2014, 2015, 2016
 Published as a public service
 by PASS IT ON!
 *NOT A GOVERNMENT PUBLICATION

LAW OFFICE OF
CHRISTOPHER SUTTON
586 LA LOMA ROAD
PASADENA, CALIFORNIA 91105-2443
TELEPHONE (626) 683-2500 · FACSIMILE (626) 405-9843
email: christophersutton.law@gmail.com

Wednesday, June 27, 2018
(Sent by email and U.S. Mail)

Councilman Chris Mac Arthur, Chairman
Land Use Committee
City of Riverside
3900 Main Street,
Riverside, California 92522

emailed to:	Senior Planner Brian Norton:	bnorton@riversideca.gov
	City Clerk Colleen Nicol:	cnicol@riversideca.gov
	Councilman Chris Mac Arthur:	cmacarthur@riversideca.gov
	Councilman Mike Soubirous:	msoubirous@riversideca.gov
	Councilman Mike Gardner:	mgardner@riversideca.gov

**Re: Violation of California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”)
Public Resources Code §§ 21000 et seq.;
Violation of California CEQA Guidelines, Title 14 C.C.R. §§ 15000 et seq.;
Planning Cases P14-1033 & P14-1034/Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration
308,000 square foot (7.07 acres) three-story proposed Mega-Warehouse
Public Meeting set for July 9, 2018, at City Council Land Use Committee**

Dear Members of the Land use Committee:

The California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) and the California CEQA Guidelines, Title 14 California Code of Regulations sections 15000 et seq. require that projects subject to public agency decisions adequately and honestly include a **project description** that includes all reasonably expected potential environmental and human health impacts before it can be decided whether or not an Environmental Impact Report (“EIR”) should be prepared prior to the public agency consideration of the project.

In *McQueen v. Board of Directors of the Mid-Peninsula Regional Open Space District* (1988) 202 Cal.App.3d 1136, 1144-1147, the Court found a project description violated CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines by engaging in a “fallacy of division” by too narrowly defining the project and omitting some of the project’s potential impacts. It cited CEQA Guidelines section 15004.

In addition, CEQA Guidelines Section 15004(c) requires:

“The environmental document preparation and review should be coordinated in a timely fashion with the existing planning, review, and project approval processes being used by each public agency. These procedures, to the maximum extent feasible, are to run concurrently, not consecutively.”

The now-pending Northside Specific Plan and its now-pending EIR are being improperly disregarded in violation of CEQA Guideline 15004(c). This project could prevent the Northside Specific Plan from being implemented and undermine the land use goals in that Plan.

The proposed project before the Land Use Committee is a massive warehouse of 308,000 square feet of enclosed space - - - over seven acres of the enclosed area - - - and three stories in height. The project description illegally omits the thousands of diesel truck trips that will be required to deliver and retrieve goods from this mega-warehouse during its operation over many decades. This is an illegal disregard of the reasonably foreseeable potential environmental impacts of this massive warehouse. A full environmental impact is required.

CEQA Guidelines section 15378 defines a "project" as follows:

(a) "Project" means the whole of an action, which has a potential for resulting in either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment, and that is any of the following:

(1) An activity directly undertaken by any public agency including but not limited to public works construction and related activities clearing or grading of land, improvements to existing public structures, enactment and amendment of zoning ordinances, and the adoption and amendment of local General Plans or elements thereof pursuant to Government Code Sections 65100-65700.

(2) An activity undertaken by a person which is supported in whole or in part through public agency contracts, grants, subsidies, loans, or other forms of assistance from one or more public agencies.

(3) An activity involving the issuance to a person of a lease, permit, license, certificate, or other entitlement for use by one or more public agencies.

(b) Project does not include:

(1) Proposals for legislation to be enacted by the State Legislature;

(2) Continuing administrative or maintenance activities, such as purchases for supplies, personnel-related actions, general policy and procedure making (except as they are applied to specific instances covered above);

(3) The submittal of proposals to a vote of the people of the state or of a particular community that does not involve a public agency sponsored initiative. (Steinv.City of Santa Monica, (1980) 110 Cal. App. 3d 458;Friends of Sierra Madre v. City of Sierra Madre(2001) 25 Cal.4th 165);

- (4) The creation of government funding mechanisms or other government fiscal activities, which do not involve any commitment to any specific project which may result in a potentially significant physical impact on the environment.
- (5) Organizational or administrative activities of governments that will not result in direct or indirect physical changes in the environment.
- (c) The term "project" refers to the activity which is being approved and which may be subject to several discretionary approvals by governmental agencies. The term "project" does not mean each separate governmental approval.
- (d) Where the lead agency could describe the project as either the adoption of a particular regulation under subdivision (a)(1) or as a development proposal which will be subject to several governmental approvals under subdivisions (a)(2) or (a)(3), the lead agency shall describe the project as the development proposal for the purpose of environmental analysis. This approach will implement the lead agency principle as described in Article 4.

Thus, the Project Description in the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration for this mega-warehouse project violates the CEQA Guidelines and CEQA. A full and honest Project Description would include an estimate of the long-term impacts of thousands of continuous diesel truck trips to and from this massive warehouse. Such a description would lead to the unavoidable conclusion that a full EIR is required before the City Council can consider this project approval. As such, the Land Use Committee must recommend to the full City Council that this project be remanded to the Planning Commission and City Staff and that the proponents of this project must prepare a full EIR before any decision-making body of the City of Riverside may consider this project.

Sincerely,



Christopher Sutton
Attorney for Karen Renfro
and Springbrook Heritage Alliance

cc: City Clerk, City of Riverside

June 27, 2018

Councilmember Chris MacArthur, Chair
City Council Land Use Committee
City of Riverside
3900 Main Street
Riverside, CA 92522

Dear Council Member MacArthur and members of the Council Land Use Committee,

I am writing to oppose the Center Street Warehouse, which comes before the Land Use Committee on July 9th.

In addition to the fact that this warehouse is inconsistent with the proposed Northside Specific Plan, I oppose the warehouse because of environmental concerns.

The planned warehouse neighbors a soccer field where children play. It would violate the suggested 1,000-foot buffer between warehouses and playgrounds, causing increased health risks to the surrounding area.


You don't have to tell mothers like me about the pollution caused by a warehouse and the resulting traffic; these are statistics that our kids live and breathe. Indeed, air pollution causes 9,200 premature deaths in California each year.

In the last two weeks alone, Riverside has been on "orange" alert from the SCAQMD for a total of 10 days. This means that our air is "Unhealthy for Sensitive Groups," like my own baby.

Riverside's Northside is rich in history and full of families—many of whom have lived in Riverside for generations. If we build warehouses in this neighborhood, the air quality—which is already an issue—will just get worse.

As you consider the Center Street Warehouse next month, I respectfully ask you to vote against it.

Sincerely



Erin E. Edwards
Ward 1 Resident, First and Lime
ee.edwards12@gmail.com